Exploring Patterns of Satisfaction and Shopping Motivation in a Tourist Shopping Village

Gianna Moscardo
School of Business, James Cook University

Pierre Benckendorff
School of Tourism, The University of Queensland

Laurie Murphy
School of Business, James Cook University

Exploring Patterns of Satisfaction and Shopping Motivation in a Tourist Shopping Village

Gianna Moscardo
School of Business
James Cook University
Townsville, Queensland 4811
Australia
Phone: + 61 7 4781 4254
Email: gianna.moscardo@jcu.edu.au

Pierre Benckendorff
School of Tourism
The University of Queensland
Queensland 4072
Australia
Phone: + 61 7 3346 6241
Email: p.benckendorff@uq.edu.au

Laurie Murphy
School of Business
James Cook University
Townsville, Queensland 4811
Australia
Phone: + 61 7 4781 4347
Email: laurie.murphy@jcu.edu au

Exploring Patterns of Satisfaction and Shopping Motivation in a Tourist Shopping Village

Abstract

Although satisfaction is a core concept in understanding visitor behaviour and shopping is a core activity for many visitors, visitor satisfaction with shopping activities has been given only limited research attention. This paper seeks to address this by examining the relationships between shopping motivation and visitor satisfaction in Hahndorf, an historic German-themed village in Australia. The study surveyed 506 visitors to this tourist shopping village (TSV) using multiple measures of satisfaction. Four shopping motivation groups were identified and profiled and a series of importance-performance analyses revealed distinctive patterns of satisfaction for each group. These results have implications both for the planning of TSVs and the way we examine visitor satisfaction.

Key words: shopping villages, IPA, satisfaction

Introduction and Literature Review

Tourist shopping villages (TSVs) have been described as "small towns or villages that base their tourist appeal on retailing, often in a pleasant setting marked by historical or natural amenities" (Getz, 2000, p. 211). Like other aspects of tourist shopping these tourist settings have been given little attention by academics despite being popular elements of many destination regions (Murphy, Pearce, Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2008). Much of the existing academic attention has been about the development pathways of TSVs, the conflicts associated with these and the consequences for TSV residents and businesses (Getz, 2000; Mitchell and de Waal, 2009). These discussions typically make a number of assumptions about what visitors are seeking from, and what they enjoy about, TSV experiences, but little empirical evidence is available on tourist perspectives (Murphy, Benckendorff, Moscardo & Pearce, 2011). This paper seeks to address this gap by exploring visitor satisfaction with their experiences of Hahndorf, a TSV in South Australia.

Pearce (2005) defines satisfaction as a post experience attitude. There is considerable consensus in social psychology that attitudes are cognitive constructs composed of three core elements – beliefs and knowledge about an object, evaluations of, and affective or emotional responses to, that object and behavioural directions associated with the object (Martin, Carlson & Buskist, 2007). While most definitions of visitor satisfaction concentrate on one or both of the latter elements – the evaluative (Meng, Tepanon & Uysal, 2006) and behavioural (Neal & Gursoy, 2008) dimensions, few tourism researchers have drawn upon attitude theories in detail in their research relying more on derivations from the consumer behaviour field (Ryan, 1995; Bowen & Clarke, 2002). As a consequence the concept most commonly used to investigate visitor satisfaction is the expectation confirmation/disconfirmation process (EDP) (Pearce, 2005; del Bosque & San Martin, 2008). This concept, most clearly described in the SERVQUAL model, argues that satisfaction is determined by the degree to which actual performance meets or exceeds expectations for performance across a range of attributes (Pearce, 2005). This approach has been heavily criticised (see Pearce, 2005, Ryan, 1995; Bowen & Clarke, 2002 for detailed critiques) with a number of problems of identified.

