Understanding tourist citizenship behavior at the destination level

Abstract:

Tourist citizenship behavior (TCB) is crucial for tourist destination management because of the benefits it provides to destinations. Despite the importance of this discretionary and altruistic behavior, however, scant research has analyzed TCB at the destination level. The present study addresses this gap. It examines the relationships between destination identification, perceived value, and TCB. It also explores the relationship between TCB and willingness to sacrifice to visit a destination. Data on a sample of 629 tourists (aged 18 years or older) were collected to test the proposed hypotheses using structural equation modeling. TCB is a reflective second-order construct (dimensions: recommendation, helping, and feedback). The results show that both destination identification and perceived value are positively related to TCB, which positively affects willingness to sacrifice. Thus, the findings provide evidence that both destination identification and perceived value are important factors in understanding tourists' citizenship behavior in destinations. Furthermore, the study shows that tourists who are willing to help others by giving feedback and recommending a certain destination (i.e., performing TCB) are also willing to make additional sacrifices to travel to that destination. The theoretical and practical implications for researchers and tourism managers at the destination level are discussed.

Keywords: Tourist citizenship behavior, destination identification, perceived value, willingness to sacrifice

1. Introduction

Customer citizenship behavior (CCB) makes a huge contribution to firm performance, service quality, and effectiveness (Groth, 2005). Given the importance of CCB, scholars have recently applied this concept to the tourist sector (e.g., Al Halbusi *et al.*, 2020; Liu & Tsaur, 2014; Liu *et al.*, 2020; Shafiee *et al.*, 2020; Tsaur *et al.*, 2021). Like CCB, tourist citizenship behavior (TCB) can provide tourist companies or destinations with a competitive advantage (Yi, Gong, & Lee, 2013).

Building on the definition of CCB proposed by Groth (2005), TCB is defined in this study as positive, voluntary, and discretionary behavior by tourists that is not required for the functioning and delivery of a tourist offering but that directly or indirectly benefits the tourist destination. Tourists who engage in TCB behave as if they were citizens of the destination. They care for and become involved with the place they visit, recommending the destination, offering feedback to destination management organizations (DMOs), and helping other tourists. TCB can therefore be understood through the lens of social exchange theory (Liu *et al.*, 2020) because, when tourists are satisfied with a destination, they feel somehow obliged (albeit voluntarily) to benefit this destination through trust and reciprocity (Cheng, Yen, & Chen, 2016). Despite the potential importance of TCB in the management of tourist destinations, only one study (Liu *et al.*, 2020) has examined TCB in relation to tourist destinations. The few studies that have examined TCB have done so from the point of view of the customer of a tourism company. They have applied CCB to tourism contexts such as culture, arts, and creative operators (Al Halbusi *et al.*, 2020), hotels (Shaffiee *et al.*, 2020), and package tourism agencies (Tsaur *et al.*, 2021). Furthermore, the antecedents and possible consequences of TCB that contribute to overall destination management performance have been underexplored. Therefore, more research in this area is needed (Liu *et al.*, 2020).

Regarding the antecedents of TCB, this study focuses on the role of destination identification and perceived value in explaining TCB at the destination level. Scholars have suggested that identification may be important when an offering is intangible, as occurs in the case of tourist destinations (Ahearne, Battacharaya, & Gruen, 2005). Destination identification can be defined as "the tourist's feelings of being connected to a destination and that defines him- or herself" (Japutra, 2020, p. 4). Identification with a tourist destination has been observed to encourage tourists to promote the destination among close friends and to increase intentions to revisit (Hultman, Skarmeas, Oghazi, &

Beheshti, 2015). Accordingly, destination identification may encourage tourists to feel a sense of connectedness to the place they are visiting (Kumar & Nayak, 2019), which could increase their TCB toward the destination. Research also suggests that perceived value can largely determine the tourist experience and behavioral intentions (Junaid *et al*., 2020; Tsaur *et al*., 2021). Due to its subjective and dynamic nature, perceived value is difficult to define. In the context of tourism, it can be thought of as "the process by which a tourist receives, selects, organizes, and interprets information based on the various experiences at the destination, to create a meaningful picture of the value of destination experience" (Prebensen *et al*., 2013, p. 254). When tourists are satisfied with the tourist experience, they perceive it as valuable (Suhartanto *et al*., 2019) and are likely to reciprocate and engage in voluntary behaviors that are advantageous to service providers (Groth, 2005). This tendency may be reflected in behaviors such as recommending the destination, offering feedback to DMOs, and helping other tourists (i.e., performing TCB).

Finally, this study also examines the willingness to sacrifice to visit the destination as a possible consequence of TCB. Willingness to sacrifice is an important variable in the analysis of consumer behavior, but tourism studies have only focused on very specific contexts, such as the environment and sustainable tourist destinations (e.g., Kantenbacher *et al*., 2019; Su, Huang, & Pearce, 2019). However, people almost always have to make both monetary and non-monetary efforts when they want to travel to a certain destination, especially when they have a strong connection with that destination (Aro, Suomi, & Saraniemi, 2018). For example, tourists who feel that they are part of (or would like to be part of) a destination may be willing to save money (monetary sacrifice) and even spend time away from loved ones (non-monetary sacrifice) to revisit that place. Thus, tourists who voluntarily act to benefit a destination through tourist citizenship behaviors are also expected to be more likely to make sacrifices to revisit that destination, even when this sacrifice is substantial.

In sum, this study aims to provide a better understanding of the concept of TCB at the destination level. Specifically, this study examines whether tourists' identification with a destination and tourists' perceived value of the destination are positively associated with tourists' citizenship behavior (TCB) toward this destination. The study also examines the extent to which TCB is related to a greater willingness to sacrifice to visit this destination. Thus, this study makes a valuable theoretical contribution by empirically examining the antecedents (destination identification and perceived value) and possible

consequences of TCB (willingness to sacrifice). While previous studies have examined TCB from the point of view of customers and tourist organizations at the organizational level (e.g., Al Halbusi *et al*., 2020; Shaffiee *et al*., 2020; Tsaur *et al*., 2021), this study examines tourists in terms of their behavior in the tourist destination and with other tourists at the destination level. Furthermore, this study confirms the multidimensionality of the constructs of TCB and willingness to sacrifice to visit a tourist destination. These latent variables are treated as reflective second-order constructs in this study. The dimensions of TCB are recommendation, helping, and feedback, and the dimensions of willingness to sacrifice are monetary and emotional sacrifice and effort. Previous tourism studies have not considered the multidimensionality of TCB in empirical analysis (e.g., Liu *et al*., 2020; Shaffiee *et al*., 2020).

