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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence family members have on the decisions associated with convention travel to Las Vegas. The study investigated several sub-issues such as decision making topologies in family convention participation, the major motives for a family's convention travel, spousal perception of decision making roles, contributing factors to family members' decision roles, consistency between perceived and realized decision making roles, and the degree of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with convention travel taken as a family.

For this study, data was collected from 146 family participants in the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB)'s convention in Las Vegas. Data was collected during April, 1992.

The results of this study show that family members influenced the decisions linked to convention travel to Las Vegas. As a secondary result of this study, family decision making in convention participation appeared to be slightly husband-dominant even though spouses perceived spousal equality in decision making roles. Among the studied variables, the two major motives for family convention travel were convention participation itself and spouses' desire to accompany the participant on the trip. The respondents reported they best perceived their spouses' preferences and desire to accompany them on the trip. Gender and household income appeared to be the strongest factors impacting the relative contribution of family members in convention travel decision making. Families were generally satisfied with their convention travel to Las Vegas. The strongest contribution to this satisfaction was made by the convention
attended itself rather than the other factors associated with Las Vegas' tourist attractions.

This study brought several findings mentioned above which could help better understand the family's decision making dynamics in convention travel. The results may have meaningful implications in meeting planning and convention sales marketing.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the United States the conventions and meetings market has been growing at an increasing rate (Abbey, 1987), becoming an important source of income in the hospitality industry. The 1981 meetings market study (Meetings and Conventions, 1981) showed a total of 842,900 meetings were held with total expenditures of $17 billion. In 1985, both the number of meetings and expenditure at meetings increased to 903,740 meetings and more than $31 billion in expenditure (Zia, 1990). McNabb/DeSoto, a Houston-based research group for the travel, hotel and resort, and packaged goods industries, estimated that planner's organizations spent between $56 billion and $73 billion to produce meetings in 1989 (Successful Meetings, 1990). More recent data (Successful Meetings, 1992) show that conventions generated a revenue of $68 billion in 1991.

There also has been a substantial increase in the number of attendees to meetings and conventions. While precise figures are difficult to pinpoint, an estimated 60 million people attended meetings and conventions between 1976 and 1986 (Teye and Dieffenderfer, 1988; Rutherford and Kreck, 1992). Shih (1986) reported about 9 million people attended conferences and conventions each year (Rutherford and Kreck, 1992). Meanwhile, the U.S. Travel Data Center (USTDC) in 1989 predicted that, in 1990, 22.5 million business travelers would travel to business meetings, with 14 millions of that total presumed to travel for the sole purpose of attending a meeting (Successful Meetings, 1990).

* This thesis follows the style of Advances in Consumer Research.
This growing meetings market contributes to the economy of the host city in many ways. Traditionally, it has been perceived as a major income spent by the convention attendee constitute a substantial contribution to local tax income, and the income of local foodservice operators and transportation firms. Another benefit is that conventions and meetings create additional jobs to maintain the host facilities as well as service the attendee. This is especially the case in a city that depends heavily on hospitality activities.

For example, meetings and conventions play a big role in Las Vegas' economy (Successful Meetings, 1991). According to the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority's (LVCVA) report (1990), in 1990 the city hosted 1,011 conventions and meetings attended by 1.75 million people that generated revenues of $1.4 billion. These figures are the result of a dramatic growth in the Las Vegas convention industry during the last ten years. In comparison, 515 conventions were held generating $324 million to the city in 1981. This growth in revenue was caused primarily by an 142 percent increase in attendance from 719,988 people in 1981 to 1,742,194 people in 1990.

Then what has been the momentum for this high-growth industry in Las Vegas? Above all, the city's capacity to accommodate large numbers of visitors seems to have played the leading role in fostering this lucrative business. Many studies (Renaghan and Kay, 1986; Successful Meetings, 1990; Fortin and Ritchie, 1976; Smith, 1985; Martin, 1990; Bloom, 1981) have shown that availability of hotel rooms is one of the primary concerns of meeting planners when they select a meeting site. Similarly, "more than 50 percent of rooms at the Las Vegas Hilton are normally reserved by conventioneer groups," said Bryant Godfrey, Reservations Manager at the hotel. Seen from these aspects, meetings and conventions deserve attention from hotel operators in
the city.

A. Problem Recognition

Recently, data (The LVCVA, 1990) show the average visitor party size in Las Vegas is 2.5 persons. This is a partial indicator of the importance of family travelers in Las Vegas. In response to this tourism behavior, hotels in the city strive to capture family groups. Such marketing effort is well reflected on several conspicuous family-oriented services and facilities within hotels, like theme parks, video arcades, safer security, special package rate, on-property child care, bowling center, advertising, etc. (Hotel/Motel Security and Safety Management, 1989)

As vacationing families continue to be an important market segment (Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980), the family market also draws attention from convention marketers. In its annual survey of 5,000 frequent travelers, Lodging Hospitality (1992) shows that more than nine out of ten respondents plan to take a family vacation in the summer of 1992. According to Sain, the former President of the LVCVA, more people are attending Las Vegas conventions with their spouses. Family-accompanied convention participation like this may imply that not all conventions are necessarily attended for the groups' business or professional purpose exclusively (Rutherford and Kreck, 1992). Sometimes they become an excuse to take a vacation, with some attendees using the occasion to bring their families (Wiswell, 1986; Rutherford and Kreck, 1992). In the 1992 Convention/Expo Summit III, Rutherford and Kreck presented data indicating that 58.9 percent of convention attendees spent money on tourism activities while they were attending conventions.
From this point of view, family members are thought to play an important part in making decisions on not only leisure activities while they attended conventions but also convention participation itself.

Many studies have been conducted to explain a family's decision making process. Most of them approached this subject from the standpoint of consumers' purchase behavior and social psychology. Some researchers (Michie and Sullivan, 1990; Darley and Lim, 1986; Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Nichols and Snepenger, 1988; Jenkins, 1978; Cosenza and Davis, 1981; Ritchie and Filatrault, 1980; Plog, 1972; Van Raaij and Franken, 1984; Myers and Moncrief, 1978) focused on family's decision making with regard to vacation and leisure activities.

Unfortunately, however, family involvement in convention participation decisions have not been thoroughly explored (Rutherford and Kreck, 1992). Although Abbey(1987), Rogers(1988), and Wiswell(1986) expressed insights into this area, many questions regarding family convention participation still remain unanswered.

B. Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to examine the influence each family member has on the decision of whether or not to take convention trip as a family and other-subdecisions combined with the convention travel to Las Vegas. In relation to this, the taxonomy of decision making in family convention participation will be examined. This study also investigates the outcome (degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction) of family convention travel to Las Vegas and the factors that impact the family's travel satisfaction. The
present study further discusses several additional aspects of family decision making related to convention participation. Specifically, following are the four sub-issues this study addresses.

1) What were the major motives for a family to take convention trip to Las Vegas?

2) How did convention attendees perceive the role of their spouses in terms of decision making?

3) What factors contributed to family members' decision roles?

4) Was the spousal perception of equality in decision making realized in actual decision making situations?

Finally, the results of this study will be incorporated into a comprehensive scheme to propose a model that may apply to explaining satisfaction and dissatisfaction of convention travel taken by a family.

C. Delimitations

This study is a replication and extension of the past research on family decision making. Since it is a relatively new context to study family decision making on convention participation, and since firmly established theoretical constructs are not found in this scope, the present study follows methodologies generally accepted by family researchers. Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980) justify a replication and extension study for two reasons. First, there is need to replicate what appear to be valuable or innovative studies in an effort to measure both the reliability and validity of the initial findings. Second, there is a research need to develop a tradition whereby previous work is used as the basis for new research so as to add to our
knowledge of a phenomenon in a systematic and cumulative fashion.

This study employed a self-administered questionnaire survey method. The survey was conducted at a convention by several trained interviewers and the sample was those attendees who brought their spouses, if not all family members, to Las Vegas while they attended the convention. These situational conditions require a survey which allows quick responses without distracting the convention as well as the respondents. Many empirical studies (Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Foxman et al., 1989; Foster and Olshavsky, 1989; Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Belch et al., 1985; Szybillo and Sosanie, 1977; Nelson, 1978; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986; Jenkins, 1979; Darley and Lim, 1986) have shown preference for the self-reported questionnaire survey in the study of family decision making.

The survey used in this study was administered to a sample of those who were accompanied by their spouses (and possibly their children) in their convention travel. Because this study is about family decision making, it is desirable to include all the respondent's children, if any, as well as the spouse. The timing of the survey, however, was not in the period in which school age children take a vacation. This fact gives a strong possibility that the respondents did not bring his or her schooling children. Therefore, this study was forced to focus on convention travelers in couples. However, the questionnaire was designed so that the respondents could optionally include their children when they filled it out.

As a target convention for the survey, an association convention was selected. A review of convention schedules in Las Vegas during the past few years confirms that the city has typically hosted large association conventions and expositions rather than corporate meetings. Thus, choosing an
association convention may contribute to the generalizability of the survey results in terms of Las Vegas conventions.

The geographical setting is the city of Las Vegas. In reality, it is impossible to conduct a survey over all conventions nationwide, not to mention all convention attendees. Therefore, a single city, Las Vegas, was selected as the survey’s geographical location. The primary reasons to choose the city of Las Vegas are that the city facilitates the administration of the survey and, at the same time, that it is one of the most active convention cities. In the United States, it ranked sixth for the volume of convention attendees and the third for exhibit and meeting space among convention cities (Welling, 1990). This implies that Las Vegas can be a good example of a convention city.

D. Significance of the Study

This study will help us better understand the dynamics of family decision making. In addition, several major applied outcomes are expected.

1) The results of the study can be applied in developing strategies for planning a successful convention. By understanding family decision making factors, convention planners may achieve a large attendance which serves a fruitful convention.

2) Hotel operators can benefit from this study. A better understanding of variables that impact on family travel decisions will enable them to advance their family-oriented hotel sales marketing.

3) The study may assist future researches in this field in understanding family convention travelers and the influencing factors of convention participation.
4) The findings of the study may contribute to city-level tourism marketing. "Understanding the decision making process for vacationers and travelers is vital to city and state governments as they pour millions of dollars annually into promotion of travel of tourism" (Jenkins, 1978).

E. Definition of Terms

1) **Convention(s):** The term "Convention(s)" in this study is defined as "meetings or gatherings of delegates, representatives, organizational members, and general people for the purpose of exchanging knowledge and information with and between the attendee" (The Convention Liaison Council, 1986; Gartrell, 1988). In the present study this term embraces all types of meetings, conventions, conferences, and trade shows. This comprehensive definition is based on the industry's use of the term. Most hotels in Las Vegas utilize the term "convention(s)" to mean and deal with all types of meetings as mentioned above (for example, the term as in "Convention Services Manager"). While the term "convention(s)" is used most frequently throughout the study, the term, "meeting(s)" or "meetings and conventions," has been used alternatively to mean basically the same thing.

2) **The family:** The term "family" is used in a wide variety of ways (Engel et al., 1973). For the purpose of this study, "The family" is defined as "married and/or unmarried couples traveling with or without children." The term, however, excludes any siblings and other relatives.

3) **Spouse:** Considering that many couples live together without being married legally, the term "spouse" in this study encompasses all people living
together in couple as a husband and wife, no matter what their legal marital status is. Such a definition concentrates on spousal functions rather than its law-binding structure as a condition of spouses, that is, a husband and wife. In fact, a cohabitating spouse is believed to influence his or her spouse's decisions in the same way a lawfully married husband or wife does.

