

IMAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AS A TRAVEL DESTINATION: A CASE STUDY OF UNITED KINGDOM COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sung Hee Park
Department of Community, Agriculture, Recreation &
Resource Studies
Michigan State University
131 Natural Resources Building
East Lansing, MI 48824

Pavlina Latkova
Michigan State University

Sarah Nicholls
Michigan State University

Abstract.—The youth travel market is a major growth segment of international tourism. The purpose of this study was to explore the travel behaviors and perceptions of United Kingdom college students with regards to the United States as a travel destination. Two objectives were formulated, to determine whether image dimensions differed based on (1) travel behavior, and (2) socio-demographic characteristics. Results suggest that the UK students studied were mostly concerned with a destination's provision of outdoor recreation, infrastructure, events/attractions, safety/environment, transportation, and value/cost. Additionally, level of agreement with the six image dimensions differed significantly depending on past travel experience, number of previous trips, purpose of and sources of travel information for the most recent trip, and age. Visitors identified a more positive image of the U.S. than non-visitors, signifying visitation's positive impact on image. Such findings have important implications for the more effective marketing of destinations to the growing youth segment.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The youth tourism market is a major growth segment of international tourism and accounts for 20-25 percent of total international tourism activity (WTO, in Richards & King 2003). As a significant sub-group of the larger youth travel market, the student college market represents a multibillion-dollar business (Bywate 1993, Chadee & Cutler 1996). However, the lack of a widely accepted definition of a youth traveler and the prevailing misconception that youth travelers exhibit low levels of

spending have led to limited research into youth and students travelers' perceptions, images, and behaviors (Carr 1998) and has also resulted in the under-marketing of this segment (Seekings 1998; Richards & Wilson 2004).

The low-spender assumption is partly a result of failure to differentiate "between spend per transaction and spend per visit" (Seekings 1998, p. 49). While young travelers tend to be price sensitive, they generate a higher number of transactions and as a result, their spending per visit is often equivalent to adult travelers' spending. Additionally, their already high spending is enhanced by long-stay visits (Seekings 1998). Accordingly, a study of the economic impact of independent youth travel in Canada revealed that youth travelers tended to stay longer (over 60 days on average), which resulted in higher overall spending (D'Anjou 2004, Richards & King 2003). Independent youth travelers also benefit local economies because they tend to purchase locally produced goods (D'Anjou 2004; Seekings 1998), thus resulting in relatively low leakage of sales revenue (Seekings 1998). Since young travelers are among the first explorers of new places, they can play an important role in the development of a destination's tourism industry. Today's young travelers will become future travelers with a significant amount of discretionary income to be spent on travel (Reisinger & Mavondo 2002). Additionally, satisfied youth travelers can become a future target market as they represent potential returning visitors (Seekings 1998).

The United Kingdom (UK) is a leading European country in terms of international youth outbound travel. In 2000, British youth took 6.4 million international trips, accounting for 12 percent of total British international travel, and the United States was the third preferred destination (WTO 2002). The high involvement of British youth in travel is often enabled by participation in a "gap year". This gap year (a break from education or employment) gives young people an opportunity to engage in some form of travel and/or voluntary work. It has been estimated that approximately 200,000 British young people aged 18-25 take a gap year per annum (Simpson 2005).

Though the U.S. is still the world's leading recipient of youth tourists (Reisinger & Mavondo 2002), the U.S.' competitors, mainly the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada (NAFSA 2003) are trying to attract the youth and college student market by promoting themselves as educational tourism destinations (Son & Pearce 2005), while drawing income away from the U.S. The importance of the student market has also been recognized by other countries, such as Korea, which have created and launched marketing strategies specifically designed to attract youth and college student travelers (Shanka & Musca 1998).

A large number of studies have established that image has an important influence on destination selection (e.g., Crompton 1979, Gartner 1993, Son & Pearce 2005). Further, many studies have examined international students enrolled at U.S. institutions of higher education. For example, Hsu and Sung (1996) examined international students' travel characteristics, while Chen and Kerstetter (1999) studied international students' perceptions of rural Pennsylvania. Other authors have compared international and American college students with regards to their travel behavior (Field 1999) and travel motivations (Kim & Jogaratnam 2002). Notably, there has been a growing effort to determine youth travelers' image of Australia as a travel destination (e.g., Murphy 1999, Shanka, Ali-Knight & Pope 2002; Son & Pearce 2005; Waitt 1996). However, there do not appear to be any studies that have investigated youth and college students' perceptions with regards to the U.S. as a travel destination.