2. Literature review

2.1. Tourist citizenship behavior (TCB)

The concept of TCB was adopted from the CCB literature. It is specifically used to analyze the citizenship behavior of tourists (Liu & Tsaur, 2014; Liu *et al*., 2020). The concept of citizenship behavior originated in the extra-role behavior of employees (Organ, 1988). In the CCB literature, the extra-role behavior of customers refers to any discretionary and voluntary action that goes beyond their status as customers of a given firm. Examples include participating in and providing feedback on the firm's activities and assisting other customers (Groth, 2005). This extra-role behavior has been explained by social exchange theory (Homans, 1958). This theory explains the conditions under which people feel obliged to reciprocate behaviors or actions when they benefit from others. Accordingly, social exchange theory predicts that when customers feel that the firm is "living up to its promise," they will not only feel grateful to it but will also turn their positive emotion into pro-organizational actions such as citizenship behaviors (Groth 2005; Liu *et al*., 2020). However, the main difference between TCB and CCB is that CCB focuses on consumers who support a firm (Groth, 2005), whereas TCB focuses on tourists who help a tourist destination and other tourists (Liu & Tsaur, 2014). Furthermore, although TCB and CCB both entail prosocial behavior (Bove *et al*., 2009), this behavior may be more evidently related to a tourist destination in the case of TCB. A tourist destination is not only where tourists visit but also where they stay, eat, interact with inhabitants, and feel safe.

As explained earlier, TCB entails positive, voluntary, and discretionary behavior by tourists that is not required for the functioning and delivery of a tourist offering but that directly or indirectly benefits the tourist destination. There are two types of TCB: tourist-oriented (i.e., helping other tourists) and destination-oriented (i.e., recommending the destination and giving feedback to DMOs. TCB is therefore a multidimensional concept consisting of three dimensions: recommendation, helping, and feedback.

Recommendation, also known as advocacy (e.g., Yi *et al*., 2013) or word-of-mouth (e.g., Sarioglu, 2020), is defined as the act of recommending services to friends, family, or others, either directly or through online communities (Yi & Gong, 2013). Recommendation thus includes recommending facilities, recommending service employees, or, most commonly, talking about the positive qualities of the product or service (Van Tonder, Saunders, Lisita, & de Beer, 2018). By influencing the behaviors and attitudes of others, this informal kind of communication can provide an important competitive advantage (Yi *et al*., 2013). In fact, recommendation is considered a more powerful communication tool than advertising because it generates greater trust, thereby saving time and money and promoting the sharing of real experiences and customer centricity (Sarioglu, 2020).

Helping other customers is a constructive behavior aimed at assisting others in using a service (Groth, 2005; Yi & Gong, 2013). This dimension is especially relevant in cases where people may have problems with a service and require special assistance. In such cases, the experiences of those who help are important, especially when they have already experienced the same problem (Hwang & Lyu, 2020). Helping other customers is mainly associated with empathetic people, who, by caring about others, help them and consequently help themselves (Joireman, Kamdar, Daniels, & Duell, 2006).

Finally, feedback refers to providing suggestions regarding the performance of a service (Yi & Gong, 2013). Consumers give feedback when they compare a delivered service with their past experiences regarding the same or other services (Voss, Spangenberg, & Grohmann, 2003). Feedback is an important source of insight to improve aspects of the tourist destination that are relevant to tourists. One of the main advantages of feedback is that it allows tourist destinations to retain tourists (Revilla-Camacho, Vega-Vázquez, & Cossío-Silva, 2015). This ability to retain tourists stems not only from the fact that tourists perceive that their opinion is valued but also from the fact that, by providing feedback, tourists develop a closer relationship with people in the organizations at the destination and/or with inhabitants of the destination (Sarioglu, 2020).

2.2. Antecedents of TCB: Destination identification and perceived value

Destination identification has received increasing attention in the tourism context in recent decades. It is now recognized as an important tool to develop long-term relationships with consumers (Nysveen, Pedersen, & Skard, 2013). Destination identification brings tourists closer to the tourist destination through a subjective process that aligns perceived destination identity (Hultman *et al*., 2015) with consumer identity (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994). That is, the self-definitional needs of tourists are satisfied through the personality traits and values that they share with the tourist destination (Hultman *et al*., 2015). From this point of view, tourists may identify not only with what the tourist attractions represent for them but also with the inhabitants of the tourist destination and their way of life. As a form of social identification, they may identify themselves as a member of that society, even without being part of it (Bhattacharya & Sen, 2003). More specifically, tourists may perceive a sense of connectedness to a destination and define themselves in terms of that feeling (Hultman *et al*., 2015; Kumar & Nayak, 2019). In addition, destination identification could enhance the self-esteem of tourists and, in turn, their citizenship behavior (Ahearne *et al*., 2005).

Accordingly, it has been argued that tourists that satisfy their self-identity needs in a given destination may have a greater commitment to that destination (Kumar & Kaushik, 2017). Tourists who identify strongly with a tourist destination would like these places to prosper or at least stay the same so that they can continue enjoying them in the future. Specifically, this greater commitment may make tourists more willing to help others, give feedback, and recommend the destination (H1). Empirical research has shown that identification influences at least one of the dimensions of citizenship behavior (recommendation). Specifically, it has been observed that destination identification positively influences advocacy and word-of-mouth among friends and acquaintances (Hultman *et al*., 2015; Rather, Najar, & Jaziri, 2020).

Perceived value is highly relevant for marketing performance because it is an important source of differentiation in terms of business offerings (Kim & Han, 2008), which directly influences customer decision making (Papista & Krystallis, 2013). Previous research has shown that perceived value relates to various elements of consumer behavior theory, such as satisfaction (e.g., Prebensen & Xie, 2017), motivation (e.g., Suhartanto *et al*., 2019), and loyalty (e.g., Li, 2021). In tourism, perceived value has primarily been linked to satisfaction because satisfaction is strongly associated with the

general assessment of the experiences lived by tourists (Su, Cheng, & Huang, 2020). Overall satisfaction arises when tourists perceive that the benefit of their visit is greater than the costs. This idea is particularly relevant when, as in TCB, consumers voluntarily participate in the service process (Troye & Supphellen, 2012). In such cases, there is an increase in the perceived value and, in turn, an increase in consumer satisfaction (Norton *et al.*, 2012). This value is assessed by consumers based on a comparison between the benefits and costs of the offering. These costs involve monetary sacrifices (e.g., the cost of a plane ticket) and non-monetary sacrifices (e.g., the time and effort involved in hotel reservation). The offering can thus be evaluated as "fair," "right," or "deserved" (Bolton & Lemon, 1999, p. 173).

No studies seem to have addressed the existence of a direct relationship between perceived value and TCB in relation to tourist destinations. However, it is reasonable to assume that, as in other contexts (e.g., Banerjee, Vasudevan, & Kiran, 2019), the greater a tourist's perceived value of a certain destination is, the more willing that tourist will be to perform extra-role behaviors for the benefit of the destination. In fact, if a tourist perceives that a destination offers good monetary and non-monetary value, that tourist will be more likely to recommend the destination, help other tourists, and give feedback to the organizations responsible for tourism in that place (H2). The tourist will be more likely to behave in this way because the higher the perceived value is, the greater the tourist involvement will become (Sharma & Klein, 2020). That is, when there is a high level of satisfaction with the perceived value of a destination, tourists feel a greater sense of belonging and feel more involved (Chi & Han, 2020; Shafiee *et al.*, 2020). This greater involvement emerges in the form of TCB (Al Halbusi *et al.*, 2020).