4) Children: The term "child or children" is also defined functionally so as to include all children living with the couple and coming from both the dyad's present or one spouse's previous marital status.

These expanded interpretations of the terms "spouse" and "children" emanate from emphasizing the affect that exists between the family members. In this regard, Park et al. (1991) suggest "... a need to recognize the salience of love, affection, and intimacy as important sources ... that influence joint decisions in families."

F. Organization of the Study

The whole context of this study centers on probing family interaction, especially between spouses, in decision making for convention participation in Las Vegas. In Chapter I, the study's problem, purposes, and delimitations were stated with a brief analysis into trends in the convention industry in both general and Las Vegas. Included in Chapter I are also statements regarding the study's significance followed by the definitions of terms used for the purpose of this study. However, the present study did not establish hypotheses because it was conducted as an exploratory study, replicating and extending past family research. Chapter II is dedicated to reviewing and investigating the literature related to family decision making. A detailed
explanation about the survey methodology will be furnished in the third chapter and Chapter IV features the survey results. Finally, the fifth chapter is reserved for a discussion and interpretation of the results and will conclude with suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A. INTRODUCTION

During the last 30 years, the family rather than the individual has been increasingly recognized as the basic unit of analysis by consumer researchers (Spiro, 1983; Grashof and Dixon, 1980; Davis, 1976; Granbois, 1971). This point of view sees the family as a unit for decision making, purchase, and consumption. Despite both the importance of this area and the significant research advances of recent years, the topic of family consumer behavior remains one of the most under-researched areas in all consumer behavior (Moore-Shay, 1988). Wilkie (1986) and Moore-Shay and Wilkie (1988) identify six characteristics that help to explain why this is the case.

1) Family decisions are made within a private, intimate social group.
   This group setting causes researchers difficulty observing the decision process without biasing it.

2) Families make and spend money continuously. This makes it difficult to capture all the consumption decisions even for a single family.

3) Family consumption decisions are not independent. Therefore family decision making may not be explained by observing some specific product purchase decisions.

4) Families have multiple decision makers. It is important to understand individual decisions and their integration into joint decisions.

5) Family decisions differ by the type of product or service.

6) Families differ significantly from each other.
Like group decision making, the phenomenon of family decision making (hereafter referred to as FDM) is very complicated and difficult to explain because several individuals interact with each other to reach a decision. This complexity and difficulty has drawn research attention from many different, but related, areas (Belch et al., 1985) such as marketing (e.g., Davis, 1970, 1971; Woodside, 1972; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Hempel, 1975), sociology and social psychology (e.g., Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Kenkel, 1963; Centers et al., 1971), and economics (Becker, 1976). These interdisciplinary research efforts have resulted in more systematized approaches to the topic and refined research methods in the field.

When it comes to the research focus, various aspects of FDM have been explored. Examples are children-included FDM (e.g., Cosenza and Davis, 1981; Belch et al., 1985; Foxman et al., 1989; Belch, Belch, and Ceresino, 1985), husband and wife interaction only (e.g., Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Darley and Lim, 1986; Nelson, 1978; Munsinger et al., 1975; Burns and granbois, 1977; Shaninger et al., 1982; Spiro, 1983), conflict and its resolution in FDM (e.g., Seymour and Lessne, 1984; Nelson, 1988; Qualls, 1988), etc. Still, studies on the topic are frequently conducted to not only advance theoretical and methodological validity, but also keep abreast with the changes in the FDM mode which are caused by constantly changing socio-economic, socio-cultural, and socio-demographic conditions.

This chapter reviews the FDM literature and summarizes widely accepted theoretical underpinnings and research findings. For the purpose of this study, a special discussion will be addressed to FDM in the vacation market. In addition, a methodological review of the existing studies will be furnished.
B. FAMILY DECISION MAKING

1. Taxonomy

A FDM taxonomy adopted by many researchers (Davis, 1976; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Green and Cunningham, 1975; Munsinger et al., 1975; Sheth and Cosmas, 1975; Woodside, 1975) is based on the model developed by Herbst in 1952 (Foster and Olshavsky, 1989; Burns and Granbois, 1980). Herbst categorized the FDM structure into four types: (1) wife dominant, (2) husband dominant, (3) autonomic, and (4) syncratic. The autonomic decision is when an equal number of decisions are made by each spouse, and the syncratic is when most decisions are made jointly by husband and wife (Engel et al., 1973). Comparatively, Davis and Rigaux (1974) used these two terms in a slightly modified way. That is, within any sample of families, if more than 50 percent make a decision jointly, the decision is classified as "syncratic;" if less than 50 percent make a decision jointly, the decision is classified as "autonomic."

In their broad literature review, Foster and Olshavsky (1989) found studies that employed Herbst's taxonomy had largely been concerned with identifying the conditions under which the various role structures occurred. Those studies show that the decision role structures changed, dependent primarily upon the type of decision (Burns, 1977; Davis, 1970; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Hempel, 1974; Munsinger et al., 1975; Szybillo and Sosanie, 1977) and the family's socio-demographic characteristics. For example, an infrequent decision such as purchasing an automobile, house or any other large durable goods tended to be made syncratically, involving more husband and wife interaction in the decision (see Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Qualls,
1987; Schiffman and Kanuk, 1978). Also, the degree of family members' involvement in FDM may vary according to the member's age, knowledge, contribution to the family economy, etc. (for more details, see Qualls, 1987; Mangleburg, 1990; Sheth and Cosmas, 1975).

While Herbst's taxonomy has been most commonly used by researchers, Herbst's original distinction between action and authority which both influence role patterns has not been thoroughly reflected in the past FDM research (Burns and Granbois, 1980). This taxonomy, when adopted in FDM research, also entails some drawbacks. It does not take children into account, centering only on husband and wife interaction (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988). The presence of children and their possible role in FDM should not be ignored. Another main drawback is that only two of the four types of role structures—autonomic and syncratic—capture group decision making (Foster and Olshavsky, 1989). Foster and Olshavsky (1989) continue to criticize the taxonomy by referring to Olshavsky and King's (1984; 1985) comments that the taxonomy focuses only upon classifying the outcomes of FDM without facilitating a deeper understanding of the processes of FDM.

To overcome these main shortcomings, Olshavsky and King (1985) proposed an interesting extension to the existing taxonomy of family role structure. According to this new taxonomy, to make a choice, a family can adopt any one of the five basic structures: parallel, hierarchical, ring, and star (with two separate forms, A and B) (see Foster and Olshavsky, 1989 for a comprehensive discussion). In the parallel arrangement, two or more members of the family unit work on the same decision simultaneously and independently without communication. The hierarchical arrangement has two or more family members ranked in terms of their decision making capabilities.
They attempt to reach a decision in the way of sequential involvement in the decision making from the lowest-ranked to the highest-ranked members with communication only between adjacent members in the hierarchy. The ring arrangement is composed of family members regarded independently as decision "specialists." Decisions are assigned to the most appropriate member in the ring who will process the decision while the member communicates directly with other members. In the star arrangement, one member is designated as a coordinator so as to mediate between other members in decision making efforts. Family members in Form A can communicate indirectly only through the coordinator, but Form B allows direct as well as indirect communication among members.

This new taxonomy was validated by Foster and Olshavsky's (1989) study of 75 families in a convenience sample. In their study, families adopted aforementioned structures with the ring structure being the most popular mode. The study also shows the possibility that FDM structure can be conceptualized in various way (Engel et al., 1973).

2. Decision Process

In the earlier stage of FDM research, most researchers focused on examining the outcomes of FDM rather than how families actually reached decisions (Davis, 1976; Nelson, 1988; Belch et al., 1985; Seymour and Lessne, 1984). They viewed purchasing as an act rather than a process (Engel et al., 1973). In general, the topological studies in which researchers tried to find out just who was most influential on the decision (Cosenza and Davis, 1981; Ekstrom et al., 1987; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Gupta et al.,
1983; O'Connor et al., 1985; Qualls, 1982, 1984; Woodside, 1975) and who made the decisions (Davis, 1971; Munsinger et al., 1975; Wilkie, 1975) did not provide any theoretically sound explanation on FDM and left FDM unconceptualized for a long time. Additionally, the methodological approach to the phenomenon was relatively confined to some topology-oriented research. Those studies changed the subdecisions under study, but maintained similar research methods, in an attempt to classify families' decision tendencies into several types.

Recently, however, the major trend in FDM research has been extended to investigating the decision process itself. This relatively new approach has increased the knowledge of FDM by describing the actual interactions of family members and changes in the amount of their influence over the several decision processes. Advancement has also been made in the conceptual framework of FDM as some researchers endeavored to explain FDM by introducing theories such as the consumption role (Webster and Wind, 1972), marital role (Davis, 1970; Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Woodside and Motes, 1979) sex role (Carlson, 1976; Qualls, 1987; Scanzoni and Szinovacz, 1980; Scanzoni, 1977), family communication topology (Moschis and Moor, 1978), power theory (Sethi, 1989), and game theory (Gupta et al., 1983; Tallman et al., 1974).

However, there exists a further need for process-oriented research on FDM (Seymour and Lessne, 1984; Spiro, 1983). According to Burns and Granbois's (1980) literature review, less than one-quarter of the FDM studies address variation across stages in the decision making process.

A number of detailed FDM models have been developed (Block and Roering, 1976). One of the most comprehensive models was presented by
Sheth (1974). He specified the nature of FDM in consumer behavior by integrating the findings of various social scientists into a comprehensive scheme. An overview of Sheth's model reveals that the FDM process is far more complicated and dynamic than the classification task of its outcomes. Meanwhile, Assael (1984) suggests an FDM model based on the integration of family roles (specified as information gatherer, influencer, decision maker, purchaser, and consumer) into five corresponding decision making stages: consumer information processing, brand evaluation, intention to buy, purchase, and post-purchase evaluation. Also, focusing on the pre-purchase decision making processes rather than the decision outcome and post-purchase processes, Gupta et al. (1983) charted a simplified FDM process in the manner of describing the sequential emergence of decision influence factors (individual, product-related, and organizational or group factors), those factors' fusion into interest, power, and conflict resolution mechanism, and the interactional outcomes. Qualls (1987) proposed that the household decision outcome derives from the household sex role orientation which underpins household influence, preference agreement, and conflict resolution. One more interesting and different conceptualization of FDM is suggested by Park's (1982) "muddling through" process. In his study of the new home purchase decision, he identified that each spouse seems to muddle through the decision process and reach the final decision without perceiving much of one another's preferences, and without learning very much about his(her) partner's strategies.

While many ways of describing the decision making process have been identified in the literature, the most common approach has been to break the decision process into three stages: (1) problem recognition, (2) information
search, and (3) the final decision (Assael, 1984; Howard and Madrigal, 1990).
Studies examine each family member's relative influence across each stage of
the process. For example, Davis and Rigaux (1974) indicated that wives were
apt to influence during the information search phase. On the other hand, the
pattern of the final decision for the 25 products cited was more likely to be
syncratic.

Four of the different products are presented as examples in Figure 1 to
visualize how husbands and wives interact in each stage to reach a final
decision. To explain the purchase of automobiles, as an example, husbands
become dominant as the process moves from problem recognition (indicated as
1 in the Figure) to information search (2 in the Figure). Then the arrow
swings upward again to the syncratic area, showing the final decision
(indicated as 3 in the Figure) is likely to be joint.