In order to secure or expand the U.S. youth tourism market share, U.S. tourism marketers should pay close attention to youth travelers' behaviors and perceptions of the U.S. as a travel destination. In particular, understanding the travel behaviors and images of UK students can help tourism marketers enhance knowledge of U.S. destinations, increase their accessibility and demand among these students (Michael et al. 2003), and overall more effectively target this lucrative travel market for which the U.S. is still the number one international destination (WTO 2002).

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions and behaviors of UK college students with regards to the

U.S. as a travel destination. More specifically, the study had two objectives: (1) to determine whether students' perceptions of the US differ based on travel behavior, and (2) to determine whether students' perceptions of the US varied with socio-demographic characteristics.

2.0 METHODS

Students enrolled at a UK university in spring 2005 comprised the study population. A total of 219 self-administered surveys were collected for a response rate of 27 percent. Since the data collected are based on a convenience sample of students at a single university, they may not represent the entire UK college student population.

The study elicited information regarding recent travel behavior, characteristics of the most recent (if any) trip to the U.S., image of the U.S. as a travel destination, and socio-demographic characteristics. Demographics and travel behavior were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while t-tests were used to compare perceptions of students who had, and had never, visited the US. Based on a review of the literature (Balogh & McCleary 1999, Chen & Kerstetter 1999, Gallarza et al. 2002, Sirakaya & McLellan 1997), 33 destination-specific image items were identified as important for a college student when selecting a travel destination. The reliability of image items was tested using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. A principal component analysis (PCA) with a Varimax rotation was used to examine underlying dimensions of the image items. Only those factors with eigenvalues equal or greater than 1.0 and items with factors loadings of at least 0.5 were retained (Tabachnick & Fidell 1983). The final number of image items was reduced to 22. MANOVA and one-way ANOVA were then used to examine whether the identified image dimensions differed with travel behavior and socio-demographic characteristics.

3.0 RESULTS

The respondents were predominantly female (59.2%), first-year students (65.7%), and currently not employed (58.4%). Their ages ranged between 18 and 21 (86.7%). The majority (72.5%) of respondents grew up in a village/small town/rural area. Approximately 44 percent

(43.8%) of respondents had visited the U.S. on at least one occasion, and the majority of respondents (78.9%) had traveled with their parents or other family members on their first U.S. trip. Regarding their most recent U.S. experience, more than 50 percent of respondents (52.3%) indicated that entertainment/sightseeing was the primary purpose of this trip, while 20.5 percent identified visiting friends or relatives. The most commonly identified primary source of information for the most recent trip was the recommendations of friends or colleagues (25.0%), and more than 80 percent (80.4%) self-organized their trip. The majority of respondents who had previously visited the U.S. indicated they would revisit the same destination (66.3%) and/or (re)visit other U.S. destinations (72.6%).

T-tests revealed several statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between visitors to the U.S. and non-visitors in their responses regarding image of the U.S. as a travel destination. Respondents with past travel experience were more likely to perceive the U.S. as a place that is friendly, relaxing, and restful and a place that offers a variety of cultural and historical attractions, parks and open spaces, and high-quality accommodations. Previous visitors were also most likely to perceive the U.S. as a unique vacation destination that is safe and inexpensive and offers good value for the money. Generally, previous visitors rated the U.S. more highly than non-visitors across the entire set of image statements. In fact, previous visitors rated the U.S. higher on all ten statements where differences were large enough to be statistically significant. While these results do not definitively establish that visitation enhances image, it is nonetheless encouraging because visitation does not appear to have a negative impact on image.

