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ABSTRACT

An Empirical Investigation of Gaming Destination Images

by

Erin Kneesel

Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu, Examination Committee Chair
Assistant Professor of Hotel Administration
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This research is an investigation of the images and perceptions of four selected gaming destinations - Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut - in order to uncover their perceived strengths and weaknesses. The evaluation of each destination will be done through evaluating cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions through a combination of quantitative and qualitative questions. The study was able to determine that there are significant differences between the perceptions of each of the four destinations. The strengths and weaknesses of each of the gaming markets can be identified to aid marketers in formulating a more effective marketing campaign and positioning strategy, as well as help to enhance the image management of each gaming destination. Overall Las Vegas was rated the top gaming market on all but one of the cognitive variables, cleanliness of environment. Interestingly, Las Vegas as given the highest mean score on the cognitive variables of family appeal and adult appeal. Throughout the majority of variables Atlantic City was mostly rated second to Las Vegas with Chicagoland and Connecticut
switching between the third and fourth gaming markets. The overall image answers coincided with the cognitive and affective variable answers supporting Las Vegas as having the best overall image. Answers to the qualitative (open-ended) questions about each gaming market offered further explanation for the quantitative questions which provided support that a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods are necessary in understanding image and perception in gaming markets.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Over the past twenty years, gaming areas have evolved from a few isolated places to a booming business located in almost every state in the United States. The presence of gaming in the U.S. has had various impacts ranging from economic impacts in the form of revenue, to social problems like increased crime and gambling addictions. In spite of the problems associated with what gaming has to offer, is it difficult to ignore its impact on gaming towns across the country. According to the American Gaming Associations 2004 State of the States Survey: “The commercial casino industry in 2003- which included 443 casinos nationwide- continued to contribute to state and local economies, generating more than $27 billion in gross gaming revenue, of which $4.32 billion was paid in direct gaming taxes” (AGA, 2004, p. 9). Gaming, otherwise known as gambling, has become a big business in the United States not only in relation to generated revenues but also in popularity. In terms of spending choices, Americans have placed overall yearly gaming spending before their yearly spending on several other forms of entertainment including DVD/VHS Rentals and Sales, Amusement and Theme Park Sales, and Movie Box Office Sales (AGA, 2004). Now, once struggling towns are being revived and are thriving, and the phenomenon known as gaming is once again taking center stage.
Due to a gain in popularity, more people are taking part in some type of gaming whether it is video poker machines, playing in poker rooms, or blackjack. According to a recent Gallup Poll conducted in December 2003, "Three in 10 Americans say they have visited a casino in the past 12 months, making it the second-most common form of gambling" (Jones, 2004). The same study compared a similar 1989 study to the 2003 study and found that only one category saw an increase over the 15 year time period. "Gallup data suggests Americans are less likely to participate in most forms of gambling than they were in 1989....The primary exception is visiting casinos, which has increased from 20% in 1989 to 30% today" (Jones, 2004).

As a result of the presence of gaming in almost every state, coupled with an increase in gaming participation, the competition for business becomes fiercer. Gaming destinations need to know how people view their destinations in relation to other competing destinations in order to more effectively position themselves (Ahmed, 1991; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Calatone, di Benedetto, Hakam, & Bojanic, 1989; Javalgi, Thomas, & Rao, 1992). Knowing the strengths and weaknesses of a particular gaming destination, as well as the opposing gaming destinations, will aid marketers in developing a better positioning strategy. In addition, being able to determine if the perceptions travelers hold are in line with the offerings of each gaming destination will help marketers to identify any gaps between supply and demand (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b).

Once basic information is known about the average casino patron, it is easy to see that the casino patrons are a powerful segment within the travel industry. It would benefit casino companies and marketers to be able to understand exactly what motivates them to
choose a specific gaming destination so that they might be able to plan a campaign exclusively aimed at getting these patrons to their casinos. Being able to understand which aspects of a destination are important and which things do not matter to the average patron, will help to re-focus the marketing plan of a casino or the destination itself. Several studies in the past looked at various forms of gaming destination choice ranging from why people choose a specific riverboat for their gaming purposes over another (Turco & Riley, 1996) to things that are important to the patrons of Indian and Riverboat casinos (Pfaffenberg & Costello, 2002). Other research studied customer satisfaction in gaming (Mayer, Johnson, Hu, & Chen, 1998), profiled the casino resort vacationer (Morrison, Braunlich, Cai, and O’Leary, 1996), and determined the impact of spenders on casino destinations (Moufakkir, Singh, Moufakkir-van der Woud, & Holecek, 2004). None of these research projects has ever compared several gaming destinations across a combination of destination and gaming attributes in order to determine what people perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of a gaming destination.

**Problem Statement**

The purpose of this study is to examine images and perceptions of four selected gaming destinations - Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut - to reveal the perceived strengths and weaknesses. Cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions of each gaming place are analyzed through a mixture of quantitative and qualitative questions to get a better understanding of how to more effectively market these gaming destinations. The results would help
those destinations enhance their image management and marketing, as well as positioning strategy.

**Importance of the Study**

Very limited research exists regarding gaming destination images and their strengths and weaknesses. While a plethora of research has been conducted on destination image, gaming areas as a destination have not been studied. Several researchers have looked at important factors in riverboat and Indian casinos (Pfaffenberg & Costello, 2002; Turco & Riley, 1996;) but no research exists that takes a look at gaming destinations across all types- commercial, riverboat, and Indian gaming. As a result of this gap in the literature, no inferences have been drawn between factors that are perceived strengths and weaknesses of a destination in relation to the selection of a gaming destination. No research has looked at the overall image and perceptions of gaming destinations as distinguished by people interested in gaming. This study will focus on determining how people perceive gaming destinations in terms of important attributes of a destination- such as safety and climate- and also gaming attributes- such as variety of games and casino promotions, as well as affective perceptions, overall image, and intentions. With some form of gaming in almost all the states in the U.S., gaming destinations are becoming a driving force behind a large percentage of trips being planned. It is critical to understand the factors that aid in determining a suitable gaming destination and how each destination is perceived in terms of image to essentially be able to promote the destination to the right people, in the right places, in the right way. The results of this research will allow each of the chosen destinations to evaluate what they are offering to their patron's (supply) with what their gaming patrons are demanding. Disagreement
between the supplied offerings and the demanded offerings of each gaming destination is an area of immediate attention and improvement. This research will open up more opportunities for further academic research on gaming destinations combined with image and perception.

**Hypotheses**

This study’s research hypotheses are:

**H1:** The average cognitive perceptions of gaming markets (destinations) are different (At least, one pair of destination are different).

Please note that this hypothesis has 19 (per cognition item) sub-hypotheses.

**H2:** The average affective perceptions of gaming markets (destinations) are different (At least, one pair of destination are different).

Please note that this hypothesis has 4 (per affect item) sub-hypotheses.

**H3:** The average overall image of gaming markets (destinations) are different (At least, one pair of destination are different).

**H4:** The behavioral intention for gaming markets (destinations) are different (At least, one pair of destination are different).

Please note that this hypothesis has 2 (recommendation and visitation intention) sub-hypotheses.

The study will control previous experience (visitation or living) with the gaming markets by examining the differences in images and behavioral intentions between visitors and non-visitors.
Assumptions

The study assumes that the respondents are truthful and honest in their responses to the questions. It is also assumed that the sampling information provided by Survey Sampling International (www.surveysampling.com) is accurate.

Reliability and Validity

Reliability is defined as the “degree to which measures are free from error and therefore yield consistent results” (Zikmund, 2003, p. 300). Repeatability is an important factor in establishing reliability. In this study, the majority of the attributes that were measured were used in previous studies which were able to establish reliability. The reliability is assessed in two ways in this study. The reliability of multi-item measures (affect and behavioral intention) was checked by reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha) (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). The reliability was also assessed subjectively by examining the converging or diverging pattern between qualitative and quantitative responses.

Validity is defined as “the ability of a scale or measuring instrument to measure what it is intended to measure” (Zikmund, 2003, pg. 302). In this study, content or face validity was established through several different methods. Content validity is truthfully selecting a scale that will measure what it is intended to measure by consulting a variety of professionals to form a professional agreement (Zikmund, 2003). During the process of selecting the attributes used to measure image and perception, extensive previous literature, numerous professors, and experts were consulted. In terms of the selected gaming attributes, questions were posted on nine different message boards specializing in gaming discussions. Responses from those discussions were used in conjunction with the limited research available to select the gaming attributes to be used in the study. The
predictive validity of the cognition and affect attributes was assessed by correlating these measures to behavioral intent measures (recommendation and visitation intention). The predictive validity concerns how well the measures are related to a future criterion (Carmines & Zeller, 1979).

Limitations

The major limitation of this study is concerning sampling issues. With the selected gaming destinations being across the United States, it was necessary to obtain a sample of respondents from all over the country. Needing respondents from all over the country limited the time frame and options for the questionnaire. An Internet survey was selected as the best method to access the greatest number of people in the shortest period of time. By using the Internet to conduct the survey, automatically people without Internet access or the proper computer skills needed to complete the survey are eliminated from the sample. This makes the results less generalizable for the general population simply because a large percentage of gaming patrons may have been excluded. Conducting Internet surveys can also be extremely advantageous in that a very large sample of people can be reached in a very short amount of time.

Other limitations are present in the actual sample of people selected to take the survey. A sample was obtained from Survey Sampling International (SSI) that consisted of a sample of people on an opt-in list that specifically stated gaming as an interest. Opt-in e-mail lists consist of people giving permission to receive e-mail surveys and questionnaires that have to do with the areas of interest they have expressed (Zikmund, 2003). Internet samples can be both advantageous and disadvantageous in terms of rapid response rates. If a sample of people from across the United States is sought, e-mails to
the various time zones must be accurately timed to include the possibility of all people filling out the survey. Also, people have a tendency to be online more during the weekends than during the week which might affect the timing of information received. Anticipating time zone differences and the “day-of-the-week effect” will help to yield more accurate results (Zikmund, 2003).

Another limitation to the study is in the selection of the top four gaming destinations. These gaming destinations were selected according to gross revenue reported by the American Gaming Association in 2003 contained within The 2005 Casino & Gaming Market Research Handbook. A better measure of the top gaming destinations might be in terms of visitor volume or overall spending impact on a destination city. Several other gaming areas exist in the United States that may not be one of the highest grossing areas but are high in terms of visitor numbers and recognition such as Biloxi, Mississippi and the Reno/Tahoe area.

Finally, an inherent limitation to this study is related to the selected attributes that are used to measure image of the selected destinations. A review of the literature revealed the most common attributes used in the past. However, very little information was available on specific attributes to be used in the measurement of gaming destinations. Overall, the interpretation of the results of this study is limited to those attributes that were selected. While steps were taken to ensure the selected gaming attributes were valid and accurate, these attributes have never been used previously in academic research.

**Definition of Terms**

**Strength:** In this paper, strength will be used to mean an aspect of a destination that makes it superior or an attribute that gives a destination a competitive advantage.
Weakness: In this paper, weakness will be used to mean an aspect of a destination that makes it inferior to others, or an attribute that gives a destination a competitive disadvantage.

Image: “Image is the total perception of the destination that is formed by processing information from various sources over time” (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991, pg. 10).

Positioning: “Positioning is the process of establishing a distinctive place for a destination in the minds of the travelers in the targeted markets” (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b, pg. 145).

Perception: In this paper, perception will be defined as “Recognition and interpretation of sensory stimuli based chiefly on memory (www.dictionary.com ).”

Destination image: According to Milman and Pizam (1995), destination image can be essentially defined as a “visual or mental impression of a place, a product, or an experience held by the general public” (Milman & Pizam, 1995, pg. 21).

Destination image components: Destination images can be formed in any of three different areas: cognitive, affective, and conative and the interconnection between these three components is where the overall image is formed (Gartner, 1993).

Gaming destination/market: Gaming destination/market in this paper will mean the geographic region to which a traveler is going for the purposes of participating in gaming.

Gaming/gambling: The American Gaming Association defines gaming as “the action or habit of playing at games of chance for stakes (AGA, Gaming vs. Gambling, 1999).” The term gambling is used to explain the actual activity of participating in gaming. For the purposes of this paper the terms gaming and gambling are used interchangeably in
accordance with the 1987 Dictionary of Gambling and Gaming which states that gaming is "the playing of games of chance for stakes; gambling (AGA, Gaming vs. Gambling, 1999)."
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

With the presence of some form of gaming in almost every state in the U.S., the business of gaming has become more than a few casinos in isolated places. As previously mentioned, gaming dollars contribute a significant amount of money to the economies of gaming cities and states which leads to the increasing importance of properly positioning these gaming destinations in order to continue to benefit from gaming dollars. For proof of the saturation of gaming into society, take a look at the presence of gaming in popular culture. Poker tournaments and celebrity poker television shows are getting higher ratings than ever before and shows like American Casino on Bravo and The Casino on Fox are exposing gaming to a much wider range of people. Whether people simply stop in at a local casino on a group trip or they are planning a trip to Las Vegas, traveling for purposes of participating in gaming is on the rise.

While the selection of a destination has been widely studied in the past, the process of selecting a specific gaming destination is a new concept. To better understand what motivates consumers in their selection of a vacation destination, regardless of purpose, it is important to know some information about that consumer. Gaming destinations need access to this information in order to develop a positioning strategy that works to their
advantage. Consumers that have expressed an interest in gambling have a profile that is essential in comprehending their motivation to visit a specific gaming destination. The Gambling Activity in the United States Gallup Poll in 2003 reports the demographics for Americans that gambled in the past 12 months to be predominately male, with the highest percentage in the 50-64 age range, and with the higher income categories participating more frequently in gaming than those in the lower ranges (Jones, 2004). The American Gaming Association’s State of the States 2004 reports that the average gambler has a higher income and is more likely to have attended college than the average American and that “the typical casino customer is slightly older than the average American” at age 48 (AGA, 2004, p. 15).

An improved understanding is necessary of those people who not only gamble, but also travel in order for marketers to effectively tailor their marketing strategy. In Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler, they found that “Two out of three casino gamblers take at least one long trip per year, while less than half of non-gamblers do. Casino gamblers are more likely than non-casino gamblers to schedule a wide range of vacation experiences. Casino gamblers like to travel in style and are more likely than non-gamblers to book upscale accommodations when they vacation” (Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler, 2004, p. 9). Harrah’s profile also found that gamblers are more likely than non-gamblers to participate in some form of entertainment, and they eat out more often than non-gamblers (Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler, 2004). Information like this can aid a gaming destination in modifying their marketing plan to ensure that potential gamblers at their destination also have a clear view of the other offerings the destination might have
besides gaming. For example, when a destination knows that gamblers eat out more often, they can be sure that complimentary lunches and dinners are available to certain patrons. Knowing that gamblers like other forms of entertainment besides gaming, a destination would be able to book shows and concerts in an effort to market more efficiently to their gaming patrons.