In the study of the purchase decision of recreation services for the
child, Howard and Madrigal (1990) find mothers' dominant influence
throughout the decision stages and fathers' slightly increased influence in the
final decision phase. The child in this study shows increased influence in the
search stage as compared to the purchase initiation phase. Although a
considerable difference in the amount of influence between the mother,
father, and child is found, it can be concluded from this study that the
decision pattern is a joint one in the final stage, which corresponds to the
previous findings.

The decision process approach leads family researchers to face another
dimension pervasive in the FDM process: conflict and its resolution.
Surprisingly, Spiro (1983) reports that 88 percent of the married couples
studied experienced disagreements during the process of purchasing a major
Figure 1. Changes in Husband-Wife Decision Roles over the Decision Process

durable and resolved the conflicts, by delegating the decision to the more knowledgeable party or by convincing the other to attribute the influence attempt to external pressures beyond the influencer's control. Meanwhile, the popularity of persuasion as a conflict resolution method was also shown by Sheth and Cosmas (1975). By using 270 sample families and six products for an FDM, Belch et al. (1985) investigated families' conflict resolution modes that was categorized by Sheth (1974) into four different types: problem solving, persuasion, bargaining, and politics. In this study, the amount of perceived disagreement was highest for the products of infrequent purchase such as automobiles and vacations. With respect to the modes of conflict resolution employed, the problem solving was the form most utilized. One possible explanation for the discrepancy on the conflict resolution mode between this study and the previous studies could be related to the fact that each study was tapping a different level of conflict behavior (Qualls, 1988).

3. Theoretical Background

In general, FDM studies lack detailed explanation of theoretical underpinnings. Burns and Granbois' (1980) review of thirty-eight papers published in five major consumer journals disclosed that about one-half of the empirical studies did not include any theoretical foundation. Without formulating conceptual frameworks, many researchers (Burns and Ortinau, 1978; Munsinger et al., 1975; Belch et al., 1985; Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980) referred to the previous research for their study construct. As a result, empiricism became the prevailing method in FDM research. Meanwhile, most theories developed are usually generated from
researchers' subjective observation and intuitive reasoning (Burns and Granbois, 1980). In spite of this, several attempts to develop a theoretical orientation of FDM are notable in the literature.

First, Blood and Wolfe's (1960) "resource theory" has been utilized frequently to interpret the dyadic influence on a purchase decision. This view contends that decision responsibility corresponds to the spouse who can provide the source (e.g. reward/punishment; Qualls, 1983) necessary to satisfy the needs of the other spouse. In the traditional household, the value of resources contributed to the family by the husband far exceeds those by the wife; accordingly, household decisions tend to be husband-dominant. Empirical studies confirm that wives' employment is an important factor that increases their participation and influence in household decisions (Strober and Weinberg, 1977; Spiro, 1983; Weinberg and Winer, 1983; Hesse-Biber & Williamson, 1984; Shukla and Kapoor, 1990). Shukla and Kapoor (1990) find that employed wives' families are more often syncratic or wife-dominated; nonemployed wives' families are more often autonomic or husband-dominated.

Second, in an attempt to capture changes in the attitudes and behavioral orientation of men and women in today's household, a sex role paradigm has emerged (Qualls, 1987). The traditional views of sex role attitudes reflect sharply dichotomous role for males and females whereas modern views reflect a greater sharing of roles between the sexes (Rosen and Granbois, 1983; Moore-Shay and Wilkie, 1988). When placed in the context of relative decision-making power of marriage partners, the previous sex role research suggests that androgynous wives may be more effective, competent, and assertive in decision-making situations as compared to their feminine peers (Shukla and Kapoor, 1990). Scanzoni (1978) contends that changing sex
roles and family members' perception on them will have a tremendous impact upon FDM processes. Numerous studies have also been conducted in terms of: household sex roles and marital decision making (Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Bonfield, 1978; Cunningham and Green, 1974, 1975), sex roles and decision role responsibilities of husbands and wives (Qualls, 1984), wives' employment and changing male roles in the household (Douglas and Wind, 1978; Ferber and Birnbaum, 1980; Shukla and Kapoor, 1990), and sex roles and household financial decisions (Schaninger et al., 1982). (For more detailed discussion on sex roles in FDM, see Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) and Qualls (1987).

Third, a theoretical review of FDM also finds the concept of power utilized in numerous studies. The original conceptualization of conjugal power was developed by Herbst (1952) and utilized by Blood and Wolfe (1960). Herbst categorized couples' types of governing arrangements as (1) wife-dominant, (2) husband-dominant, (3) autonomic, and (4) syncratic. The first two arrangements reflect autocratic power structure because one of the marital dyad makes unilateral decisions on most of the familial issues, whereas the last two arrangements reflect egalitarian power structure because power is distributed somewhat equally between spouses (Shukla and Kapoor, 1990). This outcome-oriented categorization resulted from the exercise of power by husbands and wives through discussion or negotiation in decision making processes (Scanzoni and Szinovacz, 1980). An insight into the relationship between sex role and power, presented by Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980), is that the more sex-role egalitarian the couple, the greater the likelihood of symmetrical power and satisfactory outcomes. Several researchers have conducted power-based FDM studies (see Centers et al., 1971; Gray-Little and Burks, 1983; Davis and Rigaux, 1974).
Fourth, another interesting theoretical framework has been suggested by Gupta et al. (1983) who applied a game-theoretic perspective to FDM. This approach brings up a significant comparison with the past power conceptualization in that each family member's participation in decision making is closely related to his or her interest in and preference for the decision. That is, each of the family members is motivated to obtain the best payoff in a joint decision process (Park et al., 1991). This approach appears particularly appropriate when examining the decision making process and negotiating and bargaining strategies used by families in arriving at decisions (Douglas, 1983).

Finally, Park, Tansuhaj, and Kolbe (1991) contend that the implications of affectional components such as love, affection, and intimacy should be recognized in FDM study. The family has a unique structure and characteristics different from those of other groups. However, the existing theoretical orientation in FDM research misses these subtle aspects present in family settings. In general, rational and/or utilitarian factors are more important in the group decision making process, but it is reasonable to assume that the affective factors are more important in the FDM process (Park et al., 1991). While many studies have been conducted with regard to the role of affect in consumer behavior, this affectional dimension recently began to be recognized in FDM (See Peterson et al. (1986) for more comprehensive discussion).

4. Decision Variables

Most studies attempt to measure the "influence" of family members

A large portion of the research is also devoted to examining the determinants of FDM. While many of these studies find major variation among families in the role of family members' decision-making behavior and contain methodological problems (Engel et al., 1973), a somewhat general agreement has been reached on the factors that influence the FDM style. Those factors are: cultural and subcultural difference, reference group influence, family characteristics (e.g. stage in life cycle, social class, wife's employment status, living location, decision members' personality and social networks, etc.), perceived risk and interest in the decision, the type of product, and the stages in decision processes. When compared to family characteristics and the type of product, the rest of the variables have received relatively little attention from researchers. It is, however, noticeable that in recent years the decision process-oriented approach became the major trend in FDM studies.

Whether or not the characteristics of the family influence the type of FDM has been investigated by many marketers. Kenkel (1966) and Cosenza
and Davis (1981) report sequential changes in the role of families in the decision making process over the life cycle. Most studies (Hempel, 1975; Spiro, 1983) that investigate the influence of wives' employment on FDM confirm employed wives actively participate in all the decision stages, demonstrating a significant impact upon the decision. According to Sheth (1974), both lower and upper class families tend to favor an autonomous or unilateral decision style, while middle class families are in favor of egalitarianism or joint decision making.

The type of product is another variable that may modify the roles of family members in the decision process. Many studies in this category address the ultimate question of who is more or less influential in a purchase decision of a specific product, for example, automobile, house, food, vacation, and furniture. Davis (1970) found husbands dominate decisions for automobile purchase. Wives tend to dominate decisions for food, toiletries, and small home appliances (Overholser, Haley and Associates Inc., 1975). Joint decision making is likely for the purchase of a house (Munsinger et al., 1975), vacations (Davis and Rigaux, 1974; Cunningham and Green, 1974), and furniture (Davis and Rigaux, 1974).

With regard to the study of FDM across different types of product, Davis and Rigaux (1974) undertook one of the most comprehensive and detailed investigations. They utilized 25 products which were selected and mixed to achieve a balanced distribution in the number of products between husband-dominant, wife-dominant, autonomic, and syncratic decisions. Particularly impressive is their graphical presentation of changes in the FDM style (See Figure 1) over the three stages (problem recognition, information search, and final decision) of the decision process.
In spite of many research efforts in this area, it should be noted that future research should include more types of product. Burns and Granbois (1980) and Darley and Lim (1986) criticized research in the decision making process of family purchase as almost entirely addressed to purchase experiences that were large, infrequent, and resource-binding. Studies need to address a wider variety of purchase situations, including the purchase of services. With regard to FDM in vacation purchase, most researchers included vacation as one of family-oriented purchasing items in their studies to classify it into one of the FDM patterns. In other words, they asked the respondents to show who exerted more influence on the decision itself to take a vacation trip as a family unit. They did not capture the further details of FDM in vacation behavior. Only a few studies (Jenkins, 1978; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Howard and Madrigal, 1990) dealt with FDM in vacation purchase in a comprehensive scheme.

5. Children's Influence

Only a few studies examining decision roles across stages in the decision process have included children in the analysis (Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Schiffman and Kanuk, 1978; Assael, 1984). The majority of studies have focused on husband and wife interaction. Exclusion of children in FDM studies has delayed an in-depth understanding of the FDM phenomenon because studies that have included children have identified the key role played by children in FDM. Szybillo and Sosanie (1970) report that children are involved with all stages in the decision of restaurant selection and family trip approximately 60 to 80 percent of the time. Foxman et al. (1989) found that
children had influence on idea initiation by suggesting products and learning the best buy (consumer socialization). Children's influence is also apparent in other studies such as Belch et al. (1985), Brody et al. (1981), Darley and Lim (1986), Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988), Nelson (1978), Roberts et al. (1981), and Ward and Wackman (1972).

Children's age and the types of product in the purchase decision appear to be two leading factors affecting children's influence on FDM. Atkin (1978), Darley and Lim (1986), Moschis and Mitchell (1986), Nelson (1978), and Ward and Wackman (1972) included age as one of independent variables to measure the child's involvement in FDM. Most studies have found that older children have significantly more influence than younger children (Mangleburg, 1990). The ages used differ from study to study. Atkin (1978) observed three-to-twelve years old children; Brody et al. (1981) experimented with three-to-five years old children; Ward and Wackman (1972) surveyed five-to-twelve years old children; and Moschis and Mitchell (1986) studied children in junior and senior high school. These age categories are divided again into several age sub-groups in accordance with the study's objectives. For example, Ward and Wackman (1972) employed five-to-seven, eight-to-ten, and eleven-to-twelve years of age sub-categories.

