

**EXPLORING CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS' GAMBLING MOTIVATIONS:
INDIAN RESERVATIONS VS. LAS VEGAS CASINOS**

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

In

Hospitality Management

By

Soojin Lee

2015

SIGNATURE PAGE

THESIS: EXPLORING CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS' GAMBLING
MOTIVATIONS: CALIFORNIA INDIAN
RESERVATIONS VS.
LAS VEGAS CASINOS

AUTHOR: Soojin Lee

DATE SUBMITTED: Spring 2015

The Collins College of Hospitality Management

Dr. Myong Jae Lee
Thesis Committee Chair
Hospitality Management

Dr. Eddie Mao
Hospitality Management

Dr. Margie Jones
Hospitality Management

ABSTRACT

Many hospitality-related industries consider the casino gaming industry to be a lucrative market. California Indian casinos have expanded considerably and now compete with casinos in Las Vegas. Meanwhile, a relatively higher number of California residents gamble in Las Vegas casinos. Little research has been conducted with regard to casino motivations of California residents. Thus, this study was focused on the motivations of California residents who gamble at California Indian casinos compared to those who gamble at Las Vegas casinos. A total of 300 online surveys were used for data analysis. First, exploratory factor analysis was performed to find underlying dimensions of casino motivations. Second, Independent-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the casino perception between two groups. Then, one-way ANOVA tests were also implemented to find the difference between casino motivation factors and six different demographic variables. This study will help both California Indian and Las Vegas casinos in assessing their services to effectively market and attract more California residents by meeting their needs and wants.

Key Words: Gaming industry, California Indian casinos, Las Vegas casinos, California residents, motivations, exploratory factor analysis, independent-samples t-tests, one-way ANOVA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Signature Page	ii
Abstract	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Literature Review	5
Casino Motivation	5
Casino Rewards Program	6
Casino Amenity	7
Casino Service	9
Promotions	10
Proximity	13
Hard-core Gambling	14
Variety of Games	16
Atmosphere	17
Smoking Policy	18
Casino gambler characteristics	
Gender	24
Age	25
Education	25
Occupation	26

Income	27
Ethnicity	28
Methodology	
Survey Development	29
Data Collection	30
Data Analysis	30
Findings	
Descriptive Statistics	32
Exploratory Factor Analysis	35
t-tests	39
One-way ANOVAs.....	41
Discussions	49
Conclusion	56
References.....	59
Appendix A: Casino Motivation Survey Questionnaire	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Summary of casino motivation.....	21
Table 2	Demographic profile of the sample.....	33
Table 3	Exploratory Factor Analysis.....	37
Table 4	Results of casino segment comparison.....	40
Table 5	t-tests for Individual Casino Motivational Item.....	40
Table 6	One-way ANOVA and gender.....	42
Table 7	One-way ANOVA and age.....	43
Table 8	One-way ANOVA and ethnicity.....	44
Table 9	One-way ANOVA and education.....	45
Table 10	One-way ANOVA and Income.....	46
Table 11	One-way ANOVA and occupation.....	48

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry is growing constantly in the United States. Many hospitality-related areas, including tourism, restaurant, lodging, and event, consider the gaming industry to be one of the most lucrative markets (Barsky & Tzolov, 2010). Casinos have significant appeal to many tourists throughout the world (Walker, Hinch, & Weighill, 2005). According to Siu (2007), there were only 15 casinos existed in 1970. In 1980, the number of casinos was increased to 77 in the U.S. The American Gaming Association (2011) reported that there are now 939 casinos in the United States, including tribal, commercial, and racetrack casinos. As of 2013, the gaming industry continues to expand its market, and gaming revenue has reached more than \$66 billion (Gaming Statistics, 2015). In a study by Shoemaker and Zemke (2005), casinos were widely operated only in the state of Nevada and New Jersey in the past. However, casinos have expanded its markets in 32 different U.S. states. Since the first commercial casino opening in the state of Nevada in 1931, Nevada remained the only state where gambling was legal until New Jersey joined in the development of casino industry (Walker et al., 2005). Some studies indicated that the casino industry will continue its prosperity despite the economic downturn (Bryant & Walker, 2010; Walker & Kelly, 2011).

Historically, California Indian casinos had little influence on casino gamblers. However, since early 1990's, Indian casinos have led their markets with annual gross sales of \$7.5 billion. Recently, California Indian casinos have been largely expanded thereby competing directly with other casinos in Las Vegas (Eadington, Wells, & Gossi, 2012). The National Indian Gaming Commission (n.d) stated that Indian lands can be referred to as all lands within the limit of Indian reservations which is also held by the

United States for the benefit of Indian tribes. The Indian tribal casinos are regulated by Indian gaming regulatory act of 1988. The IGRA sets different guidelines for Indian reservation casinos to be classified. Class I includes carnival and traditional games, Class II includes bingo and poker games, and Class III includes all other games that are not in Class I and Class II, such as slot machines, and casino games (Anders, 1998). In California, the casino business plays as an essential part of economic development on Indian lands because it promotes well-being for Indian lands tribal members. California is one of the top states that has a growing casino market with steadily increasing profits (Ackerman & Bunch, 2012). With an average of 26 percent growth rate per year, Indian gaming is rapidly broadening its market (Spilde & Taylor, 2013). Today, there are 62 of 109 California tribes own 68 Indian casinos in California including Indian casino resorts and mini-casinos.

Gaming revenues in Las Vegas casinos have grown from \$5 billion in 1990 to \$10.4 billion in 2010 (Eadington et al., 2012). In 2009, Las Vegas casinos felt the recession and quickly lost approximately 11 percent of gaming revenues (Eadington et al., 2012). Nevertheless, casinos in the United States today, including Las Vegas, remain internationally competitive (Barsky & Tzolov, 2010). Despite the recession, Las Vegas has expanded the number of their properties (Barsky & Tzolov, 2010). Trends for Big Las Vegas Strip casinos (2014) indicated all Las Vegas casinos have increased their total gaming revenue to \$72 million between 2008 and 2014. With continued increases in revenue, Las Vegas is expected to remain prosperous for the next 25 years (Eadington et al., 2012).

As of 2013, more than 50% of Las Vegas visitors were coming from western U.S. (Las Vegas Visitor Profile, 2013). Of which 33% were from California. Of the Californian visitors, 26% were from Southern California. Therefore, California residents are target market for Las Vegas casinos. With the option to gamble at California Indian casinos, it may be interesting to investigate why so many California residents choose to gamble in Las Vegas. Also, with the option to gamble at Las Vegas casinos, there may be motivations why so many California residents choose to gamble in California Indian casinos.

Because California residents make up the majority of visitors to Las Vegas casinos and little is known about their motivations, research should focus on gamblers' gambling perceptions and motivations toward California and Las Vegas casinos. As casinos are becoming more recognized worldwide, the gaming industry has benefited from increased research interests (Wan, 2012). Despite the international spread of the gaming industry, a relatively little research has been conducted with regard to casino motivations and perceptions (MacDonald & Eadington, 2012).

The goal of California Indian and Las Vegas casinos is to retain California resident gamblers for current and future gambling. To achieve this goal, this study will investigate California residents' motivations to gamble at either type of casino, and differences in perception. This understanding has implication for developing more effective casino management, which could help casinos provide a better customer experience for California resident gamblers. In addition, this study could provide insight into what California resident gamblers most expect from two different casinos. There also may be practical marketing implications, such that casinos could offer service that better

meets the needs and wants of California gamblers. Therefore, the results from this study will help both California Indian casinos and Las Vegas casinos in assessing their casino environment to effectively market and attract more California gamblers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study investigated what motivates California residents to visit and gamble at California Indian casinos and Las Vegas casinos. This literature review will focus on gamblers' demographic characteristics, casino motivations, behaviors, and perceptions to provide the motivation for the present study. This study investigated nine different casino motivational items, which have been considered important in previous studies; casino rewards program, casino amenity, casino service, promotions, proximity, hard-core gambling, variety of games, atmosphere, and smoking policy. Demographic characteristics of gamblers also have been considered in light of their motivations in previous studies, which include gender, age, ethnicity, education, income, and occupation.

Casino Motivation

Casino motivation has been widely applied to many gaming markets, and study of consumer involvement can greatly contribute to the understanding of target customers, and help develop marketing strategies (Laurent & Kapferer, 1985). Past study from Iwasaki and Havitz (2004) indicated that casino motivation and customer satisfaction are related to each other and predict customer loyalty. Consumer involvement predicts whether consumers will purchase a good and what goods they decide to purchase. Given the growing casino market, it is imperative to investigate whether different types of motivations influence consumers' choice to play at a particular casino. Understanding these motivations can also benefit marketing strategies that would appeal to current and future customers.

Casino Rewards Program

Many casinos have adopted customer loyalty programs as important marketing tool to attract more gamblers (Crofts, 2011; Liu 2007; Palmer & Mahoney, 2005). The airline industry was the first to launch and promote the loyalty program during the 1980s. Since then, an increasing number of hospitality-related businesses, including casino markets started to attract customers through loyalty programs (Liu, 2007). Palmer and Mahoney (2005) stated that the gaming industry has adopted more customer-focused loyalty marketing strategies. Casinos emphasize their facilities attractions, and they also develop marketing strategies that appeal to more casino customers and enhance relationships. Thus, many casinos aim to create and strengthen relationships with casino gamblers by loyalty programs.

Hospitality-related businesses implement loyalty programs in order to increase their profitability, market share, and to become more competitive since relatively higher revenue can be generated from loyal customers (Palmer & Mahoney, 2005). A loyalty program is one of the important ways that allows for repeat customers to demonstrate company loyalty (Liu, 2007). Oliver (1999) stated customer loyalty programs as a continuous commitment to re-patronize particular products or services. There are different types of loyalty benefits for customers. Derez and Nunes (2009) also noted that benefits can include rewards, amenity upgrades, points, and perks. Other types of rewards include fast check-in and priority accommodation services (Lacey, Suh, & Morgan, 2007). Palmer and Mahoney (2005) indicated that casino rewards programs can also be referred to as affinity groups, frequent customer programs, and customer clubs. The benefits provided to casino gamblers can vary based on the overall spending.

Derez and Nunes (2009) suggested that customers use loyalty programs to raise the tier level of loyalty. They also stated that customers may consider membership status an important position in society. Marketers should recognize the customers' desire for achieving and maintaining high tier levels and offer appropriate services to heighten casino gamblers' experiences. According to Meczka (2010) and Shoemaker and Lewis (1999), a majority of casino loyalty programs are point-and tier-based system, and they think that this increases casino gamblers' playing frequency. Zeithaml, Rust & Lemon (2001) found that pyramid approaches to casino loyalty programs effectively segment casino gamblers into tier levels, which strengthens the relationship between the player and the casino. Thus, casino loyalty programs could motivate casino gamblers to visit more often, striking a deal where casinos provide membership benefits in exchange for their casino gamblers' increased spending.

Casino Amenity

Although people gamble hoping to gain profit (Henderson, 2000), they also seek out entertainment, such as sightseeing, shopping, eating, and drinking (Wong & Rosenbaum, 2011). There is an important relationship between visiting casinos and leisure or social interactions (Lam & Vong, 2009; Wong & Rosenbaum, 2011). Casinos have swimming pools and nightlife activities, which generate revenue. One of the biggest motivating factors for casino gamblers visit casinos is shopping, followed by nightlife and sightseeing (Lam & Vong, 2009; Lucas & Tanford, 2012). Some gamblers report that they play different casino games because excitement motivates them. This type of gamblers should be more likely to gamble for longer period of time (Yip et al., 2011). For this reason, current casino marketers are concerned about providing various exciting casino amenities in order to attract gamblers.