Factor analysis identified six image dimensions, *outdoor recreation*; *infrastructure*; *events and attractions*; *safety and environment*; *transportation*; and, *value and cost*, which cumulatively accounted for 60.2 percent of the variance explained. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.86 was obtained for the entire scale with alphas ranging from a high of 0.80 to a low of 0.64 for the individual factors. Five items related to outdoor recreation contributed heavily to the first factor and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 and an eigenvalue of 5.68, and accounted for 25.8% of the variance explained. Factor 2 (infrastructure) consisted of

five items (Cronbach's alpha of 0.72, eigenvalue of 2.15, and 9.8 percent of the variance). Four items associated with events and attractions loaded on the third factor (.72, 1.66, 7.5%). The four items dealing with safety and environment loaded on the fourth factor (.69, 1.43, 6.5%). Two items pertaining to transportation loaded on the fifth factor (.71, 1.30, 5.9%). Factor 6 (value and cost) was also comprised of two items (.64, 1.04, 4.7%) (Table 1).

For follow-up analysis, the items that comprised each factor were added together to generate a mean score for each of the six dimensions. The overall mean scores and standard deviations (SD) for the six image dimensions were as follows: outdoor recreation, 4.02 (SD = 0.65); infrastructure, 3.92 (SD = 0.58); events and attractions, 3.70 (SD = 0.67); safety and environment, 3.00 (SD = 0.66); transportation, 3.30 (SD = 0.85); value and cost, 2.90 (SD = 0.83).

To determine whether general image dimensions differed depending on travel behavior, MANOVA, one-way ANOVA, and correlation procedures were used. Several significant differences were found. The results of the MANOVA procedure indicated that image dimensions differed depending on previous travel experience, number of previous trips, purpose of trip, and source of travel information. A follow-up one-way ANOVA procedure showed that there were significant differences with four travel behavior variables. Significant differences were found for four of the six image dimensions, *infrastructure*, *events and attractions*, *safety and environment*, and *value and cost*, for previous travel experience. The results indicated that previous visitors were more likely than non-visitors to agree with the *infrastructure*, *events and attractions*, *safety and environment*, and *value and cost* dimensions. Furthermore, respondents who had traveled to the U.S. twice were found to be more likely than respondents who had visited once, to agree with the *outdoor recreation* and *safety and environment* dimensions. The results indicated that individuals who traveled to the U.S. for entertainment and sightseeing were significantly more likely to agree with the *transportation* dimension than those who traveled to the U.S. for other purposes. Furthermore, respondents who obtained travel information from a travel agent were also significantly

Table 1.—Image Dimensions

Attribute Statement	Outdoor Recreation	Infra-structure	Events/ Attractions	Safety/ Environment	Trans- portation	Value/Cost
Offers many opportunities for outdoor recreation	0.816					
Offers outstanding scenic beauty	0.746					
Has many parks and open spaces	0.719					
Offers a lot of sports facilities	0.666					
Has good beaches	0.613					
Has a high standard of living		0.706				
Is an easy place to communicate in		0.665				
Is a good place to shop		0.646				
Offers high quality accommodations		0.614				
Offers a wide variety of restaurants		0.554				
Offers a variety of attractions			0.779			
Offers many festivals and events			0.73			
Offers many cultural/historical attractions			0.676			
Offers a variety of things to see and do			0.586			
Is a restful and relaxing place				0.714		
Has a clean environment				0.686		
Is a safe place				0.632		
Is a friendly place				0.562		
Is an easy place to get around					0.774	
Offers good ground transportation services					0.769	
Offers good value for money						0.845
Is an inexpensive destination						0.744
Eigenvalue	5.68	2.15	1.66	1.43	1.30	1.04
Variance explained (percentage)	25.8	9.8	7.5	6.5	5.9	4.7
Cumulative variance explained (percentage)	25.8	35.6	43.1	49.6	55.5	60.2
Cronbach's alpha	0.80	0.72	0.72	0.69	0.71	0.64

more likely to agree with this dimension than students who used different sources of travel information (Table 2).

MANOVA and one-way ANOVA procedures were also employed to determine whether individuals' responses to the general image dimensions differed depending on socio-demographic variables. The results of the MANOVA procedure indicated that image dimensions did differ with age. A follow-up one-way ANOVA showed that there was a significant difference for one of the six image dimensions, *infrastructure*. Respondents aged 18 were significantly more likely to agree with the

infrastructure dimension than individuals aged 19 or older (Table 2).

4.0 APPLICATION OF RESULTS

Results suggest that the UK students studied were concerned with a destination's provision of outdoor recreation, infrastructure, events and attractions, safety and environment, transportation, and value and cost. Levels of agreement with the six image dimensions differed significantly depending on past travel experience, number of previous trips, age, trip purpose, and sources of travel information for the most recent trip.