A close relationship between the type of product and the amount of influence exerted by children has been detected. It seems that most studies scrutinizing children's influence on a family decision considered two basic criteria in selecting a product as a measurement variable. One is any product that is exclusively or most frequently used or/and possessed by the child after purchase. The other is any product that requires the child's continuous participation in the consumption process. Examples for the former can be toys
and game (Ward and Wackman, 1972), children's records (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Moschis and Michell, 1986; Foxman et al., 1989; Ward and Wackman, 1972), and children's clothes (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Mehrotra and Torges, 1977; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986; Foxman et al., 1989; Roberts et al., 1981). For the latter case, examples are breakfast cereals (Atkin, 1978; Belch et al., 1985; Berey and Pollay, 1968; Mehrotra and Torges, 1977), vacations (Belch et al., 1985; Jenkins, 1979), and restaurant selection (Mehrotra and Torges, 1977; Nelson, 1978). Most studies try to find the child's direct or indirect influence on the purchase of these products. Belch et al. (1985) indicate children's influence is greatest for cereal and vacations. Meanwhile, children's influence is comparatively low in decisions regarding products for the parents' own use (e.g., magazine subscriptions) and for products that represent major, infrequent family expenditures (e.g., purchase of living room furniture) (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; see also Marketing News, 1987). In relation to the type of product, children's influence in family purchase decisions has generally been examined in a restricted context, focusing mostly on products that are used primarily by the child (Foxman et al., 1989).

A few studies has been committed to examining children's indirect influence taken into account in their parents' perception (or assumption) and parental yielding. In the study of parental perception on children's influence, the direction of study has been mainly toward the mother's perception formed in the process of child-rearing. While parental yielding tends to be child's age- and product-specific (Mehrotra and Torges, 1977), parental perceptions tend to be related to attitudes toward financial matters, nutrition, health, and traditionalism (Roberts et al., 1981). Foxman and Tansuhaj (1988) report that
the more mothers concern about their children's health, the less they perceive their children's influence in purchasing decisions. Ward and Wackman (1972) find that the older the child, the more likely that mothers would yield to the child's request.

Another aspect is the decision process approach to children's influence on family purchase decisions. Belch et al. (1985), Nelson (1978), Jenkins (1979) and Szybillo and Sosanie (1977) report that children wield more influence in the problem recognition and information search stages and that the influence declines in the final choice decision stage.

The significance of children's role in FDM has been shown by many researchers. In addition, several reasons support the inclusion of children in FDM research. First, children's role in FDM changes according to changes in the family structure and characteristics. Moschis and Churchill (1978), Moschis and Moore (1980), and Roberts (1981) suggest that children from families with high socio-economic status (i.e., high income, highly educated parents) have more influence in family purchase decisions (Howard and Madrigal, 1990) than those children from families with low socio-economic status. Also, children's role in FDM has an important marketing implication. According to Rossiter's (1979) report, over twenty percent of the nation's consumers are children. This statistic indicates that children are a quite important market to be studied. Furthermore, in a long-term perspective, the early formation of consumer attitudes contributes to later life consumption activities. From this point of view, children-included FDM studies must be further conducted.
C. FAMILY DECISION MAKING IN THE VACATION MARKET

Several family researchers and sociologists (e.g., see Darley and Lim, 1986; Orthner and Mancini, 1990; Allan and Crow, 1991) have tried to explain the relationship between leisure and family behavior. There have included Jenkins' (1978) comprehensive study, as well as such studies dealing with vacation purchase (e.g., see Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Cosenza and Davis, 1981; Van Raaij and Franken, 1984), tourism behavior (e.g., see Nichols and Snepenger, 1988; Myers and Moncrief 1978; Michie and Sullivan, 1990; Plog, 1972), restaurant selection (Mehrotra and Torges, 1977; Nelson, 1978; Szybillo and Sosanie, 1977) and the purchase of recreation services (e.g., see Howard and Madrigal, 1990).

Most of the FDM research (e.g., see Nichols and Snepenger, 1988; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Howard and Madrigal; 1990) in the vacation market has been conducted as a replication and/or extension of previous work done in other areas. Using similar theoretical frameworks and methodological techniques, they employed different measurement variables, for example, the type of product (vacation, recreation services, etc) and family characteristics (family life cycle).

Jenkins (1978) provides an initial understanding of how families make vacation decisions and how influential family members are in the total vacation decision and each of the nine subdecision areas, by undertaking an extensive study of family vacation decision making. He found that the dominance of either spouse in vacation decision making depends entirely upon the particular decision. Wives perceive husbands to be dominant in decisions regarding information collection, length of vacation, actual date of vacation,
and amount of money to spend. Husbands themselves also agree with these perceptions. Whether to take children, mode of transportation, kinds of activities, selection of lodging, and selection of destination points are decided jointly. Children are perceived by parents to exert considerable influence in vacation decision making. Wives perceive children's influence to be greatest in deciding upon the kinds of vacation activities.

In their extension and replication study, Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980) support generally the conclusions reached by Jenkins with respect to role structure and role variability. In contrast, however, the results concerning the influence of children are somewhat different. They find children exert the greatest influence on decisions concerning whether or not to take a vacation, the timing of the vacation (particularly the season), choice of vacation, the type of vacation (activities), and the type of accommodation. Children are also found to have potential to determine the outcome of the decision in situations where the husband and wife are in disagreement as to the most desirable choice.

Additionally, Nichols and Snepenger (1988) found that a majority (66 percent) of the family vacationers to Alaska employed a joint decision making mode and that wife-dominant and husband-dominant decision making households comprised thirteen and 21 percent of the sample, respectively. Cosenza and Davis' (1981) utilized a small group methodology (six stages of the FLC were employed) to conduct an in-depth analysis of the vacation purchase decision role structure over the family life cycle (FLC). In this study, later stages in the life cycle tended to have a decision role structure which was largely dominated by the female spouse. Darley and Lim (1986) suggest that single parents perceive more influence than dual parents from
children for leisure-time activities such as motion picture attendance, family outing, and participant sports. They also conclude that group differences in perception of child influence tend to be leisure-activity specific.

Vacations have been included in a number of FDM studies as an independent variable because it was believed to be a product that usually involves all the family members in the purchase decision. The researchers attempted to investigate the relative influence of family members on the vacation purchase decision and, by doing so, identify family decision making taxonomies. Examples of this type of research are studies by Jenkins (1978, 1979), Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980), Nichols and Slepenger (1988), and Howard and Madrigal (1990). Most of these studies focused on vacation behaviors while Jenkins (1978, 1979) and Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980) addressed further details of vacation decision phenomenon.

D. METHODOLOGICAL REVIEW OF THE FDM LITERATURE

1. Hypothetical Framework

In general, the FDM literature rarely contains statements of testable hypotheses. A partial cause of this comes from the lack of theoretical underpinnings. From their review of the major consumer literature, Burns and Granbois (1980) indicated that less than one-third of the papers have stated hypotheses. The absence of hypothetical statements resulted most frequently from the nature of exploratory studies. This trend continues to run through the last decade. Similarly, the contents and property of the hypotheses adopted are different dependent upon the variables used. Spiro (1983), for example, hypothesizes that the use of an influence strategy mix is
determined by various factors such as the number and age of children, marital satisfaction, a traditional family ideology, the importance of the decision, and the desire to avoid a conflict. Park et al. (1991) propose that the intimacy of family members affect the means of conflict resolution and the FDM mode. The influence of children in family vacation decisions is hypothesized in a null form in Jenkins' (1978) study. Typically, sufficient precision is lacking in the hypotheses stated (Burns and Granbois, 1980).

2. Sample Selection

Almost all FDM studies have used geographically convenient samples. Respondents' willingness to participate in the research has been the key determinant of the sample size. While most studies typically utilized samples of under 500 people, several employed a relatively large sample (e.g., 1,671 mothers by Mehrotra and Torges (1977); 1,150 mothers by Roberts et al. (1981); 1,753 travel parties by Nichols and Snepenger (1988)). Geographic convenience and nonprobabilistic, that is, nonrandom, methods in the sampling process hamper the ability to compare findings across studies and limit the generalizability of findings (Burns and Granbois, 1980).

3. Data Collection Method

Cross sectional surveys have been used most frequently. However, many researchers (Mangleburg, 1990; Werbel, 1976; Burns and Granbois, 1980; Foster and Olshavsky, 1989; Douglas, 1983; Belch et al., 1985; Nelson, 1988) have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the use of cross sectional surveys and suggested more use of observational methods in order to increase the validity of findings. A few studies (Atkin, 1978; Berey and

Information sources vary from study to study, depending upon the characteristics of the study and the sample specification. Jenkins (1978; 1979), Qualls (1988), Davis and Rigaux (1974), Hempel (1975), Burns and Granbois (1977), Ritchie and Filiatrault (1980), Schaninger et al. (1982), Cosenza and Davis (1981), Rosen and Granbois (1983), and Spiro (1983) collected data from the sample of husband and wife dyads. Samples of husband, wife, and child triads was used by Belch et al. (1985), Foxman et al. (1989), and Belch et al. (1980). Many other sample categories are also found, for example, parents (Darley and Lim, 1986; Nelson, 1978), parent-child dyads (Atkin, 1978; Brody et al., 1981; Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986), wives only (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Cunningham and Green, 1974, 1975; Szybillo and Sosanie, 1977), etc.

4. Measures and Scales

A number of influence measures have been developed to measure the relative influence of family members. Discussing the specificity of FDM influence measures from three different perspectives, predicted influence, reported influence, and outcome measures of influence, Corfman (1989) classifies the measures used in FDM studies into four different categories: attribute-related, topic-related, process-related, and influence source-related measures. Attribute-related measures are very specific and concern the components of a larger decision on a specified topic (Davis, 1970, 1971; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Cosenza and Davis, 1981; Jenkins, 1978; Qualls,
1987; Burns and Granbois, 1977; Green and Cunningham, 1975). Topic-related measures ask about relative influence on well-defined decision topics (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Davis and Rigaux, 1974). Process measures concern how decisions are made and try to find what influence sources are used or are effective in joint decision making (Qualls, 1987; Nelson, 1987; Seymour and Lessne, 1984; Nichols and Snepenger, 1988; Spiro, 1983). Finally, measures related to influence sources fathom the power-related traits possessed by decision-makers that may affect influence in joint decision making (Corfman and Lehmann, 1987; Rosen and Granbois, 1983).

Studies have employed a variety of scales to measure relative influence of family members. With a few exceptions that used a constant sum scale (Jenkins, 1978, 1979; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Woodside and Carr, 1988; Qualls, 1984; Howard and Madrigal, 1990) and rank ordering (Spiro, 1983; Qualls, 1984), most studies have used 3, 5, or 7 point Likert scales. Some studies (Belch et al., 1985; Darley and Lim, 1986; Jenkins, 1979; Nelson, 1978; Roberts et al., 1981) have asked respondents to rate influence for family members on separate scales, whereas others (Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Foxman et al., 1989; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986; Szybillo and Sosanie, 1977) have asked respondents to evaluate the aggregate influence of all family members on a single scale (Mangleburg, 1990).

5. Reliability and Validity

FDM studies have paid a little attention to reliability and validity (Burns and Granbois, 1980; Mangleburg, 1990; Werbel, 1976). While several studies mention reliability and validity (Moschis and Moor, 1978; Burns and Granbois, 1977; Davis, 1977; Spiro, 1983; Seymour and Lessne, 1984; Berey
and Pollay, 1968; Brody et al., 1986; Moschis and Mitchell, 1986; Roberts et al., 1981), many other studies do not report the results of the reliability test.