Half of the total casino revenue is generated by non-gaming amenities (Nevada Gaming Control Board, 2010). Gambling appears to be an underlying dimension that motivates individuals' leisure decisions. Lucas (2003) stated that there casino gamblers play more table games on days when a famous entertainer will perform. Moreover, Tanford and Suh (2013) explained that dining and buffet services at a casino are related to gaming revenue. Supporting this relationship, as the number of restaurant customer increases, casino restaurant volume increase as well as the amount of coins players put in slot machines (Lucas, 2003). The quality of dining service has an important influence on casino patrons' gaming behaviors as well. The pleasant accommodation service and high-quality dining services can lead to a favorable customer behavior (Mayer, Johnson, Hu, & Chen, 1998). Also, the casino hotel lodging services are one of the most important non-gaming attributes related to casino gamblers' visits (Richard & Adrian, 1996). Non-gaming amenities at a casino have started to affect the overall performance as the amenities provide opportunity for expansion (Bryant & Walker, 2010). Finally, casino gamblers enjoy non-gaming amenities by bringing members of their social groups, or at least indicated that they would like to do so (Shinnar, Young, and Cosrun, 2004). Thus, the casino experience encompasses gaming, in addition to retail, entertainment, dining, lodging, and recreation services (Titz et al., 2001).

Nearly 80% of casino gamblers are motivated by excitement to visit a casino if a variety of different casino entertainments are offered (Martin et al., 2001). They like to be around other people while gambling and using non-gaming amenities. Thus, casino gamblers may be motivated to visit casinos not only because they enjoy gambling, but

because they seek excitement through entertainment and non-gaming amenities (Lucas, 2005).

Casino Service

Pfaffenberg and Costello (2001) found that casino employee service, especially friendly service and courteous service was the important type of service that a casino could provide. Additionally, casino gamblers expect casino employees to be well-trained and able to provide services promptly. There are important relationships among performance of casino frontline employees, overall casino profitability, service quality, and customer retention (Zeithaml et al. 2001; Lio & Rody, 2012). Petrillose and Brewer (2012) stated that service quality and guest satisfaction are measured by casino services. Therefore, it is crucial to focus on providing services that best satisfy casino gamblers' expectations because casino gamblers might have different perceptions about what constitutes a quality service (Prentice, 2013). Casino frontline employees are important because they directly engage with casino gamblers (Prentice & King, 2011). Particularly, frontline employees need to provide quality services, especially to high rollers because, although they are relatively few, they account for nearly 90 percent of all table game revenue. Frontline employees also should be prepared to explain different game rules. Because casino service significantly affects a casino player's overall casino experience, casino frontline employees should be responsible for satisfying and meeting the expected service level of casino gamblers.

Casinos that constantly offer high-quality service to casino gamblers, likely create loyal customers that return to the casino more often (Petrillose & Brewer, 2012). Gamblers often regard casino service and interaction as essential components that could

exceed their expectations, which would also make them feel satisfied (Wong & Fong, 2010). Casinos should encourage their employees to be highly motivated so they can cultivate interpersonal relationships with casino gamblers, and create a more customer-friendly environment (Johnson, 2012). Johnson (2012) also stated that maintaining service-oriented employees is an important process that increases the value of the company and of the customer.

Knowing that casino service is crucial in retaining the customers, Prentice (2013) suggested that casino gamblers with different preferences may evaluate casino services differently. Titz et al. (2001) showed that table and slot machine players' perceptions had different experiences and different levels of gambling involvement. Table game players were more likely to desire to learn the intricacies of the games. Slot machine players were impulsive, and not tend to be controlled. While the table game players are more likely concerned about employee responsiveness, repeat casino gamblers expect casino hosts to show empathy, which is the employee behavior that most likely influences them to return to the casino (Zeithaml et al., 2001). Prentice (2013) found that gamblers tended to continue their patronage as long as the service they want to experience is satisfying. Prior to providing casino gaming services, it is even more important to effectively manage every service encounter since casino gamblers are motivated to visit a casino when the service is consistent (Johnson, 2012).

Promotions

Complimentary services or comps are often offered by casino industry to attract more gamblers. Comps are provided to its casino customers to reward them for their business. Casinos give out comps to promote their business, and entice more loyal

players (Burton, n.d). For instance, casino comps include free play, free foods, free drinks, and hotel rooms. Casinos give out comps to entice customers to gamble. Many casinos believe that comps are a great reinvestment that is as a major driving factor for casino markets (Suh & Tanford, 2012). The number of casinos providing free goods to their gamblers is also increasing. In a study by McGowan and Brown (2009), promotions offer a larger predictor of gaming revenue than advertising. This finding was consistent with Nudd's (2002) assertion that promotional goods are an integral part of the casino operation that appeals to gamblers, and they make gamblers stay longer, and visit more often.

Suh (2012) revealed that complimentary offers have a significant impact on a slot volume. Casino gamblers is given free room rewards, are more likely to increase the amount of coins they put in on casino plays. Suh (2012) also added that complimentary room offers motivate casino gamblers because they can save money on rooms, even though they eventually spend more on gaming instead. Rubin (2001) indicated that complimentary rewards are frequently provided to casino gamblers as an effective way of allowing them to use it toward game plays and to motivate them for future patronage. A casino offers complimentary or promotional goods to increase revenue because they expect that guests would spend more on gambling than they otherwise would. An increase in promotional allowances can also help casinos generate more operating profits because they appeal to new guests and loyal customers (Repetti, 2013). Casino gamblers use points they earned while playing for comps. For example, they can purchase show tickets or hotel rooms using points. Casinos offer various types of comps to players in

order to encourage repeat visitation or to entice them to join a casino's rewards programs (Klebanow, 2009).

Although many casinos advertise themselves through media, radio, newspapers and so on, few research studies have investigated the consequences of promotions (Yi & Busser, 2008). Tanford and Suh (2013) suggested that casinos should offer complimentary dining services to gamblers to generate maximum indirect gaming revenue and stimulate demand towards casino gaming. Jeon and Hyun (2013) noted that casino operations and the casino industry are aware that promotions motivate gamblers to visit, which increases overall spending within the casino. Casinos provide promotions that include free gifts, discounts, coupons, hotel room discounts, dining service discounts, free spa services, free show tickets, contests, cash prizes, free entries into prize drawings, and invitations to casino promotions. Thus, casino could increase revenue and the likelihood of repeat customers by frequently offering casino gamblers complimentary services.

Proximity

A study by Yi and Busser (2008) found that there is an important relationship between casino patronage and location. Casino gamblers are more likely to visit casinos requiring less travel time. This finding is consistent with Titz et al. (2001), who found that location of residence has an impact on casino gaming behavior. Related research by Mi Jeon, Magnini, Kim, and Hyun (2013) also found that long distance to a casino constrains a casino visiting frequency. Kuo, Chi and Kao (1999) noted that conveniently located places significantly affect the success of a business. Thus, proximity and accessibility of a casino affects visitor frequency (Yi and Busser, 2008).

If gamblers need to travel longer distances from their homes, they are less likely to gamble frequently because of safety concerns. Martin et al. (2011) found that 75% of casino gamblers perceived safety to be the most important concern in regard to long-distance traveling. Individuals who visit casinos are mostly concerned about the safety (Pfaffenberg & Costello, 2002), especially female gamblers and wealthy gamblers. First-time visitors who believe that casinos ensure safety and are responsible for security are more comfortable gambling. This finding was consistent with the past research from Mayer and Johnson (2003), who found that gamblers are likely to stay and play games longer when security and safety is ensured. They are also more likely to return in the future. Welte, Wieczorek, Barnes, Tidwell, and Hoffman (2004) stated that individuals living within 10 miles of a casino are more likely to become pathological gamblers. Gamblers who move closer to casinos significantly increase their visiting frequency. Welte et al. (2004) found that gambling severity varies by proximity. Individuals living in close proximity to a casino have gambling severity almost two times larger than gamblers who do not live within 10 miles of a casino. Moreover, the availability of an attractive gambling opportunity can motivate gamblers to visit a casino who would have not otherwise visited.

According to Shoemaker and Zemke (2005), residences closer to casinos strongly affect the frequency of gamblers' visits. They also investigated the behavior of frequent casino gamblers and found that when it is easier to drive to a casino, gamblers tend to become more loyal customers in the long term. According to Eadington et al. (2010), the demand for gaming includes proximity, transportation costs, and convenience of the

location. Therefore, these aspects could influence gamblers in making their decision to gamble at casinos.

Hard-core Gambling

While some gamblers play games at a casino regardless of financial difficulty, hardcore gamblers are the one who take risk while gambling. Wong et al. (2012) identified two different casino segments. Hardcore casino gamblers usually place larger bets on table games, whereas other gamblers place smaller bets on table or slot machine games. In other words, hardcore gamblers might enjoy the thrill of taking risk. They expect to win casino games and believe that they have a good chance of winning more than they have already had lost (Rousseau & Venter, 2002). Perceived winning is an important element that determines the gambling activities a casino gambler engages in (Wong et al., 2012). Mi Jeon et al. (2013) indicated that perceived winning can include a situation when the budget often goes farther, but still believe that he or she would eventually win. Mi Jeon et al. (2013) stated that hardcore gamblers visit casinos only when they believe that winning casino games would fulfill their financial needs.

Unlike casino gamblers who seek entertainment while gambling, hardcore casino gamblers are highly motivated to visit casinos with the hope of fulfilling their financial needs by placing large bets. Hardcore gamblers tend to stay longer than leisure players who bet relatively smaller amounts of money (Eadington et al., 2010). Wong et al. (2012) showed that hardcore players are highly motivated to visit and play games at the casino if they have financial difficulties. This tendency suggests that hardcore gamblers gamble frequently, and are relatively more interested in playing casino games. Shoemaker and Zemke (2005) verified that winning perception appears to strongly influence the overall

satisfaction level of hardcore gamblers. When casino games, including slot machines provide a higher payout to players, it makes them even more satisfied, and this positively affects their overall experience. Furthermore, gamblers who strongly believe that they will eventually win are more likely to gamble more (Mayer et al., 1998). Wong et al (2012) indicated that because hardcore casino gamblers spend more, they expect high-quality game service or friendly environments more than non-hardcore players do.

The gaming revenue will reach higher in many different casinos (Wong et al., 2012). And this phenomenal growth can be widely attributed to hardcore casino players since they represent nearly 70% of the revenue. The hardcore gamblers have a strong affinity to gambling. Often, they receive the highest level of service that a casino provides, as they are served with private lounge, complimentary transportation, or food and beverage services (Wong et al, 2012; Zeng & Forrest, 2009). These private services make hardcore gamblers distinct from regular casino gamblers. Moreover, hardcore gamblers' bet size is usually a few times more than the minimum amount of the bet (Zeng & Forrest, 2009). Titz et al. (2001) stated that both table and slot players desire pleasure from gambling. Meanwhile, hardcore gamblers are more likely to be involved in casino games, and usually more knowledgeable to intricacies of the games. The gaming revenue will continue to increase in many different casinos (Wong et al., 2012), and this growth can be mainly attributed to hardcore casino gamblers. The evidence presented earlier suggested that hardcore gamblers are motivated by overcoming their financial difficulties (Eadington et al., 2010). Given the expected growth of revenue generated by hardcore gamblers, it is important to understand their motivations to better attract and retain this distinct type of gamblers.

Variety of Games

Many gamblers visit casinos to play table games and slot machines, so the type of games offered can influence the type of service gamblers expect (Wong & Fong, 2010). Previous research from Lucas, Dunn, and Singh (2005) contended that the revenue from slot machine games is important for casinos' success. A related study found that slot machines are a key determinant of gamblers' satisfaction and behavior (Shoemaker & Zemke, 2005). The profit margins from slot machines are larger compared to other types of games. This not only applies to casinos in certain states, but to all major U.S casino markets. According to several different researchers, a nearly 67% of total casino gaming revenue was generated from slot machine games (Lucas et al., 2005; Yi & Busser, 2008). Besides slot machine games, there are various types of games within a casino floor. Most casinos include cards, dice, slots, wheels, and lotteries. Past research by Jeon and Hyun (2013) revealed that players' satisfaction can be enhanced if casinos provide a wide selection of casino games.

Wong and Fong (2010) insisted that gamblers consider game service as an important determinant of gambling experience. As stated by Doocey (2003), a proper mix of slot machines, types of games in casino floor, various themes, and reliable technologies are a few of the important things that casinos should consider. Doocey (2003) emphasized that while there are some games that are common in different casinos, it is recommended to offer mix of slot machines for each different target market in order to better satisfy their demands.