Table 2.—Overall Scores on Image Dimensions by Travel Behaviors

Travel behavior	Outdoor Recreation	Infrastructure	Events & Attractions	Safety & Environment	Transportation	Value & Cost
Previous travel experience						
Yes	4.09(0.69)	4.02(0.58)	3.84(0.68)	3.19(0.68)	3.23(0.94)	3.08(0.84)
No	3.97(0.64)	3.85(0.57)	3.60(0.65)	2.81(0.60)	3.35(0.78)	2.73(0.80)
F	2.09	4.47*	6.98**	19.22***	0.98	10.05**
Number of previous trips						
1	3.88(0.66)	3.94(0.62)	3.81(0.69)	2.98(0.70)	3.28(0.84)	2.95(0.96)
2	4.30(0.55)	3.98(0.50)	3.91(0.61)	3.42(0.51)	3.18(0.89)	3.14(0.79)
3+	4.07(0.77)	4.18(0.59)	3.69(0.81)	3.27(0.76)	3.36(1.13)	3.17(0.66)
F	3.65*	1.26	0.65	4.07*	0.24	0.64
Purpose of trip						
Entertainment/sightseeing	4.00(0.69)	4.10(0.58)	3.91(0.73)	3.23(0.67)	3.50(0.82)	3.11(0.84)
Visit friends or relatives	3.91(0.81)	3.98(0.56)	3.85(0.50)	3.04(0.63)	2.58(1.09)	3.17(0.57)
Other pleasure or personal reasons	4.31(0.47)	3.89(0.55)	3.85(0.58)	3.35(0.47)	3.23(0.90)	3.04(0.63)
Outdoor recreation	4.36(0.45)	3.93(0.42)	3.55(0.71)	3.18(0.65)	2.91(0.97)	3.00(1.12)
F	1.764	0.66	0.88	0.64	4.78**	0.12
Sources of travel information						
Recommendations of friends or colleagues	4.11(0.63)	4.00(0.47)	3.74(0.82)	3.08(0.61)	2.91(1.02)	2.98(0.73)
Recommendations of parents or relatives	3.93(0.75)	3.85(0.60)	3.79(0.91)	2.92(0.77)	3.46(0.78)	3.00(1.09)
Previous experience with the same destination	4.17(0.67)	3.93(0.59)	3.66(0.44)	3.324(0.63)	3.24(0.71)	3.35(0.61)
Internet/newspapers or magazines/TV program	4.40(0.43)	4.00(0.65)	4.23(0.58)	3.29(0.67)	3.04(1.03)	2.67(0.72)
Recommendations of a travel agent	4.08(0.79)	4.20(0.69)	3.92(0.69)	3.38(0.85)	3.88(0.74)	3.13(1.03)
Other	3.72(0.73)	3.96(0.59)	3.73(0.62)	2.98(0.48)	2.70(0.95)	3.20(0.82)
F	1.29	0.48	1.15	1.05	2.77*	1.11
Age						
18	3.94(0.68)	4.08(0.53)	3.78(0.71)	3.17(0.52)	3.42(0.80)	3.08(0.67)
19	4.13(0.58)	4.03(0.56)	3.85(0.63)	2.93(0.67)	3.33(0.86)	2.82(0.89)
20	3.95(0.62)	3.86(0.59)	3.63(0.65)	2.99(0.72)	3.38(0.89)	2.88(0.86)
21+	4.03(0.75)	3.76(0.58)	3.54(0.69)	2.88(0.67)	3.11(0.84)	2.79(0.82)
F	1.10	3.56*	2.59	1.75	1.28	1.15

Standard deviations are in parentheses. Dimension scores were coded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree; *significant at .05 level, **significant at .01 level, ***significant at .001 level.

When UK students visit the U.S., they are mainly concerned with events and attractions located in a safe and friendly environment; thus, destinations desiring to attract these students need to emphasize these factors in their promotion, addressing students' active social lifestyle and their aspiration for entertainment and sightseeing.

Since the majority of previous visitors to the U.S. indicated their intention to visit the same and/or (re)visit another U.S. destination, newly developed destinations and destinations that offer new tourism products should aim their promotion specifically at previous visitors. UK students who visited the U.S. were concerned with the provision of natural resources and cultural and historic

attractions; therefore, new tourism attractions could be developed based on these assets.