The first problem lies with the expectations themselves. Both Bowen and Clarke(2002) and Foster (2009) note that the consumption of tourist experiences differs in many ways from the consumption of other products and services. The novelty, complexity, and uniqueness of tourist experiences means that visitors do not always have clear expectations of all the attributes associated with their travel (Pearce, 2005). In particular it is argued that visitor experiences are made up of both expressive and instrumental attributes (Noe, 1999). Expressive attributes are those less tangible things related to the social, emotional and motivational aspects of the experience, while instrumental attributes are the tangible features that support the experience (Noe, 1999). This is similar to the distinction made between basic, performance and excitement/delight factors in consumer behaviour (Matzler, Bailom, Hinterhuber, Renzl & Pichler, 2004). This distinction builds on the work of Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959) who first identified the notion of three independent factors that influence satisfaction in different ways.

A second problem lies in the assumption inherent in EDP that all attributes are of equal importance to all visitors (Pearce, 2005; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2002). If visitors differ in their motivations or what they seek from a travel experience then logically they will differ in the importance they ascribe to different features of that experience (Ryan, 1995; Meng et al., 2006). Thus we would expect, and this has been supported by empirical evidence, that different market segments, especially those based on motivations, will derive their satisfaction from different experience attributes (Devesa, Laguna & Palacios, 2010; Meng et al, 2006; Yuksel & Yuksel, 2002). This is the core argument of Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) which is an alternative approach to understanding visitor satisfaction (Martilla & James, 1977). The technique involves measuring the gaps between importance and performance for each attribute and identifying areas for management attention that are important for consumers. It is this focus on specific gaps that makes IPA a popular choice for practitioners seeking to improve the management of a tourist experience setting.

This latter point addresses a third key problem with EDP approaches as well as other simple summary measures of overall satisfaction which do not provide clear direction for change or improvement (Pearce, 2005). A focus on overall satisfaction measures combined with an assumption of homogeneity in visitors limits both the practical value of satisfaction research and may misdirect theoretical development. Finally there have been numerous issues raised with the methodologies used to measure expectations, performance and satisfaction (Foster, 2009; Ryan, 1995; Pearce, 2005; Bowen & Clarke, 2002).

In summary it is clear that in order to better understand visitor satisfaction, either at a conceptual or practical level, it is important to use and analyse multiple measures which:
1. cover a range of dimensions of the experience,
2. include visitor generated as well as researcher generated options,
3. distinguish between expressive and instrumental attributes, and
4. recognise that different visitor motivations and levels of experience will be related to different patterns of satisfaction.

As noted earlier there has been almost no published research into visitor perspectives on TSV experiences (Murphy et al., 2008) and research into the impacts of TSV development both highlights a number of negative impacts for TSV residents and businesses and indicates that often development pathways are based on untested assumptions about what contributes to visitor satisfaction in these areas. These assumptions often underpin debates about theming, heritage preservation and the types of shops and products encouraged. Thus understanding patterns of visitor satisfaction is particularly important for TSVs planners and managers seeking to maximise

the positive benefits of tourism and avoid or limit the negative consequences. An examination of the tourist shopping literature suggests that while there are clear links to, and similarities with, leisure shopping there are additional factors that make tourist shopping unique. Firstly there are additional motives that appear to be specific to tourist shopping such as the cultural and social obligations tied to souvenir and gift purchasing (Hu & Yu, 2007) and the use of shopping as a way to experience local places and cultures (Kim & Littrell, 2001; Moscardo, 2004). Secondly much tourist shopping takes place in settings that offer a range of activities beyond shopping and thus shopping may only be one, albeit important, part of the picture for the visitors (Hu & Yu, 2007; Moscardo, 2004). Both of these issues are especially applicable to TSVs. Therefore this paper has two key aims:

1. To explore patterns of visitor satisfaction with the experience offered in a TSV in Australia, and
2. To use this case study to demonstrate the value of taking a more multi-faceted approach to visitor satisfaction measurement as suggested by the literature.

The first aim seeks to contribute to improving our understanding of visitor perspectives on TSV experiences and thus inform debates about development directions and options, while the second aim is broader in its scope and seeks to highlight the value of a more detailed examination of visitor satisfaction. In both cases the goals of the paper are applied rather than theoretical.