Casinos provide tangible products, which are gaming products and non-gaming facilities. It is important to note that gamblers' perception varies by gambling preferences,

such as the differences between slot and table game players (Wong & Fong, 2010). They may have different attitudes and perceptions toward casino games. The players' future patronage can be affected by whether casinos meet casino gamblers' expectation (Prentice, 2013). Thus, casino gamblers' patronage could vary depending on the types of both slot machines and table games available. When a variety of games are offered, players are more likely to be satisfied because offering more games may exceed gamblers' expectations and meet their needs. Players may also feel more attached to certain casinos that provide reliable, but still various themes of casino games (Doocey, 2003).

Atmosphere

As defined by Turley and Fugate (1992), the atmosphere is related to the internal and external environments of a particular facility. Johnson, Mayer, and Champaner, (2012) revealed that atmosphere is a key component of casino service that influences customers' purchasing behavior. There are a number of different service features that affect gamblers' decision toward gambling involvement. Interior, exterior, temperature, scents, noise levels, furnishings, colors, lighting, and decors are a few of many casino atmospheric services that affect gambling behavior. This finding agrees findings by Mayer and Johnson (2003), who found that floor layout and theme affects customers' satisfaction. Johnson et al. (2012) specified that the main factors of floor layouts in a casino facility are floor space, aisles, walkways, pit areas, table and slot machine areas. These elements are integral to providing an atmosphere that induces high levels of excitement (Wakefield & Blodgett, 1999).

Wong et al. (2012) emphasized that casinos need to encourage integrated themed facilities to attract more guests because themes influence service evaluation. Pleasant service environments engender higher customer satisfaction level and loyalty.

Rosenbaum (2009) indicated that casino atmospheric factors help customers escape from daily routines because they offer social and emotional support. Past research from Turley and Fugate (1992) indicated that intangible things, such as service and atmosphere, are the important elements that casino customers evaluate throughout their stay.

In terms of casino customer satisfaction, the study from Johnson et al. (2012) confirmed that the focus of creating a suitable atmosphere in the gaming floor has a significant relationship with managing customers. They emphasized that casinos should place importance on developing atmospheres that would positively influence a casino player's perception of the overall casino experience. Previous studies found that individuals who visit casinos are highly concerned about surroundings while they gamble. Considering that casino players think of the atmosphere in a multidimensional way, it appears that casino design, including theme, decorations, loudness, and ceiling height should be emphasized to fulfill the players' satisfaction (Johnson et al., 2012; Mayer & Johnson, 2003). Thus, it is important to manage overall casino atmosphere because it affects gamblers' satisfaction.

Smoking Policy

Timberlake et al. (2012) found that a majority of casino gamblers move around the casino floor in order to avoid secondhand smoke. Additionally, nearly 43% of respondents said they would likely stay longer at a casino if smoking was banned. On the other hand, the rest of the respondents indicated that they would not be affected by a smoking ban, and less than 10 percent preferred to leave the casino early if smoking was not allowed on the casino floor.

According to American nonsmokers' rights (2015), there are approximately 510 casinos that are required to be smoke-free in the U.S. Most casinos should ban smoking

inside their facilities by law. In addition, some casinos are required by their company to be smoke-free. It is expected that total casino revenue would increase by 20 percent if smoking was restricted. Mayer and Johnson (2003) noted that one element that could enhance a business's success is to include the separate areas for smokers and non-smokers. Casino patronage is most likely to be influenced by its smoking policy (Brokenleg et al., 2014). More than half of the study respondents said that they would increase their casino patronage if smoking were prohibited on the gaming floor, 18% said they would visit less often, and 28% said they would neither visit more nor less.

A study focusing on a customer's perception toward overall atmosphere stated that the smoking and non-smoking policy at a casino influences casino gamblers on their visits (Johnson, Mayer, & Champaner, 2012) Odor is one of the important casino atmospheres that a gambler is concerned about. Brokenleg et al., (2014) found that many gamblers believe that second-hand smoke is harmful and needs to be banned and that casino should consider reducing overall smoking rates to protect the health and safety of the casino customers. Nearly 70% of respondents agreed that they are bothered to some extent by smoking, Petty and Oncken (2002) found that heavy gamblers were most likely to be smokers followed by recreational and then non-gamblers. Thus, heavier gamblers are more likely smoke than lighter gamblers.

Despite the above, a study by Thalheimer and Ali (2008) indicated that a smoking ban could reduce gaming demand by around 16%. According to this study, people indicated that they would visit less frequently if smoking was banned while they gamble. Non-smoking gamblers have the intent to visit a casino where smoking ban is implemented, as the air quality is more important to them. Gamblers who do not smoke

have a strong likelihood to visit non-smoking casinos even if there's a casino that they usually gamble at (Bradley & Becker, 2011). Some surveys indicated that that smoking bans would increase casino visits (Brokenleg et al., 2014) whereas other studies indicated that smoking bans would decrease casino visits (Thalheimer & Ali, 2008). It may be that the type of gambler considered in these studies influenced responses, such that heavy gamblers who tend to smoke more would be less likely to visit casinos with a smoking ban compared to lighter gamblers.

Table 1

Summary of casino motivations

Item	Motivation	Reference
Rewards Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm motivated to gamble because I can raise my loyalty tier level -I'm motivated to earn points that can be used toward different non-gaming amenities -I'm motivated when rewards benefits are provided -I'm motivated to maintain my current casino tier level by gambling -I'm motivated to gamble because I am a loyal customer -I'm motivated when the membership services make me feel superior to others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Derez and Nunes (2009), Rust and Lemon (2001) and Zeithaml et al. (2001) -Meczka (2010) -Derez and Nunes (2009), Lacey et al. (2007) and Oliver (1999) -Derez and Nunes (2009), Liu (2007) and Shoemaker and Lewis (1999) -Liu (2007) and Meczka (2010) -Derez and Nunes (2009)
Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I enjoy shopping, eating, and drinking when I visit a casino -This casino provides non-gaming amenities that appeal to me -I like to have a social interaction, and have fun when I gamble -This casino has a variety of dining services -This casino provides spas, pools, or nightlife activities that excites my casino visit -I tend to have fun with family, friends, or relatives when I'm at a casino 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Martin et al. (2011), Wan (2011) and Wong and Rosenbaum (2011) -Bryant and Walker (2010), Lucas (2005), Marin et al. (2011) and Yip et al. (2011) -Lam and Vong (2009) and Wong and Rosenbaum (2011) -Mayer et al. (1998) and Tanford and Suh (2013) -Jeon and Hyun (2013) and Wong and Rosenbaum (2011) -Shinnar et al. (2004)
Casino Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm motivated to gamble when employees are friendly and polite -I'm motivated to gamble with consistent quality service -I'm motivated to gamble when employees are prepared to be responsive -I like to have an interpersonal relationship with casino employees -I'm motivated to gamble at casinos where employees are knowledgeable about game rules -I'm motivated where service is kept up-to-date with constant employee trainings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pfaffenberg and Costello (2001) -Lio and Rody (2012), Prentice (2013) and Zeithaml et al. (2001) -Johnson (2012) and Zeithaml et al. (2001) -Johnson (2012) and Wong and Fong (2010) -Prentice (2013) and Titz et al. (2001) -Petrillose and Brewer (2012)

Table 1 continued.

Summary of casino motivations

22

Item	Motivation	Reference
Promotions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm most likely to gamble with free slot plays or bets -I'm motivated to play at a casino when complimentary goods are offered, including dining and lodging services -I prefer to visit a casino where promotional offers are given -I tend to gamble because casinos send out invitations -I tend to gamble when there are discounts on non-gaming services such as spas, hotel rooms, or shows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Brown (2009) and Suh and Tanford (2012) -Jeon and Hyun (2013), Suh (2012) and Tanford and Suh (2013) - Brown (2009) and Suh and Tanford (2012) -Nudd (2002) -Brown (2009) and Suh and Tanford (2012)
Proximity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The distance between a casino and my home is important -I'm motivated to gamble at a casino that ensures safety and security of my visit -The transportation costs influence my casino visit -I'm motivated to gamble because my neighborhood has an attractive gambling opportunity -I prefer a casino where it's easier to drive from my home -I gamble at this casino because it is accessible by public transits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Yi and Busser (2008) and Kuo et al. (1999) -Johnson (2003), Martin et al. (2011) and Pfaffenberg and Costello (2002) -Eadington et al. (2010) -Shoemaker and Zemke (2005) and Welte et al. (2004) -Shoemaker and Zemke (2005) -Martin et al. (2011)
Hard-core Gambling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm motivated to gamble for a long period of time to win -I play at a casino on a regular basis expecting for a big payout -I'm motivated to gamble because increasing amount of bet excites me -I visit casinos only when I need to fulfill my financial needs -I gamble at this casino because I win more often compared to other casinos -I continue to gamble at this casino even though I lose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Eadington et al. (2010) -Henderson (2000), Wong et al. (2012) and Zeng and Forrest (2009) -Titz et al. (2001) -Eadington et al. (2010), Lam (2007) and Wong et al. (2012) -Mi Jeon et al. (2013) and Rousseau and Venter (2002) -Mayer et al. (1998), Rousseau and Venter (2002), Shoemaker and Zemke (2005) and Titz et al. (2001)

Table 1 continued.

Summary of casino motivations

Item	Motivation	Reference
Variety of Games	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm motivated by a variety of different features of casino games -I'm motivated by different slot machine games -I'm motivated by different types of table games -I gamble at this casino because I like to play games with the use of dice and roulette -A wide selection of games is important to my casino visit -I'm motivated to visit a casino when it provides games that other casinos do not have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lucas (2003), Wong et al. (2012) and Prentice (2013) -Lucas et al. (2005) -Wong and Fong (2010) -Lam (2007) -Jeon and Hyun (2013), Lucas (2003), Prentice (2013) and Wong et al. (2012) -Jeon and Hyun (2013)
Atmosphere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The scents, loudness, and lightning influence my casino visit -I'm motivated to gamble with a comfortable casino atmosphere -They casino facility designs, such as interior, decors, ceiling height, and theme influence my gambling behavior -Floor layouts, including the areas of games located are important to my casino visit -The exterior of this casino motivates my visit -I'm motivated to play games because of its constant changes on casino themes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lucas (2003), Wong et al. (2012) and Prentice (2013) -Lucas et al. (2005) -Wong and Fong (2010) -Lam (2007) -Jeon and Hyun (2013), Lucas (2003), Prentice (2013) and Wong et al. (2012) -Jeon and Hyun (2013)
Smoking Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -I'm likely motivated to visit a casino because smoking is prohibited -I'm likely motivated to visit a casino because smoking isn't prohibited -The overall casino air quality affects my gambling behavior -I prefer this casino because I can avoid second-hand smoke -I'm motivated to gamble when a casino provides both non-smoking and smoking areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Brokenleg et al. (2014) and Thalheimer and Ali (2008) -Bradley and Becker (2011) -Bradley and Becker (2011) - Brokenleg et al. (2014) and Timberlake et al. (2012) -Johnson et al. (2012) and Petty and Oncken (2002)

CASINO GAMBLER CHARACTERISTICS

Gender

Previous studies have shown that males and females have different gambling behaviors (Walker et al., 2005; Wong, Fong & Liu, 2012). Males usually take more risk and are more likely to become addicted to gambling compared to female gamblers (Fong & Ozorio, 2005; Walker et al., 2005). On the other hand, females consider casino services to be more important while gambling. Women prefer to interact or socialize with other people to share their feelings and emotions, which agrees with Bernhard, Dickens, and Shapiro (2007), who found that males are more likely to gamble alone and that females prefer to gamble while socializing (Fong & Ozorio, 2005).

Males and females also differ in their motivations. Walker et al. (2005) showed that male gamblers are motivated to take risks, whereas female gamblers are motivated to escape their daily routines. A study regarding gambling motivations revealed that female gamblers were significantly older, with the average age of females 44 years old (ranging from 19 to 81 years old) and the average age of males 38 years (ranging from 18 to 75 years old; men ranged from 18 to 75 years (Nower & Blaszczynski, 2010). Also, female gamblers spend more money per visit than male gamblers. Brenner and Brenner (1990) argued in a study that older women gamble because of insecurity after retirement and the death of their partner. One of the casino games frequently played by women is slot machine games, and they think that casino games are entertaining. Most women do not believe that casino gambling provides a source of income, and potential financial gain was considered the least important casino motivations that influenced female gamblers (Tarra, Singh, & Moufakkir, 2000). More research should investigate gambling

perception differences between males and females (Wong et al., 2012). Nevertheless, it is clear that male and female gamblers differ in their motivations to gamble.