The results of the study showed that there were significant differences in image perception between visitors and non-visitors. Visitors indicated a more positive image of the U.S. than non-visitors; thus, visitation appears to have a positive impact on image. For example, visitors reported higher scores on the following image dimension: the “U.S. has many parks and open spaces.” Therefore, destinations need to emphasize their natural resources in their marketing communication campaigns aimed at the UK college student market. In addition, UK students who have visited the U.S. on multiple occasions were mostly concerned with outdoor recreation activities; as such, they represent a potential market segment for U.S. destinations that offer outdoor recreation activities and facilities. Additionally, the majority of students went on a self-organized trip; thus, they could become a potential target market for vacation and/or tour packages if these were designed to meet their needs and concerns as indicated in this study.

UK students who have never visited the U.S. before were concerned with cost more than were previous visitors. Therefore, marketers should emphasize student rates and discounts in promotions targeted at the youth and college markets. In addition, they should use fluctuations in the U.S.:UK currency exchange rate to their advantage.

Finally, regardless of previous visitation, UK college students were concerned with outdoor recreation and transportation. Destinations need to place a greater emphasis on promotion of these factors. Criteria indicated by this study should be taken into account by tourism planners and destination marketers to develop and promote their tourism products more effectively to the college student market.

5.0 CONCLUSION

Crompton (1979) defined image as “the sum of beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of a destination” (p. 18). Since visitors often have very little experience with destinations, their decision is usually based on the image of the destination, rather than objective reality. While image may not be a true representation of what

a given destination has to offer to visitors, this image nevertheless does exist in the mind of the tourist (Mayo 1973). Since image has been established to have a key influence on destination choice (Crompton 1979, Gartner 1996, Son & Pearce 2005), image studies can assist destinations’ planning, development, and management endeavors to establish and/or expand their market share. Marketing communication campaigns can be used to strengthen destination image by presenting images that attempt to appeal to their target markets. Destinations that desire to become successful vacation locations need to promote an image that is unique and attractive, and that appeals to a larger vacation market segment (Mayo 1973).

In the ongoing competition for new international customers, travel and tourism researchers and marketers should pay more attention to youth and college student travelers because they represent a distinct and growing international travel market segment (Chadee & Cutler 1996, Field 1999, Richards & Wilson 2004). Though measuring the youth market is difficult, several studies have identified youth and college student markets’ travel behavior, preferences, and determinants of their destination choice. A few studies have explored college students’ image of a travel destination; however, studies focusing specifically on international youth and college students’ perceptions of the US as a travel destination are lacking, and it is this deficiency that the current study has attempted to address. This lack of reliable information regarding youth and student travelers’ perceptions and image of a destination is significant because it has deterred the effective target marketing of these travel segments.

As mentioned above, a large number of British youth travel internationally during their gap year (Simpson 2005). Similarly, Chadee and Cutler (1996) found that 90% of students in New Zealand planned on traveling overseas after their graduation. Field (1999) concluded that the college market is lucrative (if positioned properly), and should be targeted by destinations’ tourism marketers. Since the youth and college student markets are the major growth segment in the international travel market, studies examining their perceptions of vacation destinations will enable destinations to effectively

position their marketing strategies to enhance their appeal and attractiveness to the youth and college student markets, distinguish themselves from their competitors, and increase their market share.

Though the results of this study cannot be generalized to the entire student population, this study does contribute to the limited research available concerning college students' images and choices of travel destinations. The results show that there is a relationship between students' perceptions of the U.S. as a travel destination and their travel behavior. The study also found that students' perceptions of the U.S. varied with number of previous trips to the U.S., trip purpose, sources of travel information, and age. Findings such as these can help U.S. tourism developers, planners, and managers seeking to increase their market share of UK and other students. Further, identification of students' images, preferences, and expectations can assist in the more effective positioning and marketing of U.S. destinations. Given the growing size and importance of the youth and student travel market, further analysis of this market segment appears highly warranted.