2.3. The impact of TCB on tourists' willingness to sacrifice

Willingness to sacrifice can be interpreted from a monetary and non-monetary perspective (Cronin, Brady, & Hult, 2000). Monetary sacrifices include direct costs (e.g., the price paid for travel, accommodation, and expenses in the tourist destination) and indirect costs (e.g., the effort that the tourist makes to raise the money to travel). Non-monetary sacrifices include effort and emotional sacrifices. Effort reflects the actions carried out by tourists to have a successful travel experience (Beldona & Kher, 2015). For example, tourists may be willing to work harder to make up for their absence during the trip. Emotional sacrifices involve being away from loved ones and favorite things that are missed during a trip (Beldona & Kher, 2015).

Sometimes, the emotional attachment is so strong that it could lead to a deeper emotional sacrifice, based on the love that tourists feel for the destination they visit (Aro *et al.*, 2018). Thus, sacrifices can appear in the context of long-term relationships (Etcheverry & Le, 2005). If a person is satisfied with a relationship, be it personal or business, that person tends to like and appreciate the other party in the relationship (Geyskens, Steenkamp, & Kumar, 1999). As a result, the person may be willing to make sacrifices to maintain that relationship. In fact, tourists who feel that they are part of (or would like to be part of) a destination may be willing to save money and even be away from loved ones to revisit. Although no studies in the tourism literature seem to have explored the link between TCB and willingness to sacrifice for a destination, extra-role behaviors often involve sacrifice in terms of time, effort, and psychological well-being (Bove *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, we expect tourists who are willing to help other tourists, give feedback, and recommend a specific destination to be willing to make additional sacrifices to travel to that place (H3).

3. Method

As explained earlier, this study aims to provide a better understanding of the concept of TCB at the destination level. Specifically, this study's primary aim is to explain whether tourists' identification with a destination and tourists' perceived value of the destination are positively associated with tourists' citizenship behavior (TCB) at this destination. Its secondary aim is to clarify the degree to which TCB is related to a greater willingness to sacrifice to visit this destination. To achieve these aims, the following research hypotheses, which are based on the previous literature review, form the basis of our proposed model. These hypotheses are summarized in Fig. 1.

> *H1: Destination identification is positively related to tourist citizenship behavior (TCB).*
>
> *H2: Perceived value of the tourist destination is positively related to tourist citizenship behavior (TCB).*
>
> *H3: Tourist citizenship behavior (TCB) is positively related to a tourist's willingness to sacrifice for a destination.*

< Insert Figure 1 about here>

3.1. Data collection and sample characteristics

The participants in this study were asked to complete a questionnaire. They were informed that it was voluntary and that responses would be anonymous. No names or

contact details were requested. The data were gathered using an online survey to control for social desirability bias. Non-random quota sampling was used to ensure the sample structure reflected that of the population in terms of gender, age, region of origin, education, and occupation. Population quotas and sources are available upon request. Respondents were contacted via email. The Qualtrics platform was used to gather the data. To control for the type of tourist and to gather comparable trip information, the sample was restricted to Chilean nationals living in Chile and reporting information from tourist experiences within their home country. The data gathering process required two consecutive waves to ensure sample representativeness. The fieldwork was performed between October and December 2019. The cross-sectional survey data were gathered in the Chilean spring season because this period is when most domestic tourism takes place. During the summer season, international travel is more prevalent. A final sample of 629 cases remained after removing atypical cases, duplicate cases, serial responses, and incomplete questionnaires. Table 1 shows the main features of the final sample.

< Insert Table 1 about here>

3.2.Measures

A questionnaire was used to gather data on the focal variables of this study. An initial version of the questionnaire was pretested by experts in marketing and tourism. A pilot sample of tourists (n = 20) then completed the questionnaire under similar conditions to the final sample. To ensure respondents focused on a specific and relatively homogeneous tourist destination, they were asked to "*think about the most visited tourist destination in your country (Chile)*" at the beginning of the questionnaire. All scales used to measure the concepts analyzed in this study were selected from the literature and were adapted to the context of the study. Specific details of the constructs and items are presented in Table 2.

Tourist citizenship behavior (TCB) was measured using a three-dimensional scale (Groth, 2005). Under this approach, TCB is conceived as a reflective second-order construct formed of three dimensions: recommendation (four items), helping (three items), and feedback (three items). *Destination identification* (DI) was measured using a four-item scale adopted from Su and Swanson (2017), and the *perceived value* (PV) of the tourist destination was operationalized following the approach used by Iniesta-Bonillo, Sánchez-Fernández, and Jiménez-Castillo (2016). Finally, *willingness to sacrifice* (WTS) to visit the destination, was based on the scale provided by Beldona and

Kher (2015), together with items adapted from other studies (Cronin *et al*., 2000; Bélanger, Caouette, Sharvit, & Dugas, 2014). WTS is conceived as a three-dimensional reflective second-order scale consisting of the dimensions of indirect monetary sacrifice (three items), emotional sacrifice (four items), and effort sacrifice (three items). The latent variables (constructs) in all cases were measured using multi-item measurement scales. Respondents were requested to indicate their agreement on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

3.3. *Data analysis*

The two-step estimation procedure proposed by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) was followed. First, the measurement model was estimated using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to assess the reliability and validity of the measures. In parallel, the second-order nature of TCB and WTS was evaluated by comparing competing models. Common method bias was also assessed following the statistical procedure proposed by Bagozzi, Yi, and Phillips (1991). Under this procedure, four models were estimated using the variables included in the study to assess variance as a result of traits (factors), method (single survey), and errors. Second, the structural model was estimated using structural equation modeling (SEM) to test the proposed hypotheses. All estimations were performed in EQS 6.2.

4. Results

4.1. *Measure validation*

The CFA estimation of the structural model showed acceptable fit levels (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2009; see Table 2). Convergent validity was confirmed because the item's factor loadings were statistically significant, and all loadings were above 0.5. The average variance extracted (AVE) scores were greater than 0.5 for all factors, thereby verifying convergent validity. All composite reliability measures were above the recommended level of 0.65, thereby confirming construct reliability (Steenkamp & Geyskens, 2006). None of the 95% confidence intervals of the correlations between each pair of factors included the value 1 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). Similarly, in all cases, the squared between-construct correlations were less than the average variance extracted (AVE) scores. These two results confirm discriminant validity.