Age

Age appears to be one of the significant variables in terms of gambling motivations (Yip et al., 2011). In late 1900's, a little more than 30% of the people aged 65 years or older had gambled. Starting from 1998, the number of American gamblers who are 65 years and older has increased by 45% because gambling has become a popular social activity (McNeilly & Burke, 2000). This implies that older people tend to have a more desire toward gambling compared to younger people. Senior gamblers participate in casino gambling more frequently with different types of games than younger gamblers (Rousseau & Venter, 2002). Past research from McNeilly and Burke (2000) also revealed that older gambling patrons are more inclined to gamble at casinos seeking relaxation or fun activities. Also, they gamble to escape from daily routines and to relieve boredom. This finding suggests that older gamblers gamble for excitement and entertainment. Bernard et al. (2007) found that gamblers between 50 and 64 are much more likely to gamble alone. Individuals who are between 21 and 34 are less likely to gamble alone. Taken together, the evidence suggests that age influences the motivations and the gambling behaviors of casino gamblers.

Education

The level of education of casino visitors varies. About 37% of the casino customers had completed high school, 38% completed post-secondary training, and less than 30% held 4-year college degrees (Walker et al., 2005). Perfetto and Woodside (2009) examined how frequently casino players gambled. They found that gamblers with

extremely frequent casino visits had high school educations or less, and a majority of those with low-level education were female. On the other hand, male gamblers tended to have higher educations. Walker et al. (2005) investigated the relationship between education level and gambling behavior in tourists and locals. Nearly one-third of the tourists who gambled held 4-year college degrees, whereas rest of them who gambled in casinos closest to their homes held high school diplomas. This finding was consistent with Martin et al. (2011), who found that casino visitors with higher level of educations were more likely to travel to gamble than those with high school educations or less. Therefore, it appears that casino patrons who live closer to casinos are more likely to frequent the casino, whereas those with higher levels of education are more willing to travel to gamble.

Occupation

According to the study examined by Hu, Borden, Harris, and Maynard (2008), occupation is one of the important predictors of gaming expenditure. Bernhard et al.'s (2007) study found that retired usually gamble alone followed by employed, unemployed, and homemaker gamblers. However, students or homemakers are less likely to play casino games. Kingi, Clarke, Abbott, Tse, and Manaia (2007) found that casino players who have factory or manual-related occupations gamble often at casinos. The players with no occupations also tended to gamble most frequently, followed by gamblers with professional and managerial jobs. Although unemployed and homemaker individuals were classified as frequent gamblers, about half of them were less likely to become addicted to gambling. Moreover, students and clerical workers were the groups that showed a relatively lower frequency of casino gambling. Particularly, those who work at

offices or have clerical jobs are unlikely to become pathological gamblers (Kingi et al., 2007). Thus, occupation seems to influence the gambling behaviors as well as the gambling frequency of gamblers, such that students and office workers are less likely to gamble frequently compared to those in other professions.

Income

In a study by Shinnar et al., (2004), income level appeared to influence gambling behavior. Based on the study from Martin et al. (2011), individuals with high disposable income are likely to spend more on casino gambling compared to those with low incomes. In general, the average income of casino patrons is approximately \$45,000. Another study also showed that income level was one of the factors that were significantly related to frequency of casino visits (Petrillose & Brewer, 2012). Casino players with higher incomes, spend more in the casino. A previous study indicated that more than half of casino gamblers with income less than \$20,000 spend an average of \$491, whereas 75% of gamblers with more than \$80,000 annual household income spend nearly \$600 on average (Perfetto & Woodside, 2009). The average annual income of gamblers who frequently visit a casino, but do not play many games is more than \$45,000. On the other hand, the average incomes of professional players, who have persistent and recurrent gambling behaviors, are relatively higher. Professional gamblers earn more than \$100,000. Casino gamblers who are addicted to gambling reported that they earn almost no income from gambling (Weinstock, Massura, & Petry, 2013). Thus, although those with greater income tend to spend more and visit casinos more frequently, low-income gamblers spend a larger proportion of their total income, on average, than higher-income gamblers.

Ethnicity

According to Las Vegas Visitor Profile (2014), a majority of visitors were Caucasians followed by Asians, Hispanics, and African-Americans. Chhabra (2007) found that among different ethnicities of gamblers, African-Americans gambled more frequently and were more likely to become pathological gamblers (Chhabra, 2007; Petry, Rach, & Blanco, 2010; Petry, Stinson, & Grant, 2005). Meanwhile, Caucasians were less likely to gamble for a long time at casinos. Asians and Hispanics gambled more frequently than Caucasians, but less than African-Americans (Yip et al., 2011). This was also consistent with the finding from Abbott and Volberg (1999), who found that non-Caucasians are at a greater risk of becoming addicted to gambling (Petry et al., 2005; Welte et al., 2004). Zeng and Forrest (2009) found that, Chinese males were fanatic about gambling. Chinese gamblers spent more time and put higher bets on casino games, especially when they played baccarat or table poker games. Therefore, it seems that non-Caucasians spend more, gamble more frequently, and are at higher risk for developing a pathological gambling addiction than Caucasians.

METHODOLOGY

Survey Development

A preliminary set of casino motivations influencing gamblers' gambling behavior was developed through an extensive literature review. Then, a pilot study was conducted with 35 people who are California residents, at least 21 years of age, and have gambled at California Indian, Las Vegas, or both casinos in the past 12 months. The target sample size for the actual survey was 300 California residents. According to Baker (1994), a sample size of 10-20% of the actual study is a reasonable number of participants to consider enrolling in a pilot study. Several researchers also noted that a pilot study is a pre-testing of a research instrument that might provide valuable insights about the study. Although a pilot study does not fully guarantee success in the actual study, it increases the likelihood. Thus, it is an important process of the study design (Baker, 1994; van Teijlingen, & Hundley; 2002). The initial 51 casino motive items were tested in order to eliminate any ambiguity of the items, and to ensure content validity. The measure was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Reliability indicated the items in this study are excellent in measuring interest as most of the items had value above 0.9. Based on the results from the pilot study, a final version of the questionnaire was developed, consisting of 1 screening question, 11 past experience information, 36 motivation items, and 6 questions to elicit respondents' demographic information. Lastly, the final survey was given online using Qualtrics.

The final survey included 36 items exploring casino motivations and asked respondents to indicate their agreement on a 7-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 1= "*strongly disagree*" to 7= "*strongly agree*". The single screening question was

identified from Crosby and Taylor (1983). The study indicated that affective commitment has an impact on making or purchasing certain decisions that would either pledge or bind the individual to a behavior (Backman & Crompton, 1991). Therefore, the survey asked, “Which casino are you more emotionally attached to?” to separate two different group. Researchers also suggested that individuals are less likely to change attitude when the attachment is consistent with their decisions. Oliver (1999) stated that strong emotional attachment leads to exclusive repurchase. Then, demographic variables were covered with multiple-choices.

Data Collection

The target sample of this study were California residents, at least 21 years of age, and have gambled at California Indian casinos and Las Vegas casinos in the past 12 months. A screening question was asked to evenly distribute participants who are emotionally attached to either California Indian or Las Vegas casinos. Qualtrics was used to administer the survey. A total of 309 responses were collected from May 18 to May 23, 2015. Nine outliers were found based on Z-score and removed from the sample. A total of 300 responses were used for data analysis. Of the 300 participants surveyed, 152 indicated that they are more likely to be California Indian casino gamblers, and 148 indicated that they are California residents, but more likely to be Las Vegas casino gamblers.

Data Analysis

The data collected from Qualtrics were analyzed using IBM SPSS 22.2 statistical package. Missing data and outliers were found through a data screening process to ensure the potential usefulness and validity. The main data analyses were carried out in three

stages. First, descriptive statistics was conducted to provide demographic profiles of study participants. Second, exploratory factor analysis revealed and delineated underlying dimensions associated with casino motive attributes. Finally, independent t-tests and ANOVA tests were implemented to examine possible differences in casino motives between casino segments and demographic variables.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Statistics

Participants' gender, age, ethnicity, education, income, and occupation were obtained. Table 2 shows the demographic profile of the study respondents.

Approximately half (56.6%) of the participants of California Indian casino gamblers were female. 22.4% of them were between 31 and 40 years old. Most participants reported that they were White or Caucasian (68.4%). Almost one-third of participants (30.9%) held a four-year college degree. Nearly 22% of participants had income between \$60,000 and \$81,000. California Indian casino gamblers reported having full-time jobs (41.4%) followed by retired (27%), part-time (9.9%), homemakers (7.2%), unemployed (6.6%), Student (2%), and professional jobs (1.3%). Among California residents who gamble at Las Vegas casinos, more half of the participants were female (56.8%). 23% of them between 21 and 30 years old. A majority of Las Vegas gamblers were Caucasian (69.6%). Unlike California Indian casino gamblers, more than a third held 4-year college degree (37.2%). Interestingly, 27% of participants reported having income of more than \$100,001, followed by \$60,000 to \$80,001 (18.2%), \$20,001 to \$40,000 (16.9%), \$40,001 to \$60,000 (16.2%), \$80,001 to \$100,000 (11.5%), \$10,001 to \$20,000 (7.4%), and \$10,000 or less (2.7%). Moreover, nearly one-half of participants reported having full-time jobs (47.3%). Overall, the profiles seem fairly similar. The most notable similarities appear to be for the age, gender, and ethnicity demographics, with both types of gamblers being mostly female, either younger (21-30 years old) or older (51-70 years old), and White or Caucasian. Although both types of gamblers report having full-time jobs, reported income seems to differ, with California residents who prefer California

Indian casinos having a lower income than California residents who prefer Las Vegas casinos. This higher income may afford greater travel opportunity to Las Vegas casinos.

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N=300)

Characteristics	N		%	
	California Gamblers	Las Vegas Gamblers	California Gamblers	Las Vegas Gamblers
<u>Gender</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Male	66	64	43.4	43.2
Female	86	84	56.6	56.8
<u>Age</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
21-30	22	34	14.5	23.0
31-40	34	26	22.4	17.6
41-50	18	21	11.8	14.2
51-60	33	33	21.7	22.3
61-70	35	27	23.0	18.2
71 or older	10	7	6.6	4.7
<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Caucasian	104	103	68.4	69.6
African-American	12	7	7.9	4.7
Mexican-American	13	5	8.6	3.4
Hispanic	6	10	3.9	6.8
American-Indian	2	1	1.3	0.7
Asian	15	22	9.9	14.9
<u>Education Level</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
High-school	34	20	22.4	13.5
2-year college	35	41	23.0	27.7
4-year college	47	55	30.9	37.2
Post graduate	24	24	15.8	16.2
Other	12	8	7.9	5.4
<u>Income</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
\$10,000 or less	9	4	5.9	2.7
\$10,001-\$20,000	11	11	7.2	7.4
\$20,001-\$40,000	33	25	21.7	16.9
\$40,001-\$60,000	28	24	18.4	16.2
\$60,001-\$80,000	33	27	21.7	18.2
\$80,001-\$100,000	12	17	7.9	11.5

\$100,001 or more	26	40	17.1	27.0
<u>Occupation</u>	<u>152</u>	<u>148</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Part-time	15	10	9.9	6.8
Full-time	63	70	41.4	47.3
Homemaker	11	16	7.2	10.8
Professional jobs	2	3	1.3	2.0
Student	3	7	2	4.7
Unemployed	10	4	6.6	2.7
Retired	41	30	27.0	20.3
Other	7	8	4.6	5.4

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Table 3 reports the results of exploratory factor analysis that used principal component analysis for extraction and a varimax orthogonal with Kaiser normalization for the 36 casino motivational items that met the factor loading criteria of 0.3 and above. The decision to use 7 factors was based on the PCA. The Kaiser criterion that eigenvalue of are greater than 1.0. The underlying patterns of dependent variables were examined to determine if they can be combined into smaller sets by conducting exploratory factor analysis. Principal components and varimax rotation was used to reduce the number of variables. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO; Kaiser, 1974) measure and Bartlett's test of sphericity was checked to determine sampling adequacy. Kaiser (1974) stated that if KMO values between 0.7 and 0.8 indicate that the data is factorable. In this study, the KMO was 0.889 and Barlett's test of sphericity was significant, $p < 0.001$. The communalities of above 0.5 for all factors were maintained. Kaiser (1974) suggested that 0.3 or less is considered a low communality and may be dropped from the analysis. Therefore, 1 item (I gamble at this casino even though I lose) was removed from further analysis because it had a low communality (0.231). Principal component analysis was then rerun with 35 casino motivational items. Through the exploratory factor analysis, this study could identify each variable to be loaded on the factor, eigenvalue of greater than 1.0. A total of 7 factors were produced that accounted for 65.63% of variance.