6.0 CITATIONS

- Bywater, M. 1993. **Market segments: The youth and student travel market.** *Travel and Tourism Analyst.* 3: 35-50.
- Baloghu, S.; McCleary, K.W. 1999. **A model of destination image formation.** *Annals of Tourism Research.* 26(4): 868-897.
- Carr, N. 1998. **The young tourist: A case of neglected research.** *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research.* 4: 307-318.
- Chadee, D.; Cutler, J. 1996. **Insights into international travel by students.** *Journal of Travel Research.* 35(2): 75-80.
- Chen, P.-J.; Kerstetter, D.L. 1999. **International students' image of rural Pennsylvania as a travel destination.** *Journal of Travel Research.* 37: 256-266.
- Crompton, J.L. 1979. **An assessment of the image of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image.** *Journal of Travel Research.* 17(4): 18-23.
- D'Anjou, A. 2004. **Youth tourism in Canada.** Youth Tourism Consortium of Canada, Ottawa.
- Field, A. 1999. **The college student market segment: A comparative study of travel behaviors of international and domestic students at a Southeastern university.** *Journal of Travel Research.* 37: 375-381.
- Gallarza, M.G.; Saura I.G.; Garcia, H.C. 2002. **Destination image: Towards a conceptual framework.** *Annals of Tourism Research.* 29(1): 56-78.
- Gartner, W.C. 1993. **Tourism Development: Principles, Processes and Policies.** New York: John Wiley.
- Hsu, C.; Sung, S. 1997. **Travel behaviours of international students at a midwestern university.** *Journal of Travel Research.* 36(1): 59-65.
- Kim, K.-Y.; Jogaratnam, G. 2002. **Travel motivations: A comparative study of Asian international students and domestic American college students.** *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing.* 13(4): 61-82.
- Mayo, E. 1973. **Regional images and regional travel behavior.** *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Travel Research Association Conference.* Salt Lake City, Utah: 211-217.
- Michael, I.; Armstrong, A.; King B. 2003. **The travel behaviour of international students: The relationship between studying abroad and their choice of tourist destinations.** *Journal of Vacation Marketing.* 19(1): 57-66.
- Murphy, L. 1999. **Australia's image as a holiday destination-perceptions of backpacker visitors.** *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing.* 8(3): 21-45.

- National Association of Foreign Affairs (NAFSA): Association of Foreign Educators 2003. Retrieved April 1, 2003, from <http://www.nafsa.org>.
- Richards, G., & King, B. (2003). Youth travel and backpacking. *Travel & Tourism Analyst*, 6, 1-23.
- Richards, G.; Wilson, J. 2004. **The international student travel market: Travelstyle, motivations, and activities.** *Tourism Review International*. 8: 57-67.
- Reisinger, Y.; Mavondo, F. 2002. **Determinants of youth travel markets' perceptions of tourism destinations.** *Tourism Analysis*. 7: 55-66.
- Shanka, T.; Ali-Knight, J.; Pope, J. 2002. **Intrastate travel experiences of international students and their perceptions of Western Australia as a tourist destination.** *Tourism and Hospitality Research*. 3(2): 245-256.
- Shanka, T.; Musca, J. 1998. **An exploratory study of international students' involvement in domestic tourism—A West Australian case.** Retrieved October 5, 2005, from http://smib.vuw.ac.nz:8081/www/ANZMAC1998/Cd_rom/Shanka139.pdf
- Seekings, J. 1998. **The youth travel market.** *Travel & Tourism Analyst*. 5: 37-55.
- Simpson, K. 2005. **Dropping out or signing up? The professionalisation of youth travel.** *Antipode*. 37(3): 447-469.
- Sirakaya, E.; McLellan, R.W. 1997. **Factors affecting vacation destination choices of college students.** *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*. 8(3): 31-44.
- Sirgy, M.J.; Su, C. 2000. **Destination image, self-congruity, and travel behavior: Toward an integrative model.** *Journal of Travel Research*. 38: 340-352.
- Son, A.; Pearce, P. 2005. **Multi-faceted image assessment: International students' views of Australia as a tourist destination.** *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*. 18(4): 21-35.
- Tabachnick, B.C.; Fidell, L.S. 1983. **Using Multivariate Statistics.** New York: Harper & Row.
- Waitt, G. 1996. **Korean students' assessment of Australia as a holiday destination.** *Australian Geographer*. 27(2): 249-269.
- WTO. 2002. **Youth Outbound Travel of the Germans, the British & the French.** Madrid: WTO.