Now that it has been established that people who participate in gaming are a powerful segment of consumers, it is understandable why a study that looks at the image and perception of gaming destinations would be useful. For each of the four destinations, marketers will be able to compare what they are offering as a destination, with what consumers are demanding. Any discrepancies between the supplied offerings and the demanded offerings are a place where each destination can improve. Getting a better understanding of the overall image of each gaming destination will also help in formulating a more accurate positioning strategy. Image is a powerful determinant in where people choose to travel (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997). A more precise look at how consumers view each gaming destination will provide information for marketers to adjust and re-focus their marketing efforts. As Brown (2001) mentions “a person who participates in gaming activities would not necessarily visit casino resorts in a particular destination, for several reasons: his/her perceptions and attitudes, and convenience factors like distance, time, etc.” (Brown, 2001, pg. 42). In accordance with this statement, this project seeks to uncover those perceptions and attitudes as well as which factors make the selected destinations stronger or weaker in the eyes of the casino patron.
Relevant Gaming Literature Review

Casino Choice Factors

After an extensive review of the academic literature, no studies specifically examined the cognitive and affective perceptions or the overall image and behavioral intentions of gaming destinations and markets with the four selected gaming markets. Due to image being an important factor in any destination, gaming or not, it is hard to believe that no information exists in the form of image studies in conjunction with gaming destinations, at least within the academic world. Each of the four selected destinations have Convention and Visitors Bureaus (CVB) working on their behalf that probably have commissioned image studies that were privately funded and not published or available to people outside of the CVB.

The most closely related research comparable to this project is aimed at uncovering choice factors for riverboat gamblers and important items for Indian and riverboat casinos. The first study's (Turco & Riley, 1996) purpose was to investigate which factors were vital to casino gamblers in their process of choosing a specific riverboat casino in the Chicagoland area and to identify the type of alternative activities consumers would choose if they were not gambling. “When considering the notion of alternative activities, it has been found that there are two distinct motives for gambling- gambling for entertainment and gambling for monetary gain” (Turco & Riley, 1996, pg. 26). The authors argued that by taking into consideration these two motivations, casinos need to tailor to the needs of each type of gambler by offering alternative activities for entertainment and a variety of games for those gamblers motivated by the desire to win. These findings coupled with the information published in Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the
American Casino Gambler confirm that people who partake in gaming demand alternative entertainment options. The authors also found that for those people who do not gamble on a frequent basis, the recommendation of relatives and family as well as the uniqueness of the experience were two of the main reasons for their decision to select a specific riverboat casino. This same study revealed that for the frequent gambler other reasons, such as potential to win and service quality, were their motivation in choosing a particular riverboat casino. While the selection of a riverboat casino is essentially different from the selection of a gaming destination, in general the results of this study are very applicable to the present research.

In a similar study, Pfaffenberg and Costello (2002) looked at which factors were important to both Indian and riverboat casinos throughout various locations in the United States. Respondents were asked about their casino encounter, as well as the importance of twenty-five items or attributes. The twenty-five items that were selected were consulted in the selection of attributes for the present study. Pfaffenberg and Costello looked at attributes ranging from better odds to location to free drinks offered. The authors found that for both riverboat and Indian casino patrons, the single most important factor was safety, followed by friendly employees and service. When separated into Indian casino patrons and riverboat casino patrons, the most important factor remained safety. Interestingly, this study concluded that tangible items such as guest rooms, the actual facility, and food were not reported to be as important to these patrons as intangible items such as service and security.

The results of the study by Pfaffenberg and Costello are important in that they include an analysis of both riverboat and Indian gaming patrons which the previous study by
Turco and Riley (1996) did not. The first study did not specifically mention previous visitation as a factor in determining the choice factors. However, of the choice factors offered, two of the options were as follows: Lucky/won there before and Wanted to visit for the first time (Turco & Riley, 1996). The study conducted by Pfaffenberg and Costello (2002) took into account previous visitation which is an important factor in the discussion of image and perception.

Of the gaming literature, the two previously mentioned studies were the most closely related to the current research. However, these studies focused on casinos, not on destinations or gaming markets. While gaming literature as a whole is rapidly expanding, in general it remains very limited in terms of gaming destination image, perception, and intentions. Other forms of literature consulted in determining the selected attributes in the current study revealed many other important factors to casino patrons. Reece (2001) looked at travelers to Las Vegas and the Atlantic City area. The purpose of his study was to measure the impacts of distance, lifestyle, and demographics on travel to Las Vegas and Atlantic City in order to recognize the characteristics of consumers that have a high demand for each of these destinations. Reece concluded that distance has a strong negative influence on both Las Vegas and Atlantic City. He was also able to determine that households with older residents are more likely to travel to Atlantic City but not to Las Vegas and that the various lifestyle attributes measured really had no effect on travel to Las Vegas. In conjunction with this study and the ones previously mentioned, several attributes were selected for study in the current project.
The Role of Non-Gaming Attractions

In a related study, Moufakkir et al. (2004) sought to refine a common misunderstanding that casino patrons spend their money only on gambling and do not contribute funds outside of participation in gaming. Several studies contained within the present gaming literature look at the role of non-gaming activities. In this study, Moufakkir et al. (2004) examined three segments of spenders—light, medium, and heavy—in casino destinations. Through segmenting casino patrons by their spending behaviors the authors were able to look at differences across spending in relation to demographics, purpose of trip, trip characteristics, and gambling behavior to aid marketers in developing a more effective plan for each of the target markets. The authors found that heavy casino spenders had considerably higher expenditures for all of the stated non-gaming activities and that heavy spenders were not drawn to a destination simply because of the presence of casinos. This study was also able to confirm what Crompton (1990) found that “tourists are attracted to urban destinations by the combination and variety of attractions, events, and services they have to offer…and casino visitors are no exception” (Moufakkir et al., 2004, pg. 70). Another interesting determination in this research came in the form of trip origin. The authors found that “more than three-fourths of the heavy spenders were from outside the gaming state while 32 percent were from a neighboring state and the rest were from other states. The greatest majority of medium spenders (45 percent) and light spenders (39 percent) came from the gaming state” (Moufakkir et al., 2004). These findings have direct impact on the marketing plans of gaming destinations and in determining their target market.
Brown (2001) investigated the type of customers that might be interested in participating in gaming if gaming were to be established in Kentucky. The purpose of this research was to profile visitors to Kentucky based on gaming activity and destination-specific behaviors. Brown segmented visitors into four categories: those who do not participate in gaming and would not visit a casino resort, those who do not participate but would visit, those who participate but would not visit, and those who participate and would visit. This study found differences among the four studied groups in terms of characteristics and demographics and identified specific segments vital to gaming destinations that could be directly targeted through marketing efforts.

Research by Morrison et al. (1996) conducted a comparison between travelers to casino resorts, ski resorts, beach resorts, and country resorts. The authors recognized the gaming destination’s increasing battle within the vacation market to lure vacationers to their resorts instead of to the beach or the country. This study was undertaken in an effort to determine if casino resort travelers differed from the other three segments in areas such as activity participation and trip planning characteristics. The authors concluded that the casino vacationers participated in fewer activities outside of the casino than did the other three types of vacationers. These findings are contradictory to what was found by Moufakkir et al. (2004) which concluded that heavy spenders spent a significant amount of money outside of the gaming atmosphere. The authors were also able to determine that “the main attraction in a casino vacation apparently is gambling in the casino” (Morrison et al., 1996. pg. 60). In this study the authors not only looked at demographics, trip characteristics, and participation in activities, but they also looked at a section they entitled “Benefits experienced on Trip.” This section asked vacationers to
rate each of the four types of destinations based on adjectives to describe their experience. Casino travelers labeled their trip experience as “exciting” more often than the beach, ski, and country resort travelers did, and the attributes of fun, relaxation, and enjoyment were also important to casino vacationers.

Overall, through a combination of the current literature in gaming coupled with the literature present in the area of destination image and perception, the set of attributes used in this research was determined. While no academically published information was available in the area of gaming destination image and perception specifically, each of the previously mentioned research projects were able aid in the determination of which factors were important to measure according to casino patrons.

**Destination Image and Positioning**

Throughout the growing composition of tourism literature, the topic of destination image and positioning has been widely studied. Authors have researched everything from tourism destination choice (Papatheodorou, 2001; Seddighi & Theocharous, 2002; Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000; Woodside & Lyonski, 1989), awareness and familiarity of a destination (Milman & Pizam, 1995), destination attractiveness (Hu & Ritchie, 1993), destination image formation (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Beerli & Martin, 2004a; Beerli & Martin, 2004b), the measurement of destination image (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993; Gallarza, Gil, & Calderon, 2002), assessing destination image and positioning through photographic images (Dann, 1996; Day, Skidmore, & Koller, 2002; MacKay & Fesenmaier, 2000), destination image and the role of culture (MacKay & Fesenmaier, 2000), image segmentation in tourism destinations (Leisen, 2001), destination positioning and perceived images (Beerli & Martin, 2004a; Beerli and Martin, 2004b; Chen & Hsu,
2000; Pike & Ryan, 2004), image formation process and destination selection (Gartner, 1993; White, 2004), affective images in destinations (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997), image differences between types of visitors (Awaritefe, 2004; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991), convention destination images (Oppermann, 1996), and association meeting planners perceptions and intentions of convention cities (Baloglu & Love, in press).

In a review of the destination image literature from 1973-2000, Pike (2002) concluded that over half of the papers studied measured perceptions of a single destination with no other destinations to be compared. This review also found that countries were the most popular destination to be studied as opposed to states or cities, and that there is a disagreement about the use of attribute lists to determine destination image.

Quantitative (Structured) Studies

Throughout the destination image and perception literature reviewed, each study used a different method to reach a variety of conclusions about destination image. The majority of studies examined used mainly quantitative methods in the formation of their survey instrument. Of the twelve quantitative studies reviewed, eleven asked respondents to rate a list of attributes or feelings based on various scales (Awaritefe, 2004; Baloglu & Love, in press; Beerli & Martin, 2004a; Beerli & Martin, 2004b; Chen & Hsu, 2000; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Leisen, 2001; MacKay & Fesenmaier, 2000; Pike & Ryan, 2004; Rittichainuwat, Qu, & Brown, 2001). The remaining quantitative study conducted by Seddighi and Theocharous (2002) applied the Lancasterian model to tourism. The Lancasterian model was originally applied to the area of consumer analysis, but has since been modified to provide a new approach to
consumer demand theory. One study by Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) evaluated a set of destinations based on a set of feelings established by Russel, Ward, and Pratt (1980-1981) which included pleasant, exciting, arousing, distressing, unpleasant, gloomy, sleepy, and relaxing. In a study by Baloglu and McCleary (1999b) and Baloglu and Love (in press), cognitive attributes, evaluation of the feeling sets established by Russel and colleagues, and overall image were investigated.

Qualitative (Unstructured) Studies

Three studies explored destination image and destination choice through the use of qualitative methods, mostly using open-ended questions. Tapachai and Waryszak (2000) explored images of a destination that might affect the decisions a prospective tourist makes in regards to a vacation destination, and in this case, the authors specifically studied Thailand and the United States. Several hypotheses were tested in Woodside and Lysonoski’s (1989) study which posed a set of open-ended questions to respondents in an effort to determine which destinations are contained within their choice set, as well as which destinations are not included in their choice set. Finally, Dann (1996) used a set of pictorial elements both pre-trip and on trip, to elicit open descriptions about various elements of Barbados as a destination.

Quantitative and Qualitative Studies

Following the quantitative and qualitative studies in destination image research are those studies that use a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods such as this research will use. In a study on the measurement of destination image, Echtner and Ritchie (1993) argued that a combination of structured and unstructured methods should be used to encapsulate all the components of destination image. Their study used three
open-ended questions along with a Likert scale rating system for a list of attributes. In Echtner and Ritichie’s (1993) study the three open-ended questions were formulated with the first allowing respondents to think openly about a given destination and overall image; the second question asked about the mood and atmosphere of a specific destination; while the last question solicited answers about which attractions the respondent deems to be individual to that destination. These three open-ended questions where then followed by the rating of a list of thirty-five attributes. Several of the studies that involved the use of quantitative and qualitative methods used a combination of a focus group discussion followed by a survey (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu & Love, in press; Day et al., 2002; Milman & Pizam, 1995; Oppermann, 1996) in which respondents would evaluate a variety of destinations on both structured (scale items) and unstructured (freely elicited responses) questions.

**Market Positioning**

Throughout the literature, it was evident that many different studies incorporated the use of a scaling system in which to rank attributes related to a specific destination in order to look more closely at image through positioning. As stated by Baloglu and McCleary (1999b), “Positioning is the process of establishing a distinctive place for a destination in the minds of the travelers in the targeted markets” (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b, pg. 145). In an attempt to establish the proper position of a destination, researchers have turned to evaluating market position in terms of rating attribute lists. Many different sets of attributes have been developed (Awaritefe, 2003; Beerli and Martin, 2004a; Beerli and Martin, 2004b; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999b; Baloglu & Love, in press; Echtner & Ritchie, 1993; Fakeye &
Crompton, 1991; Gartner, 1989; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Kozak, 2001; Opperman, 1996; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001; Seddighi & Theorcharous, 2002) and each study contains its own unique set of selected attributes. Beerli and Martin (2004a) argued that each destination being studied is distinctive and therefore the selection of attributes with which to measure image is reliant upon a variety of factors within that destination. MacKay and Fesenmaier (2000) noted that the majority of tourism destination image research had been focused on attribute identification rather than a visual representation of a destination. This discrepancy in a uniform set of attributes will essentially allow the destinations being studied to tailor-make a list of attributes deemed important to more accurately assess image as it relates to them.

Several authors throughout tourism literature have focused their studies on determining tourist destination strengths and weaknesses relative to other similar destinations built around a set of attributes as determinants (Anderssen & Colberg, 1973; Awaritefe, 2003; Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Baloglu & Love, in press; Calatone et al., 1989; Crompton, Fakeye, & Lue, 1992; Fenton and Pearce, 1988; Gartner, 1989; Goodrich, 1978; Haahti, 1986; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001). Anderssen and Colberg (1973) found that the perception of nine Mediterranean locations differ throughout the selected eight image attributes in terms of perception. In looking at nine tourist regions located both in and out of the U.S., Goodrich (1978) determined that several dimensions or attributes scored fairly similarly across each of the regions. Haahti (1986) studied the perceptions of several European summer holiday locations of the same status in an attempt to discover Finland’s position among them. It is important to note that this study, unlike Baloglu and McCleary’s
studies (1999a & 1999b), did not take into consideration the possible familiarity of the
destination to the respondents. This study discovered that among the selected attributes,
each of the destinations significantly varied. Calantone et al. (1989) observed the images
of numerous Pacific Rim countries and analyzed them based on various origins, various
destinations, and a variety of attributes. The outcome was determined to be that tourist’s
perceptions of a specific destination are different across any number of attributes as well
as the tourist’s home country.

In their study concerning the Rio Grande Valley’s image Crompton, Fakeye, and Lue
(1992) attempted to match benefits required by visitors to those that the destination had to
offer through an effective positioning method. The image of Hawaii, California, Florida,
and Arizona were compared to the image of the Rio Grande Valley centered on the
various push and pull benefits that visitors demanded. Within this study, familiarity and
previous visit were both taken into consideration.

Hu and Ritchie (1993) studied how perceived attractiveness of a specific destination
will vary depending on the context in which the choice to visit that destination is being
made. The authors of this study separated the experiences into two distinct travel
situations, education and recreation, and summed the ratings given on various attributes
to obtain an attractiveness score for each travel situation across five countries. This study
concluded that the “importance of the majority of destination attributes can vary
significantly with the context of the vacation experience sought” (Hu & Ritchie, 1993,
pg. 34).