Methodology

This paper is based on a survey of 506 visitors (response rate of 42 per cent) conducted in the TSV of Hahndorf. Hahndorf is the main attraction in the Adelaide Hills Tourism region, a short drive from the city of Adelaide in South Australia. With a population of approximately 1,800 people, Hahndorf is well known for its locally produced fresh food and produce, its German heritage and ethnicity and the artwork of the German-Australian landscape artist, Hans Heysen. Like many TSVs, Hahndorf is located within a scenic rural area, contains a significant number of well-preserved heritage buildings and offers a variety of specific events throughout the year. This particular village possesses the characteristics of a typical TSV as described by Getz (2000) and so results from this study have potential applications to other TSVs. Tourism Research Australia (2008) reports that the most common features sought in Hahndorf by visitors were opportunities for exploration, time with friends and family, food and wine and German heritage. Shopping was also a critical element of the Hahndorf experience with 78 per cent of visitors reporting that they spent time browsing the shops and 59 per cent reported actual shopping, making up two of the four most common activities along with walking the main street (92 per cent) and dining (63 per cent).

The data reported in the present study were collected using a self-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire included the following components and approaches suggested in the reviews of visitor satisfaction:

- Tourist shopping motivation, which was measured by rating the importance of seven different types of shopping and the overall place of shopping in travel decisions;
- Expressive experience attributes including a set of 15 statements describing motives for visiting the TSV rated for both importance and performance with five point scales and a list of eight possible TSV themes rated for appeal on a seven point scale (derived from Moscardo, 2004 and Murphy et al., 2008);
- Instrumental experience attributes which were examined using two sets of questions, a set of statements focussed on aspects of shops rated for both performance and importance and a list

of 18 TSV features from which the respondents were asked to select the five most essential for a good experience (derived from Heung and Cheng, 2000 and Murphy et al., 2008);
- Socio-demographic and trip behaviour variables including age, gender, travel party, previous visits and length of stay; and
- Outcomes including an index of overall satisfaction and multiple measures of expenditure.

Research assistants positioned at various locations along the main street approached all people passing them during the survey time period and after screening out local residents, visitors who agreed to participate were given the questionnaire to complete. Surveying was conducted over a two week period in a high visitation season including weekdays, weekends and school holidays.

The majority of respondents were female (65.4 per cent), with an average age of 45 (see Table 1). The majority of respondents were also domestic visitors (84. 3 per cent), almost one-half of which were from the metropolitan Adelaide area (46.3 per cent). The local nature of the market is reflected in the fact that 62. 9 per cent of respondents had previously visited Hahndorf, 42.6 per cent were on a day trip to the village, and 44. 8 per cent were planning to visit again within the next 12 months. With respect to this visit, most respondents were travelling with their spouse or partner (39.4 per cent) or with family members, including children (25.3 per cent). This profile is consistent with that reported by Tourism Research Australia (2008).

Table 1. Profile of Respondents

Gender			
Male	34.6%	**% repeat visitors**	62.9%
Female	65.4%		
		% planning to visit again	
Age		Yes, within 12 months	44.8%
Mean	44.6	Yes, within 5 years	21.1%
		Yes but not sure when	22.4%
Origin		Not sure	9.0%
Australian	84.3%	No	2.8%
International	15.7%		
		Travel Party	
Length of trip		Alone	3.8%
Day trip	42.6%	With spouse or partner	39.7%
2-3 days	14.7%	With family members	25.3%
4-7 days	17.9%	With a group of friends	16.4%
More than 7 days	32.1%	In another type of group	4.1%