Construct validity of the existing FDM studies is another serious issue. In review of the FDM literature focusing on children's influence, Mangleburg (1990) reports that with one exception (Brody et al., 1981) a majority of the studies reviewed are low or very low in validity. Two basic reasons contribute to the low construct validity. First, most studies fail to provide an accurate definition of "influence" to which respondents may refer when they participate in the study. As a result, respondents' notion of what the term means may not be congruent with the researcher's notion (Mangleburg, 1990) and, furthermore, the notion may be different even among all the respondents. A possible method to reduce this notional difference may be to employ very detailed scales without complexity so that the respondents can weigh families' influence on a more specific scale. On the other hand, respondent distortion in response (Werbel, 1976) may be the other contributory factor to diminishing construct validity. Most FDM studies ask respondents to assess family members' influence in either separate or aggregate level. This may not only extract respondents' inaccurate evaluations of the influence attempts made by their family members, but it may also breeds socially desirable answers especially on the matter of each member's power distribution in decision making. This method, however, has been widely used basically for two reasons. One is that there is no serious difference in responses between respondent husbands and wives (Howard and Madrigal, 1990). The other reason is that it takes less time to respond than having separate scales for each family member.
6. Summary

This chapter outlined the results of the past FDM research. Herbst's (1954) taxonomy (husband or wife dominant, autonomic, and syncratic decision) has been found to be the most prevailing method of classifying the outcomes of FDM. Only recently have many FDM researchers begun to employ a decision process approach rather than the outcome-oriented approach to the phenomenon of FDM. Efforts to explain the FDM dynamics have been exerted from interdisciplinary perspectives. The type of product and family characteristics appear to be the two strongest determinants of family members' influence. As a result of socio-cultural changes, children have become a significant factor in the FDM process. In general, FDM studies contain many limitations in methodology. This is due to a weak conceptual framework.

Though numerous studies have investigated vacations as a set of products in which to study joint decision making, research that has dealt solely with FDM in the vacation market in detail is scanty. Previous studies focused on family vacation decision must be replicated and expanded to gain reliability. Since family travel is commonly shared by all the members of the family, children should not be excluded from FDM studies in this area. The decision process approach is of particular importance to the study of family travel decision because travel involves a number of subdecisions which may affect the family decision modes of the future travel purchase. Possible contribution can also be made by applying methodologies used and developed in past FDM research in other areas into the hospitality area. Finally, characteristics unique to the phenomenon of traveling, especially as a family, should be properly taken into consideration in the study of family travel decision making.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

A. Questionnaire Design

Data for the present study have been collected by a questionnaire administered to a sample of family convention travelers in Las Vegas. The questionnaire has a total of six pages including the cover page (see the sample questionnaire in Appendix). The questionnaire is organized in five main parts in which each part holds on average seven questions on one separate page. The questionnaire was designed to be answered by one of the members of a family group. That respondent was asked to estimate the relative influence of each family member in the decision making associated with convention participation. Though several family researchers obtained responses from both parents and at least one child, earlier studies (Davis, 1970; Granbois and Willet, 1970) cited considerable evidence supporting the contention that the responses of husband and wives are very similar and, therefore, it is sufficient to question only one spouse (Howard and Madrigal, 1990).

Contents. Each part of the questionnaire was written to gather different, but related, data that constitute an important portion of FDM. Part I explored the underlying travel reasons or motives that are linked to Las Vegas' travel attractions and that are believed to influence FDM on convention participation in Las Vegas (eight questions). These reasons and motives are closely associated with other activities rather than convention participation, entertainment opportunities in the city, family accompaniment, other tourist
attractions around the city, and accessibility. Part II examined the amount of influence exerted by each of family members in the decision making of convention purchase in Las Vegas (five questions). In this section, the respondents were asked to evaluate the influence of each family member specifically on the travel decision itself, the length of stay, travel budget, and restaurant and entertainment selection. The respondents' perception or assumption on his/her spouse's role in FDM was investigated in Part III (eight questions). This part was drafted especially to probe any possible distortion of the spouse's decision roles in spousal perception. The respondents in this section were asked to rate their perceptions on their spouses' preferences and decision making patterns. In Part IV, the respondent was asked to measure the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with family convention travel to Las Vegas (six questions). The six questions were addressed to the city's atmosphere for family travelers, hotel and motel services, family recreation and entertainment, the convention attended, and the city's general attractiveness. Finally, Part V collected the respondent family's demographic data including gender, household income, the number of children, age, and travel budget.

**Validity.** The final questionnaire has been developed following two pretests and on-going procedural supervision by the Thesis Committee. The first pretest was administered to fifteen graduate students in a research methodology class in the College of Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Thirteen out of the fifteen students completed their responses and made comments mainly on the length of the instrument, wording and the measurement scales of Part II. Based on the results of the first pretest, the questionnaire was revised.
To measure the amount of influence exerted by each family member in the decision, early drafts of the questionnaire included two versions of Part II that were written using different measurement scales but same contents: one was projected on a constant-sum scale in which the respondents were asked to divide 100 points among family members corresponding to their influence on the decision, and the other was a ten point, 10-most influential to 1-no influence, scale in which the respondents were asked to simply check the number that best indicated the degree of each family member's influence on the decision. The reason for using a ten point scale was that the scale was believed to give a compacted and congruent projection of 100 points utilized in the first constant-sum version. Also, this scale was believed to provide a more detailed measurement without burdening the respondents than a three, five, or seven point scale. Many researchers (Jenkins, 1978, 1979; Qualls, 1984, 1987; Werbel, 1976; Howard and Madrigal, 1990; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Woodside and Carr, 1988) have used or contended a constant-sum scale in measuring the relative influence of each family member in FDM. However, many other researchers (Spiro, 1983; Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Foxman et al., 1989; Darley and Lim, 1986) have utilized three-, five- or seven-point Likert scales for the same purpose.

In the first pretest, the respondents were asked to compare the two versions of Part II. As a result, only one respondent favored the constant-sum scales. The rest of the twelve students, however, preferred the 10 point scored rating scale for three basic reasons. First, it was much easier to answer on this scale than the constant-sum scale. Second, less time was required to respond to this scale. The constant-sum scale took too much time and required a mathematical operation to answer. Also, the scale forced the
respondent to figure out the exact amount of each member's influence by assigning any specific points. Finally, Part II on the scored rating scale looked less complicated, inducing more participants in the survey. Therefore, as a result of the first pretest, Part II on the scored rating scale was selected and some revisions were made on the other parts of the questionnaire.

The second pretest was conducted at the front desk of the Las Vegas Hilton hotel. The objective of the second pretest was to examine the clarity and understanding of each question among typical respondents. Ten travelers were asked to fill out the questionnaire while they were checking-in or -out. Upon the completion of their responses, a brief interview with each of the respondents was taken in order to ask them any difficulty in filling out the questionnaire. Most of them indicated no problem in understanding what they were asked, but suggested the questionnaire be shortened. The final questionnaire was developed as a result of the second pretest by omitting two or three less important questions from each part of the questionnaire.

**Measurement scales.** The questionnaire contained two series of Likert statements in Part I and III, respectively. In Part I, the respondent's perception on the attractions of a convention travel destination (Las Vegas) was measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 5-very important to 1-very unimportant. To capture the respondent's perception on his/her spouse's influence in the decision process, Part III employed a five-point Likert measurement scaled from 5-strongly agree to 1-strongly disagree. As mentioned above, a ten point rating scale was used in Part II as a result of the first pretest to measure family members' relative influence on the convention travel decision. Part IV employed a Delighted-Terrible (DT) scale to measure the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of a convention travel taken by
the family. Maddox (1985) examined the construct validity of several methods of measuring satisfaction with tourism. He showed that the DT scale exhibits superior convergent validity. Thus the scale was utilized in the present study to measure satisfaction with families' convention travel to Las Vegas.

B. Survey Methods

Several association meeting planners randomly drawn from the 1992 Las Vegas Convention Directory (LVCVA, 1992) were contacted to arrange conventions for the survey. Only one association, the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), approved the survey at its convention in Las Vegas which was held at the Las Vegas Hilton hotel and the Las Vegas Convention Center from April 13 through April 16 of 1992. An attendance of approximately 50,000 people from all over the United States and foreign countries was expected for this convention.

During the first two days of the convention, approximately 250 potential respondents were approached in the hall, registration area, and cafeteria of the convention center while they were attending the convention, and then a brief screening interview was conducted to identify whether the person or family was qualified as a sample of the survey. As noted earlier, to be included in the survey the respondent had to come from the outside of Las Vegas and bring his/her spouse on the convention trip to Las Vegas. When the respondent was qualified as a result of the initial interview, a self-administered questionnaire was handed to the respondent. Through this sampling method 159 respondents completed the survey. However, 13 of the 159 responses were excluded from the data analysis because of incompletion.
and inappropriate responses. Thus, the sample size was 146 (159 - 13) family convention travelers.

Six graduate students from the Hotel College of the UNLV assisted in the process of collecting data. Before initiating the survey, they were trained specifically as to how to contribute to the survey's objectives, how to identify the appropriate respondents, and how to lead the survey. In training the survey staff, an emphasis was given to minimizing interviewer bias in the process of sample selection. Thus the surveyors were encouraged to approach randomly selected potential respondents and ask if they brought their spouses and children on the convention trip coming out of Las Vegas.

While the effort was made to capture as many family convention travelers as possible, this form of convenience sampling is not representative (Howard and Madrigal, 1990). First, because the survey was conducted over a two day period, the sample may not represent all the family participants in the four day NAB convention. Second, although cooperation was generally excellent, approximately twenty percent of the people interviewed for initial qualification refused to participate in the survey. In most cases, the major reason of refusal was time constraints.

C. Data Analysis

The major objectives of the data analysis were to (1) identify the relative influence exerted by family members and the decision making patterns in the decisions associated with for convention travel, (2) measure the degree of the family's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with convention travel to Las Vegas and detect which of the travel motives contributed to the family's
overall feeling about the trip, (3) find out the major motives of family
convention travel to Las Vegas, (4) examine spousal perceptions related to
spouse's decision roles, (5) investigate the role of demographic variables on
the relative influence and decision roles of family members, and (6) test the
significance and nature of the relationship between the respondent's actual
assessment on the relative influence made by his/her spouse and the
respondent's perception on the decision making role of his/her spouse.

The Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSSx) was utilized to
analyze the collected data. In the first stage of the analysis, a frequency
analysis was performed to obtain descriptive statistics. Each question was
treated independently. In the second stage of the analysis, a multiple
regression analysis was performed by regressing the mean values of each
question in Part I onto families' overall feeling about their convention trip to
Las Vegas. This regression identified how travel motives contributed to the
family's overall satisfaction. The third stage of the analysis utilized several
characteristics of the sample as independent variables and family members'
relative influence as the dependent variable in a set of t tests to identify
contributory factors in FDM for convention travel-related decisions. Finally,
a correlation coefficient analysis was carried out. This analysis compared the
relative influence exerted by the spouse to the spouse's decision role
perceived by the respondent in order to uncover the relationship between
these two decision parameters.
CHAPTER IV.
RESULTS

This chapter presents the results obtained from 146 family convention travelers to the city of Las Vegas. First, the characteristics of the sample are presented. Second, family members' relative influence on the investigated decisions and their the family's decision making types are demonstrated. Third, findings on the family's satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the convention travel and the factors impacting this tourism satisfaction are illustrated. Fourth, explanation on the major motives for family convention travel and spousal perceptions on decision making roles has been included. Finally, the chapter also includes the results of the t tests and correlation analysis, used to identify the factors contributed to family members' decision roles and discrepancy between perceived spousal decision roles and realized spousal decision roles, respectively.