As Table 3 shows, it presents the results of exploratory factor analysis and its reliability tests. Moreover, factors were performed with Cronbach's alpha to test the internal consistency of the items for each factor. Most factors demonstrated decent

internal consistency based on Cronbach's alpha: ranging from 0.62 to 0.86, above the minimum value of 0.6 (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 2006).

Factor 1 contained seven items that appeared to be related to loyalty. So this factor was named Loyalty (11.8% of the total variance). Factor 2 contained six items that appeared to be related to casino service. This factor was named Casino Service (11.58%). Factor 3 contained five items that appeared to be related to location convenience. This factor was named Convenience (9.78%). Factor 4 contained five items that appeared related to casino atmosphere. This factor was named Tranquil and Winning (8.93%). Factor 5 contained four items that appeared to be related to casino smoking policy. This factor was named Scenic and Smoking Policy (8.81%). Factor 6 contained five items that appeared to be related to casino non-gaming amenities. This factor was named Social and Entertainment (8.42%). Finally, Factor 7 contained three items that appeared to be related to relief and escape. This factor was named Relief and Escape (6.33%).

Table 3

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Casino Motives	Factor Loadings	Communalities	Means (Comp)	SD
<u>Factor 1: Loyalty (Eigenvalue=10.35; Variance=11.78; Reliability Alpha=0.862)</u>				
Membership Benefits	0.864	0.796	3.91	1.737
Membership Tier-level	0.843	0.775	3.73	1.787
Promotional Offers	0.752	0.621	4.72	1.532
Loyalty	0.656	0.694	4.16	1.630
Complimentary Service	0.593	0.549	4.57	1.734
Comfortness	0.454	0.552	4.33	1.634
Casino Advertisements	0.421	0.476	3.99	1.512
<u>Factor 2: Employee Service (Eigenvalue=2.97; Variance=11.58; Reliability Alpha=0.807)</u>				
Prepared to be responsive	0.810	0.745	4.89	1.268
Friendly and polite	0.801	0.746	4.98	1.209
Consistent quality service	0.760	0.765	5.26	1.130
Service kept up-to-date	0.726	0.649	4.91	1.589
Knowledgeable employees	0.577	0.652	4.07	1.589
Relationship with employees	0.427	0.66	3.38	1.626
<u>Factor 3: Convenience (Eigenvalue=2.78; Variance=9.78; Reliability Alpha=0.841)</u>				
Proximity to casino	0.874	0.786	4.59	1.851
Driving time	0.820	0.732	4.40	1.849
Transportation costs	0.706	0.589	4.03	1.728
Safety and Security	0.612	0.574	4.64	1.484
Neighborhood opportunity	0.591	0.686	3.22	1.730
<u>Factor 4: Tranquil & Winning (Eigenvalue=2.57; Variance=8.93; Reliability Alpha=0.807)</u>				
Facility Design	0.742	0.706	4.54	1.517
Visually Attractive Furniture	0.731	0.719	4.43	1.512
Uniqueness	0.658	0.583	4.13	1.560
Floor Layouts	0.611	0.629	4.73	1.437
Winning Perception	0.441	0.449	4.45	1.621
<u>Factor 5: Scenic & Smoking Policy (Eigenvalue=1.68; Variance= 8.81; Reliability Alpha=0.859)</u>				
Avoid Secondhand smoke	0.891	0.822	4.16	1.972
Non-smoking areas	0.885	0.826	4.50	1.919
Overall air quality	0.776	0.736	4.74	1.640
Smoking and non-smoking area	0.653	0.531	4.72	1.820
<u>Factor 6: Social & Entertainment (Eigenvalue=1.36; Variance= 8.42; Reliability Alpha=0.794)</u>				
Non-gaming Amenities	0.461	0.559	5.14	1.296
Exciting Activities	0.579	0.583	4.35	1.779
Place large bets	0.639	0.685	3.03	1.737
Use of dice and roulette	0.707	0.674	3.37	1.926
Variety of table games	0.787	0.744	3.82	1.908

Factor 7: Relief & Escape (Eigenvalue=1.26;Variance=6.33;Reliability Alpha=0.617)

Have fun with relatives	0.657	0.552	5.70	1.209
Wide selection of casino features	0.645	0.594	5.29	1.337
Various slot machine types	0.568	0.534	5.31	1.511

Note. Thirty six casino motivational items were used for initial exploratory factor analysis. One item was removed because of its low communality level. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization was used for this analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was 0.89. Total variance explained was 65.63%. Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranged from 0.62 to 0.86. The scale ranged from 1= "strongly disagree" to 7= "strongly agree".

t-tests

The study employed an independent t-test to examine the mean difference in casino motives between California resident Indian gamblers and California resident Las Vegas gamblers. The independent t-test was used to determine whether there is a significant difference between the casino motivations of residents who prefer to gamble at California Indian casinos versus residents who prefer to gamble at Las Vegas casinos. The results indicated that there exists a significant difference in terms of casino motivations. For individuals who gamble at Indian casinos showed stronger tendencies for proximity of casino (5.26/3.91). California residents who gamble at California Indian casinos have a relatively stronger tendency to driving distance (4.97/3.80). They wouldn't want to drive for a while just to gamble at casinos. Individual items that are related to loyalty are more important to California residents who are more emotionally attached to Las Vegas casinos. Finally, individual items that are closely related to social and entertainment were relatively appealing to Las Vegas gamblers. They tend to enjoy casino non-gaming amenities (3.89/4.81). For entertaining amenities, such as pool, spa, and nightlife, California resident Las Vegas gamblers think it is important. Composite means for seven casino motivations were calculated and then compared across California Indian casino gamblers and Las Vegas gamblers, as shown in table 4. The results showed that California Indian casino gamblers ($M = 4.58$) had higher composite scores on the Convenience factor than Las Vegas casino gamblers ($M = 3.77$), $t(298) = 5.364, p < .05$. In contrast, California Indian casino gamblers ($M = 3.68$) had lower composite scores on the Social and Entertainment Factor than Las Vegas casino gamblers ($M = 4.20$), $t(298) = -3.571, p < .05$. a result, California Indian casino and

Las Vegas gamblers were related with statistically significant mean differences. Table 4 indicates the results of casino segment comparison. Table 5 presents the results of t-tests for individual casino motivational items.

Table 4

Results of casino segment comparison

Casino Motivational Factors	Composite Mean		t-statistic	Sig.
	California Gamblers	Las Vegas Gamblers		
1. Loyalty	4.33(1.12)	4.25(1.11)	0.644	0.52
2. Employee Service	4.61(1.08)	4.55(1.03)	0.492	0.62
3. Convenience	4.58(1.22)	3.77(1.37)	5.364	0.000*
4. Tranquil & winning	4.36(1.16)	4.56(1.13)	-1.521	0.13
5. Scenic & smoking policy	4.53(1.52)	4.53(1.57)	0.005	0.99
6. Social & entertainment	3.68(1.37)	4.20(1.15)	-3.571	0.000*
7. Relief & Escape	5.44(1.00)	5.43(1.05)	0.09	0.93

* $p < 0.05$

Table 5

t-tests for Individual Casino Motivational Item

Items	Composite Mean		t-statistic	Sig.
	California gamblers	Las Vegas gamblers		
<u>Factor 3. Convenience</u>				
Close proximity to casino	5.26	3.91	17.56	0.000*
Easier to drive to casino	4.97	3.80	4.883	0.028*
<u>Factor 6. Social & entertainment</u>				
Entertaining amenities that excite my visit, including pool, spa, and nightlife	3.89	4.81	7.513	0.006*

* $p < 0.05$

One-Way ANOVAs

The normality assumption was evaluated by examining the skew and kurtosis values of each groups' distributions for each dependent variable. This suggests that normality assumption is satisfied. There were no violations of the homogeneity of variance assumption. The subjects were unrelated, which indicates that the independent assumption is also met. One-way ANOVAs were conducted to assess the possible differences among the casino motivational factors measures as well as among the demographic variables as a function of the type of California resident casino gambler. The dependent variables were the composite scores on the seven different casino factors identified in the principal component analysis. The independent variables were gender, age, education, income, ethnicity, and occupation. Moreover, post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests were conducted to identify which means were significantly different from each other.

One-way ANOVA test indicated that there were statistically significant differences between males and females in terms of casino motivations. In comparing the seven different factors, male California Indian casino gamblers agreed more with Social and Entertainment component items than female gamblers. $F(5, 294) = 32.210$, $p < 0.05$. In contrast, female California Indian gamblers reported less agreement with statement related to social and entertainment items than males. Female Las Vegas casino gamblers agreed with more statements related to Relief and Escape items than males. $F(1, 146) = 5.490$, $p < 0.05$.

Table 6

One-way ANOVA and gender

California Indian casino gamblers				
Group means				
Casino factors	Male	Female	F	Sig.
Loyalty	4.38	4.29	0.264	0.608
Employee service	4.71	4.53	0.997	0.320
Convenience	4.70	4.47	1.282	0.259
Tranquil & winning	4.33	4.38	0.067	0.796
Scenic & smoking policy	4.66	4.43	0.848	0.359
Social & entertainment	3.93	3.49	3.913	0.050*
Relief & escape	5.33	5.52	1.474	0.227

* $p < 0.05$

Male (n=66); Female (n=86).

Las Vegas casino gamblers				
Group means				
Casino factors	Male	Female	F	Sig.
Loyalty	4.31	4.20	0.417	0.519
Employee service	4.63	4.49	0.729	0.395
Convenience	3.79	3.75	0.021	0.886
Tranquil & winning	4.50	4.60	0.224	0.637
Scenic & smoking policy	4.54	4.52	0.005	0.945
Social & entertainment	4.31	4.12	1.003	0.318
Relief & escape	5.20	5.60	5.487	0.021*

* $p < 0.05$

Male (n=64); Female (n=84).

As shown in Table 7, one-way ANOVAs and post-hoc Tukey's HSD tested for the relationship between California Indian and Las Vegas gamblers. The results showed that there were significant differences between age and factor composite scores.

California Indian gamblers aged between 21 and 50 years old agreed more with statements related to Loyalty compared to older groups. In addition, California Indian casino gamblers aged 41 and 50 year olds agreed more with statements about Employee Service than 61 to 70 years old. $F(5, 146) = 3.052, p < 0.05$. Younger California Indian casino gamblers ($M = 4.87$) agreed more with statements related to Tranquil and Winning items than older gamblers ($M = 3.86$), as well as with statements related to

Social and Entertainment items (2.69). $F(5, 146) = 3.73, p < 0.05$. Las Vegas gamblers younger than 40 years old agreed more with items related to Loyalty, Tranquil and Winning, Social and Entertainment, Relief and Escape compared to older age groups. $F(5, 142) = 11.301, p < 0.05$.

Table 7

One-way ANOVA and age

California Indian casino gamblers									
Group means									
Casino Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.58	4.79	4.99	3.79	4.05	3.80	5.91	0.000*	4,5,6<2,3
Employee service	4.65	4.80	5.31	4.50	4.21	4.37	3.05	0.012*	5<3
Convenience	4.43	4.74	5.22	4.55	4.17	4.64	2.08	0.072	N/A
Tranquil & winning	4.35	4.87	4.81	4.19	3.86	4.10	3.73	0.003*	5<2,3
Scenic & smoking policy	4.31	4.82	4.81	4.34	4.44	4.45	0.60	0.707	N/A
Social & entertainment	4.50	4.79	4.17	3.24	2.69	2.18	22.76	0.000*	4,5,6<1,2,3
Relief & escape	5.20	5.22	5.94	5.53	5.55	5.17	1.85	0.107	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) 21-30 (n= 22); (2) 31-40 (n=34); (3) 41-50 (n=18); (4) 51-60 (n=33); (5) 61-70; (n=35); (6) 70 and up (n=10).