< Insert Table 2 about here>

4.2.Multidimensionality of TCB and WTS

The literature suggests that both TCB (e.g., Kim *et al*., 2020) and WTS (e.g., Beldona & Kher, 2015) should be conceived as reflective second-order constructs. To assess this multidimensionality, we followed the approach outlined by Steenkamp and Van Trijp (1991). We designed a rival model strategy with three competing models. Model 1 was a first-order model in which all the items that made up TCB and WTS were considered as a single factor in each case. Model 2 was a second-order model with three dimensions of TCB and one dimension of WTS. Model 3 was a second-order model with multidimensional measures of TCB and WTS. We performed two Chi-squared difference tests (c2) to determine which model had a better fit (Bagozzi & Dholakia, 2006). The results confirmed the multidimensionality of TCB because the difference between Model 2 and Model 1 was statistically significant at the 1% level (c2 = 650.0, 8 df, p < .01). WTS also seemed to be a second-order construct (c2 = 1663.01, 3 df, p < .01). All remaining fit indicators were better for Model 2 than for Model 1 and better for Model 3 than for Model 2. Therefore, both concepts were treated as second-order constructs.

4.3.Common method variance

To assess the potential common method bias derived from the use of a single method (survey) to gather the data, we analyzed the common method variance by following the method described by Bagozzi *et al*. (1991). We compared four CFA models to assess the explanatory power of the traits (factor structure), method (survey), and traits and method together. Table 3 shows that Models 2 and 4 had significantly better fit than Models 1 and 3, respectively. Thus, the variance due to traits (factor structure) seemed highly significant. However, Models 3 and 4 had significantly better fit than Models 1 and 2, respectively. Therefore, some of the variance was explained by the method (survey). According to the joint analysis of both sources of variance (Model 4: traits and method), the method-only model accounted for 34.7% of the variance, and trait factors were the main source of variance (60.2%).

< Insert Table 3 about here>

4.4. Assessment of the proposed model and hypothesis testing

The proposed model was estimated using SEM with maximum likelihood estimation. In the final model, both TCB and WTS were second-order constructs. The final model had suitable levels of goodness-of-fit (see Fig. 2). The three proposed factors

explained 88.2% of the variance of TCB and 25.8% of the variance of willingness to sacrifice (see Fig. 2).

< Insert Figure 2 about here>

The results for the antecedents of TCB were as expected. There is evidence to suggest a positive and direct relationship between a tourist's level of identification with a destination (DI) and TCB ($\beta = 0.210$, $p < .01$). This evidence supports H1. Moreover, the tourist's perceived value of the tourist experience (PV) is also strongly related to the extent to which the tourist performs TCB ($\beta = 0.800$, $p < .01$). These results support H2. The joint interpretation of these two coefficients suggests that perceived value may condition tourists' behavior to a greater extent than destination identification. The construct of TCB is confirmed to be a reflective second-order factor. All loadings between the three first-order constructs and the overall TCB construct were significant and greater than 0.80. Interestingly, the analysis also shows a positive and direct relationship between TCB and willingness to sacrifice to visit the tourist destination ($\beta = 0.508$, $p < .01$), thereby supporting H3. Table 4 summarizes the path coefficients for the indirect and direct relationships.

< Insert Table 4 about here>

5. Discussion and implications

This study highlights the importance of the concept of TCB in the management of tourist destinations. Our results show the importance of having tourists who perform voluntary behaviors that benefit the destination (i.e., TCB) because they are personally involved with the destination and would make considerable sacrifices to visit. In addition to this interesting finding, our study highlights the fact that, to elicit TCB from visitors, it is important for them to identify with the destination and perceive it as valuable.

Specifically, the findings of this study show that TCB is positively related to destination identification and perceived value. Our results show that a higher level of identification with the destination increases tourists' TCB. In the intangible context of tourist destinations (Ahearne *et al*., 2005), a tourist's identification with a destination is particularly relevant. In fact, when tourists perceive that a destination's attractions, inhabitants, and way of life match their aspirations, they develop a strong cognitive and psychological attachment (Hultman *et al*., 2015). Although the destination identification– TCB relationship has not specifically been addressed in the tourism literature, our results

are consistent with those of other studies that have examined related concepts. For example, our results echo those of Liu et al. (2020), who found that emotions experienced by tourists at a destination (e.g., joy or happiness) positively affect two key elements of TCB: recommendation and feedback. Furthermore, our results are consistent with those of Hultman *et al*. (2015), who reported that identification with a tourist destination is an important driver for tourists to promote that place among family and friends. In addition, our results show that tourists' perceived value of the destination is important in making tourists behave like citizens of the destination. When tourists have a positive image of the trade-off between the benefits and costs involved in their visit (Bolton & Lemon, 1999; Prebensen *et al*., 2013), they develop greater commitment. This commitment emerges in the form of behaviors such as recommending the tourist destination, giving feedback, and helping other tourists (i.e., performing TCB). These results support those of a previous tourism study indicating that the perceived value of a tour leader directly influences TCB toward that leader (Tsaur *et al*., 2021). They also concur with those of studies in other contexts, where it has been observed that perceived value is directly related to CCB in the case of hotels (e.g., Cheng *et al.,* 2016) and sporting events (Kim, Byon, & Baek, 2020).

Finally, the findings of this study suggest that TCB positively influences tourists' willingness to sacrifice to visit a tourist destination. This finding implies that tourists' participation in the process of value co-creation of a tourist destination is important (Al Halbusi *et al*., 2020). In fact, the interaction of tourists with the destination and with other tourists is important to achieve a more positive attitude toward that destination (Groth, 2005). When tourists help other tourists, give feedback regarding the management of a destination, and recommend the destination to close friends (and even people they do not know), they develop a strong bond with the destination (Liu et al., 2020). This bond may make tourists willing to undergo monetary and emotional sacrifices, as well as sacrifices in their daily life and work, to visit that destination (Cronin *et al*., 2000). This extra-role behavior could lead to sacrifices in terms of time, effort, and psychological well-being (Bove *et al*., 2009). More specifically, tourists may be willing to reduce their monthly expenses, make greater efforts at work, and even make sacrifices in their usual lifestyle to save money for a trip to the destination. Furthermore, they may be willing to sacrifice relationships with people who are close to them and be away from the people and things they love. Most previous studies have examined the role of environmental commitment in willingness to sacrifice (Su *et al*., 2019). However, no study has examined the relationship between TCB and willingness to sacrifice. Thus, the current study presents a

different perspective within the tourism context in that it supports the assertions of Bove et al. (2009). When tourists behave beyond their role as visitors, they tend to be more willing to make a sacrifice in the same terms as those described by Beldona and Kher (2015), namely money, emotions, and effort.