A. Descriptive Results

Data was collected from a sample of 146 family-accompanied convention travelers to Las Vegas. Out of the 146 respondents 104 (71%) were male and 39 (27%) female. Three respondents did not report their gender. Table 1 shows the age distribution of the respondents and their spouses. From the table the average age of the respondents appeared to be slightly higher than that of their spouses, and more than half of the respondents and their spouses were in the age group between 35 to 44 years. In 1991, 44 percent of respondent families earned household incomes of more than $75,000 and another 49
percent earned between $35,000 and $75,000.

Table 2 shows the amount of the family's budget for the entire trip and the amount allocated to the family's leisure activities during the trip. Most of the families (83%) reported that they allocated less than $1,000 for leisure activities during their stay in Las Vegas. Concerning the number of children, about 44 percent (49 families) of families had two children and 26 percent were living with only one child. However, only 24 respondents brought one or more children on their convention travel to Las Vegas.

Table 1. Age Distribution of Family Convention Travelers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Categories</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
<th>Spouses (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>8 (5.7)</td>
<td>5 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 34</td>
<td>22 (15.7)</td>
<td>31 (23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>58 (41.4)</td>
<td>55 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>35 (25.0)</td>
<td>22 (16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>10 (7.1)</td>
<td>17 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 65</td>
<td>7 (5.0)</td>
<td>4 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>140 (100)</td>
<td>134 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subtotals may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding. Difference in the grand total are caused by missing values.
Table 2. Amount of Money Budgeted for Trip and Leisure Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget ($)</th>
<th>Trip (%)</th>
<th>Leisure (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>35 (24.8)</td>
<td>65 (53.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 1,000</td>
<td>48 (34.0)</td>
<td>36 (29.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 - 1,500</td>
<td>25 (17.7)</td>
<td>10 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,501 - 2,000</td>
<td>15 (10.6)</td>
<td>2 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2,001</td>
<td>18 (12.8)</td>
<td>9 (7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141 (100)</td>
<td>122 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Subtotals may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding. Difference in the grand total are caused by missing values.

B. Relative Influence and Decision typology

In general, the respondents report that among their family members they themselves exerted the highest relative influence on the subdecisions investigated. There was no major difference in the mean value in how male and female respondents responded to the questions about relative decision influence (See Table 3). However, as shown in Figure 2, the spouse did participate actively in making family-oriented decisions. Meanwhile, children's relative influence on the same subdecisions were minimal. Both spouses and children exerted more influence on decisions regarding the amount of money to spend, choice of family dining places, and types of entertainment to enjoy than on decisions regarding whether to take a family travel to Las Vegas and the length of stay. The initial data analysis reveals that the largest number of
Figure 2. Relative Influence of Family Members

1) Regarding the decision to come to Las Vegas as a family

- Respondent: 7.81 (n=145)
- Spouse: 6.65 (n=138)
- Children: 2.25 (n=65)

2) Regarding the decision on the length of stay

- Respondent: 8.42 (n=144)
- Spouse: 6.29 (n=140)
- Children: 2.17 (n=64)

3) Regarding the amount of money to spend on the trip

- Respondent: 7.95 (n=145)
- Spouse: 7.03 (n=140)
- Children: 2.27 (n=62)
4) Regarding the choice of dining places for the family

- Respondent: 7.67 (n=143)
- Spouse: 7.48 (n=139)
- Children: 2.98 (n=63)

5) Regarding the types of entertainment to enjoy as a family

- Respondent: 7.07 (n=144)
- Spouse: 6.91 (n=141)
- Children: 3.46 (n=63)

Note: The numbers on the graphs represent the degree of relative influence.
( 1--- No influence / 10--- Most influential )
n= 146 ( male = 104/ female = 39 / unknown=3 )
the respondents evaluated himself or herself and his or her spouse to be most influential in every decision. Additionally, it is difficult to compare children's relative influence with that of the respondents or spouses because the number of the respondents who reported children's influence was too small. Out of the 146 respondents, only 63 respondents, on average, reported children's relative influence on each of the five questions. Overall, the relative influence exercised by the respondent, spouse, and children was somewhat consistent through all the subdecisions (See Appendix A for a more specified responses on each question).

When consistency in responses of higher scores on the respondents' part and the proportion of male (104) to female (39) in the respondents are considered, the decisions related to convention travel to Las Vegas were slightly husband-dominated.

C. Tourism Satisfaction and Its Contributing Factors

In most cases, the respondent families were satisfied with their trip to Las Vegas (Figure 3). The factors that impacted their satisfaction were, in the order of the mean score, the convention they attended, overall service and amenities provided by hotels and motels, the city's overall attractiveness, the city's atmosphere, especially for family travelers, and opportunities present in the city for family recreation and entertainment (Figure 3). Notably, no respondent expressed negative feelings, that is dissatisfaction, regarding the convention they attended. The mean value (5.332) of the family's satisfaction measured on several criteria is quite consistent with that of the respondent family's overall feeling about the trip to Las Vegas (5.455).
Figure 3.

Degree of Satisfaction Resulted from Family Convention Travel

1. The convention attended (n=146).
2. The family's overall feeling about the trip to the city (n=145).
3. Overall service and amenities of hotels and motels (n=146).
4. The city's overall attractiveness (n=146).
5. The city's atmosphere for family travelers (n=146).
6. Opportunities for family recreation and entertainment (n=143).
The present study also examined, via multiple regression, the factors that constitute the partial predictors of this tourism satisfaction with the convention trip taken by the family. The independent variables were the underlying travel motives identified from questions 1 to 8 in Part I of the questionnaire and the dependent variable was the family's overall satisfaction with the convention travel. Using the stepwise method with an acceptance significance level (PIN) of 0.05, each of the independent variables were assessed as to how well they predicted the family's satisfaction with the trip.

To test the hypothesis, the following regression model was used:

\[ Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6 + b_7X_7 + b_8X_8, \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = the family's overall feeling (satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction) about the trip,
- \( a \) = constant term or \( Y \) axis intercept,
- \( b_1-b_8 \) = regression coefficient to be estimated,
- \( X_1 \) = convention participation compared with other activities,
- \( X_2 \) = availability of various entertainments,
- \( X_3 \) = accompanying spouses on the trip,
- \( X_4 \) = bringing the family on the trip,
- \( X_5 \) = various tourist attraction around the city,
- \( X_6 \) = travel cost to the city compared with that to other cities,
- \( X_7 \) = easy accessibility to the city, and
- \( X_8 \) = resting and relaxing atmosphere of the city.
The initial regression analysis shows how well each of the investigated independent variable explain the changes in the ratings of the family's overall feeling about the convention travel (Table 3). According to the results, the variables $X_3$, spouses' accompaniment, and $X_8$, the city's resting and relaxing atmosphere, seem to have more relationship with the dependent variable than other variables examined. These results were run again in a stepwise multiple regression analysis in which all the independent variables were considered relatively. The reason to use the stepwise multiple regression method is that all the independent variables are correlated each other as factors impacting the dependent variable.

### Table 3. Summary Results of Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Betas</th>
<th>$t$ values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>9.129E-06</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>2.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>4.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple $R = 0.33$; $R$ square = 0.11; adjusted $R$ square = 0.10; $F = 16.49$; significant $F = 0.0001$; $Y$ intercept (a) = 4.63.
Table 4 shows only the significant results of analysis as all the other insignificant independent variables are dropped from the analysis.

Table 4. Significant Results of the Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Betas</th>
<th>t values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = 0.38; R square = 0.14; adjusted R square = 0.13; F = 11.26; significant F = 0.0000; Y intercept (a) = 4.31.

As a result, the following regression equation is as estimated:

\[ Y = 4.31 + 0.17X8 + 0.15X3. \]

These results show that only two regression coefficients (b3 and b8) are statistically significant. This indicates that higher ratings on each of these two independent variables (X3 and X8) are associated with a higher rating on the family's overall evaluation of the trip. For example, b8 is equal to 0.17. This means that, according to the model, a one-unit increase in the rating of "resting and relaxing atmosphere of the city" will result in a 0.17 increase in the rating of "the family's overall feeling about the trip." According to the estimates, the factor "resting and relaxing atmosphere of the city" has a larger effect on the rating of the family's overall feeling about the trip than the factor "accompanying spouses on the trip." The value of r squared, the
coefficient of determination, was 0.14 and it indicates the percentage of the variation in the ratings of the family's overall feeling about the trip (Y) explained by the variation in the two independent variables. In this case, the two independent variables explain 14 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

D. Motives of Family Convention Travel

As anticipated from the nature of the sample, convention participation was the most important reason for the family trip to Las Vegas (Figure 4). About 77 percent of families regarded it as very important and only two families considered convention participation to be less important than other activities during their trip. About half (46%) of the family convention travelers to Las Vegas were highly motivated by their spouses' desire to accompany them on this trip. When the family considered taking a trip to Las Vegas, tourist attractions around the city and the respondent's desire to bring families appeared to be unimportant.

E. Spousal Perceptions Related to Decision Making

The respondents generally reported that they have quite a good understanding of their spouses in terms of decision making tendency (Figure 5). In particular, more than half of the respondents reported they perceived their spouses' preference very well and recognized that their spouses wanted to visit Las Vegas with them. The respondents generally agreed that they and their spouses had a relatively equal power in decision making. The last three
Figure 4. Motives of Family Convention Travel

1. Convention participation (n=146).
2. Spouses' desire to accompany on the trip (n=145).
3. Easy accessibility to the city (n=146).
4. Resting and relaxing atmosphere of the city (n=146).
5. Relatively low travel cost (n=146).
6. Availability of various entertainments in the city (n=146).
7. Tourist attractions around the city (n=146).
8. Family accompaniment on the trip (n=141).
Figure 5. The Role of Spouses in Decision Making as Perceived by respondents

1. I know my spouse's preference very well.
2. My spouse wanted to visit Las Vegas with me.
3. My spouse has an equal say in any decision.
4. My spouse would say this trip was my decision.
5. My spouse wanted to attend this convention with me.
6. My spouse normally follows my decision.
7. My spouse normally yield his/her opinion to me.
8. I yield my opinion to my spouse very often.

Note: n = 146 (male = 104 / female = 39 / unknown = 3)
perception parameters imply that the respondents and their spouses were likely to take a conciliatory attitude to reach an agreement in decision making, by yielding their own opinions or decisions to the spouses. Since they responded they know their spouses' preference, there exists a possibility that the respondents might take into account the spouses' decision preference with regard to convention travel this time. Consequently, the real relative influence of the spouses could be more than that shown in Figure.

F. Contributing Factors to Decision Roles

In order to identify which characteristics of the sample are related to the family members' decision roles, t tests have been performed utilizing demographic data as independent variables and family members' relative influence on each subdecision as dependent variables. The independent variables used were gender, household income, the number of children, and both the respondent' and spouse's ages, whereas the dependent variables were the relative influence of the respondent, spouse, and children, respectively, on the decisions regarding: (1) taking a trip to Las Vegas as a family; (2) the length of stay; (3) the amount of money to spend on the trip; (4) choosing dining places for the family during the trip; and, (5) the types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas (See Table 5 for statistically significant results; see Appendix B for overall results). In order to balance the number of respondents in each group, all the independent variables were divided into two groups roughly equal in size.

The results of the t test showed that, in most cases, the investigated subdecisions were not seriously affected by those sample characteristics.
Among the studied sample characteristics the gender and income factors appeared to be the most significant influencer on the subdecisions (Table 5). The number of children living with the respondent also demonstrated its impact upon children's involvement in deciding the length of stay in Las Vegas.