In a study of Thailand’s international image, authors Rittichainuwat et al. (2001)
assessed the image of Thailand as well as the strengths and weaknesses of Thailand as a
destination. This study accounted for repeat and first-time visitors in an effort to compare each visitor’s perception across the selected attributes. Awaritefe (2003) compared the types of tourism demanded by both tourist and non-tourist respondents as well as looking at the factors that might impact their destination choice in the country of Nigeria.

Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) used a similar model that was used by Russel, Ward, Pratt, and Snodgrass (Russel, 1980; Russel & Pratt, 1980; Russel, Ward, & Pratt, 1981; Russel & Snodgrass, 1987) in their work on affective images in tourism destinations. This model contended that affective images of tourism destinations vary throughout a spectrum of positive (arousing, exciting, pleasant, and relaxing) and negative (sleepy, gloomy, unpleasant, and distressing) elements. However, prior visits to a destination were not taken into account.

In a study conducted by Baloglu and McCleary (1999b), the authors compared the strengths and weaknesses of both visitors and non-visitors to the countries of Turkey, Egypt, Greece, and Italy in order to uncover the current image of each country. This research mirrors Baloglu and McCleary’s (1999b) efforts closely with the exception of the destinations being studied as well as the attributes selected for comparison. They argued that comparative images of various tourist destinations can be easier identified using a contrast between rival destinations and, that through the process of comparing these images, each destination will be able to determine several of its core competencies. The authors found that non-visitors had very different views than visitors which could imply that non-visitors might have a skewed image of the four countries studied.
The most recent study conducted by Baloglu and Love (in press) looked at the perceptions and intentions of association meeting planners for five U.S. conventions cities- Las Vegas, Chicago, Dallas, Atlanta, and Orlando. This study was undertaken in an effort to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of each of these convention cities and to determine the position of each city in comparison with the other top convention cities in terms of a set of cognitive and affective variables, as well as their overall image and behavioral intentions. Basically this study was able to look at each city and compare it to the other four cities in terms of cognitive variables such as facilities and logistics; affective variables such as pleasant and relaxing; overall image; and intention.

Components of Image/Image Formation

A review of the present literature on destination image revealed a split consensus on the components of image formation and the image formation process. Of the literature assessed, the majority mentioned cognitive and affective elements of image formation (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Baloglu & Love, in press; Beerli & Martin, 2004a; Beerli and Martin, 2004b; Dann, 1996; Day et al., 2002; Gartner, 1993; White, 2004). Gartner (1993) was the first to argue that image was comprised of three interrelated concepts: cognitive, affective, and conative. Gartner (1993) defines the cognitive component of image to be an assessment of the attributes of a product or destination. The affective component of image is described as being linked to the motives a person has for choosing a specific destination. The conative component of image is the action part of image in which a person makes a decision based on their cognitive and affective perceptions of a destination.
Dann’s (1996) study sought to provide an alternative to the method of ranking a list of attributes by presenting respondents with a set of questions followed by images to measure their cognitive and affective perception of Barbados. This study discovered that the cognitive evaluation of a destination was based on a mental comparison to other destinations and that affective images were expressed socio-linguistically to the researcher. Dann concluded that by exploring the manner in which the respondents react to actual destination images, marketers can essentially comprehend the degree to which their efforts have been targeted correctly.

Gartner (1993) not only discussed the different agents of image formation but he also identified eight image formation agents to explain the overall image formation process. The image formation agents in Gartner’s work are based on using the word agent as a force producing a specific result. “The image formation process can be viewed as a continuum of separate agents that act independently or in some combination to form a destination image unique to the individual” (Gartner, 1993, pg. 197). These eight recognized image agents are Overt Induced I, Overt Induced II, Covert Induced I, Covert Induced II, Autonomous, Unsolicited Organic, Solicited Organic, and Organic. Each of these different types of agents has positive and negative aspects about them and can be placed in one of three categories: cost, market penetration, and credibility. The selection of the ideal image formation agents in the development of the proper targeted image depends on factors such as money, target market, demographics, timing, type of image to be portrayed, and the product itself.

Baloglu and McCleary (1999b) define the cognitive and affective component of image according to Genereux, Ward, and Russel (1983). “Knowledge about the place’s
objective attributes is represented by the perceptual/cognitive component, whereas the affective component is knowledge about its affective quality" (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b). In their study of destination image formation, Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) hypothesized that perceptual/cognitive and affective evaluations influence a person's evaluation of a particular destination. They found that a mixture of information sources, as well as age and education, aided in perceptual/cognitive assessments of a destination.

Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) determined that the number of information sources available to tourists positively affected their image formation of that destination. The most important source of information that has an effect on perceptual/cognitive evaluations is through word-of-mouth. Beerli and Martin (2004a) also studied image formation and found that various information sources and personal factors affected the image formation process. The authors found that secondary information sources had no influence on cognitive first-time image while organic and autonomous sources considerably influence factors related to cognitive image. These authors were able to confirm the findings presented by Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) that word-of-mouth significantly influences cognitive image. Beerli and Martin (2004b) were also able to confirm the findings of Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) that tourist motivations directly influence the affective component of the image formation process.

Day et al. (2002) investigated the use of strategic image management in relation to travel activities and experiences that motivate tourism in Queensland, Australia, as well as identifying the top visual images that help to achieve that motivation. The authors evaluated the image formation agents that Gartner (1993) presented to specifically target
the overt induced, covert induced, and autonomous agents through determining the strongest visual images of Queensland.

Of the destination image literature reviewed, several studies mentioned organic and induced images (Awaritefe, 2004; Chen & Hsu, 2000; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001) that were first mentioned by Gunn (1972). Gunn argued that a tourist’s destination image formation was a result of two components: organic image, which deals with a tourist’s image without having visited a specific destination, and induced image, which is formed by actually visiting a destination.

Fakeye and Crompton (1991) studied the relationship between organic, induced, and complex images in relation to prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. The authors found that non-visitors perceived image factors differently than first-timers and repeaters. The authors suggest that a better understanding of the discrepancy between the organic image held by prospective visitors and the complex image held by repeat visitors is where marketers need to start when forming a positioning and promotional plan.

Rittichainuwat et al. (2001) took induced and organic image formation into account when selecting their sample for a study on Thailand’s international image. They argued that previous visitation would have an affect on the image of Thailand. This study found that repeat travelers were very aware of Thailand’s attributes in spite of place of origin. This finding is consistent with Fakeye and Crompton (1991) who found that the more frequently people visit a destination, the better their image is of that destination. The study also found that destination image not only affects the decision to visit for the first
time, but also the possibility of returning to a destination through an analysis of positive and negative images.

Brown (2004) also took into account the aspect of prospective and actual tourists in his study that looked at destination image differences in Nigeria. He was able to determine that non-tourists perceived the destination they considered important differently than the tourists who were visiting that destination. The findings of this study confirmed what was found by Fakeye and Crompton (1991) and Rittichainuwat et al. (2001) that previous experience with a destination changes the images held of that destination.

Three studies within the review of the literature discussed a combination of Gunn’s (1972) induced and organic image components, and Gartner’s (1993) affective and cognitive image components (Leisen, 2001; Pike & Ryan, 2004; Woodside & Lyonski, 1989). Pike and Ryan (2004) argued that positioning is based on several different components, three of which they emphasized in their research on destination positioning. Their research highlighted three positioning components— the overcommunication of society, the elimination of clutter through the mind, and through the formation of shortened, focused messages. However, Fishbein (1967) was referenced as the original researcher of the cognitive, affective, and conative components, according to the authors. Pike and Ryan (2004) argue that “cognition is the sum of what is known about a destination, which may be organic or induced. In other words, this is awareness, knowledge, or beliefs, which may or may not have been derived from a previous visit” (Pike & Ryan, 2004, pg. 334). The authors were able to determine the importance of the
positioning of a destination in terms of the three perceptions—cognitive, affective, and conative.

Woodside and Lysonski (1989) argued that affective associations have an affect on the selection of a particular vacation destination. They stated that “affective associations are usually positive for destinations a consumer would consider visiting and negative for destinations a consumer has decided not to visit” (Woodside & Lysonski, 1989). The authors concluded that affective associations made by potential visitors represent what they believe to be true and relevant about a specific destination.

In a similar study, Leisen (2001) segmented the market into groups based on their images of a specific destination with the intention of identifying which groups have a favorable image and which groups have a less favorable image. Leisen argues that image is a combination of organic image and resulting image, as well as the affective associations that were mentioned by Woodside and Lysonski (1989). Leisen (2001) determined that given the high cost of promotional materials, destination marketers should re-focus efforts to highlight the positive images and work on moving neutral images into the positive image category.

Several other studies reviewed did not mention Gartner’s affective and cognitive image formation agents, or Gunn’s organic and induced image components, but instead proposed their own ideas about image formation (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993; MacKay & Fesenmaier, 2000; Milman & Pizam, 1995; Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000).

In Milman and Pizam’s (1995) study they argued that destination image was a combination of three different factors other than those mentioned by Gunn and Gartner. In accordance with Reuland, Coudrey, and Fagel (1985) the authors stated that
destination image is a combination of the product, the behavior and attitude of employees that are in contact with visitors and the environment. The purpose of this study was to analyze the images that travelers have of a specific destination and to test whether awareness and familiarity had an effect on that image in relation to the Central Florida area. The study was able to determine that tourists who had previously visited Central Florida had a positive image of the area and were more likely to visit again. This study also found that those respondents who were aware of Central Florida as a destination did not have a more positive view than those that were not aware.

Etchner and Ritchie (1993) referred to their work from 1991, and argued that destination image is composed of three different continuums: (1) attribute-holistic; (2) functional-psychological, and (3) common-unique. The authors stated that destination image is comprised of “perceptions of individual attributes (such as climate, accommodation facilities, friendliness of the people) as well as more holistic impressions (mental pictures or imagery) of the place” (Etchner & Ritchie, 1993, pg. 3). As mentioned previously, Etchner and Ritchie used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to more accurately determine destination image in this study. The authors found that the open-ended questions used in the research were able to bring out the holistic and unique components of destination image. They also determined that through the inclusion of the open-ended questions, more detail and description was given on the various destination's being studied that might not be present in a strict ranking of an attribute list.

In Tapachai and Waryszak's (2000) study the aim was to assess the worth of beneficial image in the decision of tourists to visit Thailand and the United States, as well
as apply a category-based approach to beneficial image of vacation destinations. Citing Keaveney and Hunt (1992), the authors propose using a category-based image processing theory which will help to determine two components of image, salient attributes and holistic impression. This theory is based on the fact that an “individual does not face each new stimulus as a completely novel experience but compares the incoming data with prior information or schema stored in memory” (Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000, pg. 38).

The study found that Thailand should strengthen beneficial images in regard to functional, epistemic, and conditional values for potential visitors. The United States should emphasize beneficial attributes in terms of functional, epistemic, emotional, and conditional values within their tourism promotion plans.

MacKay and Fesenmaier (2000) investigated the role of culture in determining destination image. They hypothesized that the number of dimensions and the interpretation of dimensions used to evaluate visual material would not vary by culture. Seven different scales were selected from previous research in landscape perception for the respondents to evaluate each image. The findings indicate that there can be commonalities as well as differences, between two cultural groups with regard to the role of culture in destination image.

Together a list of attributes and a person’s perception of how the various attributes rate for a specific destination form the overall image of that destination, whether it be a combination of cognitive and affective image components such as Gartner (1993) argues or induced and organic image components such as Gunn (1972) proposed. Gartner (1986) stated that a person’s overall perception of a variety of attributes contained within a destination will form altogether into an overall image. Ahmed (1991) argued that
overall image and the attributes of image need to be separated in order to understand each independently. Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) argue that overall image of a destination is comprised of designative and appraisive images which are entwined to create what is known as overall image. No matter how overall image is formed, the use of rating a list of attributes is essential to determining the overall image of a destination.

**Previous Visitation**

The concept of previous visitation to a destination has become highly debatable in terms of its affect on overall destination image formation. Gartner (1993) argued that "experience through prior travel to an area is not necessary for attitudes to be formed toward the type of image projected or acquired about a destination" (Gartner, 1993. pg. 192-193). Beerli and Martin (2004b) reiterated the importance of previous visitation when they argued that destination image has a tendency to have a more positive outcome when the visitor has prior experience with the destination. The authors then state the importance of perceived destination image in the post-trip and intent to re-visit stage. The majority of research evaluated controlled for previous visitation in order to get a more accurate look at the differences previous visitation might have on the image formed of a specific destination (Awaritefe, 2004; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Baloglu & Love, in press; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1996; Day, Skidmore, & Koller, 2002; Etchner & Ritchie, 1993; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Hunt, 1975; Milman & Pizam, 1995; Oppermann, 1996; Phelps, 1986; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001; Tapachai & Waryszak, 2000).

These studies can then be broken down into a better segmented group of studies that took previous visitation into consideration. Some studies looked at the difference between
respondents who had traveled to a specific destination and those who did not (Ahmed, 1991; Awaritefe, 2004; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Milman & Pizam, 1995; Phelps, 1986). Overall, these research studies found that image of a particular destination was changed after visiting that destination. They also found that major differences existed between the visitor and non-visitor groups in terms of destination image. Baloglu and McCleary (1999b) stated that “destination marketers should distinguish between visitors and non-visitors when developing image or positioning strategies for their destinations in a specific market because the two groups may require different positioning and communication strategies” (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b, pg. 146).

Three studies reviewed used previous visitation as a screener question for the sample. In Etchner and Ritchie’s (1993) study of the measurement of destination image, the authors randomly assigned a country to be evaluated by each respondent. However, if a respondent had visited the country, they were then randomly assigned one of the other countries being studied. Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) also used the concept of previous visitation as a screening question for their respondents in their study on destination image formation. Lastly, Tapachai and Waryszak (2000) only selected respondents who had not visited Thailand or the United States to be included in their study which looked at beneficial image in tourist destination selection.

Several other studies required previous visitation to a selected destination as a qualifier for the study. Dann (1996) interviewed respondents based on pre-trip and during-trip opinions in his study on images of Barbados as a destination. To assess Thailand’s international travel image, Rittichainuwat et al. (2001) hypothesized that as
the number of visits to a specific destination increase, the better the image of that destination will become. The sample selected in this survey consisted of visitors who were leaving Thailand. The study found that repeat travelers were well informed about Thailand’s attributes. In their study to identify the types of visual images that best represent the reasons why people visit Queensland, Australia, Day et al. (2002) asked only respondents who had previously visited Australia to participate. This study was able to determine which visual images were more effective and should be included in a marketing campaign.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The primary purpose of this research was to examine the images and perceptions of respondents in order to reveal the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the four selected gaming destinations - Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN) and Connecticut. This research will also attempt to determine the respondent’s cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions of each of the gaming places through the use of quantitative and qualitative questions to get an improved understanding of how these places can be marketed more effectively to the target market through image management and an enhanced positioning strategy.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the process that was used to accomplish the research, the procedures used to gather and organize the data, and the methods that were used to evaluate the data collected.