5.1. Managerial implications

The results of this study have major managerial implications, primarily in relation to the efforts that tourism managers should make to strengthen the connection that tourists feel with the place they visit. Accordingly, it is crucial for tourist destination managers to ensure that tourists consider visiting a destination as an action that has positive value from both a monetary and non-monetary perspective. From a monetary point of view, attention should be paid to public services and attractions (e.g., museums, zoos, or parks). To achieve higher levels of tourists' perceived value, several strategies can be followed. For example, prices can be maintained within a reasonable range so that they are not perceived as too high or abusive. This strategy should also include basic services such as toilets and public transport. From a non-monetary point of view, managerial actions could focus on traffic, safety in the streets, and queues at the main attractions, among others (e.g., Sudigdo, Khalifa, & Abuelhassan, 2019). However, these actions alone are not enough. These actions must also be tangible and well communicated so that they become a source of perceived value for tourists (Zamani & Valmohammadi, 2014). For instance, Calza et al. (2020) suggested that an effective strategy to increase perceived value is to develop customization strategies using 4.0 technologies. For example, tourist destination managers can use augmented reality in attractions (e.g., museums) to enhance memories and emotions related to the places they visit as something pleasant, engaging, and memorable.

Furthermore, actions that help tourists identify with the tourist destination are important. Although this identification largely depends on tourists' lifestyle and self-concept (Japutra, 2020), it also depends on the differentiation of the tourist destination. This differentiation is provided by the destination's attractions and the behavior and attitudes of the inhabitants toward tourists. Here, tourist destination managers should focus their efforts on enhancing the image of the destination to make it clear and attractive to tourists. This image should be promoted in tourist attractions, as well as in the treatment of the inhabitants and those who work in service companies (e.g., hotels, restaurants, tourist information agencies, and taxis). Complementing this idea, previous research has

highlighted the importance of fulfilling tourists' autonomy, relatedness, and competence to increase destination identification (e.g., Japutra, 2020). Thus, DMOs should promote activities to increase tourist autonomy by, for example, increasing the personalization of their offerings. DMOs could also use technologies to promote closeness with others (e.g., Ahn & Back, 2019) by, for example, providing tourists with a digital storybook they could send to family and friends. Overall, the key is to create campaigns and training focused on educating the inhabitants and employees of tourism-related companies. In particular, these individuals should be trained to provide a service that offers high levels of quality, satisfaction, and memorable tourist experiences. These actions highlight the importance of tourism for the local economy.

It is also important for tourism managers at the destination to encourage tourists' participation in the process of co-creation. Given that this process should follow the principles of dialogue, access, and transparency (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004), tourists should be encouraged to participate in meetings where problems observed in the tourist destination can be defined and resolved. They should also jointly analyze new attractions that can offer a better experience to tourists. This analysis need not be performed while tourists are at the destination but can take place before or after their visit (Duerden, Ward, & Freeman, 2015). According to Prebense and Xie (2017), it is important for tourists to be involved both physically and mentally in this co-creation process so that they perceive greater value in their experience of interacting with the destination. To achieve this aim, managers at the destination should actively involve tourists and maintain their interest in improvements at the destination (Prebensen & Foss, 2011). For example, they could send regular newsletters, especially to tourists who have participated in the co-creation process.

In addition to the above, tourists should be motivated to give feedback through tourist information offices or similar. Along with this type of feedback, managers should make it easy for tourists to recommend the tourist destination by using their social networks, leaving comments, or encouraging other people to visit. The idea is to learn more about the experiences of travelers during their visits, focusing on both the quality of the services offered by public and private companies and the infrastructure, attractions, and perceived security of the destination. This joint effort can make the destination a better place to visit.

5.2.Limitations and future research lines

The limitations of this study offer possible opportunities for research in the future. First, although the sample size (n = 629) and response distribution were acceptable and greater than in previous studies (e.g., Liu *et al*., 2020; Tsaur *et al*., 2021), data were gathered from respondents in only one country (Chile). Therefore, the results of this study could be enhanced by applying this model to other tourist destinations. Additionally, it would be of interest to analyze the contextual factors of the destination (e.g., brand destinations or national vs. international destinations) that may influence the proposed model. Second, care must be taken when interpreting the results of this study. The study is based on cross-sectional survey data. Therefore, causality cannot be inferred. Longitudinal studies or experimental designs could be used to identify causal relationships between the factors discussed in this paper and TCB. Third, the study used self-reported measures, which may have led respondents to give exaggerated answers regarding their citizenship behavior (Kormos & Gifford, 2014). Self-reported measurement is common in behavioral research, and studies have shown that self-reported behavior is highly correlated with actual behavior (e.g., Kormos & Gifford, 2014). However, future studies should include more objective measures of tourist behaviors. Third, this paper presents a behavioral model of TCB. Although the proposed relationships between the antecedents and TCB and between TCB and willingness to sacrifice were found to be statistically significant, future models could strengthen this framework by including new variables (e.g., positive and negative emotions, destination attractiveness, and pro-environmental behaviors). Finally, although this study focused on tourists' psychological variables (e.g., TCB, perceived value, and destination identification), it would be of interest to understand the relationship of these variables with sociodemographic variables such as age, gender, and educational level. A deeper understanding of the profile of tourists with, for example, a low perceived value of a given destination (e.g., Ahn, 2020) could help DMOs design more effective, tailor-made marketing campaigns targeting such tourists. In addition, a segmentation analysis of tourists could also provide valuable insight. This analysis could follow the method described by Penagos-Londoño *et al.* (2021) and could be based on traditional sociodemographic factors, as well as the novel psychological variables included in this study.

References

Ahearne, M., Bhattacharya, C.B., & Gruen, T. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of customer-company identification: Expanding the role of relationship marketing. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 574-585.

Ahn, J. (2020). Effectiveness of demographic characteristics in understanding Malaysian customers' perceived value of the integrated resort sector. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 26*(2), 195-210.

Ahn, J., & Back, K. J. (2019). The role of autonomy, competence and relatedness: Applying self-determination theory to the integrated resort setting. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31*(1), 87–104.

Al Halbusi, H., Jimenez Estevez, P., Eleen, T., Ramayah, T., & Hossain Uzir, M.U. (2020). The roles of the physical environment, social servicescape, co-created value, and customer satisfaction in determining tourists' citizenship behavior: Malaysian cultural and creative industries. *Sustainability*, *12*(8), 3229.

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

Aro, K., Suomi, K., & Saraniemi, S. (2018). Antecedents and consequences of destination brand love. A case study from Finnish Lapland. *Tourism Management*, *67*, 71-81.

Bagozzi, R.P., & Dholakia, U.M. (2006). Antecedents and purchase consequences of customer participation in small group brand communities. *International Journal of research in Marketing, 23*(1), 45-61.

Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L.W. (1991). Assessing construct validity in organizational research. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(3),421-458.

Banerjee, J., Vasudevan, M., & Kiran, P. (2019). Investigating the antecedents of customer citizenship behaviour. *Adalya Journal, 8*(10), 178-184.

Bélanger, J.J., Caouette, J., Sharvit, K., & Dugas, M. (2014). The psychology of martyrdom: Making the ultimate sacrifice in the name of a cause. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*(3), 494.

Beldona, S., & Kher, H.V. (2015). The impact of customer sacrifice and attachment styles on perceived hospitality. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 56*(4), 355-368.