Las Vegas casino gamblers									
Group means									
Casino Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.03	4.15	3.10	2.53	0.03*	6<1
Employee service	4.72	4.86	4.39	4.37	4.60	3.74	1.88	0.10	N/A
Convenience	4.1	4.16	3.73	3.62	3.32	3.26	1.72	0.13	N/A
Tranquil & winning	5.02	4.92	4.50	4.22	4.41	3.26	4.79	0.00*	6<4;2<1
Scenic & smoking policy	4.62	5.13	4.37	4.51	4.00	4.50	1.50	0.20	N/A
Social & entertainment	4.84	4.95	4.16	3.64	3.71	3.03	11.3	0.00*	4,5,6<1,2
Relief & escape	5.5	5.8	5.41	5.27	5.50	4.38	2.34	0.045*	6<2

* $p < 0.05$

(1) 21-30 (n= 34); (2) 31-40 (n=26); (3) 41-50 (n=21); (4) 51-60 (n=33); (5) 61-70; (n=27); (6) 70 and up (n=7).

As shown in Table 8, one-way ANOVAs also assessed differences in different casino motivation factor composite scores between different ethnicities. There was one statistically significant difference for the California Indian casino gamblers' group:

Hispanic (M= 6.11) agreed more with items related to Relief and Escape than

Caucasians (M=5.56) and Asians (M= 4.73). $F(5, 146) = 2.770, p < 0.05$. By contrast,

there were no statistically significant differences found among six ethnicities. For Las Vegas gamblers' groups, no statistical significance was found in the mean difference between six different ethnicities.

Table 8

One-way ANOVA and ethnicity

California Indian casino gamblers									
Group means									
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.33	4.00	4.49	4.33	4.50	4.44	0.29	0.91	N/A
Employee service	4.68	4.22	4.45	5.11	5.00	4.30	1.01	0.40	N/A
Convenience	4.71	4.12	4.06	4.13	5.10	4.51	1.33	0.26	N/A
Tranquil & winning	4.37	4.00	4.45	4.70	4.00	4.36	0.38	0.86	N/A
Scenic & smoking policy	4.63	4.54	4.02	4.88	3.38	4.30	0.74	0.59	N/A
Social & entertainment	3.50	3.72	4.11	4.83	3.40	4.11	1.81	0.11	N/A
Relief & escape	5.56	5.31	5.15	6.11	5.17	4.73	2.77	0.02*	1,6<4

* $p < 0.05$

(1) Caucasian (n=104); (2) African-American (n=12); (3) Mexican-American (n=13); (4) Hispanic (n=6); (5) American Indian (n=2); (6) Asian/Pacific Islander (n=15).

Las Vegas casino gamblers									
Group means									
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	F	Sig.	
Loyalty	4.22	5.04	4.06	4.54	4.14	4.01	1.09	0.37	
Employee service	4.54	4.69	5.07	4.78	5.50	4.28	0.84	0.52	
Convenience	3.75	4.23	4.04	4.28	1.40	3.52	1.23	0.29	
Tranquil & winning	4.52	4.74	4.44	4.92	5.60	4.50	0.46	0.81	
Scenic & smoking policy	4.53	4.89	3.55	4.55	6.00	4.57	0.63	0.68	
Social & entertainment	4.15	4.31	4.16	4.74	3.40	4.24	0.59	0.71	
Relief & escape	5.50	4.95	5.87	5.13	6.67	5.23	1.18	0.32	

* $p < 0.05$

(1) Caucasian (n=103); (2) African-American (n=7); (3) Mexican-American (n=5); (4) Hispanic (n=10); (5) American Indian (n=1); (6) Asian/Pacific Islander (n=22).

As shown in Table 9, one-way ANOVAs were conducted to assess differences in agreement with items related to different casino motivations as a function of education level. For California Indian casino gamblers, those with four-year college degrees ($M = 4.36$) agreed with more items related to the Social and Entertainment factor than those with a high school diploma ($M = 3.35$). On the other hand, those with a

high school diploma agreed with more items related to the Relief and Escape factor than those with four-year college degrees ($M = 5.76$). $F(4,147) = 3.643, p < 0.05$.

For Las Vegas casino gamblers, those with two-year college degrees agreed more with items related to Tranquil and Winning, Scenic and Smoking Policy, and Social and Entertainment factor compared to those with other levels of education. In addition, those with two-year, four-year, and post-graduate degrees agreed more with items related to the Scenic and Smoking Policy factor. $F(4,143) = 2.681, p < 0.05$.

Table 9

One-way ANOVA and education

California Indian casino gamblers								
Group means								
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.37	4.26	4.41	4.47	3.83	0.80	0.53	N/A
Employee service	4.60	4.65	4.55	4.77	4.42	0.27	0.90	N/A
Convenience	4.60	4.66	4.49	4.82	4.08	0.82	0.51	N/A
Tranquil & winning	4.38	4.46	4.23	4.68	3.85	1.23	0.30	N/A
Scenic & smoking policy	4.17	4.64	4.47	5.08	4.38	1.38	0.24	N/A
Social & entertainment	3.35	3.40	3.97	4.36	2.93	4.05	0.004*	1,5<4
Relief & escape	5.76	5.59	5.01	5.57	5.53	3.64	0.007*	3<1

* $p < 0.05$

(1) High school (n=34); (2) 2-year college (n=35); (3) 4-year college (n=47); (4) Post graduate (n=24); (5) Other (n=12).

Las Vegas casino gamblers								
Group means								
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.09	4.59	4.17	3.9	4.48	1.87	0.12	N/A
Employee service	4.23	4.79	4.50	4.42	4.81	1.27	0.29	N/A
Convenience	3.47	4.28	3.59	3.75	3.18	2.27	0.05	N/A
Tranquil & winning	3.90	5.06	4.42	4.56	4.53	4.30	0.003*	1,3<2
Scenic & smoking policy	3.60	4.84	4.84	4.69	2.66	6.38	0.000*	1,5<2,3,4
Social & entertainment	3.56	4.46	4.33	4.14	3.78	2.68	0.034*	1<2
Relief & escape	5.57	5.64	5.32	5.25	5.33	0.87	0.49	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) High school (n=20); (2) 2-year college (n=41); (3) 4-year college (n=55); (4) Post graduate (n=24); (5) Other (n=8).

As shown in Table 10, a series of one-way ANOVAs were conducted to assess differences in composite scores of casino motivations factors as a function of income level. For California Indian casino gamblers, those with annual incomes greater than \$100,001 ($M = 4.32$) agreed more with items related to Social and Entertainment than those with annual incomes between \$10,001 and \$20,000 ($M = 3.09$). $F(6,145) = 2.150$, $p < 0.05$.

For Las Vegas casino gamblers, there were no statistically significant differences between seven different education levels.

Table 10

One-way ANOVA and income

California Indian casino gamblers										
Group means										
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.73	4.06	4.21	4.27	4.27	4.48	4.53	0.55	0.77	N/A
Employee service	5.13	4.65	4.46	4.58	4.58	4.75	4.60	0.48	0.82	N/A
Convenience	5.47	4.56	4.70	4.30	4.15	4.90	4.78	2.15	0.05	N/A
Tranquil & winning	4.64	4.62	4.23	4.23	4.24	4.62	4.61	0.82	0.56	N/A
Scenic & smoking policy	3.89	5.02	4.33	4.76	4.26	4.54	4.89	1.1	0.37	N/A
Social & entertainment	3.60	3.09	3.21	3.74	3.82	3.68	4.32	2.06	0.05*	2<7
Relief & escape	5.74	5.61	5.58	5.49	5.20	5.39	5.37	0.62	0.71	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) \$10,000 or less (n=9); (2) \$10,001-\$20,000 (n=11); (3) \$20,001-\$40,000 (n=33); (4) \$40,001-\$60,000 (n=28); (5) \$60,001-\$80,000 (n=33); (6) \$80,001-\$100,000 (n=12); (7) \$100,001 or more (n=26).

Las Vegas casino gamblers										
Group means										
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	3.96	3.64	4.21	4.67	4.25	4.11	4.27	1.23	0.29	N/A
Employee service	4.17	4.24	4.48	4.81	4.57	4.44	4.60	0.55	0.77	N/A
Convenience	5.20	3.49	3.76	4.16	3.41	4.27	3.51	2.15	0.05	N/A
Tranquil & winning	5.00	3.91	4.53	5.00	4.56	4.62	4.42	1.44	0.20	N/A
Scenic & smoking policy	3.94	4.39	4.59	4.51	4.49	4.96	4.44	0.34	0.92	N/A
Social & entertainment	4.00	3.42	4.10	4.52	4.14	4.11	4.40	1.46	0.20	N/A
Relief & escape	5.50	5.24	5.47	5.82	5.51	5.12	5.30	1.00	0.43	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) \$10,000 or less (n=4); (2) \$10,001-\$20,000 (n=11); (3) \$20,001-\$40,000 (n=25); (4) \$40,001-\$60,000 (n=24); (5) \$60,001-\$80,000 (n=27); (6) \$80,001-\$100,000 (n=17); (7) \$100,001 or more (n=40).

As shown in Table 11, a series of one-way ANOVAs were conducted to assess differences in composite scores of casino motivations factors as a function of occupation. For California Indian casino gamblers, there were statistically significant differences on the Loyalty factor, and on the Social and Entertainment factor. Post-hoc Tukey's HSD revealed that those with full-time jobs ($M= 4.62$) agreed more with Loyalty factor items than those who are retired ($M= 3.92$). $F(7,144) = 2.250, p < 0.05$. Moreover, those with part-time ($M=3.83$) and full-time ($M=4.51$) jobs agreed with more Social and Entertainment factor items than those who are homemakers ($M=3.31$), unemployed ($M=2.80$), and retired ($M=2.68$). $F(7,144) = 10.438, p < 0.05$.

For Las Vegas gamblers, there was a statistically significant difference among Convenience factor composite score as a function of occupation, Post-hoc Tukey's HSD tests revealed that those who are unemployed ($M=5.85$) agreed more with Location Convenience factor items than those with part-time jobs ($M= 3.38$), $F(7,140) = 3.06, p < 0.05$. Similarly, those with full-time jobs ($M= 4.73$) agreed more with Social and Entertainment factor items than those with part-time jobs ($M= 3.56$), homemakers ($M = 3.79$), and those who are retired ($M = 3.28$). $F(7,140) = 7.204, p < 0.05$.

Table 11

One-way ANOVA and occupation

California Indian casino gamblers											
Group means											
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	4.37	4.62	4.06	3.64	4.48	3.99	3.92	5.02	2.52	0.03*	7<2
Employee service	4.47	4.76	4.52	4.17	4.28	4.68	4.31	5.64	1.72	0.11	N/A
Convenience	4.39	4.74	4.11	5.10	4.80	5.28	4.17	5.29	2.10	0.05	N/A
Tranquil & winning	4.41	4.55	4.51	4.60	4.27	4.20	3.92	4.97	1.47	0.18	N/A
Scenic & smoking policy	4.42	4.78	3.34	5.50	3.50	4.53	4.55	4.43	1.58	0.15	N/A
Social & entertainment	3.83	4.51	3.31	4.40	3.80	2.80	2.68	3.40	10	0.000*	3,6,7 <1,2
Relief & escape	5.40	5.30	5.73	5.83	5.11	5.77	5.32	6.24	1.21	0.30	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) Part-time employee (n=15); (2) Full-time employee (n=63); (3) Homemaker (n=11); (4) Professional jobs (n=2); (5) Student (n=3); (6) Unemployed (n=10); (7) Retired (n=41); (8) Other (n=7).