Sample

The target population for this study was comprised of adults (21 years or older) who had previously expressed an interest in gaming. The sample population was obtained from Survey Sampling International (SSI), a company specializing in statistically drawn telephone and online samples (www.surveysampling.com). This company offers over 3,500 lists of targeted e-mail address of individuals who have given
their permission to be sent information on a selected topic (Zikmund, 2003). SurveySpot, SSI's online survey panel, draws respondents from 1.6 million households with over 4.25 million members available to complete surveys (SSI, 2004). The sample chosen for this research consisted of SSI SurveySpot members that expressed an interest in gaming, which is one of SSI's specialized lists of respondents. "This sample is weighted to predict a pool of responders balanced to the US total population, using 2003 American Community Survey data from the US Census. It is balanced on: gender and age (six age ranges: 18-24 / 25-34 / 35-44 / 45-54 / 55-64 / 65+)" (C. Corely, SSI, personal communication, March 7, 2005). A total of 2,000 invitations were sent out to the SurveySpot members explaining the purpose of the research, along with a link to the online survey site, Survey Monkey (surveymonkey.com). The survey was open for respondents on March 1, 2005, and was closed on March 3, 2005. As an incentive for completing the survey, each SurveySpot member was entered in a drawing for $10,000 that SSI offers each month.

A significant issue in sampling is determining the proper sample size (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2005). Without previous research in this area, guidelines for estimating variances when using rating scales have been used. As specified in Churchill and Iacobucci, on a five point scale the typical range of variances will be between 1.2 and 2.0. 

\[ n = \left( \frac{z^2}{H^2} \right) \cdot s^2 \]

where:

- \( z \) = z-value at 95% confidence level
- \( s^2 \) = variance
- \( H \) = desired precision
n(minimum)= \( \frac{(1.96)^2}{(0.20)^2} \times 1.2 = 115 \)

n(maximum)= \( \frac{(1.96)^2}{(0.20)^2} \times 2.0 = 192 \)

To be conservative, it is advisable to use a variance estimate at or near the high end of the range (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2005, pg. 365). Therefore, it was determined that the sample size for this study should be around 200.

A total of 300 surveys were gathered with only 222 being usable (response rate of 11.1%). The other 78 surveys were deemed incomplete because respondents did not completely finish the questionnaire and those answers were not factored into the overall results. A total of 222 questionnaires were collected and coded for data analysis. Data was collected for the four top gaming markets: Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. These gaming markets were selected because they were the top four markets in terms gross revenue as published by the American Gaming Association in The 2005 Casino & Gaming Market Research Handbook.

SSI Overall Process

In the formation of this research project, the major issue encountered was in determining a sample population with which to survey and receive valid and accurate results. Due to time constraints and a variety of other factors, an online questionnaire was selected as the method for data collection. In working with a company such as SSI, many of the regular survey administration functions are in the hands of the company. The following is an overview of the process of working with SSI in obtaining a sample. A Project Manager from SSI was assigned to this research project to aid in determining the best sample for obtaining the stated research objectives. This research was aiming for a total of 200 completed questionnaires. Based on the number of questions and the time
it takes to complete a survey a quote was given to the researcher of the cost to obtain a sample from SSI. A total of $1,407 dollars was paid to SSI to obtain a total of 200 completed interviews, or surveys. The study was funded through UNLV Hotel College Dean’s office based on research scholarship money donated by the industry for student research on gaming. SSI’s policy is to give a 10% grace period due to the nature of the Internet and the rapidity of online surveys. The designed survey was input into Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com), an online survey program. After the survey was input and ready for data collection, an invitation was drafted to the survey respondents asking them for their participation and explaining the research project. This invitation along with the survey URL was forwarded to the Project Manager at SSI.

The Project Manager then tested the URL and confirmed that their SSI redirect link has been placed in the proper place within the survey to take the SurveySpot members to their Thank-You page to be entered into the monthly drawing. In the meantime, the Project Manager worked on statistically drawing the sample that the invitation will be e-mailed to. Once the sample is completed and the survey is ready for data collection, the invitations were sent out (in this case 2,000 invitations were e-mailed). Project managers at SSI and the survey administrator both kept watch on the amount of completed interviews, or questionnaires, and closed the survey when the targeted sample size was achieved. If necessary an additional supplement invitation would be sent out to additional SurveySpot members to ensure the researcher the guaranteed 200 respondents. Once the targeted amount of respondents was obtained, the survey was closed to any additional respondents.
Online Data Collection

Every survey instrument used in data collection has strengths and weaknesses. Granello and Wheaton (2004) referenced an article by Duffy (2000) which stated that increasingly more people have Internet access and gradually more researchers are choosing online data collection as a feasible option across all areas of research. In this research, an online questionnaire was devised and implemented because of the ease online data collection provides. As mentioned previously, when working with a sampling company such as SSI, some aspects of the project are made easier while other portions are made more difficult. Some advantages to using web-based surveys are reduced project time, lower cost, the ability to be interactive, easier data entry, access to real-time data, respondent anonymity, and more flexibility in terms of formatting (Granello & Wheaton 2004; Zikmund, 2003). Some disadvantages are the representativeness of the selected sample, response rates, technical problems, security issues, and survey design problems (Granello & Wheaton 2004; Zikmund, 2003).

Advantages

Researchers are turning to the Internet to conduct their research due to reduced waiting periods when receiving responses. Farmer (1998) stated that “typical turnaround time is 4 to 6 weeks with traditional mail surveys, 2 to 3 weeks for telephone surveys, and only 2 to 3 days for Web-based surveys.” Not only is time an important factor in online research, but also the reduction in cost. “Web-based surveys are 50% less expensive to implement than telephone surveys, and 20% less expensive than mail surveys” (Farmer, 1998). Administering a survey online also allows the researcher to be more interactive with the respondent. The researcher can control which questions a
respondent will be asked based on answers to previous questions. This interactive ability also allows a more accurate sample because qualifier questions can be asked first in order to determine the respondents’ qualifications for the survey. Online surveys also allow for much easier data entry because most web-based survey programs track the results in a computer analysis program such as Microsoft Excel or SPSS. The time it takes to enter data from mail surveys is reduced because the respondents' answers are immediately entered into a database. Another advantage to online surveys is the allowance the researcher has to access real-time data so that the researcher can review the progress of their survey in real time. Online surveys also allow respondents more confidentiality and anonymity than face-to-face, mail, or telephone surveys because of the absence of an interviewer. Lastly, the Internet provides the researcher more flexibility in terms of the formatting of their actual questionnaire. Researchers have the ability to use color, graphics, sound, and even animation in their surveys (Granello & Wheaton, 2004). Also with Internet surveys, researchers have the ability to control whether or not a respondent answers a question through the use of pop-up warnings telling the respondent that they need to answer the question in order to move on. Overall, online surveys are quickly becoming a feasible option for researchers.

Disadvantages

The major disadvantage to conducting a survey questionnaire online is that the sample cannot be a representative sample. Due to the fact that many people still do not have access to the Internet, those potential respondents are automatically eliminated from the sample. Also excluded from the sample are people who have problems with navigating the Internet or have general computer problems. Web-based surveys are also
disadvantageous because of issues concerning response rates. Granello and Wheaton (2004) cite several different studies that were able to conclude that web-based surveys have lower response rates than mail surveys. Respondents have varied access to the Internet, and slower loading times for webpages might cause frustration and technical problems. While the use of sound and animation may be an advantage, in this case animation and sound will cause the questionnaire to load more slowly and might result in lower response rates due to respondent’s frustration in waiting for the webpage to load. Another major issue with online data collection is in terms of security. While online surveys allow for anonymity, some respondents might still be hesitant to provide sensitive information if they are unsure if the data is secure. Lastly, problems can be encountered with online surveys with regard to survey design. If qualifying questions are not included, unqualified respondents’ will be able to fill out the questionnaire and then the accuracy of the data might be questioned. Also, the order of questions in a web-based survey and a paper survey are completely different. Taking into consideration the respondent’s inability to view the entire questionnaire on a paper survey in advance gives the researcher a more strenuous task in determining the proper question order (Granello & Wheaton 2004; Zikmund, 2003). While online surveys do have several disadvantages, the advantages in this research project outweigh them.

Survey Instrument

The basic structure of the questionnaire is as follows: Internet gaming preferences, general gaming preferences, previous visitation questions, perceptions/images of the four gaming markets, feelings questions on each of the four gaming markets, overall image
and intentions questions on the four gaming markets, and demographic information. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix A.

Due to an increase in participating in Internet gaming, the first three questions were included in order to be able to profile the Internet gambling behavior of the respondents. The next section of general gambling preferences were included to get a feel for the type of gamblers the respondents were as well as which games were preferred. These five questions were similar to those asked on a Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) Visitor Profile Study as well as an article written by Baloglu (2002) on Casino Customer Loyalty. The next two questions were used to control for previous experience (visitation and living) with the destinations, which was discussed in detail in the Literature Review section. As mentioned previously, this study used a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to uncover the respondent’s cognitive and affective perceptions, as well as overall image of each of the gaming markets. The next section of questions was asked to get at their perceptions and images of each gaming market by eliciting free responses on what the respondent thinks when each destination is mentioned. These questions were asked prior to the scale items so as to not influence word-choices they will use in their open-ended responses (Baloglu & Love, in Press).

The most complicated section of the survey was when respondents are asked to rate a list of nineteen pre-selected attributes for each of the four gaming markets. After the perception and image section of questions, survey respondents were asked their feelings about each gaming market based on selected sets and scales of feelings. Overall image and behavioral intentions were measured in the subsequent section which asked a question about the overall image of each gaming market as well as a question about
recommending each gaming market and intent to visit or re-visit. The last section covered the demographic information including age, gender, education, marital status, and income.

Questionnaire Development

The most intricate question developed to be in the questionnaire was the question which required respondents to rate Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut based on a list of nineteen selected attributes designed to measure cognitive perception. After an extensive review of the literature on destination image, a list of general destination attributes was complied. The process of selecting gaming attributes for this question was more complicated in nature. Of the literature that existed, several articles were consulted in the selection of the gaming attributes (Morrison et al., 1996; Moufakkir et al., 2004; Pfaffenberg & Costello, 2002; Reece, 2001; Turco & Riley, 1996). These studies helped to identify which attributes might be gambling related and should be included in the present research. To ensure the content validity of the selected gaming attributes to be measured, messages were posted on eight different message forums specifically dealing with gaming. On the American Casino Guide website a discussion board allows people with questions about gaming, hotels, comps, and a variety of other casino related concerns to post a message which other members of the site read and respond to. The members of this discussion board were asked “When you choose a gaming destination what do you look for? Or in other words, what factors do you take into consideration when you chose a gaming destination?” (AmericanCasinoGuide.com, 1/21/05). On a Las Vegas for Visitors Forum on About.com the same message was posted as the American Casino Guide message board. The answers on both were
reviewed to develop the gaming attributes to be measured. Messages were also posted in
discussion groups on Google.com Groups in a Gambling/Miscellaneous Group and a
Gambling/Poker Group. Two Yahoo Groups were selected for message postings as well.
The Yahoo Groups, Casino Gambling and Casino Friends, were asked the same question
listed above along with an additional question: “Also what do you see are the
strengths/weaknesses of the following gaming destinations: Las Vegas, Atlantic City,
Chicago/Gary, Indiana Gaming Area, Indian Gaming in Connecticut” (Yahoo Groups,
1/21/05). Similar messages were posted on the LasVegasTalk.com discussion board and
the Las Vegas Advisor Message Forum, asking members to give their strengths and
weaknesses for each of the gaming markets listed as well as what they specifically look
for in a gaming destination. All of the responses from each of the message boards were
complied into a master list of attributes. These responses coupled with the gaming
literature were used to select the set of gaming-specific attributes for the question on the
overall image and perception of each of the gaming markets. By posting messages on
various discussion boards with members interested in gaming and participating in
gaming, the content validity of the selected attributes is supported.

Questions contained in the online survey pertaining to the respondent’s feelings about
each of the four gaming markets have previously been used in other studies as a way to
measure affective image and perception. The affective evaluations of each destination
were measured on a 5-point scale using the affective image scales that were originally
developed by Russel and colleagues (Russel, 1980; Russel & Pratt, 1980; Russel, Ward, &
Pratt, 1981; Russel & Snodgrass, 1987) and was used in studies performed by Baloglu
and Brinberg (1997), Baloglu and McCleary (1999b), Baloglu and Mangaloglu (2001),
Pike and Ryan (2004), and Baloglu & Love (2004 in press). Russel et al. (1980) analyzed over a hundred adjectives that could be used to describe an environment and developed an eight dimension adjective model with which to evaluate affective image and perception. The following differential scales were used to assess affective image: pleasant/unpleasant, relaxing/distressing, arousing/sleepy, and exciting/gloomy.

The section of demographic questions were patterned after the questions used by the Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler. The ranges for each of the demographic questions were identical to those in the Harrah’s study to be able to compare the demographics of the Harrah’s study to the present research.

The questionnaire was pre-tested on 10 graduate students to evaluate the wording, flow, and layout. Respondents were informed they needed to evaluate the questionnaire in terms of wording and were asked to report any parts of the questionnaire that were confusing. Respondents were told that this preliminary test of the survey instrument was necessary in order to get proper feedback on any questions or problems. At the conclusion of the pre-testing period, no changes or modifications were made.

Measurement

As mentioned previously, nineteen attributes were selected to assess the cognitive perceptions and image of the four selected gaming markets. The selected items were generated based on an extensive review of existing literature, message board postings on gaming-related websites and groups, and discussions with various professors. The importance of the attributes for each gaming market was measured on a 5-point scale on which 1 meant “Poor”, 2 meant “Fair”, 3 meant “Good”, 4 meant “Very Good” and 5 meant “Excellent” as well as a “Don’t Know” option to avoid response bias.
Respondents were asked to rate each gaming destination whether or not they had visited each place or not. To evaluate the respondents’ previous experience with each of the gaming markets, they were asked to indicate whether or not they had ever visited each of the gaming markets, as well as whether they had lived or were living in the gaming areas. To measure the affective images and perceptions of each gaming market, a 5-point bipolar scale (Pleasant-Unpleasant, Arousing-Sleepy, Exciting-Gloomy, and Relaxing-Distressing) was used along with a “Don’t Know” option. The questionnaire also included several open-ended questions in which respondents’ were asked: “What words or image come to mind when you think of the following places as a gaming market?” Due to the questionnaire being online, respondents’ were provided a text box and were asked to write at least three things. To measure the overall image of each gaming market, respondents’ were asked to rate their image on a 5-point scale with an anchor scale of 1 being “Poor” and 5 being “Excellent.” Two questions were also included in the questionnaire that relate to behavioral intentions. One question asked if the respondent would recommend each gaming market to family and friends and was measured on an anchor scale with 1 being “Not Recommend At All” and 5 being “Definitely Recommend.” The other question asked whether they would consider visiting or revisiting each of the gaming destinations and was measured on an anchor scale with 1 being “Definitely Not” and 5 being “Definitely Will.” Both the overall image and behavioral questions had a “Don’t Know” option included.

Data Analyses

The data analyses involved using SPSS 12.5 for Windows to run several procedures. All of the open-ended questions were content analyzed and formed into categories based
on the most frequently referenced words and or images for each of the gaming markets-Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. Before hypotheses testing, the data was checked for normality and outliers by histograms and normality plots of variables and residuals and Cook’s distance.