Bhattacharya, C.B., & Sen, S. (2003). Consumer-company identification: A framework for understanding consumers' relationships with companies. *Journal of Marketing, 67*(2), 76-88.

Bolton, R.N., & Lemon, K.N. (1999). A dynamic model of customers' usage of services: Usage as an antecedent and consequence of satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research, 36*(2), 171-186.

Bove, L.L., Pervan, S.J., Beatty, S.E., & Shiu, E. (2009). Service worker role in encouraging customer organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Research*, *62*(7), 698-705.

Calza, F., Pagliuca, M., Risitano, M., & Sorrentino, A. (2020). Testing moderating effects on the relationships among on-board cruise environment, satisfaction, perceived value and behavioral intentions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 32*(2), 934-952

Cheng, J.C., Wu, C.S., Yen, C.H., & Chen, C.Y. (2016). Tour leader attachment and customer citizenship behaviors in group package tour: The role of customer commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *21*(6), 642-657.

Chi, X., & Han, H. (2020). Exploring slow city attributes in Mainland China: tourist perceptions and behavioral intentions toward Chinese Cittaslow. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *37*(3), 361-379.

Cronin Jr, J. J., Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing, 76*(2), 193-218.

Duerden, M.D., Ward, P.J., & Freeman, P.A. (2015). Conceptualizing structured experiences: Seeking interdisciplinary integration. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *47*(5), 601-620.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*(2), 239-263.

Etcheverry, P. E., & Le, B. (2005). Thinking about commitment: Accessibility of commitment and prediction of relationship persistence, accommodation, and willingness to sacrifice. *Personal Relationships*, *12*(1), 103-123.

Geyskens, I., Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Kumar, N. (1999). A meta-analysis of satisfaction in marketing channel relationships. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *36*(2), 223-238.

Groth, M. (2005). Customers as good soldiers: Examining citizenship behaviors in internet service deliveries. *Journal of Management*, *31*(1), 7-27.

Hair Jr., J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2009). Multivariate Data Analysis. 7th Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, 761.

Homans, G.C. (1958) Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology 63*(6), 597–606.

Hultman, M., Skarmeas, D., Oghazi, P., & Beheshti, H. M. (2015). Achieving tourist loyalty through destination personality, satisfaction, and identification. *Journal of Business Research*, *68*(11), 2227-2231.

Hwang, J., & Lyu, S. O. (2020). Relationships among green image, consumer attitudes, desire, and customer citizenship behavior in the airline industry. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, *14*(6), 437-447.

Iniesta-Bonillo, M. A., Sánchez-Fernández, R., & Jiménez-Castillo, D. (2016). Sustainability, value, and satisfaction: Model testing and cross-validation in tourist destinations. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(11), 5002-5007.

Japutra, A. (2020). Building enduring culture involvement, destination identification and destination loyalty through need fulfilment. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 1-15.

Joireman, J., Kamdar, D., Daniels, D., & Duell, B. (2006). Good citizens to the end? It depends: Empathy and concern with future consequences moderate the impact of a shortterm time horizon on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1307–1320.

Junaid, M., Hussain, K., Asghar, M. M., Javed, M., & Hou, F. (2020). An investigation of the diners' brand love in the value co-creation process. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 45*, 172–181.

Kantenbacher, J., Hanna, P., Miller, G., Scarles, C., & Yang, J. (2019). Consumer priorities: what would people sacrifice in order to fly on holidays?. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, *27*(2), 207-222.

Kim, K., Byon, K. K., & Baek, W. (2020). Customer-to-customer value co-creation and co-destruction in sporting events. *The Service Industries Journal, 40*(9-10), 633-655.

Kim, W., & Han, H. (2008). Determinants of restaurant customers' loyalty intentions: a mediating effect of relationship quality. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, *9*(3), 219-239.

Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*: 656-669.

Kormos, C., & Gifford, R. (2014). The validity of self-report measures of proenvironmental behavior: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 40*, 359–371

Kumar, J., & Nayak, J. K. (2019). Exploring destination psychological ownership among tourists: Antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, *39*, 30-39.

Kumar, V., & Kaushik, A. K. (2017). Achieving destination advocacy and destination loyalty through destination brand identification. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *34*(9), 1247-1260.

Li, J. (2021). Impact of tourists' perceived value on brand loyalty: a case study of Xixi National Wetland Park. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *26*(3), 262-276.

Liu, J.S., & Tsaur, S.H. (2014). We are in the same boat: Tourist citizenship behaviors. *Tourism Management*, *42*, 88-100.

Liu, L., Cui, T., Wu, J., Cao, R., & Ye, Y. (2020). Encouraging tourist citizenship behavior through resource uniqueness and service quality: The mediating role of emotions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *27*(1), 45-60.

Nysveen, H., Pedersen, P. E., & Skard, S. (2013). Brand experiences in service organizations: Exploring the individual effects of brand experience dimensions. *Journal of Brand Management, 20*(5), 404-423.

Norton, M. I., Mochon, D., & Ariely, D. (2012). The IKEA effect: When labor leads to love. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22*(3), 453-460.

Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.

Papista, E., & Krystallis, A. (2013). Investigating the types of value and cost of green brands: Proposition of a conceptual framework. *Journal of Business Ethics, 115*(1), 75-92.

Penagos-Londoño, G. I., Rodriguez–Sanchez, C., Ruiz-Moreno, F., & Torres, E. (2021). A machine learning approach to segmentation of tourists based on perceived destination sustainability and trustworthiness. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management, 19*, 100532.

Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 18*(3), 5–14.

Prebensen, N. K., & Foss, L. (2011). Coping & cocreating in tourist experiences. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 13*, 54-67.

Prebensen, N. K., Woo, E., Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M. (2013). Motivation and involvement as antecedents of the perceived value of the destination experience. *Journal of Travel Research, 52*(2), 253-264.

Prebensen, N. K., & Xie, J. (2017). Efficacy of co-creation and mastering on perceived value and satisfaction in tourists' consumption. *Tourism Management, 60,* 166-176.

Rather, R. A., Najar, A. H., & Jaziri, D. (2020). Destination branding in tourism: insights from social identification, attachment and experience theories. *Anatolia*, *31*(2), 229-243.

Revilla-Camacho, M. Á., Vega-Vázquez, M., & Cossío-Silva, F. J. (2015). Customer participation and citizenship behavior effects on turnover intention. *Journal of Business Research, 68* (7), 1607-1611.

Sarioglu, C. I. (2020). Customer citizenship behavior: scale development and validation. *Management & Marketing Journal*, *18*(1). 57-72.

Shafiee, M. M., Tabaeeian, R. A., & Khoshfetrat, A. (2020). Tourist engagement and citizenship behavior: The mediating role of relationship quality in the hotel industry. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *20*(4), 481-492.