Results & Discussion

The analysis was conducted in three main steps similar to procedures described by Yuksel and Yuksel (2003) and Devesa, Laguna and Palacios (2010). The first step used a factor cluster analytic technique to identify different groups based on the shopping motivation items. In the second step these shopping motivation groups were then profiled on the other variables and finally importance performance analyses were conducted for each motivation segment for both expressive and instrumental attributes. In the first step a principal components factor analysis with a Varimax rotation was conducted on the eight shopping motivation items. This factor analysis reported in Table 2 identified two clear factors – one that included shopping at markets in small towns and villages, which can be seen as a kind of specialist local shopping, and the other which combined all other leisure shopping items. The factor scores resulting from this factor analysis were then used as the data for a K-means cluster analysis. A number of cluster solutions were examined and a four cluster solution provided the clearest differentiation between

groups. The mean scores of the four clusters on the two shopping motivation factors are also provided in Table 2. One-way analyses of variance indicated that the four clusters differed significantly on both factors. Cluster 1 was labelled Non-shoppers as they had the lowest scores on both shopping factors, while Cluster 2 was labelled Serious Shoppers as they had the highest scores on both shopping factors. Cluster 3, which was the largest group, had a high score on specialist local shopping and a low score for leisure shopping in general and so were labelled Specialist Shoppers. Finally Cluster 4 had a moderate score on leisure shopping but a low score on specialist local shopping and so was labelled Urban Leisure Shoppers.

Table 2. Results of the Factor Cluster Analysis of Tourist Shopping Motivation

Factor Analysis: Shopping Motives	Factor 1 Leisure Shopping	Factor 2 Specialist Local Shopping
Duty free shops	.66	
Shops around attractions	.60	
Urban shopping precincts	.84	
Direct outlet shopping	.72	
Shopping malls/centres	.85	
Importance of shopping in travel decisions	-.54	
Markets		.87
Shopping in small towns/villages		.90
(variance explained)	38%	23%

Cluster Analysis: Motive Factor	Cluster 1 Non-Shoppers (n=49)	Cluster 2 Serious Shoppers (n=72)	Cluster 3 Specialist Shoppers (n=171)	Cluster 4 Urban Leisure Shoppers (n=87)
Leisure Shopping	-0.73	1.28	-0. 64	0. 62
Specialist Local Shopping	-1.67	0.61	0. 60	-0. 73

The second step in the analysis involved profiling these four shopping clusters or segments on the other variables of interest. For all but the open-ended questions on best elements and suggested improvements, a series of one-way ANOVAs for interval data and chi-square analyses for ordinal and nominal data were conducted to identify significant differences between the four segments with a $p<0. 05$ level set for all tests. Significant differences were reported for most of the variables examined and Table 3 provides a summary of a selection of the key significant findings. In summary Non-shoppers were the oldest group, the most likely to be male, the least likely to be Australian residents and the least likely to have visited the TSV previously. They were particularly interested in ethnicity and heritage themes and they emphasised ease of getting around and heritage in desirable TSV attributes. Serious Shoppers were the youngest group and the most likely to be female. This group was also the most interested in the food and wine and arts and craft themes. They also gave the highest ratings for antiques as a theme. As might be expected this group were the most likely to buy Hahndorf products in stores at home and recommend these products to others. This group emphasised markets as an essential TSV attribute. Specialist Shoppers was the largest group, the group most likely to be staying in Hahndorf overnight, to have been to Hahndorf before, and to be Australian residents. They were interested in a range of themes including heritage, ethnicity, local scenery, food and wine and arts and crafts. Their three most essential TSV attributes were heritage, architecture and markets. They were the second most likely to buy Hahndorf products when they return home and to recommend local products to others. Finally the Urban Leisure Shoppers had a similar profile to the Non-Shoppers. These findings are broadly consistent with other tourist shopping segmentation studies (Hu & Yu, 2007; Josiam, Kinley & Kim, 2005; Moscardo, 2004; Geuens,

Vantomme & Brengman, 2004) suggesting that there may be a common underlying structure to the tourist populations to these settings.