The hypotheses were tested by using the General Linear Model (GLM) Repeated Measures procedure available in the SPSS 12.5. Prior to hypothesis test, a series of independent sample t-tests were conducted to see if differences exist between visitors (or those who have lived or been living in a particular gaming place) and non-visitors (or those who have not lived or been living in a particular gaming place).

Repeated measures analysis allows the researcher to evaluate a situation in which respondents are measured on more than one instance (Grimm & Yarnold, 1995). In this case, the repeated measures analysis was used to compare each respondent’s answers for multiple destinations or repeated answers from the same subject of each gaming market. In other words, because one respondent rated each of the four gaming markets, repeated measures analysis was used to evaluate the respondent’s answers for each of the instances, or gaming markets. When using repeated measures MANOVA, a supplementary assumption, must be met. This assumption is called the sphericity assumption and concerns the “difference variables that are created from the original dependence variables” (Grimm & Yarnold, 1995, pg. 270). The perceptions and intentions for each gaming market were compared by using independent sample t-tests with the Bonferroni inequality correction. Mauchly’s test of sphericity, which was automatically displayed for a repeated measures analysis, is used to test that assumption.
If the test is significant (probability level is less than 0.05), the corrected (adjusted) F-values (Greenhouse-Geisser or Hyunh-Feldt) should be used (SPSS, 1999).

The Bonferroni correction "is a multiple-comparison correction used when several dependent or independent statistical tests are being performed simultaneously" (www.mathworld.wolfram.com, pg.1). The Bonferroni inequality correction helps you to understand "familywise and experimentwise alphas, because it defines the maximum value of alpha for a given set of statistical tests" (Grimm & Yarnold, 1995, pg. 248). The GLM repeated measures analysis was employed in order to compare the cognitive, affective, and overall image perceptions, as well as behavioral intentions for the four gaming places. The Bonferroni multiple comparison tests at an alpha level of 0.05 were used in an effort to understand how each of the gaming cities differed from each other on each of the variables. In terms of the cognitive evaluations, because there were a total of nineteen different variables, the significance level was corrected by the number of variables to help decrease Type 1 error, which means rejecting the null hypothesis when it should not be. For the cognitive perception analysis the adjusted significance level is 0.0026 (0.05/19 = 0.0026). For the affective image and perception analysis the adjusted significance level is 0.0125 (0.05/4 = 0.0125). The behavioral intention Bonferroni adjustment put the significance level at 0.025 (0.05/2 = 0.025) because only two questions were asked involving respondent's behavioral intentions for each of the gaming markets. No Bonferroni inequality correction was required for the overall image because this only involved one question.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The majority of survey respondents were male (64.9%) with the highest percentage being in the 36-50 age range (35.1%), followed closely by the 21-35 age range (32.0%). More males were respondents in this survey than females which could be the result of many factors including the fact that the general gambling population is predominately more male than female, and the Internet population targeted in this project was more obviously male dominated. This sample could have been predominately male as a result of the SurveySpot panel having a higher percentage of males over females as well.

Approximately 40% stated their education level to be Some College/Associate Degree. The greater part of survey respondents reported their marital status to be married (59.5%), with the highest percentage of people being in the Under $35,000 income range (28.4%). Roughly 25% of respondents reported their income range to be between $35,001-$55,000 and approximately 20% in the $55,001-$75,000 income range.

Respondents were from 42 different states with the highest percentage living in California (10.8%), followed by Florida (8.1%), and then New York (6.8%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 222)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College/Associate Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Bachelors Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Never Married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (Divorced, Separated, Widowed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $35,000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001-$55,000</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,001-$75,000</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001-$95,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $95,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet Gambling Profile

Approximately 15% of respondents said that they took part in some form of Internet gambling. The respondent’s reported that they gambled on the Internet throughout various time intervals with the highest percentage being 2 to 3 times a month (23.5%) followed by 3 to 6 times a week (14.7%). The majority of people who participate in Internet gambling cited casino games (50.0%) as their preferred method of gaming. Responses included Fantasy sports and Pro Picks for the NFL as options for other Internet gaming in which they participate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gamble on Internet</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 times a year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 times a year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 times a month</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 times a week</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internet Gambling Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casino games</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race &amp; Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gambling Preferences Profile**

An overwhelming majority of the survey respondents do not gamble on the Internet (84.7%) with only 63.5% reporting that they do gamble in land-based casinos. The sample for this project was targeted at people who expressed an interest in gambling, which produced interesting results concerning this question. The definition of what constitutes gambling might not have been clear enough to the respondents which could potentially result in an incorrect answer. Over half of the survey respondents stated they gamble in land-based casinos once a year or less (58.1%). Just over half of the respondents (53.6%) stated that they do not play progressive jackpot machines and the highest percentage cited their main reason for gambling to be for Fun/Recreation/Hobby (45.9%).
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Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gambling Preferences</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gamble in Land-Based Casinos</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How Often</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year or less</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 times a year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 times a year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 times a month</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 times a week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Play progressive jackpot machines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main reason for gambling</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To win money</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun/Recreation/Hobby</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from worries/problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked which games the respondent’s most preferred to play, the most commonly cited answer was Slot Machines with 26.9%, followed by Blackjack with 18.7% and Video Poker with 14.8%. Responses in the other category ranged from gambling purely for entertainment sake or gambling to waste time while visitors are in town.
Table 4

Preferred Games in Land-Based Casinos (N=487)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Games</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Poker</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slot Machines</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackjack</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingo</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race &amp; Sports Book</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keno</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roulette</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Poker</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craps</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Visitation and Residence

The section inquiring about previous visitation to the four gaming market areas produced the following results. Slightly over half of the respondents (50.5%) have visited Las Vegas for the purpose of gambling, while 25.2% have visited Atlantic City, 10.4% have visited Connecticut, and 7.2% have visited the Chicagoland area. An overwhelming majority of respondents did not live or had not previously lived in any of the gaming markets mentioned: Las Vegas (98.2%), Atlantic City (99.1%), Chicagoland (IL, IN) (91.9%), and Connecticut (95.9%).
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Table 5

Previous Visitation to Gaming Markets (N= 222)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>92.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>89.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Previous Residence in Gaming Markets (N=222)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Comparison to Harrah's

The demographic information from this project- age, education level, and annual income- was compared to the demographic information obtained in the Harrah's 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler. The Harrah's study found that 29% of gamblers were between the ages of 51-65 while the current study found that age range to
only have 22.1%. In the age ranges of 21-35 and 36-50 the Harrah’s study had 24% each while this project had 32% and 35.1% for those ranges respectively. This difference in the age of the respondent’s could be due to the sample selected to take the Harrah’s survey, which mainly consists of regular gambling patrons to Harrah’s casinos and card members which tend to have a higher average age. The current study sample was taken from a sample of the general gaming population rather than specific casino patrons which will result in different age levels, education levels, and income. With regards to education, the Harrah’s profile revealed that 45% of participants had no college education while the current study found that only 13.1% had no college education. 40.5% of respondents to the current study stated Some College/Associate Degree compared to 28% in the Harrah’s Study. This difference in education level could be a result of a variety of factors including the sample that Harrah’s used (casino patrons), the sample used here (general gaming patrons), and because of the use of the Internet. In terms of annual income, the Harrah’s 2004 profile stated that “the higher a person’s income, the more likely he or she is going to play casino games” (Harrah’s 2004 Profile of the American Casino Gambler, 2004, pg. 13). Harrah’s study found that the higher income range of Over $95,000 had the highest percentage of respondents (32%) while the current study only found 13.1% of respondents to be in that range. The second highest percentage range reported by the Harrah’s study was the $75,001-$95,000 range with 30%, compared to the current study that found only 13.1% in that range. The present research found that the highest percentage of respondents were in the lower income range of Under $35,000 with 28.4%. The differences in these two sets of data may be due to a variety of different factors. The present study was conducted on the Internet which might
result in a different demographic profile simply due to the type of people with Internet access. Also, because the survey was on the Internet, a large majority of people were eliminated from the sample, mainly those in the older age ranges because of technology problems and general problems associated with computers and the Internet. The Harrah’s 2004 study was a mail survey that was targeted based on a nationally representative group based on the 2003 Census Data of the casino patrons of Harrah’s, while this survey was targeted specifically to Internet users who expressed an interest in gambling.

Qualitative Perceptions

Each survey respondent was asked to answer an open-ended question about the four gaming markets. Respondent’s were asked, “What words or images come to mind when you think of (Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), or Connecticut) as a gaming market?” The results were content analyzed and produced fascinating results. The top ten things mentioned for each destination included a combination of cognitive perceptions and affective evaluations given for each gaming place. The most frequently cited words or images of Las Vegas with seventy-five respondents mentioning them were Lights/Bright/Electricity. The second most mentioned word or image was Excitement with forty-two references, followed by Fun being mentioned thirty-six times. Money/Rich and Shows were indicated a total of thirty times each by respondents. Of the top five responses for Las Vegas, two of the images were related to cognitive perceptions while the other three were affective perceptions about the destination.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Table 7

Ten Top Open-ended Responses Las Vegas

1. Lights/Bright/Electricity (75)
2. Excitement (42)
3. Fun (36)
4. Money/Rich (30)
5. Shows (30)
6. Gaming/Gambling (26)
7. 24/7 Town/Partying/Nightlife (23)
8. Entertainment (22)
9. Flashy/Glitzy/Showy (19)
10. Noise/Loud/Sounds (18)

When respondents were asked about words and images for Atlantic City, a variety of different responses were stated. The most frequently cited word or image was Boardwalk with thirty-three references, followed by Dirty/Seedy/Scary with twenty-four mentions. Third and fourth place was a tie between Casinos and Gaming/Gambling, each with twenty references. The fifth and sixth most mentioned word or image was Donald Trump and Ocean/Water each with nineteen mentions. The top five words or images of Atlantic City involved a combination of cognitive and affective evaluations similar to Las Vegas.
Table 8

Top Ten Open-Ended Responses Atlantic City

1. Boardwalk (33)
2. Dirty/Seedy/Scary (24)
3. Casinos (20)
4. Gaming/Gambling (20)
5. Donald Trump (19)
6. Ocean/Water (19)
7. Money (14)
8. New York/New Jersey (12)
9. Weather/Cold (12)
10. Sand/Beach (12)

The open-ended question asking about Chicagoland (IL, IN) produced an assortment of different answers and proved more difficult to analyze than the answers received from the Las Vegas and Atlantic City questions. The most commonly referenced word or image about Chicagoland was Cold/Weather/Windy with sixteen mentions. Weather was followed by Riverboats which were cited a total of twelve times. The third and fourth most mentioned word or image was Gaming/Gambling and Crowded/Lots of people, each with ten references. The fifth and sixth spots were a tie between Fun and Casinos with a total of seven mentions each.
Table 9

Top Ten Open-Ended Responses Chicagoland (IL, IN)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cold/Weather/Windy</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riverboats</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gaming/Gambling</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Crowded/Lots of people</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Midwest/Heartland</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Big City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boring</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elicited open-ended responses gathered for Connecticut were also more difficult to code than those responses given for Las Vegas and Atlantic City. The most frequently cited word or image for Connecticut was Indian/Native Americans/Reservations with twenty-five references. The second most commonly mentioned image was Cold/Snow with eighteen mentions. The third, fourth, and fifth words or images mentioned about Connecticut as a gaming area was a three-way tie between Fun, Gaming/Gambling, and Boring/Simple/Bland, each with ten references. Along with the other three gaming markets, the top five words or images for Connecticut also included a combination of cognitive and affective perceptions about the destination.
Table 10

**Top Ten Open-Ended Responses Connecticut**

1. Indian/Native American/Reservation (25)
2. Cold/Snow (18)
3. Fun (10)
4. Gaming/Gambling (10)
5. Boring/Simple/Bland (10)
6. Atmosphere (9)
7. New England/East Coast (9)
8. Unlikely/Unknown (8)
9. Exciting/Excellent/Enjoyment (8)
10. Casinos (8)

---

*Hypotheses Testing and Discussion*

**Assumptions**

For the GLM Repeated Measures analysis, the normality of dependent variables and outliers should be checked (SPSS, 1999). The data was checked for normality and outliers by histograms of variables and residuals and Cook’s distance. No significant violation of the normality assumption and extreme values was detected. Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations for cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intention variables. Another assumption of the repeated measures is the sphericity assumption (homogeneity of variance of the differences between any two levels of a
within-subject factor). Mauchly’s test of sphericity, which is automatically displayed for a repeated measures analysis, is used to test that assumption. If the test is significant (probability level is less than 0.05), the corrected (adjusted) F-values (Greenhouse-Geisser or Hyunh-Feldt) should be used (SPSS, 1999). The findings showed that the sphericity assumption was violated for all variables (i.e. Mauchly’s tests were significant) and therefore, the corrected F-ratios and their associated probabilities were used.

Previous experience

Prior to testing hypotheses, a series of independent sample t-tests were executed to see if the previous experience (visitation and living) with the destinations should be controlled. No significant differences were found for any cognitive items for each destination between visitors (or those who have lived or been living in a particular gaming place) and non-visitors (or those who have not lived or been living in a particular gaming place). In a comparison between those respondents who had previously visited and those who had not, Las Vegas was different in affective, overall image, and behavioral intentions. There were no significant differences for Atlantic City. Chicagoland (IL, IN) produced differences between visitors and non-visitors in affective evaluations and behavioral intentions. Differences between visitors and non-visitors were also found for Connecticut in terms of affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions. The majority of differences were small and there were not enough respondents for three gaming destinations to make a meaningful comparison. Because of the repeated measures design, excluding the respondents was not possible, either. Therefore, all hypotheses were conducted on the whole data set given the reasons above.
Table 11

Mean and Standard Deviation for Cognitive, Affective, Overall Image, and Behavioral Intentions for each Gaming Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of games</td>
<td>4.61 (.721)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows/entertainment</td>
<td>4.65 (.723)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to attractions</td>
<td>3.89 (1.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/dining</td>
<td>4.35 (.811)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>4.03 (.980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino comps (freebies)</td>
<td>3.61 (1.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino promotions</td>
<td>3.81(1.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player Clubs</td>
<td>3.91 (.852)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>3.61 (.966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of environment</td>
<td>3.68 (.983)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>3.94 (1.016)</td>
<td>3.21 (.963)</td>
<td>3.39 (.856)</td>
<td>2.93 (.675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel to</td>
<td>3.76 (1.188)</td>
<td>3.32 (1.059)</td>
<td>3.37 (1.027)</td>
<td>2.89 (.960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of tourist attractions</td>
<td>4.08 (1.029)</td>
<td>3.03 (.976)</td>
<td>3.13 (.827)</td>
<td>2.45 (.678)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>3.98 (.917)</td>
<td>3.44 (.838)</td>
<td>3.24 (.739)</td>
<td>3.33 (.724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.56 (1.075)</td>
<td>2.88 (.968)</td>
<td>2.81 (.746)</td>
<td>2.66 (.789)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tour appeal</td>
<td>3.92 (1.019)</td>
<td>3.44 (.988)</td>
<td>3.00 (.834)</td>
<td>2.91 (.839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family appeal</td>
<td>3.09 (1.285)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.092)</td>
<td>2.71 (.819)</td>
<td>2.57 (.903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult appeal</td>
<td>4.51 (.805)</td>
<td>3.96 (.892)</td>
<td>3.33 (.798)</td>
<td>3.32 (.872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable room rates</td>
<td>3.44 (1.056)</td>
<td>2.98 (.908)</td>
<td>2.87 (.757)</td>
<td>2.83 (.667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant/Unpleasant</td>
<td>4.14 (1.073)</td>
<td>3.07 (1.227)</td>
<td>2.86 (1.032)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.041)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousing/Sleepy</td>
<td>4.41 (.922)</td>
<td>3.42 (1.130)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.035)</td>
<td>2.67 (1.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressing/Relaxing</td>
<td>3.45 (1.112)</td>
<td>2.96 (1.084)</td>
<td>2.82 (.942)</td>
<td>3.10 (1.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting/Gloomy</td>
<td>4.48 (.911)</td>
<td>3.37 (1.207)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.063)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Image</td>
<td>4.34 (1.029)</td>
<td>3.32 (1.173)</td>
<td>2.75 (.997)</td>
<td>2.76 (1.091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Intentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>4.14 (1.197)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.300)</td>
<td>2.61 (1.094)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit/Revisit</td>
<td>4.15 (1.260)</td>
<td>3.02 (1.362)</td>
<td>2.59 (1.247)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.268)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers in parentheses are the standard deviation for each of the variables measured. Numbers not in the parentheses are the mean for each variable.
and to take advantage of statistical power.