Table 5 presents only the significant findings of the t test. The t values of the respondents' gender are equal to 3.04, 3.49, and 2.89 with significance levels of 0.004, 0.001, and 0.005 for the three subdecisions, the respondent's influence on the decision to come to Las Vegas as a family, the respondent's influence on the length of stay, and the respondent's influence on the trip budget, respectively. These values indicate that the differences are larger than one would expect by chance. Therefore, the respondent's gender is one factor that influences the amount of relative influence reported by the respondent. From this results, it is noted that the male respondents, compared with the female respondents, tended to estimate more highly their influence on the three subdecisions.

Household income was also related to perceived influence. The t test utilized two groups of respondents according to the income level, one with the 1991 family income of less than $65,000 and the other with the 1991 family income of $65,001 or more. The income factor appears likely to be related to spouses' influence on the selection of restaurants and entertainment for the family at a significance level of 0.016 and 0.023, respectively, and to the respondent's influence on choosing the types of entertainment to enjoy as a family at a significance level of 0.054, respectively. Respondents with income less than $65,000 answered that their spouses had more influence than that reported by members of the higher income group on the selection of dining
Table 5. Significant Results of the t Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent’s influence on the decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent’s influence on the length of stay</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent’s influence on trip budget</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than $65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$65,001 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse’s influence on the selection of dining places</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent’s influence on entertainment choice</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse’s influence on the choice of entertainment to enjoy as a family</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children living with respondent</td>
<td>Less than two</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values are ranged from 1-no influence to 10-most influential.
places during the trip. Also, the respondents from the lower income group reported that they had more influence on the selection of entertainment to enjoy as a family than that reported by those respondents from the higher income group.

Finally, respondent families with less than two children were categorized into one group, and those with three or more into the other. The difference between the two groups on children's influence on the decision regarding the length of stay entailed a t value of 2.40 and a two-tailed p value of 0.02. Consequently, it is likely that there is a significant difference in children's influence on deciding the length of stay between the two groups having a different number of children. The present study shows that the respondents with less than two children rated more highly their children's influence on the decision than the respondents with three or more children did.

G. Perceived vs. Realized Decision Power

A correlational analysis was performed to investigate relationships between the respondents' perception of spousal decision roles and the actual influences effectuated by the respondents and their spouses. In the analysis, the answers to the question "I believe that my spouse has an equal say in any decision" were correlated with the answers to the five subdecisions, the decisions regarding whether or not to travel as a family, the length of stay, the amount of money to spend, the places to eat, and the types of entertainment to enjoy (Table 6). For these five subdecisions the difference in answers between the respondents and their spouses was first calculated.
be used in the analysis. Specifically, the spouse's perceived influence was subtracted from the respondent's perceived influence for each of the five subdecisions.

Among the studied subdecisions, the decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas entailed the highest mean difference in the realized influence of by the respondents and their spouses. Also the mean influence difference is higher in the decision of whether or not to travel as a family than in the rest of the three decisions.

The results of the analysis show in general a consistent negative relationship between the answers to the perceptual question and the answers to the five examined subdecisions (Table 6). The negative relationship was particularly significant between the perception-related question and the first three subdecisions, that is, the decision to come to Las Vegas as a family, the decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas, and the decision regarding the amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas. In other words, the higher the respondents' evaluation on perceptual equality in spouses' decision making role, the lower the difference in the relative influence exerted by the respondent and spouse on these three subdecisions. Even though the correlation coefficients for the other two variables are not statistically significant, they are still in the correct direction (negative) to be logically consistent.
Table 6. Summary Results of the Correlation Coefficient Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean influence difference between R and S</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my spouse has an equal say in any decision. (n=144)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>-0.330 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>-0.367 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>-0.339 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

Note: R = Respondent  
S = Spouse  
The respondents' and spouses' influences were measured on an 1-no influence and 10-most influential scale.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

A. Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relative influence exerted by family members and family decision making patterns in the subdecisions that were related to family convention travel. Data collected from 146 family travelers show that the respondent, who was in most cases male, exercised the most influence on all of the investigated subdecisions. The spouse's influence also appeared to be somewhat important. However, children had very little influence on these decisions. Consequently, from the composition of male and female in the number of respondent, family decision making on the subdecisions associated with family convention travel appears to be slightly husband-dominated. Among the subdecisions studied, the spouse is most influential on the decision regarding the choice of dining places for the family. Compared to other subdecisions, children participate more actively in decision making of choosing entertainment to enjoy as a family.

Another purpose of this study was to investigate the degree of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction with convention travel to Las Vegas taken by families and the contributing factors to this tourism satisfaction. As shown in Figure 3, families were generally satisfied with their travel to Las Vegas. The convention attended gave the greatest satisfaction, whereas the availability of family recreation and entertainment in the city the least among the tested variables. Also, the respondent families were quite satisfied with the services of the hotels/motels where they stayed. This satisfaction was
likely to be best explained by, first, the city's resting and relaxing atmosphere and, second, spouse accompaniment on the trip (See Table 4).

In addition, the present study originally addressed four sub-issues helpful in understanding the dynamics of family decision making regarding convention travel.

1) What were the major motives for a family to take convention trip to Las Vegas? Among the examined variables, the two strongest motives for family convention travel were convention participation itself and spouse's desire to accompany on the trip, whereas tourist attractions around the city and children's accompaniment on the trip were relatively unimportant reasons for the trip (See Figure 4).

2) How did convention attendees perceive the role of their spouses in terms of decision making? In general, the higher mean values reported by the respondents on the questioned spousal perceptions may mean that the respondents have a good understanding of their spouses' decision making tendencies (See Figure 5). Spouses' preferences and desire to accompany on the trip were especially well perceived by the respondents. General agreement was reached on equality in decision roles between the respondents and their spouses. For the three questions, "my spouse normally follows my decision," "my spouse normally yield his/her opinion to me," and "I yield my opinion to my spouse very often," the respondents showed less agreement than for the others.

3) What factors contributed to family members' decision role? Gender and household income appear likely to be the most frequent variables to influence the relative contribution of family members in convention travel decision making (See Table 5). However, factors such as the respondents'
and spouses' ages and the number of children accompanied on the trip do not seem to have an influence on the decision making (See Appendix B).

4) Was the spousal perception of equality in decision making realized in actual decision making situation? While the respondents generally agreed that their spouses has an equal say in any decision making (See Figure 5), they estimated that they exerted more influence on the five subdecisions than their spouses (See Figure 2 and Appendix A).

B. Discussion and Suggestions

The initial results of this study are consistent with those of past research in that husband, wife and child interact with each other to reach a decision on the purchase of a product to be shared by the family members (see Ritchie and Fillatruait, 1980; Jenkins, 1978; Belch et al, 1985; Foxman and Tansuhaj, 1988; Nelson, 1978; Atkin, 1978; Foxman et al, 1989; Ward and Wackman, 1972). The amount of relative influence of each family member is constant throughout all the subdecisions. Although all of the subdecisions seem to be slightly husband-dominant, wives' influence are still significant (see Figure 2).

In addition, the mean influence difference between the respondents and spouses was higher for the major subdecisions, that is, decisions regarding whether or not to travel as a family and the length of stay, than the other three minor subdecisions.

Children's influence was considered by a relatively small number of the respondents. A plausible explanation for this is that the dyad's children were in school at the time of the trip. This fact could lead the dyad to leave their
children out of the decision making process for the trip. Also, children's relative influence was extremely small when compared with that of their parents. This implies that a convention travel decision is likely made by parents without involving children very much.

With regard to children's influence, travelers reported children's relative influence more on the decision regarding the choice of dining places for the family and the types of entertainment to enjoy as a family than on the other subdecisions examined in this study. Out of the 146 respondents, 63 people responded to these two questions, while only 24 families brought children on the trip. Thus, it is assumed that 39 (63 - 24) respondents must have answered these questions by hypothesizing as if they brought their children on the trip or by recalling experience in similar situations.

In Figure 4, the respondents rated highly spouse's desire to accompany on the trip as a travel motive while assigning the lowest point to accompanying families on the trip. This result is quite consistent with the high ratings shown in the frequency analysis of Part III and multiple regression. Figure 5 shows that respondents perceived their spouses' strong desire to accompany on the trip and Table 4, the multiple regression equation, indicates that accompanying spouses on the trip and resting and relaxing atmosphere were two strongest contributory factors to the family's tourism satisfaction.

Although the variable, the resting and relaxing atmosphere of the city, ranked the fourth highest among the travel motives, it appeared to be the best predictor of the family's tourism satisfaction in the multiple regression. This implies that though families were not as strongly motivated to travel by the destination's relaxing atmosphere as they were by other motives, their satisfaction with the travel was strongly affected by this factor. This result
has an important marketing implication. Travel motives and the factors impacting travel satisfaction are not necessarily identical. Furthermore, one may infer that the family's satisfaction with the city's overall amenities could contribute to the family's high degree of satisfaction with the convention attended and, eventually, to the family's overall satisfactory feeling about the trip.

Measurement of spousal perceptions in Figure 5 illustrates that the respondents (most likely husbands) knew their spouses' preference very well. This may mean that though the spouses' (most likely wives) relative influence is slightly lower than the respondents', it could be more than that actually measured in a conceptual sense. That is, there was a possibility that the respondents incorporated their knowledge about their spouses' preference into their decision making without any prior discussion.

In the correlation analysis, a consistent negative relationship was found between the respondents' perception of their spouses' decision power and the mean difference in influence exerted by the respondents and spouses. That is, the respondents who perceived a higher degree of spousal equality in decision making tended to report a lower influence difference. This negative relationship was particularly evident between the perception and the influence difference exerted on decisions regarding whether or not to travel as a family, the length of stay, and the amount of money to spend.

Comprehensively, all the results of this study can be incorporated into a model that illustrates decision making and tourism satisfaction influencers and feedback (Figure 6). The model was developed on the basis of the this study. Therefore, it may not capture the overall phenomenon of FDM dynamics. However, it can help better understand FDM allied with convention travel.
Figure 6. FDM and Satisfaction in Convention Participation
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The model shows that while many situations and factors such as the event itself and destination characteristics can affect the family's convention travel and related decisions, family characteristics are also important variables in these decisions. These variables appeared to determine in part the family's tourism satisfaction. It is especially noticeable that the degree of the family's satisfaction with the travel is affected by family interactions in decision making during the travel. The degree of satisfaction may have direct influence and indirect influence through family members on the future decisions related to convention travel.

The present study resulted in several outcomes meaningful to meeting planners, hotel operators, and the city's tourism planners. Today, many meetings and conventions recognize the importance of family participants and therefore include a family program in their schedules so as to increase participation rates. For example, the Las Vegas Hilton, the most active convention hosting hotel in the city, has an on-property child care facility for family-accompanied convention participants. In this regard, this study found that the other members as well as the expected convention attendee of the family were important especially in that they participated in convention participation decision making.

Hotel operators and the city's tourism marketers can take best advantage of the study's results and implications on family travel motives and satisfaction. People want to bring their spouses to the city. To encourage potential travelers to visit Las Vegas with their spouses and families, the city must provide them with appropriate travel conditions regarding, for example, accessibility, comfort, cost, entertainment, etc. This responsibility remains primarily for the city's tourism planners and hotel operators.
In the process of applying the results of this study, attention must be given to the generalizability of the results. The survey was conducted toward a relatively small sample of only one association convention. This limits the application of the results to every convention.