Table 3. Profiles of the Tourist Shopping Segments

Profile Variable	Non-Shoppers	Serious Shoppers	Specialist Shoppers	Urban Leisure Shoppers
Age (mean years)	48.4	38.3	44.6	40.8
Male	62%	145	33%	44%
Female	38%	86%	67%	56%
Australian resident	78%	81%	87%	82%
International resident	22%	19%	13%	18%
Been to Hahndorf before	55%	58%	67%	59%
Staying overnight in Hahndorf	15%	16%	26%	13%
Essential TSV features				
• Easy to find your way around	49%	28%	24%	35%
• Pedestrian friendly	43%	22%	39%	44%
• Visually appealing architecture	41%	35%	50%	32%
• Not too crowded	43%	19%	27%	31%
• Well preserved heritage buildings	45%	47%	66%	57%
• Markets	18%	49%	40%	28%
Interest in TSV Themes (mean score)				
• Local history & heritage buildings	4.3	4.2	4.6	3.9
• Ethnic history and heritage	4.2	4.2	4.5	3.9
• Special scenery	4.2	4.2	4.4	3.9
• Music, theatre & performance	2.9	3.8	3.6	3.4
• Local food & wine	4.1	4.5	4.5	4.1
• Local arts & crafts	3.7	4.5	4.5	4.1
• Antiques	2.8	3.6	3.5	3.5
Likelihood that they would (mean score, 1 not at all, 5 very likely)				
• Buy regional products in store at home	2.2	3.6	3.6	3.0
• Recommend products from region	3.5	4.5	4.3	3.8
Mean expenditure in Hahndorf shops (AUD)	$25.4	$35.1	$37.2	$19.5
Mean overall satisfaction (1 very satisfied to 7 very dissatisfied)	4.2	3.3	3.2	4.1

In terms of overall satisfaction and shopping expenditure the four shopping segments differed significantly with Serious Shoppers and Specialist Shoppers the most satisfied and highest spenders and the Non-Shoppers and Urban Leisure Shoppers least satisfied and lowest spenders. While these results confirm the importance of recognising heterogeneity in tourist populations, it offers little in the way of either practical implications or conceptual directions. It tells us what but not why with regard to satisfaction. In order to understand the why the third step in the analysis involved more detailed examination of patterns of satisfaction using importance-performance analyses (IPA) conducted on the sets of expressive and instrumental attributes. An initial set of one-way ANOVAs found that significant differences existed between the four groups for nearly

all the importance and performance ratings. IPA provides a way to make sense of these differences by focussing on where the gaps between importance and performance exist. Firstly paired samples t-tests are performed to identify gaps between importance and performance that are statistically significant in order to limit the number of attributes being examined following the approach taken by Breiter and Milman (2007). The remaining attributes are then mapped onto a two dimensional grid (importance by performance). This grid is then organised into four quadrants which are labeled: 'Concentrate Here' (high importance, low performance), 'Keep Up the Good Work' (high importance, high performance), 'Low Priority' (low importance, low performance and 'Possible Overkill' (low importance, high performance) (Martilla & James, 1977). The quadrants are most often determined by using the overall mean importance and overall mean performance scores as the points for determining low and high importance and performance. Thus an attribute that has a mean importance score high than the overall mean and a men performance score higher than the overall mean performance will be fall in the 'Keep Up the Good Work' quadrant. While there has been much debate about how to measure and plot gaps (see Oh, 2001; Matzler et al., 2004), the available evidence supports the basic idea of classifying gaps by importance (Bacon, 2003). In the present study this approach yields 8 IPA grids and given the current space limitations these were summarized and are presented in Table 4. This summary highlights the key results but does not allow for the full analysis of overall patterns.