**Cognitive Perceptions**

The repeated measures analysis was performed on cognitive perceptions of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. The multivariate tests of Pillai's Trace and Wilks's Lambda were significant at 0.0001 probability level. Mauchly's test of Sphericity was performed in order to reveal if the data is violating the sphericity assumption. For each of the nineteen cognitive variables, the observed probability level was below 0.05, which indicates that the variance differences between gaming markets are not equal across the nineteen variables. Since the sphericity assumption for repeated measures analysis was violated, a corrected $F$-value must be used. The Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt corrected $F$-values were significant at 0.0026 or lower probability level for all nineteen variables, which indicated that at least one pair of gaming destinations are different. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was supported (See Table 12).

The Bonferroni multiple comparisons revealed that for the following attributes significant differences were found among all four destinations of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut: Variety of games, Shows/entertainment, Weather, Casino comps (Freebies), Player Clubs, and Shopping. The Variety of games variable and the Shows/entertainment variable gave the highest average ratings to Las Vegas and Atlantic City, which are the more well-known and established gaming areas. The Weather dimension produced the highest average rating for Las Vegas and the lowest average rating for Connecticut. On average, Las Vegas has more hot weather year round than Connecticut, so the survey respondents viewed warmer weather as an
advantage for a destination in this survey. Casino comps (freebies) and Player Clubs were rated slightly higher for Las Vegas and Atlantic City than for Chicagoland and Connecticut more than likely do to the respondent’s previous experience or knowledge of the first two gaming markets over the later two. The variable Shopping was rated the highest for Las Vegas followed by Chicagoland. This might be due to the fact that more people are knowledgeable about the shopping areas throughout Las Vegas because many of them are within the major hotel properties. Chicagoland might be viewed higher in terms of shopping because of the fact that it is a big city and respondents associate metropolitan areas with better shopping. Connecticut was rated last again, which is a result of a lack of familiarity with the destination as well as the countryside, rural feeling that was expressed in the free-response questions.

For the variables Proximity to attractions, Restaurants/dining, Safety and security, Cleanliness of environment, Ease of travel to, Variety of attractions, Value for money, and Affordable room rates, it was found that Atlantic City and Chicagoland were not significantly different from one another. What is more interesting to note is that differences were found between Las Vegas and Connecticut in terms of these variables proving that the respondents view these variables for each of these places very differently. For example, the respondents see the restaurant offerings in Las Vegas to be very different than those offered in Connecticut, but they see the dining options in Atlantic City and Chicagoland to be very similar. The variables Casino promotions, Group tour appeal, Family appeal, Affordable room rates, and Adult appeal established no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut. However, for these variables, respondents viewed Las Vegas and Atlantic City differently. The dimensions
Table 12

Cognitive Image Differences among Gaming Markets: Repeated Measures Analysis with Multiple Comparison Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Greenhouse-Geisser</th>
<th>Huynh-Feldt</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of games</td>
<td>4.61a</td>
<td>4.04b</td>
<td>3.55c</td>
<td>3.46d</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows/entertainment</td>
<td>4.65a</td>
<td>3.38b</td>
<td>2.71c</td>
<td>2.72d</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to attractions</td>
<td>3.89a</td>
<td>3.23b</td>
<td>3.18b</td>
<td>2.64c</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/dining</td>
<td>4.35a</td>
<td>3.45b</td>
<td>3.43b</td>
<td>3.22c</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>4.03a</td>
<td>2.75b</td>
<td>2.29c</td>
<td>2.53d</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino comps (Freebies)</td>
<td>3.61a</td>
<td>3.23b</td>
<td>2.89c</td>
<td>2.75d</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino promotions</td>
<td>3.81a</td>
<td>3.27b</td>
<td>2.91c</td>
<td>2.85c</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player Clubs</td>
<td>3.91a</td>
<td>3.32b</td>
<td>2.95c</td>
<td>2.66d</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>3.61a</td>
<td>2.96b</td>
<td>2.97b</td>
<td>3.45a</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Atlantic City</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of environment</td>
<td>3.68a</td>
<td>3.94a</td>
<td>3.76a</td>
<td>3.98a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>2.98b</td>
<td>3.22b</td>
<td>3.32b</td>
<td>3.37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel to</td>
<td>2.93d</td>
<td>3.39c</td>
<td>3.13b</td>
<td>3.24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of tourist attractions</td>
<td>2.89c</td>
<td>3.37b</td>
<td>2.45c</td>
<td>3.33b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>3.03b</td>
<td>3.13b</td>
<td>3.60c</td>
<td>3.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>3.86c</td>
<td>3.28b</td>
<td>2.81c</td>
<td>3.91c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tour appeal</td>
<td>4.08a</td>
<td>3.45a</td>
<td>3.00e</td>
<td>3.57b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family appeal</td>
<td>3.92a</td>
<td>3.44b</td>
<td>2.71c</td>
<td>3.90b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult appeal</td>
<td>4.51a</td>
<td>3.33c</td>
<td>3.33c</td>
<td>3.32c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 (continued)

(p-values are not shown in the image)
Table 12 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Greenhouse-Geisser</th>
<th>Huynh-Feldt</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable room rates</td>
<td>3.44a</td>
<td>2.98b</td>
<td>2.87b, c</td>
<td>2.83c</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bonferroni adjustment was used for all univariate and multiple comparison tests. The p-values with "**" are significant at the adjusted significance level of 0.0026 (0.05/19 = 0.0026). Means with a different letter are significantly different at 0.001 or lower probability level. The multivariate tests of Pillai’s Trace and Wilk’s Lambda for all variables were significant at 0.0001 or lower probability level. All variables were measured on a 5-point scale.
of Safety and security and Cleanliness of environment showed no significant difference between Las Vegas and Connecticut.

For the variable Proximity of attractions, Las Vegas received the highest mean score and could have been rated higher than the other destinations simply because a majority of the tourist attractions in Las Vegas are located within The Strip area or in very close proximity. Atlantic City and Chicagoland were not seen as significantly different in terms of proximity of attractions which might be due to both of these cities being located within a Tri-state area. Chicagoland is conveniently located in the tri-state area of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, while Atlantic City is located within the tri-state area of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania so respondents view their proximity to major attractions to be the same. On the Restaurant/dining dimension, no significant difference was found between Atlantic City and Chicagoland, and Las Vegas was rated the highest. With the massive number of restaurants available within the city of Las Vegas coupled with immense growth in the restaurant industry within the city, it is not surprising that restaurants/dining was rated so high. The variable Casino Promotions showed no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut, with Las Vegas being rated the highest overall.

The component of Safety and security showed that no significant difference between Atlantic City and Chicagoland or Las Vegas and Connecticut, which is an interesting finding. Las Vegas was rated the highest in terms of safety and security, while Atlantic City received the lowest rating among the four destinations. The open-ended question responses about Atlantic City along with this rating, is evidence that the city's image of being an unsafe place is the prevalent view. Connecticut might have achieved higher
scores on this attribute because people tend to view Connecticut as a more rural, country area as confirmed by the free-responses questions. Atlantic City and Chicagoland might be associated more with larger cities and crime, which resulted in lower ratings. The variable of Cleanliness of environment, produced the same results as the Safety and security variable with no significant differences being found between Las Vegas and Connecticut or Atlantic City and Chicagoland. This cognitive variable was the only attribute in which Las Vegas did not receive the highest average mean score, with Connecticut edging out the other three destinations. These results might be attributed to the same reasons as those mentioned for safety and security. People associate the degree of cleanliness with a city versus country atmosphere, cities being more on the dirty/littered side and the country being more clean and pure. What is interesting to note here is that Las Vegas is a large city and the results of these two variables appear to be skewed towards Las Vegas. This indicates that on these two dimensions, Safety and security and Cleanliness of environment, Las Vegas has a favorable image in the eyes of the respondents.

The variable Ease of travel to had Las Vegas rated the highest among the four destinations, with no significant difference between Atlantic City and Chicagoland. Connecticut was rated the lowest, possibly related to the view of Connecticut being a non-metropolitan area and more difficult to get to. Atlantic City and Chicagoland are both located within the confines of large metropolitan areas which provide easier access. The “Variety of attractions” dimension showed no significant difference between Atlantic City and Chicagoland, with Las Vegas being rated the highest and Connecticut the lowest. This is confirmation for Las Vegas that the promotional efforts of the past few
years pushing alternative activities available besides gaming have essentially worked effectively on potential visitors. Marketers for the gaming areas in Connecticut might want to examine their positioning strategy more closely to determine whether they are promoting their casino gaming areas to have a variety of attractions because the evidence here shows that people do not view the area that way.

In terms of the Customer service variable, this study found no significant difference between Atlantic City and Connecticut. Customer service is a difficult dimension to define. Overall, Las Vegas and Atlantic City are service-oriented towns with the main business focusing on the industry of service. No difference between Atlantic City and Connecticut in terms of customer service should cause marketers and promoters of Atlantic City to re-evaluate their city’s overall image of service. When a service-oriented town such as Atlantic City is not seen as separate from the other cities in terms of customer service, a problem exists. Chicagoland was rated the lowest in terms of customer service which could be attributed to a variety of different reasons such as unfamiliarity of the gaming area. It is interesting to note here that Midwest towns are generally viewed as being more hospitable and friendly. Being given the lowest customer service rating might mean a re-evaluation of the service reputation of casinos and riverboats in the Chicagoland area in an effort to bring these two views of the Midwest hospitality and Chicagoland gaming service closer together. The dimension of Value for money also reported no significant difference between Atlantic City and Chicagoland. The comparison between Atlantic City and Chicagoland in terms of value for money makes sense because each of these cities is located in urban areas, which
generally tend to be more expensive. Las Vegas was given the highest average score of 3.56, while the other gaming markets were rated in the 2’s.

The variable Group tour appeal found no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut, with Las Vegas scoring higher than a 3.5 average score. Prior research has shown that areas such as Chicagoland and Connecticut are more widely used for group bus tours for retirees and day trip travelers. It is interesting to note that these two destinations have achieved lower average scores on this variable, meaning that the respondent’s perception of these places as a group tour option is skewed. Group travel could have been interpreted to mean convention travel, spring break trips or incentive travel, which would result in a higher score for Las Vegas. For the dimension Family appeal, no significant difference was found between Atlantic City and Connecticut or Chicagoland and Connecticut. This can be interpreted to mean that the only gaming market that is not viewed the same in terms of family appeal is Las Vegas. This result is remarkable considering that several years ago, Las Vegas made the decision to do away with directly appealing to families and has since been promoting the city as an adult destination. The respondents of this study still view Las Vegas as an option for family vacations and gave it the highest average rating among the four gaming markets. The component of Adult appeal found no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut. Las Vegas was given the highest average rating, followed by Atlantic City. Both of these cities are more established as “gaming areas” offering more activities than gaming for adults to enjoy such as nightclubs, high-end shopping, and spas. This attitude was confirmed by the free-response questions which produced a variety of words and images related to adult-oriented activities.
Lastly, the final cognitive variable measured was Affordable room rates. For this variable no significant difference was found between Atlantic City and Chicagoland or Chicagoland and Connecticut. Las Vegas was given the highest average rating across the four gaming markets. This result seems rather surprising considering that Las Vegas has some of the highest hotel room rates in the country. However, it must be mentioned that not only does Las Vegas have high room rates, but they also have extremely low room rates which helps in appealing to all types of visitors from all income levels.

**Affective Perceptions**

A total of sixteen $t$-tests were performed (4 variables X 4 gaming markets) to test the affective perceptions of Hypothesis 2. The repeated measures analysis was performed on the affective perceptions of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. The multivariate tests of Pillai’s Trace and Wilks’s Lambda were significant at 0.0001 probability level. Mauchly’s test of Sphericity was performed in order to reveal if the data is violating the sphericity assumption. For each of the four affect variables, the observed probability level was below 0.05, which indicates that the variance differences between gaming markets are not equal across the sixteen variables. Since the sphericity assumption for repeated measures analysis was violated, the corrected $F$-values were used. The Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt corrected $F$-values were significant at 0.012 or lower probability level for all four variables, which indicated that at least one pair of gaming destinations are different on each affect variable. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported (Table 13).

Table 13 shows the results for affective evaluations. On the Pleasant/Unpleasant scale, Las Vegas was rated more positively than Atlantic City, Chicagoland, and
### Table 13

Affective Image Differences among Gaming Markets: Repeated Measures Analysis with Multiple Comparison Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Greenhouse-Geisser</th>
<th>Huynh-Feldt</th>
<th>F-ratio,</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant/Unpleasant</td>
<td>4.14a</td>
<td>3.07b</td>
<td>2.86b</td>
<td>2.96b</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arousing/Sleepy</td>
<td>4.41a</td>
<td>3.42b</td>
<td>2.88c</td>
<td>2.67d</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing/ Distressing</td>
<td>3.45a</td>
<td>2.96b, c</td>
<td>2.82b</td>
<td>3.10c</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting/Gloomy</td>
<td>4.48a</td>
<td>3.37b</td>
<td>2.88c</td>
<td>2.90c</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bonferroni adjustment was used for all univariate and multiple comparison tests. The p-values with "*" are significant at the adjusted significance level of 0.0125 (0.05/4 = 0.0125). Means with a different letter are significantly different at 0.001 or lower probability level. The multivariate tests of Pillai’s Trace and Wilk’s Lambda for all variables were significant at 0.0001 or lower probability level. All variables were measured on a 5-point scale.
Connecticut. There was no significant difference among other destinations at 0.012 probability level.

The Arousing/Sleeping scale produced the following results: each of the four gaming markets were seen as different. Las Vegas received the highest average score, while Connecticut received the lowest average score. This perception might be due to Las Vegas being viewed as a metropolitan 24-hour town with a variety of options available to visitors at all hours, while Connecticut is viewed as a more rural, sleepy, country setting as confirmed by the free-response questions.