Las Vegas casino gamblers											
Group means											
Casino factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	F	Sig.	Post-hoc
Loyalty	3.91	4.47	4.07	4.67	4.02	5.25	4.00	3.55	1.90	0.07	N/A
Employee service	4.20	4.69	4.34	4.61	4.64	5.30	4.40	4.25	0.95	0.47	N/A
Convenience	3.38	3.78	3.83	4.60	4.80	5.85	3.24	3.80	3.06	0.005*	1<6
Tranquil & winning	3.92	4.70	4.53	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.32	4.48	1.03	0.41	N/A
Scenic & smoking polic	4.45	4.48	4.67	6.00	4.29	4.94	4.35	4.94	0.59	0.76	N/A
Social & entertainment	3.56	4.73	3.79	4.87	4.42	4.75	3.48	3.28	7.20	0.000*	1,3,7,8<2
Relief & escape	5.27	5.39	5.79	4.89	5.9	6.25	5.22	5.46	1.18	0.32	N/A

* $p < 0.05$

(1) Part-time employee (n=10); (2) Full-time employee (n=70); (3) Homemaker (n=16); (4) Professional jobs (n=3); (5) Student (n=7); (6) Unemployed (n=4); (7) Retired (n=30); (8) Other (n=8)

DISCUSSIONS

The current study aimed to investigate California residents' motivations to gamble at California Indian and Las Vegas casinos, as well as identify their demographic profiles. The findings from this study provide insight into the motivations of California resident casino gamblers. Through a thorough literature review, this study identified a set of potential factors that motivated California resident gamblers to gamble, designed a survey to assess agreement with these motivations, and then used principal component analysis to identify several components, or groups of items that respondents agreed with to a similar extent. This seven component solution yielded components related to Loyalty, Employee Service, Convenience, Tranquil and Winning, Scenic and Smoking Policy, Social and Entertainment, and Relief and Escape. Finally, a series of analyses revealed that different demographics were related to different motivations that depended, in part, on whether California resident casino gamblers preferred to gamble at California Indian casinos or at Las Vegas casinos.

The principal component analysis revealed a set of factors that appear important for understanding the motivations of casino gamblers. The Loyalty factor included items related to motivations to maintain membership tier-levels, maintain membership benefits, and receive promotional goods. The casino employee service factor included items related to motivations to visit casinos that have friendly employees, polite employees, and employees that deliver consistent quality service. The Convenience is another important factor that included items related to motivations to visit casinos where respondents considered driving distance, transportation costs, and the safety and security of a visit.

The Tranquil and winning factor included items related to motivations to visit casinos because of the casino's floor designs, the casino's uniqueness, and casino facility's design. The Scenic and Smoking Policy component included items related to motivations to visit casinos concerning the environment, such as the overall air quality and the amount of secondhand smoke in a casino. Previous studies have indicated that the casino market is paying close attention to the growing desire among casino patrons for the establishment of smoking and non-smoking areas (Timberlake et al., 2012). The current study revealed that California resident gamblers who prefer to gamble at California Indian and Las Vegas casinos are somewhat concerned about avoiding secondhand smoke, suggesting that these gamblers would appreciate the establishment of smoking and non-smoking areas. Therefore, casinos that provide separate smoking and non-smoking areas might motivate California residents' decisions to visit and gamble at California Indian or Las Vegas casinos. The Social and Entertainment component included items related to enjoying non-gaming amenities, such as pool, spa, and other nightlife activities. By contrast, the current study found that, among California residents who preferred to gamble at California Indian and Las Vegas casinos, those with full-time jobs appeared more motivated by the availability of non-gaming amenities compared to those other occupations or who were unemployed. This contrasts with previous research from Kingi et al. (2007) that unemployed gamblers are more likely to search for entertainment. The Relief and Escape component included items related to motivations to visit casinos in order to have fun with friends and family, and to enjoy a variety of casino games, including slot machines. Interestingly, the current study showed difference between male and female Las Vegas gamblers on overall scores on the Relief and Escape

component. This is consistent with Brenner and Brenner (1990), who found that women seek different types of slot machine games. In terms of ethnicity, the finding is also consistent with Yip et al. (2011), who found that Hispanic gamblers are more likely to engage in gambling activities than Caucasian. The current study also found results that differed from prior research. This study found that Las Vegas gamblers with lower levels of education agreed more with Relief and Escape items than those with higher levels of education. By contrast, Martin et al. (2011) found that those with higher levels of education more frequently visited casinos to gamble. In terms of employment status, both groups with full-time jobs perceived Social and Entertainment factor importantly.

The findings from differences between demographical variables and casino motives suggested that groups of people may have different motivations and perceptions toward a casino visit. Different age groups, annual income they earn, education level, ethnicity, and occupations are important demographic variables that need to be carefully considered when attempting to understand their behaviors.

Among California residents who gamble at California Indian casinos, male gamblers are more interested in fun elements as they play games. Non-gaming amenities appeared to be more important to males than female gamblers. Young California gamblers are more interested in hard-core gambling, loyalty, employee service, and entertainments. The finding indicated that young gamblers tend to receive a variety of different membership benefits. On the other hand, older groups indicated that the close proximity to a casino was a relatively important aspect that motivates them to gamble. Relief and Escape, was deemed more important to Hispanic gamblers than Caucasians and Asians. Yip et al. (2011) revealed that African-Americans showed a higher frequency

on casino gambling. However, this study found that Hispanics perceived Relief and Escape factor importantly when gambling. Also, individuals with higher education tend to look for fun activities and entertainments when they play games. The Social and Entertainment factor was more preferred by gamblers with annual income of more than \$100,001. They like to experience nightlife activities, but are not much interested in travelling long distances just to gamble. Experiencing non-gaming activities, such as nightlife, spas, pools, and many other exciting activities had a significantly higher level of agreement among those gamblers who are financially well-off. In the area of Loyalty, California Indian casino gamblers with full-time occupations perceived it as important casino motivation. They tend to receive different membership benefits while maintaining their current member status.

Female Las Vegas gamblers prefer to play slot machine games. Also, they are most likely to have fun with their friends and families. According to Bernhard et al (2007), females like to socialize and get along with other players at casinos. However, this study revealed that female gamblers are more interested in building a relationship with their relatives playing slot machine games. California residents who visit Las Vegas casinos are young, and more concerned about the overall atmosphere of the casino floor. They tend to enjoy casino non-gaming amenities, such as shopping, dining, and other fun activities. There were statistically significant differences between young and old age groups. All factors except for Employee service, Convenience, and Scenic and Smoking Policy were chosen as the most important casino motives by young Las Vegas gamblers. In terms of ethnicity, their perceptions toward casino motives were not varied. Gamblers with higher education level tend to give top priority to experiencing attractive and fun

atmospheres, whereas those who have two-year college degrees give top priority to winning the games. In general, gamblers with annual income between \$40,001 and \$60,000 look for a wide selection of casino games where they can enjoy with other people. Moreover, unemployed gamblers are more likely concerned about close proximity. Instead, those with full-time occupations seek to enjoy non-gaming amenities.

Age was an important variable for California gamblers, indicated by the finding that older California gamblers were motivated by location Convenience than younger California gamblers. One potential reason for this is that older gamblers may have a more difficult time driving to casinos to ailments that affect aging individuals, such as vision loss, hearing loss, and fatigue. Occupation was an important variable for Las Vegas gamblers because gamblers with no jobs are likely to consider location an important motivation that affects their casino visits. If gamblers are unemployed, it would be harder for them to afford expenses that will be needed to go to Las Vegas, including transportation, lodging, dining, and gas. Although Las Vegas offers various types of entertainment services to their casino gamblers, such as shows, perks, points, food, beverages, and free plays, it would be most effective to provide distinctive services specifically designed for California residents. Las Vegas sends mail invitations to casino gamblers, but it is suggested that they develop higher amount of discounts or increased points offers just for California residents. As stated in Las Vegas Visitor Profile (2013), Las Vegas casino market is widely comprised of California residents, thus it is important to retain them by offering differentiated services.

The current findings suggest practical marketing strategies for casino marketers in both California Indian and Las Vegas casinos. Casino marketers should use different

strategies that speak to the different motivations of California residents who gamble at California Indian and those who gamble at Las Vegas casinos. It is crucial for both casinos to use several different marketing strategies.

California Indian casinos should advertise how close and convenient it is to access to their casinos. Indeed, location was an important motivation (Titz et al., 2001; Yi & Busser, 2008). The results of this study also indicated that the close proximity is most likely to enhance satisfaction level of California gamblers, which is consistent with the findings from previous studies (Titz et al., 2001; Yi & Busser, 2008). Therefore, California Indian casino gamblers could be better enticed with offers for gaming, dining, and entertainment services. Employee Service was also considered one of the most important areas that influence California gamblers' visits. It would be effective to emphasize that the location can ensure gamblers' safety and security concerns. Casinos should encourage their employees to provide consistent service to their guests by effectively recruiting and managing employees. Moreover, Social and Entertainment are the areas gamblers search for, but are not actively provided by California casinos. California Indian casinos should advertise or offer more opportunities for sightseeing, shopping, drinking, eating, and fun activities should be offered to gamblers. In addition, they should offer payback percentages to lure California gamblers because they emphasize the chance that gamblers could win often with wide selections of casino games. Finally, because the results also indicated that California residents choose to gamble at Las Vegas because of its visually attractive environment, California Indian casinos should consider changing the floor themes, and its casino facility design in order to improve the overall atmosphere.

The results of the study suggest a different set of marketing strategies for Las Vegas casinos to entice California residents who prefer to gamble in California. Las Vegas casino gamblers may be motivated to experience fun elements, diverse entertainment, and exciting activities around the casino motivate their visits. It would most effective way to develop sightseeing, shopping, or dining services to attract California gamblers while giving them complimentary casino chips, limousine rides, rewards benefits, show tickets, and casino perks. This would make California residents to stay longer and spend more on gambling. Because females prefer to have fun with friends and family, more activities, such as pool, spas, and retail shops where they can enjoy with other people would be effective marketing strategy to consider. Martin et al. (2011) stated that the location is one of the important motivations that gamblers are concerned about since it can ensure their safety and security. The study showed that individuals, especially females who gamble at Las Vegas casinos, were motivated by location. Las Vegas casinos need to ensure safer environments for their California casino patrons. As a consequence, more California residents would revisit the casinos. Lastly, it would also be effective to provide promotions through direct mails and invitations to lure gamblers from California.

CONCLUSION

Although the casino industry has been increasingly focusing on gambling behavior, little to no research has explored the motivations of California residents to gamble either at California Indian or Las Vegas casinos. The goal of this study was to identify what motivates California residents to gamble at either of these casino types, and to compare the casino perception between demographic variables. Overall, this study found that California residents are motivated to visit casinos for different reasons, which has practical implications for these casinos' marketing strategies. The results also have theoretical implications in that California residents may consider these motivations prior to making a decision about whether to visit a casino to gamble as well as which casino to visit. Future research should explore how these motivations are related to self-reported and actual casino behavior.

In response to the research objective relating to California gamblers' needs and wants, the results of different statistical approach of this study showed that casino rewards program, consistent quality service, locations, tranquil and winning, fun activities, smoking policies, and relaxing atmosphere are the significant items influencing gamblers' perceptions in selection between Indian and Las Vegas casinos.

The findings of this study suggested importance of casino motives of California residents that contain valuable insights for both casino marketers. With the effort to identify casino motivations in California state, this study can be reflected on the bottom line of the casino motivational studies, which leads to a growing investigation about casino motives of other states. The future casino management should be reevaluated to ensure the satisfaction and expectation of the gamblers.

This study was interested in understanding what motivates California residents to gamble at California Indian casinos or at Las Vegas casinos. This study found important demographic differences in these types of gamblers as well as motivational differences using a highly content-valid survey of different motivations. After considering which motivations are most important for California residents, future research should consider whether these stronger motivations can actually motivate California resident gamblers to visit casinos to gamble, to visit more frequently, and to spend more money. Thus, the current research adds to a growing body of research of casino behavior by exploring the motivations of California residents to gamble.

Although this study provides rare and valuable insights related to exploring the casino motives and measuring the differences among California residents, the findings of this study must be interpreted with caution. First, there is a lack of representation of the California resident sample. The study targeted California casino gamblers, and they were randomly selected that the area of specific regions could not be identified. In light of this limitation, the results may not be able to represent the entire California residents. For this reason, the chosen participants of this study were not classified as representative for each particular region. Future studies should adequately separate California residents from each region to find out about the motivational differences between California residents who gamble at California Indian and those who gamble at Las Vegas casinos.