Table 4. Summary of IPAs on Expressive and Instrumental Attributes

IPA Quadrant	Non-Shoppers	Serious Shoppers	Specialist Shoppers	Urban Leisure Shoppers
Keep up Good Work	Products unique to region [a] Place to be with family & friends	Escape the city Time with friends	Escape the city Learn about the place	Escape the city
Concentrate Here	**Attitude of staff** [b] **Value for Money**	**Attitude of staff** **Value for money** **Opening hours** **Price of products**	**Attitude of staff** **Availability of regionally distinctive products** **Value for money** **Price of products** **Opening hours**	**Attitude of staff** **Efficiency of staff** **Value for money** **Availability of regionally distinctive products**
Possible Overkill	Learn about place Show others around Meet locals Special events **Language ability of staff**	Quiet day out See an attraction Learn about place Meet locals Show others around Special events **Language ability of staff**	Be with friends Show others around See an attraction Meet locals Special events **Language ability of staff** **Physical layout of stores**	See an attraction Show others around Special events
Low Priority			Opening hours	Price of products Neatness and cleanliness of shops

a. Within each cell items are presented in order of importance.
b. Items in bold are instrumental shopping attributes, other items are expressive attributes

Several points evident in Table 4 are noteworthy. Firstly, it is clear that there are some common items across all groups that both contribute in a positive way to satisfaction, such as special events, or can be seen as issues to address, such as value for money and sales staff attitudes. But the table also shows patterns specific to each group. Of particular interest are the Specialist Shoppers who express concerns about the availability of regionally distinctive products and opening hours. Secondly, it is clear that visitors respond differently to the expressive and

instrumental attributes with no negative gaps identified for expressive attributes. Matzler and colleagues (2004) would argue that these are excitement factors whose presence adds to rather than determines satisfaction and that these should not be ignored even if they appear in the Overkill quadrant. Thirdly, the Serious and Specialist Shopper groups both provided more detailed evaluations of both sets of attributes but especially for the instrumental shopping related attributes.

Conclusions & Implications

The study reported here has implications at three levels. Firstly, for Hahndorf these results and others not able to be reported here have specific implications. Issues around opening hours, sales staff training and provision of special events are some of these place specific challenges. Secondly, there are broader implications for TSVs in general. For example, the results highlight both the importance of shopping and the variety of approaches to shopping that exist in the tourist market for TSVs. There seems to be reluctance amongst both tourism practitioners and academics to openly recognise the importance of shopping in visitor behaviour that is not shared by visitors themselves. There is also strong support from those interested in shopping for the provision of regionally unique and distinctive products. This suggests that those responsible for planning and development regulation need to consider carefully the implications of development changes for the producers of these kinds of products. The development of more generic shopping in response to second home developments or amenity migration and the move to brand stores or factory outlets could have unanticipated consequences for a range of local businesses.

Finally, the results have implications for the way we measure and analyse visitor satisfaction. It is clear that measures of overall satisfaction give a very limited picture that can hide important group differences. This approach is too simplistic both for practitioners and for theoretical development and testing. In recent years in tourism there has been considerable growth in the use of complex multivariate techniques to test various proposed models of aspects of visitor behaviour. In the area of visitor satisfaction that has typically involved modelling in an attempt to predict or identify pathways to some outcome measure of overall satisfaction. The results in the present study indicate the pathways to satisfaction will be different for different groups within the visitor population and so such models need to be conducted separately for different groups. This is not often done because, as in the present study, sample sizes cannot support it. Tourism researchers need to more explicitly recognise and work within these limits.

Forests are often defined by the type, prevalence and mix of trees that can be found within them and it is recognised that changes in any of these things results in a different forest. Just as recognising the differences between trees is critical to understanding forests, recognising the differences between visitors is critical to understanding tourism.

References

Bacon, D. R. (2003). A comparison of approaches to importance-performance analysis. *International Journal of Market Research*. 45(1), 55-73.

Bowen, D. & Clarke, J. (2002). Reflections on tourist satisfaction research: Past, present and future. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(4), 297-308.

Breiter, D. & Milman, A. (2007). Predicting exhibitor level of satisfaction in a large convention center. *Event Management*, 10, 133-143.

Del Bosque, I. R. & San Martin, H. (2008). Tourist satisfaction: A cognitive-affective model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 551-573.