Sharma, V. M., & Klein, A. (2020). Consumer perceived value, involvement, trust, susceptibility to interpersonal influence, and intention to participate in online group buying. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *52*, 101946.

Steenkamp, J. B. E., & Van Trijp, H. C. (1991). The use of LISREL in validating marketing constructs. *International Journal of Research in marketing, 8*(4), 283-299.

Su, L., Cheng, J., & Huang, Y. (2020). How do group size and group familiarity influence tourist satisfaction? The mediating Role of perceived value. *Journal of Travel Research*. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287520966384.

Su, L., & Swanson, S. R. (2017). The effect of destination social responsibility on tourist environmentally responsible behavior: Compared analysis of first-time and repeat tourists. *Tourism Management, 60*, 308-321.

Su, L., Huang, S., & Pearce, J. (2019). Toward a model of destination resident–environment relationship: the case of Gulangyu, China. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, *36*(4), 469-483.

Sudigdo, A., Khalifa, G. S., & Abuelhassan, A. E. (2019). Driving Islamic attributes, destination security guarantee & destination image to predict tourists' decision to visit Jakarta. *International Journal on Recent Trends in Business and Tourism, 3*(1), 59-65.

Suhartanto, D., Brien, A., Primiana, I., Wibisono, N., & Triyuni, N. N. (2019). Tourist loyalty in creative tourism: The role of experience quality, value, satisfaction, and motivation. *Current Issues in Tourism, 23*(7), 867–879.

Troye, S. V., & Supphellen, M. (2012). Consumer participation in coproduction: "I made it myself" effects on consumers' sensory perceptions and evaluations of outcome and input product. *Journal of Marketing, 76*(2), 33-46.

Tsaur, S. H., Yang, T. L., & Tsai, C. H. (2021). Tour leader likeability and tourist citizenship behaviours: mediating effect of perceived value. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-15.

Van Tonder, E., Saunders, S. G., Lisita, I. T., & de Beer, L. T. (2018). The importance of customer citizenship behaviour in the modern retail environment: Introducing and testing a social exchange model. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *45*, 92-102.

Voss, K. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Grohmann, B. (2003). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of consumer attitude. *Journal of Marketing Research, 40*(3), 310–320.

Yi, Y., & Gong, T. (2013). Customer value co-creation behavior: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(9), 1279–1284.

Yi, Y., Gong, T., & Lee, H. (2013). The impact of other customers on customer citizenship behavior. *Psychology & Marketing*, *30*(4), 341-356.

Zamani, M., & Valmohammadi, C. (2014). The role of mass communication methods in the development of tourism industry in Iran. *Industrial and Commercial Training.* 46(6), 315-320.

Version in Spanish (Original language):

Muchas gracias por concedernos su tiempo para esta encuesta. Su participación es muy importante para el éxito de este proyecto. Su información individual está protegida por el secreto estadístico y será tratada en forma estrictamente confidencial y anónima.

P1. ¿Ha viajado por CHILE en los últimos 2 años?   Si/No

P2. ¿Podría indicar el nombre del destino turístico en CHILE que más ha visitado estos 2 últimos años?
P2a. Nombre: _____   P2b. número de visitas: _____

P3. PENSANDO EN EL DESTINO TURÍSTICO MÁS VISITADO EN SU PAÍS (CHILE), por favor, marque con una (X) el número de la siguiente escala (de 1 a 7) que mejor refleje su opinión acerca de cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones que le presentamos a continuación. Utilice la siguiente escala como guía para dar su respuesta.

Total desacuerdo	Desacuerdo	Algo en desacuerdo	Neutral	Algo de acuerdo	De acuerdo	Total acuerdo
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

P4. COMPORTAMIENTO CIUDADANO DEL TURISTA (TCB)							
P4a. TCB RECOMENDACIÓN							
Recomiendo este destino turístico a mis familiares.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recomiendo este destino turístico a mis pares.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Recomiendo este destino turístico a las personas interesadas en los atractivos y servicios que hay en este lugar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Doy referencias sobre este destino turístico a mis compañeros de trabajo y a otras personas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P4b. TCB AYUDA							
Ayudo a otros a comprar un viaje a este lugar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Enseño a alguien a cómo usar los servicios de este lugar turístico correctamente.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Explico a otros turistas a cómo usar los servicios de este lugar turístico correctamente.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P4c. TCB FEEDBACK							
Contesto una encuesta de satisfacción al turista respecto a este lugar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Proporciono comentarios útiles a la oficina de servicio al turista de este lugar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Informo a este lugar sobre el excelente servicio recibido por un empleado.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

P5. IDENTIFICACIÓN CON EL DESTINO (DI)							
Los éxitos de este destino turístico son mis éxitos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuando alguien elogia este lugar, lo siento como un cumplido personal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cuando alguien critica este lugar, me incomoda.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

P6. VALOR PERCIBIDO DEL DESTINO (PV)							
Considerando el dinero que gasté, vale la pena visitar este destino turístico	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Considerando el tiempo que pasé, vale la pena visitar este destino turístico.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Considerando el esfuerzo que hice, vale la pena visitar este destino turístico.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

P7. DISPOSICIÓN A SACRIFICAR (WTS)							
P7a. WTS SACRIFICIOS MONETARIOS INDIRECTOS							
El dinero ganado con esfuerzo lo destiné a hacer realidad este viaje.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tuve que reducir la cantidad de dinero que normalmente gasto en otras cosas, debido al dinero que gasté en este viaje.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Tuve que hacer esfuerzos para juntar el dinero para viajar a este lugar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P7b. WTS SACRIFICIOS EMOCIONALES							
Fue difícil estar lejos de las personas que amo en casa durante la duración de este viaje.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fue difícil estar lejos de mis cosas favoritas en casa durante la duración de este viaje.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fui de viaje a este lugar, incluso si mis seres queridos me rechazaban.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fui de viaje a este lugar, incluso sacrificando mi relación con mis seres queridos.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
P7c. WTS SACRIFICIOS DE ESFUERZO							
Me preparé mucho para que este viaje fuera lo más fácil posible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Reorganicé varias tareas en mi vida cotidiana para lograr que este viaje se haga.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Para que este viaje suceda, tuve que hacer arreglos importantes en mi casa y el trabajo para compensar mi ausencia durante el viaje.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

VARIABLES SOCIODEMOGRÁFICAS

Por favor, rellene la siguiente información personal. Recuerde que el tratamiento de la información será confidencial.

P8. Género: Femenino/Masculino
P9. Edad:
P10. Nivel Educacional máximo alcanzado: Secundaria/Nivel técnico/Universitario (grado)/Magíster/Doctorado
P11. Ocupación: Desempleado/estudiante/ Trabajo independiente (autónomo)/Técnico/Administrativo/Mando medio/Dirección
P12. Nacionalidad: _____
P13. Lugar de Residencia (Área geográfica de origen del turista):
Área metropolitana de Santiago, Biobío, Valparaíso, Maule, Los Lagos, Libertador B. O'Higgins, La Araucanía, etc.