The Relaxing/Distressing scale determined that Atlantic City was not significantly different from Chicagoland, and Atlantic City was not significantly different from Connecticut. Las Vegas once again was given the highest average score. Since Las Vegas is the ultimate gaming vacation destination, respondents might view Las Vegas as relaxing because they are on vacation or are on a trip lasting more than one day. Back in the year 2000, Las Vegas initiated a marketing campaign with a slogan “Do nothing or Do everything.” Free-response images and words about Connecticut as a gaming market support the relaxation feeling, with most people viewing Connecticut as a calm, boring, countryside area.

On Exciting/Gloomy scale, there was no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut. However, Las Vegas and Atlantic City were perceived to be more exciting than Chicagoland and Connecticut with Las Vegas rated as the most exciting destination. This may be due to the fact that these two cities are longer established gaming areas with an extensive gaming history to invoke a more feelings of excitement. Overall, in terms of the affective evaluations, the destinations from the most
to least favorable were as follows: Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Connecticut, and Chicagoland.

**Overall Image**

The repeated measures analysis was performed on the overall image perceptions of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. Mauchly’s test of Sphericity was significant (p<0.05) for overall image, indicating that the variance differences between gaming markets are not equal. Since the sphericity assumption for repeated measures analysis was violated, the corrected F-values were used. The Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt corrected F-values were significant at 0.05 or lower probability level, which indicated that at least one pair of gaming destinations have different overall images. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was supported (Table 14). The Bonferroni main effect results showed that Las Vegas had the highest average score for overall image, followed by Atlantic City, and then Connecticut and Chicagoland together. These findings are consistent with the cognitive and affective perceptions which rated Las Vegas first, followed by Atlantic City on the majority of variables. Las Vegas had the highest average mean score on all cognitive and affective variables with the exception of Cleanliness of environment, so it is logical that Las Vegas would be rated first in terms of overall image as well. The affective evaluations placed Las Vegas highest in terms of pleasantness, arousing, relaxing, and exciting which together with the cognitive evaluations helped to form the respondent’s overall image.

**Behavioral Intentions**

The repeated measures analysis was performed on the behavioral intentions of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut. The multivariate tests of
Table 14

Overall Image Differences among Gaming Markets: Repeated Measures Analysis with Multiple Comparison Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Greenhouse-Geisser</th>
<th>Huynh-Feldt</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Image</td>
<td>4.34a</td>
<td>3.32b</td>
<td>2.75c</td>
<td>2.76c</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Means with a different letter are significantly different at 0.05 or lower probability level. All variables were measured on a 5-point scale.
Pillai’s Trace and Wilks’s Lambda were significant at 0.0001 probability level. For each behavioral intention variable, the observed probability level for Mauchly’s test of Sphericity was below 0.05, which indicated that the variance differences between gaming markets were not equal. Since the sphericity assumption for repeated measures analysis was violated, the corrected F-values were used. The Greenhouse-Geisser and Huynh-Feldt corrected F-values were significant at 0.025 (0.05/2) or lower probability level for both variables, which indicated that at least one pair of gaming destinations are different on both recommendation and visitation intention variable. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported (Table 15).

With regard to recommending each of the gaming markets to family or friends and intention to visit or revisit, no significant difference was found between Chicagoland and Connecticut at 0.025 probability level. The respondents perceived both Chicagoland and Connecticut to be the same in terms of giving recommendations and visiting for the first time or revisiting in the future. This result might spark a re-evaluation of the overall marketing and promotional plan for these two gaming areas. Every destination strives to impress visitors to return and word-of-mouth is a powerful marketing tool to bring in future business. If people do not see Chicagoland casinos and riverboats any differently than Connecticut Indian casinos, then a major marketing problem exists. Las Vegas received the highest average score on both variables with scores in the 4’s and Atlantic City received the second highest average score on each of the variables with scores in the 3’s. The results indicate Las Vegas enjoys a significant word-of-mouth promotion and recommendations. Consistently Atlantic City came in second after Las Vegas and before
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Gaming Markets</th>
<th>Greenhouse-Geisser</th>
<th>Huynh-Feldt</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>Chicagoland</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>4.14a</td>
<td>3.08b</td>
<td>2.61c</td>
<td>2.71c</td>
<td>.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit/Revisit</td>
<td>4.15a</td>
<td>3.02b</td>
<td>2.59c</td>
<td>2.69c</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bonferroni adjustment was used for all univariate and multiple comparison tests. The p-values with "*" are significant at the adjusted significance level of 0.025 (0.05/2 = 0.025). Means with a different letter are significantly different at 0.001 or lower probability level. The multivariate tests of Pillai’s Trace and Wilk’s Lambda for all variables were significant at 0.0001 or lower probability level. All variables were measured on a 5-point scale.*
Chicagoland and Connecticut. Connecticut received the third ranked scores, with Chicagoland producing the lowest scores on each of the two variables.

**Summary of Hypothesis Testing**

Las Vegas, throughout the cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intention questions, received the overall highest scores among the four gaming markets with the exception of the cognitive variable of Cleanliness of environment, for which Connecticut received the highest mean score. Across the twenty-six variables tested, Las Vegas was found to be perceived similarly to one other destination, Connecticut, on two cognitive variables—safety and security and cleanliness of environment. On almost half (9 variables) of the cognitive variables measured, Atlantic City was not significantly different from Chicagoland. The variables that Atlantic City was perceived to be the same as Connecticut were Family appeal and Customer service. No significant difference between Atlantic City and both Chicagoland and Connecticut was found in terms of the affective variables of pleasant and relaxing. Connecticut was determined to have no significant differences from Atlantic City on two cognitive and two affective variables. Chicagoland was perceived in the same way as Connecticut on a total of ten variables (five cognitive, two affective, overall image, and both behavioral intentions) showing no significant difference in they way respondents scored and perceived each destination. All four hypotheses were confirmed for cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intentions for most of the gaming markets. While some of the variables did not produce significant differences between two or three of the gaming markets, none of the twenty-six cognitive variables, four affective variables, overall image, or two
behavioral intention variable tested showed that all of the gaming markets were the same.
For each variable at least one of the four destinations was not perceived to be the same.

Table 16

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1- There will be differences across the four selected gaming destinations in terms of cognitive perceptions.
Results- Of all nineteen cognitive variables tested, at least one of the four gaming destinations was perceived to be different from the others.

Hypothesis 2- The affective perceptions of each destination will be different from each other.
Results- Across the four variables tested for affective perceptions, at least one of the four gaming markets was statistically different from the others.

Hypothesis 3- There will be differences across the four gaming destinations concerning overall image perception.
Results- In terms of overall image perception, each of the four gaming markets was determined to be different with the exception of Chicagoland and Connecticut.

Hypothesis 4- The behavioral intentions of the respondents will be different across the four selected destinations.
Results- The behavioral intentions of Las Vegas and Atlantic City were viewed differently, while no significant difference between Chicagoland and Connecticut was found.
Reliability and Validity Assessment

The findings indicated that qualitative and quantitative responses were mostly converged, which provided evidence for the reliability of the responses. The reliability of multi-item measures (affect and behavioral intention) was checked by Cronbach's alpha (Carmines & Zeller, 1979). A reliability score greater than 0.70 indicates a good reliability. The reliability scores for affective evaluations were 0.84 (Las Vegas), 0.88 (Atlantic City), 0.83 (Chicagoland), and 0.81 (Connecticut). The reliability scores for behavioral intentions, on the other hand, were 0.88 (Las Vegas), 0.85 (Atlantic City), 0.78 (Chicagoland), and 0.85 (Connecticut). These results provided support for the reliability of the results. The predictive validity of the cognition and affect attributes was assessed by correlations of these measures to behavioral intent measures (recommendation and visitation intention). The results showed that all correlations are significant at 0.0001 probability level and ranged from 0.330 to 0.610, providing support for the predictive validity.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the images and perceptions of survey respondents in an attempt to reveal the perceived strengths and weaknesses of four selected gaming destinations—Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland (IL, IN), and Connecticut—as well as cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions for each gaming place to get a better understanding of how to more effectively market these gaming destinations.

The study focused on the images and perceptions of people expressing an interest in gaming of four selected gaming market areas. The overall findings indicate that for the sample of gaming patrons, they view each gaming market differently in terms of cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intentions. These differences, which were discovered through a mixture of quantitative and qualitative questions, have identified the strengths and weaknesses of the gaming markets, as well as which variables are deemed most important. This information will be imperative to forming a more accurately targeted marketing and positioning strategy for each of the selected gaming areas.

It is difficult to compare the results of this study to those conducted previously because a study of this nature has never been attempted before. However, several other
studies have examined cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions for convention destinations, international tourist destinations, and domestic tourist destinations (i.e., Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Baloglu & Love, in press; Chen & Hsu, 2000; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Hu & Ritchie, 1993; Oppermann, 1996; Pike & Ryan, 2004). The present study was able to establish differences among cognitive perceptions, affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions for gaming markets similar to other studies that found differences for destinations in different context (vacation, convention, etc.).

The results of this study have been enhanced and confirmed by the answers to the open-ended questions about each gaming market. While the cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intentions of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland, and Connecticut were determined through a rank system, the qualitative responses provided further clarification and support for the scores each market received. For example, Connecticut was rated the highest in terms of cleanliness of environment. Qualitative responses about Connecticut revealed that respondents identify the area with the country, trees, and fall colors which can explain the higher rating in terms of cleanliness. The other destinations were all viewed as being more urban and dirty. Another example of the open-ended responses providing support for the quantitative answers is in terms of the cognitive variable of ease of travel to. Atlantic City and Chicagoland were viewed as being similar with distance and closeness being mentioned for each market. Qualitative responses reveal that for each of these markets, “close/distance” was cited more often than Las Vegas and Connecticut. The qualitative responses in this case support that these
two destinations are seen as similar because they are closer in proximity to the respondents.

This study separated image into several different components to look at each facet independently. Researchers in a variety of disciplines have stated that image is comprised of two main components: cognitive and affective evaluations (Dobni & Zinkhan, 1990). Ahmed (1991) argued that the evaluation of overall image and its various components would be different and that measuring each component separately is necessary to develop a more accurate positioning strategy. Genereux, Ward, and Russel (1983) contended that knowledge about a destination's objective attributes is embodied by the cognitive component while the affective component is knowledge about a destination's affective quality. Information presented in this research project has allowed for the separation of all facets of image—cognitive evaluations, affective evaluations, overall image, and behavioral intentions—in order to get a more accurate look at each gaming destination. Essentially, marketers and casino management will have a more precise view of each gaming destination because they can look not only at cognitive perceptions in terms of attributes, but also affective evaluations, and overall image in formulating a more effective image management plan and position strategy.

The present study used a mixture of quantitative (structured) and qualitative (unstructured) questions to get a more defined view of each of the selected gaming markets. Echtner and Ritchie (1993) argued that in order to fully encapsulate all the components of image, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods must be employed. Baloglu and Love (in press) used a similar methodology to the present study when they examined association meeting planners' perceptions of convention cities.
Their research was able to establish that the qualitative responses provided further clarification for the scores of the cognitive evaluations, affective evaluations, overall image, and intentions. Because no research has been performed specifically dealing with the image of gaming markets in the past, it was vital for the research to include all facets of image and image evaluation. The present research included a mixture of structured and unstructured questions to get a more detailed look at each of the destinations from the start. While no former studies exist to compare the results to, future research can use similar methodology to confirm or discover new findings with relation to gaming market image.

Comments, Implications, and Suggestions

The results of this research project have both practical and theoretical implications. The study determined the strengths and weaknesses of the four gaming markets. Theoretically this research proved that a combination of quantitative and qualitative perceptions is required to get a more accurate understanding of each gaming market. While the quantitative questions on cognitive perception, affective perception, overall image, and behavioral intentions provided interesting results, the qualitative questions were able to offer an enhanced explanation for the motive behind the ratings of each variable. The free-response qualitative questions uncovered perceptions that were undeterminable through simply answering the quantitative questions.

These results would be beneficial to the local governments of each of these areas to help in tourism related projects and budgets. Private gaming companies should be interested in the results to help them more accurately position themselves not only within each market, but within the United States in general. This information will allow local
convention and visitor bureaus (CVBs) to get an idea of their image, and how that image compares to other gaming areas. In addition, CVB’s might also find this information vital to their city promotion plan. City promoters can re-evaluate their current positioning strategy and make changes and modifications in order to establish a more favorable image for their destination. The findings of the cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intention questions together with the free-response qualitative questions can be used in the development of determining a more precise target market and an improved positioning strategy, as well as help to highlight each gaming market’s strengths while attempting to improve some weaknesses. For each of the four destinations, marketers will be able to compare what they are offering as a destination with what consumers are demanding. Any discrepancies between the supplied offerings and the demanded offerings are a place where each destination can improve. For example, in this study it was determined that Las Vegas was rated low in terms of safety and security. The respondents perceived the security presence within the city to be less than what they expected and view it as being one of the weak areas for the Las Vegas gaming market. Being aware that safety is a concern for visitors and that the respondents of this survey rated security rather low, city officials, marketers, and hotel management can increase security presence in order to make guests feel more at ease.

The gaming market of Chicagoland might launch a full scale marketing plan in an effort to get more people to recommend their casinos and visit again. Chicagoland was rated the lowest of the four destinations on both of the behavioral intention questions. Word-of-mouth is a powerful marketing tool and the results of this survey should spark promoters and marketers in the Chicagoland casino areas to re-evaluate their position.
Receiving low scores for recommendations and intent to visit or revisit could potentially close a business eventually. Chicagoland marketers and hotel management need to determine the best positioning strategy to increase the possibility of people recommending their casinos through word-of-mouth and considering a return visit.

The responses to the qualitative questions produced some beneficial perceptions and images of each of the gaming areas that might be useable in forming different marketing campaigns aimed at a variety of different segments. With regard to the weaknesses determined by the results of this study, each of the gaming markets should focus their efforts on improving only those attributes that they have control over. For example, Las Vegas scored second to Connecticut on one cognitive variable, Cleanliness of environment. In the future Las Vegas might want to implement a citywide clean-up program or consider initiating further research on which areas of the city people feel need improvement. An example of a weakness that is out of the control of gaming companies, the government, and the local CVB’s, is weather. Chicagoland and Connecticut both scored rather low in terms of the weather attribute which is uncontrollable to everyone. These two destinations might want to focus more on enticing customers through targeted promotions regardless of the weather or in the favorable seasons for each climate.

With various forms of gaming present in most of the states within the United States, the competition for gaming profit is increasing with each new casino opening. It is crucial for gaming markets throughout the United States to effectively evaluate their strengths and weaknesses in order to more accurately develop a marketing strategy. These gaming markets need to evaluate whether the demand for their products is a reflection of the reality. Gaming markets should compare their intended image or the
image they supply, to the perceived image held by the respondents of this survey or the image they have to calculate to difference between the two. These differences in promotion, message, communication, and positioning strategy can then be adjusted to close the gap between planned image and perceived image. For example, Las Vegas received the highest average mean score for the cognitive variable of Family appeal. As mentioned previously the LVCVA, the body in charge of the promotional budget for the city of Las Vegas, has chosen to market Las Vegas as an adult-themed/“what happens in Vegas, stays in Vegas” destination. In the early 90s Las Vegas was heading towards attempting to become a more family-oriented destination. The results of this study show that respondents still view Las Vegas as a family-oriented town even though that is not the main focus of the marketing campaign. The LVCVA needs to decide if they need to correct their positioning strategy and advertising to reflect or include this current perception.