Deng, W., Kuo, Y., & Chen, W. (2008). Revised importance–performance analysis: three-factor theory and benchmarking. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(1), 37-51.

Devesa, M., Laguna, M., & Palacios, A. (2010). The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, 547-552.

Foster, C. I. (2009). Processes and performances of tourist (dis)satisfaction. In M. Kozak and A. Decrop (Eds), *Handbook of Tourist Behaviour: Theory and Practice* (pp. 133-144). New York: Routledge.

Getz, D. (2000). Tourist Shopping Villages: Development and Planning Strategies. In C. Ryan & S. Page (Eds.), *Tourism Management: Towards the New Millennium* (pp. 211-225). Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Geuens, M., Vantomme, D. & Brengman, M. (2004) Developing a typology of airport shoppers. *Tourism Management*, 25, 615-622.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959*). The motivation to work.* New York: Wiley

Heung, V., & Cheng, E. (2000). Assessing tourists' satisfaction with shopping in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China. *Journal of Travel Research,* 38, 396-404.

Hu, B. & Yu, H. (2007) Segmentation by craft selection criteria and shopping involvement. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1079-1092.

Josiam, B., Kinley, T., & Kim, Y. -K. (2005). Involvement and the tourist shopper: Using the involvement construct to segment the American tourist shopper at the mall. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(2), 135-154.

Kim, S., & Littrell, M. (2001). Souvenir buying intentions for self versus others. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 638-357.

Martilla, J., & James, J. (1977). Importance-performance analysis. *The Journal of Marketing*, 77-79.

Martin, G. N., Carlson, N. R., & Buskist, W. (2007). *Psychology* (Third Edition). Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Matzler, K., Bailom, F., Hinterhuber, H., Renzl, B., & Pichler, J. (2004). The asymmetric relationship between attribute-level performance and overall customer satisfaction: a reconsideration of the importance-performance analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management, 33*(4), 271-277.

Meng, F., Tepanon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2006). Measuring tourist satisfaction by attribute and motivation: The case of a nature-based resort. *Journal of Vacation Marketing,* 14(1), 41-56.

Mitchell, C. & de Waal, S. B. (2009) Revisiting the model of creative destruction: St. Jacobs, Ontario, a decade later. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 25, 156-167.

Moscardo, G. (2004) Shopping as a destination attraction: An empirical examination of the role of shopping in tourists' destination choice process and experience. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10, 294-307.

Murphy, L., Benckendorff, P., Moscardo, G., & Pearce, P. L. (2011). *Tourist Shopping Villages: Forms and Functions.* Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge.

Murphy, L., Moscardo, G., Benckendorff, P., & Pearce, P. L. (2008). Tourist Shopping Villages - Exploring Success and Failure. In A. Woodside and D. Martin (eds) *Tourism Management: Analysis, Behaviour and Strategy* (pp. 405-423). CABI, Wallingford.

Neal, J. D. & Gursoy, D. (2008). A multifaceted analysis of tourist satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47, 53-62.

Noe, F. (1999). *Tourist Service Satisfaction*. Champaign Illinois: Sagamore.

Oh, H. (2001). Revisiting importance-performance analysis. *Tourism Management, 22*(6), 617-627.

Pearce, P. L. (2005). *Tourist Behaviour: Themes and Conceptual Schemes*. Clevedon, UK: Channel View Publications.

Ryan, C. (1995). *Researching Tourist Satisfaction: Issues, Concepts, Problems*. London: Routledge.

Smith, S., & Costello, C. (2009). Culinary tourism: Satisfaction with a culinary event utilizing importance-performance grid analysis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(2), 99- 110.

Tourism Research Australia (2008). *Hahndorf Visitor Profile and Satisfaction Report.* Canberra: Tourism Research Australia.

Yuksel, A & Yuksel, F. (2003). Measurement of tourist satisfaction with restaurant services: A segment-based approach. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(1), 52-68.