Version in English (Translation):

Thank you very much for taking your time for this survey. Your participation is very important to the success of this project. Your individual information is protected by statistical secrecy and will be treated strictly confidentially and anonymously.

Q1. Have you traveled in CHILE in the last 2 years? Yes/no

Q2.- Could you indicate the name of the tourist destination in CHILE that you have visited the most in the last 2 years?
P2a. Name: _____ P2b. number of visits: _____

Q3.- THINK ABOUT THE MOST VISITED TOURIST DESTINATION IN YOUR COUNTRY (CHILE), please indicate with an (X) which number on the following scale (from 1 to 7) best reflects your opinion about each of the following statements. Use the scale below as a guide to give your answer.

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q4. TOURIST CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (TCB)							
Q4a. TCB RECOMMENDATION	q						
I recommend this tourist destination to my relatives.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I recommend this tourist destination to my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I recommend this tourist destination to people interested in the attractions and services that are in this place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I give references about this tourist destination to my co-workers and other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q4b. TCB HELPING							
I help others buy trips to this place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I teach people how to use the services of this tourist place correctly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I explain to other tourists how to use the services of this tourist place correctly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q4c. TCB FEEDBACK							
I answer tourist satisfaction surveys regarding this place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I provide helpful comments to the tourist service office at this location.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I inform this place about the excellent service received by employees.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q5. DESTINATION IDENTIFICATION (DI)							
The success of this tourist destination is my success.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When someone praises this place, I take it as a personal compliment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
When someone criticizes this place, it makes me uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q6. PERCEIVED VALUE (PV)							
Considering the money I spent, this tourist destination is worth a visit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Considering the time I spent, this tourist destination is worth visiting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Considering the effort I made, this tourist destination is worth visiting.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q7. WILLINGNESS TO SACRIFICE (WTS)							
Q7a. WTS INDIRECT MONETARY EFFORTS							
I put my hard-earned money into making this trip a reality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I had to reduce the amount of money that I normally spend on other things, due to the money I spent on this trip.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I had to make efforts to raise the money to travel to this place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q7b. WTS EMOTIONAL EFFORTS							
It was difficult being away from the people I love at home for the duration of this trip.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It was difficult being away from my favorite things at home for the duration of this trip.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I went on a trip to this place, even if my loved ones rejected me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I went on a trip to this place, even sacrificing my relationship with my loved ones.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Q7c. WTS EFFORT SACRIFICES							
I prepared a lot to make this trip as easy as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I rearranged various tasks in my daily life to get this journey done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
For this trip to happen, I had to make major arrangements at home and work to make up for my absence during the trip.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Q8. Gender: Female / Male

Q9. Age:

Q10. Maximum educational level achieved: Secondary/Technical / University (degree) / Master's / Doctorate

Q11. Occupation: Unemployed/student/ Self-employed/Technical/operations/Administrative/Mid-management/Top-Management

Q12. Nationality: _____

Q13. Place of residence (tourists' home region):

Santiago Metropolitan, Biobío, Valparaiso, Maule, Los Lagos, O'Higgins, La Araucanía, etc.

Appendix 2

Table A2.1
Mean. standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis, and Pearson's correlation of the variables used in the study

Item	Range	Mean	Std. Dev.	Skewness (S)	Kurtosis (K)
Destination Identification (DI)					
DI1	1-7	4.96	1.577	-0.752	-0.044
DI2	1-7	5	1.557	-0.826	0.165
DI3	1-7	4.83	1.555	-0.699	-0.043
Perceived value (PV)					
PV1	1-7	5.46	1.424	-1.22	1.363
PV2	1-7	5.64	1.409	-1.27	1.379
PV3	1-7	5.63	1.383	-1.265	1.548
TOURIST CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR (TCB)					
TCB recommendation					
TCBR1	1-7	5.77	1.385	-1.501	2.348
TCBR2	1-7	5.76	1.43	-1.446	1.853
TCBR3	1-7	5.43	1.442	-0.987	0.707
TCBR4	1-7	5.61	1.445	-1.335	1.61
TCB helping					
TCBH1	1-7	5.46	1.385	-1.124	1.148
TCBH2	1-7	5.32	1.402	-0.921	0.553
TCBH3	1-7	5.48	1.444	-1.151	1.142
TCB feedback					
TCBF1	1-7	5.31	1.425	-1	0.786
TCBF2	1-7	5.29	1.44	-0.935	0.604
TCBF3	1-7	5.51	1.343	-1.18	1.38
WILLINGNESS TO SACRIFICE (WTS)					
WTS indirect monetary					
IMS1	1-7	5.23	1.554	-0.917	0.351
IMS2	1-7	5.15	1.545	-0.846	0.232
IMS3	1-7	5.27	1.517	-1	0.594
WTS emotional					
EMOS1	1-7	4.26	1.932	-0.286	-1.098
EMOS2	1-7	4.71	1.794	-0.617	-0.627
EMOS3	1-7	4.57	1.81	-0.516	-0.785
EMOS4	1-7	4.08	1.898	-0.192	-1.133
WTS effort					
EFFS1	1-7	4.63	1.694	-0.571	-0.537
EFFS2	1-7	4.59	1.693	-0.513	-0.582
EFFS3	1-7	4.67	1.68	-0.636	-0.412

Note: n = 629 individuals.

Table A2.2
Pearson's correlation of the averaged variables used in the study

	DI	PV	TCB rec	TCB help	TCB feed	WTS imon	WTS emo	WTS effo
Destination identification (DI)	-	.573**	.527**	.598**	.656**	.685**	.427**	.449**
Perceived value (PV)		-	.843**	.791**	.786**	.734**	.309**	.362**
TCB recommendation (TCB rec)			-	.831**	.774**	.668**	.300**	.356**
TCB helping (TCB help)				-	.818**	.679**	.300**	.338**
TCB feedback (TCB feed)					-	.685**	.388**	.385**
WTS indirect monetary (WTS imon)						-	.468**	.521**
WTS emotional (WTS emo)							-	.810**
WTS effort (WTS effo)								-

Note: n = 629 individuals. Aggregated variables are the arithmetic mean of the items of each factor.

** $p < 0.01$; * $p < 0.05$

Appendix 3
Sample size adequacy

To test the adequacy of the sample size, we estimated the minimum sample size needed for structural equation modeling (SEM), given the complexity of the model and other features of the estimation. We used the sample size calculator proposed by Soper (2021).

The anticipated effect size was medium (0.30), the desired statistical power was 0.80, the number of latent variables in the model was 10, the number observed variables was 26, and the probability level was 0.05.

Based on the above details, the optimal sample size is at least 268 individuals. The sample in our study consisted of 629 individuals. Therefore, the size of the sample in this study was adequate.

Reference:

Soper, D.S. (2021). A-priori Sample Size Calculator for Structural Equation Models [Software]. Available from https://www.danielsoper.com/statcalc