Limitations of the Study

The most significant limitation to this research is that the results are not generalizable across the population of the United States or even the population of the Internet. They are not generalizable over the population used for the study since no non-response bias was assessed. While the sample selected were people expressing an interest in gaming, the results of this survey are also not generalizable across gaming patrons. When using the Internet to conduct online research, it is extremely difficult to obtain a representative sample. People without Internet access and people who experience technical problems with computers are eliminated from the sample automatically. The sample of respondents used in this survey was people who consistently participate in online
surveys. Many other people access the Internet on a regular basis and their thoughts and opinions are not considered in this project because only a select number of Internet users participated in the study.

The method selected for this research involved online surveying which in itself has several limitations. The first and most notable limitation for this online survey is through the use of the Internet. Technical problems arise occasionally and people experience frustration with sluggish Internet connections and slow loading webpages. Another problem with online surveys occurs in the area of security. Online respondents might be hesitant to enter personal information on a website that they do not know is secure. Traditionally online surveys have lower response rates than other forms of data collection such as telephone and mail surveys.

Another major limitation of this study is concerning the selection of a sample. With the selected gaming destinations being across the United States, it was necessary to obtain a sample of respondents from all over the country. Requiring respondents from all over the country limited the time frame to gather data and the various options for the survey, whether it be mail, telephone, or online. An Internet survey was selected as the best method to access the greatest number of people across the U.S. in the shortest period of time. In working with SSI, a statistically drawn sample was produced which allowed for people throughout the U.S. to participate in the research. Respondents in the study were from 42 different states, which did allow for a countrywide opinion.

An additional limitation to the study was in determining which gaming markets or areas to ask respondents about. It was decided that the gaming destinations were to be selected according to reported gross revenue by the American Gaming Association.
(AGA) in 2003. The 2005 Casino & Gaming Market Research Handbook contained a list of the top gaming markets consistent with the AGA reports for the years 2002 and 2003. The top four gaming markets for 2003 were selected to be studied in this research. A better measure of the top gaming destinations might be in terms of visitor volume or overall spending impact on a destination city. However, this information is much more difficult to access. Several other gaming areas exist in the United States that may not be one of the highest grossing areas but are high in terms of visitor numbers and recognition such as Biloxi, Mississippi and the Reno/Tahoe area.

An added limitation to this study is in terms of the selected attributes that are used to measure cognitive perception and image. A review of the literature in gaming, tourism, and hospitality revealed the most common attributes used in past studies. However, very little information was available on specific attributes to be used in the measurement of gaming destinations. The interpretation of the results of this study is limited to those attributes that were selected to be evaluated. Steps were taken to ensure the selected gaming attributes were accurate through the discussion board postings and conversations with experts in the field. The combination of attributes contained in this study has never been used previously in academic research and it will therefore be difficult to compare the results to other surveys.

This study was also limited in terms of which images respondents were asked to comment on. The present research was restricted to images of each place as a gaming market, rather than an overall evaluation of each place in terms of destination image. Finally, the positions for the destinations on affective, overall image and behavioral
intentions may vary within visitors and non-visitors as this study could not compare them in each segment.

**Further Research**

Since this study was conducted with only four gaming markets and only a mere selection of nineteen cognitive attributes, it may be beneficial in the future to replicate this study with more gaming markets and a more complete list of attributes. At the very least, future research can apply the same methodology and framework (quantitative and qualitative, with cognitive, affective, overall image, and behavioral intention questions) to a variety of other gaming markets across the country such as Tunica and Biloxi, Mississippi or Reno and Lake Tahoe, Nevada. Due to the fact that very little literature existed on gaming specific attributes, a reproduction of this study in the future with improved cognitive attributes would be even more valuable for each of the gaming markets tested. The present research was able to determine a list of qualitative attributes for each of the four destinations selected. Future research can use these qualitative lists to develop a more accurate list of attributes.

Also, this study looked at gaming market areas which included land-based casinos, Indian casinos, and riverboat casinos spread throughout the United States. Further research on this subject might take a look at images and perceptions of just Indian gaming areas in relation to one another or land-based casino operations compared to other land-based operations. Also, this study was conducted only within the United States gaming context. Several successful gaming areas exist throughout the world and a suggestion for further research might be to compare gaming markets globally to get a better idea of which gaming market has the best overall image across the world.
This study examined cognitive perception, affective perception, overall image, and behavioral intentions for each of the four selected destinations. A suggestion for further research would be to investigate the affective perceptions, overall image, and behavioral intentions of the same destinations or another set of destinations to compare the potential discrepancies that are present between the views of visitors and non-visitors.

Another option for future research might be to look at casino operations within a selected market to compare the cognitive, affective, behavioral intentions, and overall image of a specific casino/hotel with regards to other casino/hotels in the same market. For example, the same study could be replicated with the gaming markets of Las Vegas, Atlantic City, Chicagoland, and Connecticut being changed to hotels such as Mandalay Bay, Bellagio, Wynn Las Vegas, and MGM Grand. This might help the marketing teams at each property tailor their marketing strategy even more than a citywide comparison of destinations in general. Overall, because this project was an attempt to close the gap in the tourism, hospitality, and gaming literature, projects similar to this one could only add to the growing knowledge base to help people truly understand how to promote, position, and market their product (location) to the right people. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of each gaming market is necessary to effectively market and develop image and positioning strategy and promote correctly to the target market, now and in the future.
Hello and thank you for coming to this site to participate in the survey. My name is Erin Kneesei and I am a graduate student working on my Masters in Hospitality Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to gain insight into what people perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of gaming destinations. Your truthful responses will help the gaming places to better understand your perceptions and experiences, and to serve you better. The data obtained from this research will be used to complete a thesis project at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because you have expressed an interest in gaming.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: Give approximately 15-20 minutes of your time to answer some basic questions about gaming destinations.

Benefits of Participation
There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn the strengths and weaknesses of the selected gaming destinations to aid in marketing them more effectively in the future.

Risks of Participation
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. You may become uncomfortable when answering some questions.

Cost / Compensation
There will be no financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take 15-20 minutes of your time. You will be compensated for your time by being entered into a contest to win $10,000 from Surveyspot.com. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas may not provide compensation or free medical care for an unanticipated injury sustained as a result of participating in this research study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu at 895-3932.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted, you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu at baloglu@ccmail.nevada.edu or myself.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

Should you want a copy of the results of the survey, please feel free to send a separate e-mail to EBERT345@aol.com.

Thank you for your time and cooperation!

BY CLICKING HERE YOU AGREE TO HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY! I AM AT LEAST 21 YEARS OF AGE.
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Gaming Market Image

Internet Gambling Preferences

* 1. Do you gamble on the Internet?
   - Yes
   - No
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Gaming Market Image

Internet Gambling Preferences

* 2. How often do you gamble on the Internet?
   - Once a year or less
   - Twice a year
   - 3 to 6 times a year
   - 7 to 12 times a year
   - 2 to 3 times a month
   - Once a week
   - Twice a week
   - 3 to 6 times a week
   - Daily

<< Prev   Next >>

3. I gamble in the following ways on the Internet (Check all that apply)
   - Casino games
   - Lottery
   - Race & Sports
   - Bingo
   - Other (please specify)
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Gaming Market Image

Gambling Preferences

4. Do you gamble in land-based casinos?
   ☑ Yes
   ☐ No
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5. How often do you gamble in land-based casinos?
   - Once a year or less
   - Twice a year
   - 3 to 6 times a year
   - 7 to 12 times a year
   - 2 to 3 times a month
   - Once a week
   - Twice a week
   - 3 to 6 times a week
   - Daily
6. Do you play progressive jackpot machines?

☐ Yes
☐ No
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Gaming Market Image

Gambling Preferences

* 7. What is your main reason for gambling?
   - To win money
   - Fun/Recreation/Hobby
   - Excitement
   - Challenge
   - Escape from worries/problems
   - Other (please specify)
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8. Which of the following games do you prefer to play? (Please check all that apply)
- Video Poker
- Slot Machines
- Blackjack
- Bingo
- Race and Sports Book
- Keno
- Roulette
- Table Poker
- Craps
- Other

<< Prev Next >>
**Previous Visit**

* 9. Have you ever visited the following places to gamble?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Gaming Market Image

#### Previous Visit

*10. Have you ever lived or are living in the following gaming places?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>🌟</td>
<td>🌟</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* 11. What words or images come to mind when you think of LAS VEGAS as a gaming market? (Please write at least 3 things)
12. What words or images come to your mind when you think of ATLANTIC CITY as a gaming market? (Please write at least 3 things)
13. What words or image come to your mind when you think of CHICAGOLAND (IL, IN) as a gaming market? (Please write at least 3 things)
14. What words or image come to your mind when you think of CONNECTICUT as a gaming market? (Please write at least 3 things)
15. Listed below are some attributes that determine the quality of a gaming place. Using the scale below, where "1" means "Poor" and "5" means "Excellent," please evaluate each place as a gaming market for each item that best reflects your perception. PLEASE RATE EACH PLACE NO MATTER IF YOU VISITED THERE OR NOT!

1- Poor
2- Fair
3- Good
4- Very Good
5- Excellent
X- Don't Know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Las Vegas</th>
<th>Atlantic City (NJ, IN)</th>
<th>Chicago</th>
<th>Connecticut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player Clubs</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of environment</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino comps (Freebies)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino promotions (Discounts, Coupons)</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult appeal</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/dining</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity to tourist attractions</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family appeal</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of tourist attractions</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group tour appeal</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows/entertainment</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of games</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable room rates</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of travel to</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td>▼</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Below is a list of scales that can be used to describe your feelings towards places. Evaluate each place as a gaming market on each word set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Unpleasant</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Pleasant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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17. Below is a list of scales that can be used to describe your feelings towards places. Evaluate each place as a gaming market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Arousing</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Sleepy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Below is a list of scales that can be used to describe your feelings towards places. Evaluate each place as a gaming market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Distressing</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Relaxing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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19. Below is a list of scales that can be used to describe your feelings towards places. Evaluate each place as a gaming market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Gloomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Gaming Market Image

Your Overall Image and Intentions

* 20. Check the answer that best describes your overall image of each place as a gaming market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Poor 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Gaming Market Image
Your Overall Image and Intentions

21. Indicate if you would recommend each place to your friends and relatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Recommend At All</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Definitely Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### UNLV Gaming Market Image
### Your Overall Image and Intentions

*22. Would you consider visiting (or revisiting if you have visited already) the following places for gaming?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Definitely Not 1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Definitely Will 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicagoland (IL, IN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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About You

* 23. Please indicate your age:
  - 21-35
  - 36-50
  - 51-65
  - 66+
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* 24. Please indicate your gender:
   ☑ Male
   ☑ Female
UNLV

Gaming Market Image

About You

25. Please indicate your education level:
   - No college
   - Some college/associate degree
   - Bachelors degree
   - Post bachelors degree

<< Prev      Next >>
* 26. Please indicate your marital status:
   - Single (never married)
   - Single (divorced, separated, or widowed)
   - Married
   - Other (please specify)
* 27. Please indicate your annual household income before taxes:
   - Under $35,000
   - $35,001 - $55,000
   - $55,001 - $75,000
   - $75,001 - $95,000
   - Over $95,000
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UNLV
Gaming Market Image

About You

* 28. Please indicate which state you currently live in:

<< Prev        Next >>

Thank you for your time and cooperation!!
UNLV

Social/Behavioral IRB – Expedited Review
Approval Notice

NOTICE TO ALL RESEARCHERS:
Please be aware that a protocol violation (e.g., failure to submit a modification for any change) of an IRB approved protocol may result in mandatory remedial education, additional audits, re-consenting subjects, researcher probation suspension of any research protocol at issue, suspension of additional existing research protocols, invalidation of all research conducted under the research protocol at issue, and further appropriate consequences as determined by the IRB and the Institutional Officer.

DATE: February 28, 2005
TO: Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu, Tourism and Convention Administration
FROM: Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
RE: Notification of IRB Action by Dr. Michael Stitt, Chair
Protocol Title: Empirical Investigation of Gaming Destination Images
Protocol #: 0502-1524

This memorandum is notification that the project referenced above has been reviewed by the UNLV Social/Behavioral Institutional Review Board (IRB) as indicated in regulatory statutes 45 CFR 46. The protocol has been reviewed and approved.

The protocol is approved for a period of one year from the date of IRB approval. The expiration date of this protocol is February 28, 2006. Work on the project may begin as soon as you receive written notification from the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS).

PLEASE NOTE:
Attached to this approval notice is the official Informed Consent/Assent (IC/IA) Form for this study. The IC/IA contains an official approval stamp. Only copies of this official IC/IA form may be used when obtaining consent. Please keep the original for your records.

Should there be any change to the protocol, it will be necessary to submit a Modification Form through OPRS. No changes may be made to the existing protocol until modifications have been approved by the IRB.

Should the use of human subjects described in this protocol continue beyond February 28, 2006, it would be necessary to submit a Continuing Review Request Form 60 days before the expiration date.

If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at OPRSHumanSubjects@ccmail.nevada.edu or call 895-2794.

Office for the Protection of Research Subjects
4505 Maryland Parkway • Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-4137
(702) 896-2794 • Fax: (702) 896-8184

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Hello and thank you for coming to this site to participate in the survey. My name is Erin Kneesel and I am a graduate student working on my Masters in Hospitality Administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Purpose of the Study
You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to gain insight into what people perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of gaming destinations. Your truthful responses will help the gaming places to better understand your perceptions and experiences, and to serve you better. The data obtained from this research will be used to complete a thesis project at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Participants
You are being asked to participate in the study because you have expressed an interest in gaming.

Procedures
If you volunteer to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following: Give approximately 15-20 minutes of your time to answer some basic questions about gaming destinations.

Benefits of Participation
There may be no direct benefits to you as a participant in this study. However, we hope to learn the strengths and weaknesses of the selected gaming destinations to aid in marketing them more effectively in the future.

Risks of Participation
There are risks involved in all research studies. This study may include only minimal risks. You may become uncomfortable when answering some questions.

Cost /Compensation
There will be no financial cost to you to participate in this study. The study will take 15-20 minutes of your time. You will be compensated for your time by being entered into a contest to win $10,000 from Surveyspot.com. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas may not provide compensation or free medical care for an unanticipated injury sustained as a result of participating in this research study.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or concerns about the study, you may contact Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu at 895-3932.

For questions regarding the rights of research subjects, any complaints or comments regarding the manner in which the study is being conducted you may contact the UNLV Office for the Protection of Research Subjects at 895-2794.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact my faculty advisor Dr. Seyhmus Baloglu at baloglu@ccmail.nevada.edu or myself.

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in this study or in any part of this study. You may withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relations with the university. You are encouraged to ask questions about this study at the beginning or any time during the research study.

Confidentiality
All information gathered in this study will be kept completely confidential. No reference will be made in written or oral materials that could link you to this study. All records will be stored in a locked facility at UNLV for at least 3 years after completion of the study. After the storage time the information gathered will be destroyed.

Should you want a copy of the results of the survey, please feel free to send a separate e-mail to EBERT345@aol.com.

Thank you for your time and cooperation!

BY CLICKING HERE YOU AGREE TO HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY! I AM AT LEAST 21 YEARS OF AGE.
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