C. Suggestions for Future Research

This study should be replicated and extended in further detail to gain more reliability and validity. The sample of this study is somewhat homogeneous in age, income, and travel purpose. The survey was conducted with a convenience sample traveling as a family for the purpose of convention participation in Las Vegas. The sample has relatively high income and cannot represent all family convention travelers. Data related to children were collected from only a small number of the respondent. Thus the results of the study must be tested with different samples from different sources. In particular, more data about children must be included in family decision making. The model proposed in this study should be evaluated and revised by more rigorous studies in the future.

Observational methods merit inclusion in future research on family decision making. Most of the family decision making studies have employed a self-reported questionnaire survey on the assumption that the respondent had ability to exactly measure the relative influence of family members, which is questionable. The subject bias can be reduced by using an observational study. However, if an observational study is to be done in a laboratory, researchers must be careful to setting up decision making situations because people can behave differently in an artificial settings.
In this study the relative influence of family members was measured by a separate set of scales on which one respondent from each family evaluated each member's influence separately. This reduces comparability between each member's relative influence. Additionally, with regard to Part II, an analysis of data without making distinction between male and female respondents restricted its data interpretability. Therefore, in the future, family researchers are strongly encouraged to obtain data from all the members of the family participating in the study, if time and cost are not important constraints. This method is expected to reduce the subject bias and, at the same time, increase the validity of data.

Perceived relative influence of family members in decision making also deserves extensive research attention. The family is a peculiar social group whose members share better understanding and affection with each other than those of any other group. Thus this understanding can intensify the possibility that members take each other's preference into account without any interaction. This indirectly reflected preference is another form of relative influence.

Finally, another suggestion for future research is that researchers must pay more attention to cross-cultural aspects of family decision making (for more detailed discussion, see O'Connor et. al (1985)). The power structure and other characteristics of the family may be different from culture to culture or from nation to nation. Conventions as well as travel and other businesses are becoming globalized. In this context, family decision making on an international level would be of great value to marketers.
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APPENDICES
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## APPENDIX A.

### Relative Influence of Family Members

Note: Scales are ranged from 1-no influence to 10-most influential.  
All the responses were reported by the respondents.  
Subtotals may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

1. On the decision to come to Las Vegas as a family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Respondent (%)</th>
<th>Spouse (%)</th>
<th>Children (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 (9.0)</td>
<td>20 (14.5)</td>
<td>42 (64.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>4 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
<td>3 (2.2)</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8 (5.5)</td>
<td>13 (9.4)</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 (6.9)</td>
<td>16 (11.6)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 (6.9)</td>
<td>9 (6.5)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 (10.3)</td>
<td>22 (15.9)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 (8.3)</td>
<td>14 (10.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70 (48.3)</td>
<td>34 (24.6)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 145 (100) 138 (100) 65 (100)
2. On the decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Respondent (%)</th>
<th>Spouse (%)</th>
<th>Children (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (4.2)</td>
<td>25 (17.9)</td>
<td>44 (68.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>7 (5.0)</td>
<td>5 (7.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>9 (6.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 (4.2)</td>
<td>12 (8.6)</td>
<td>6 (9.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10 (6.9)</td>
<td>9 (6.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 (5.6)</td>
<td>13 (9.3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19 (13.2)</td>
<td>14 (10.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15 (10.4)</td>
<td>13 (9.3)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>76 (52.8)</td>
<td>36 (25.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144 (100)</td>
<td>140 (100)</td>
<td>64 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. On the decision regarding the amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Respondent (%)</th>
<th>Spouse (%)</th>
<th>Children (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>12 (8.6)</td>
<td>44 (71.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 (2.1)</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 (10.3)</td>
<td>19 (13.6)</td>
<td>7 (11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 (9.7)</td>
<td>14 (10.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14 (9.7)</td>
<td>15 (10.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18 (12.4)</td>
<td>21 (15.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 (8.3)</td>
<td>15 (10.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>62 (42.8)</td>
<td>36 (25.7)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145 (100)</td>
<td>140 (100)</td>
<td>62 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. On the decision regarding the selection of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Respondent (%)</th>
<th>Spouse (%)</th>
<th>Children (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (0.7)</td>
<td>11 (7.9)</td>
<td>38 (60.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (2.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15 (10.5)</td>
<td>12 (8.6)</td>
<td>6 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21 (14.7)</td>
<td>13 (9.4)</td>
<td>5 (7.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 (9.1)</td>
<td>11 (7.9)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24 (16.8)</td>
<td>20 (14.4)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 (7.0)</td>
<td>22 (15.8)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>49 (34.3)</td>
<td>44 (31.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143 (100)</td>
<td>139 (100)</td>
<td>63 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. On the decision regarding the types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Respondent (%)</th>
<th>Spouse (%)</th>
<th>Children (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 (5.6)</td>
<td>16 (11.3)</td>
<td>36 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (2.8)</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 (1.4)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>2 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 (3.5)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19 (13.2)</td>
<td>15 (10.6)</td>
<td>5 (7.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24 (16.7)</td>
<td>15 (10.6)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 (9.0)</td>
<td>12 (8.5)</td>
<td>4 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16 (11.1)</td>
<td>18 (12.8)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12 (8.3)</td>
<td>17 (12.1)</td>
<td>5 (7.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>41 (28.5)</td>
<td>38 (27.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 144 (100)      | 141 (100)  | 63 (100)     |
### APPENDIX B

**The Results of t Tests**

(* * = statistically significant)

1. *By household income ($65,000 or less : $65,001 or more)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Influencers</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.02 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.05 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.02 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. By gender (male : female)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Influencers</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.004 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.001 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.005 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. By respondents' age (44 or less : 45 or more years old)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Influencers</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. By spouses' age (44 or less : 45 or more years old)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Influencers</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. By the number of children they have (two or less : three or more children)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Influencers</th>
<th>t values</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.02 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of money to spend on the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of dining places for the family during the trip to Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas</td>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Survey Questionnaire

Dear Respondents:

I am a graduate student, majoring in Hotel Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV). This survey is conducted for my Masters degree. Please fill out this questionnaire and return it to the surveyor.

Thank you very much for cooperation and have a good time in Las Vegas.

Sincerely,

HaeMoon Oh

cc: Dr. Wesley S. Roehl
Dr. Kaye-Sung Chon
Ms. Patti Shock
Dr. Clint Richards
PART I

**Directions:** Please read each item below and rate how important it was to you when you planned this visit to Las Vegas. For example, if it was very important for your trip to Las Vegas, circle 5. However, if it was very UNimportant, circle 1.

**NOTE:** The meanings of numbers to circle:

- **5---Very important**
- **4---Somewhat important**
- **3---Neutral (mixed feeling)**
- **2---Somewhat UNimportant**
- **1---Very UNimportant**

1. How important is it to attend this convention compared to other activities you would like to do while visiting Las Vegas?

   5 4 3 2 1

2. When you decided to attend this convention, how important was it that there were various entertainments in Las Vegas that you could enjoy after attending this convention?

   5 4 3 2 1

3. How important to you was your spouse's desire to accompany you in this trip to Las Vegas?

   5 4 3 2 1

4. How important was your desire to bring your family to Las Vegas?

   5 4 3 2 1

5. When you decided to come to Las Vegas, how important were various tourist attractions to see around Las Vegas?

   5 4 3 2 1

6. How important was travel cost for your family trip to this city as compared to other cities?

   5 4 3 2 1

7. How important was easy accessibility to this city for your family trip?

   5 4 3 2 1

8. How important was it for your family to rest and relax in Las Vegas?

   5 4 3 2 1

Please continue on the next page.
**Directions:** Please try to recall who was influential in deciding each item discussed below. Then circle a number to show the degree of influence you, your spouse and your children had on the decision. For example, if your spouse entirely responsible for the decision, circle 10. However, if he or she had no influence on the decision, circle 1. Please repeat this evaluation for yourself, your spouse and your children for each item.

**NOTE:** The larger the number is, the more influence the number means.
10—Most influential 1—No influence

1. Decision to come to Las Vegas as a family.
   - You: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Spouse: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Children: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

2. Decision regarding the length of stay in Las Vegas.
   - You: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Spouse: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Children: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

3. Amount of money to spend on this trip to Las Vegas.
   - You: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Spouse: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Children: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

4. Choice of dining places for your family during your visit to Las Vegas.
   - You: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Spouse: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Children: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

5. Types of entertainment to enjoy as a family in Las Vegas.
   - You: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Spouse: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
   - Children: 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Please continue on the next page.
PART III

Directions: Please read and circle the appropriate number that indicates your belief. For example, if you strongly agree with the statement, circle 5 and circle 1 if you strongly disagree with it.

NOTE: Numbers mean: 5--------Strongly agree
                        4--------Agree
                        3--------Neutral (Neither agree nor Disagree)
                        2--------Disagree
                        1--------Strongly Disagree

I believe:

1. My spouse wanted to visit Las Vegas with me. 5 4 3 2 1
2. My spouse wanted to attend this convention with me. 5 4 3 2 1
3. I know my spouse's preferences very well. 5 4 3 2 1
4. My spouse would say that this trip was my decision. 5 4 3 2 1
5. My spouse has an equal say in any decision. 5 4 3 2 1
6. My spouse normally follows my decision. 5 4 3 2 1
7. I yield my opinion to my spouse very often. 5 4 3 2 1
8. My spouse normally yields his or her opinion to me. 5 4 3 2 1

Please continue on the next page
PART IV

Directions: Please indicate how much your family is satisfied or dissatisfied with these item(s) about your trip to Las Vegas. For example, if it was delightful for your family to experience it, circle "Delighted", or circle "Terrible" if it was terrible.

Note: The term "Mixed feeling" means "about equally satisfied and dissatisfied".

1. Atmosphere of the city for your family.
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

2. Overall service and amenities of the hotel/motel where you are staying.
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

3. Opportunities for family recreation and entertainment.
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

4. The convention you are participating in.
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

5. The city's overall attractiveness.
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

6. What is your family's overall feeling about this trip to Las Vegas?
   Delighted  Pleased  Mostly satisfied  Mixed feeling  Mostly dissatisfied  Unhappy  Terrible

Please continue on the next page
PART V

Please complete this survey by answering the last few questions. These questions will be used for statistical purpose only.

1. Your sex (check one): ______:Male ______:Female

2. Household income in 1991 (check one):
   1. ______: Less than $15,000
   2. ______: $15,001 to $25,000
   3. ______: $25,001 to $35,000
   4. ______: $35,001 to $45,000
   5. ______: $45,001 to $55,000
   6. ______: $55,001 to $65,000
   7. ______: $65,001 to $75,000
   8. ______: More than $75,000

3. How many children do you have? ______ children.


5. Your age (check one): ______: Under 25
   ______: 26 to 34
   ______: 35 to 44
   ______: 45 to 54
   ______: 55 to 64
   ______: Above 65

   Your spouse's age (check one on this side)
   ______: 26 to 34
   ______: 35 to 44
   ______: 45 to 54
   ______: 55 to 64
   ______: Above 65

6. Would you like to visit Las Vegas again? ______: Yes ______: No ______: Maybe
   If yes or maybe, with whom would you like to visit? (check one)
   ______: Alone
   ______: With spouse only
   ______: With children only
   ______: With spouse and children

7. Your personal budget Amount of money that was dedicated to leisure activities while visiting Las Vegas (check one on this side).
   ______: Under $500
   ______: $501 - $1,000
   ______: $1,001 - $1,500
   ______: $1,501 - $2,000
   ______: More than $2,000

Thank you very much for cooperation. Please return this questionnaire to the surveyor.