Another limitation is that the data were collected with a small sample that may not be representative. Therefore, future research should be verified in larger samples since it also allows a more detailed segmentation as there would be more involvement level and a possible use of more clusters. Future studies are encouraged to expand the casino

motivational items to explore how different casino motives can influence California gamblers. Researchers may want to consider exploring which particular casino motivations could better fulfill California resident gamblers' needs with larger inclusion of motivational items, and the future results would be applicable across different California regions.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, W., & Bunch, R. (2012). A comparative analysis of Indian gaming in the united states. *American Indian Quarterly*, 36(1), 50-74.
- AGA (American Gaming Association) (2011). *The AGA survey of casino entertainment*. Washington, DC: AGA. Retrieved from:
<http://www.americangaming.org/files/aga/uploads/docs/sos/aga-sos-2011.pdf>
- Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights (2015). Retrieved May 1, 2015, from www.no-smoke.org
- Anders, G. (1998). Indian gaming: Financial and regulatory issues. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 556(1), 98-108.
- Backman, S. J., & Crompton, J. L. (1991a). The usefulness of selected variables in predicting activity loyalty. *Leisure Sciences*, 13, 205-220.
- Baker, T.L. (1994), *Doing Social research* (2nd Edn.), New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Barsky, J., & Tzolov, T. (2010). The effectiveness of casino loyalty programs-their influence on satisfaction, emotional connections, loyalty and price sensitivity. Retrieved from
http://repository.usfca.edu/ml/1/?utm_source=repository.usfca.edu%2Fml%2F1&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- Bernhard, B. , Dickens, D. , & Shapiro, P. (2007). Gambling alone? a study of solitary and social gambling in america. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 11(2), 1.

- Bradley, G. , & Becker, C. (2011). Consumer attitudes and visit intentions relative to a voluntary smoking ban in a single casino resort with a dense competitive set. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal*, 7(2), 41.
- Brenner, R., & Brenner, G. A. (1990). *Gambling and Speculation: A Theory, a History and a Future of some Human Decisions*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryant, L., Walker, D. (2010). Profitability and return on investment from casino amenities. Retrieved from <http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/hhrcg/1>
- Brokenleg, I. “Shaneequa,” Barber, T. K., Bennett, N. L., Peart Boyce, S., & Blue Bird Jernigan, V. (2014). Gambling with our health. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 47(3), 290–299. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2014.04.006
- Burton, B. (n.d). Comp basics. Retrieved from <http://casinogambling.about.com/cs/comps/a/compbasic.htm>
- Crofts, C. R. (2011). An exploratory study of casino customer loyalty programs. Retrieved from <http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/1096/>
- Crosby, L. A., & Taylor, J. R. (1983). Psychological commitment and its effects on post-decision evaluation and preference stability among voters. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9, 29-35.
- Chhabra, D. (2007). Ethnicity and marginality effects on casino gambling behavior. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13(3), 221-238.
- Dense, J., & Barrow, C. W. (2003). Estimating casino expenditures by out-of-state patrons: Native American gaming in Connecticut. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 410–415.

- Drèze, X. , & Nunes, J. (2009). Feeling superior: The impact of loyalty program structure on consumers' perceptions of status. *Journal of Consumer Research*,35(6), 890-905.
- Doocey, P. (2003). Slot Secrets Revealed. *Casino Journal*, 16 (9), 60–62.
- Eadington, W. R., Wells, R. H., & Gossi, D. (2010). Estimating the impact of California tribal gaming on demand for casino gaming in Nevada. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 14(2), 33–45.
- Grisaffe, D. , & Nguyen, H. (2011). Antecedents of emotional attachment to brands. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(10), 1052-1059.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (6thed). Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hu, W. , Borden, G. , Harris, T. , & Maynard, L. (2008). Do job, age, and place of residence matter for gaming activity? a study of the mid-colorado river communities. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 12(1/2), 29.
- Iwasaki, Y., & Havitz, M. E. (2004). Examining relationships between leisure involvement, psychological commitment and loyalty to a recreation agency. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36, 45–72.
- Jeon, S., & Hyun., S. (2013). Examining the influence of casino attributes on baby boomers' satisfaction and loyalty in the casino industry. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16(4), 343-368.
- Johnson, L. (2012). Using the critical incident technique to assess gaming customer satisfaction. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 6(2), 1.

- Johnson, L., Mayer, K. J., & Champaner, E. (2012). Casino atmospherics from a customer's perspective: a re-examination. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 8(2), 1.
- Kaiser, H.F. (1974) An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39, 31-36.
- Kingi, P., Clarke, D, Abbott, M., Tse, S., Manai, W., et al. (2007). Reasons for starting and continuing gambling in a mixed ethnic community sample of pathological and non-problem gamblers. *International Gambling Studies*, 7(3), 299-313.
- Klebanow, A. (2009). Customer reinvestment analysis in the gaming industry. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 1(4), 386-391.
- Lam, D. (2007). An observation study of Chinese baccarat players. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 11(2), 63.
- Las Vegas Visitor Profile. (2013). Retrieved March 3, 2015, from <http://www.lvcva.com/stats-and-facts/visitor-statistics/>
- Las Vegas Visitor Profile. (2014). Retrieved April 20, 2015, from <http://www.lvcva.com/stats-and-facts/visitor-statistics/>
- Gaming Statistics (2015). Retrieved April 30, 2015, from <http://rubinbrown.com/Industries/gaming.aspx>
- Laurent, G., & Kapferer, J. (1985). Measuring consumer involvement profiles. *Journal of Marketing Research*, XXII, 41–53.
- Lio, H.-L. M., & Rody, R. (2012). The emotional impact of casino servicescape. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 13(2), 2.
- Liu, Y. (2007). The long-term impact of loyalty programs on consumer purchase behavior and loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 71(4), 19–35.

- Lucas, A. F. (2003). Measuring the effect Of casino-operated restaurant volume on slot machine business volume: An exploratory study. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 27(1), 101–117. doi:10.1177/1096348002238883
- Lucas, A. F., Dunn, W. T., & Singh, A. K. (2005). Estimating the short-term effect of free-play offers in a Las Vegas hotel casino. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 18(2), 53–68. doi:10.1300/J073v18n02_05
- Lucas, A. F., & Tanford, S. (2012). Evaluating the impact of a new resort amenity on gaming business volumes. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 14(2), 1.
- MacDonald, A., & Eadington, W. R. (2012). The systematic study of gaming operations. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 16(2), 3.
- Mayer, K. , & Johnson, L. (2003). A customer-based assessment of casino atmospherics. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 7(1), 21.
- Mayer, K.J., Johnson, L., Hu, C., & Chen, S. (1998). Gaming customer satisfaction: An exploratory study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37, 178–183.
- McGowan, R., & Brown, T. (2009). Revenue generation at casino resorts: The use of “comp”-based promotions. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 13, 363–385.
- McNeilly, D. P., & Burke, W. F. (2000). Late life gambling: The attitudes and behaviors of older adults. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 16, 393–415.
- Meczka, Katharine S., "Complimentary rewards in Las Vegas casinos: A literature synthesis and recommendations for profitable complimentary reward programs" (2010). UNLV Theses/Dissertations/Professional Papers/Capstones. Paper 554.

- Mi Jeon, S. , Magnini, V. , Kim, I. , & Sean Hyun, S. (2013). Causal relationships between table game players' perceptions of service quality, perceived winning, and game spending. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(6), 922-944.
- National Indian Gaming Commission (n.d). Retrieved April 4, 2015, from www.nigc.gov
- Nower, L. , & Blaszczynski, A. (2010). Gambling motivations, money-limiting strategies, and precommitment preferences of problem versus non-problem gamblers. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26(3), 361-372.
- Palmer, R., & Mahoney, E. (2005). Winners and Losers: segmenting a casino loyalty programme. *International Gambling Studies*, 5(2), 271–287.
doi:10.1080/14459790500303501
- Petry, N. M., Stinson, F. S., & Grant, B. F. (2005). Comorbidity of DSM-IV pathological gambling and other psychiatric disorders: Results from the national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 66(5), 564–574.
- Petry, Nancy M, Carla J Rash, and Carlos Blanco. "The Inventory of gambling situations in problem and pathological gamblers seeking alcohol and drug abuse treatment." *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 18.6 (2010): 530-538.
- Petrillose, M. J., & Brewer, K. P. (2012). An exploration of customer retention factors in Las Vegas casino resort properties. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 5(2), 1.
- Petty, N., & Oncken, C. (2002). Cigarette smoking is associated with increased severity of gambling problems in treatment-seeking gamblers. *Addiction* , 97, 745-753.

- Perfetto, R. , & Woodside, A. (2009). Extremely frequent behavior in consumer research: Theory and empirical evidence for chronic casino gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 25(3), 297-316.
- Pfaffenberg, C. J., & Costello, C. (2002). Items of importance to patrons of Indian and Riverboat casinos. *Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 6(1), 33.
- Prentice, C. (2013). Service quality perceptions and customer loyalty in casinos. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(1), 49-64.
- Prentice, C. , & King, B. (2011). The influence of emotional intelligence on the service performance of casino frontline employees. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11(1), 49-66.
- Repetti, T. (2013). The finance and marketing dilemma: Do promotional allowances actually increase revenue and profits for Atlantic city casinos?. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 17(1), 1.
- Richard, M.D., & Adrian, C.M. (1996). Determinants of casino repeat purchase intentions. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 4(3), 25–39.
- Rosenbaum, M. S. (2009b). Restorative servicescapes: restoring directed attention in third places. *Journal of Service Management*, 20, 173-191.
- Rousseau, GG., & Venter, DJL. (2002). Measuring consumer attitudes towards gambling. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 87-92.
- Shinnar, R. , Young, C. , & Corsun, D. (2004). Las Vegas locals as gamblers and hosts to visiting friends and family: Characteristics and gaming behavior. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 8(2), 39.

- Shoemaker, S., & Lewis, R. (1999), Customer loyalty in hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 18, No. 4 pp. 345-370.
- Shoemaker, S., & Zemke, D. M. V. (2005). The “Locals” Market: An emerging gaming segment. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 21(4), 379–410. doi:10.1007/s10899-005-5555-5
- Siu, R. (2007). Is casino gaming a productive sector? A conceptual and cross-jurisdiction analysis. *Journal of Gambling Business and Economics*, 1(2), 129–146.
- Spilde, K. , & Taylor, J. (2013). Economic evidence on the effects of the Indian gaming regulatory act on Indians and non-Indians. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 17(1), 13.
- Suh, E. (2012). Estimating the impact of free-play coupon value on players’ slot gaming volumes. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 53(2), 134-143.
- Suh, E., & Tanford, S. (2012). The impact of paid versus complimentary showroom entertainment on gaming volumes. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 21(4), 374–394. doi:10.1080/19368623.2011.615024
- Tanford, S., & Suh, E. (2013). How restaurant variety indirectly impacts gaming for different casino worth segments. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(3), 328–345. doi:10.1108/09596111311311008
- Tarras, J. , Singh, A. , & Moufakkir, O. (2000). The profile and motivations of elderly women gamblers. *Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 5(1), 33.
- Thalheimer, R. , & Ali, M. (2008). The demand for casino gaming with special reference to a smoking ban. *Economic Inquiry*, 46(2), 273-282.

- Timberlake, D. , Wu, J. , & Al-Delaimy, W. (2012). Tribal casinos in california: The last vestige of indoor smoking. *Bmc Public Health*, 12(1), 144.
- Titz, K. , Andrus, D. , & Miller, J. (2001). Hedonistic differences between mechanical game players and table game players: An exploratory investigation on the road to a comprehensive theory for gambling. *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal*, 6(1), 23
- Trends for Big Las Vegas Strip Casinos, 2008-2014 (2014). *Nevada Gaming Abstract*. Carson City: Nevada Gaming Control Board, 2009-15.
<http://gaming.unlv.edu/reports/bigstripcasinotrends.pdf>
- Turley, L. , & Fugate, D. (1992). The multidimensional nature of service facilities. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6(3), 37-45.
- van Teijlingen, E. , & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing Standard (Royal College of Nursing (Great Britain) : 1987)*, 16(40), 33.
- Wakefield, K. , & Blodgett, J. (1999). Customer response to intangible and tangible service factors. *Psychology & Marketing*, 16(1), 51-68.
- Walker, G. , Weighill, A. , & Hinch, T. (2005). Inter- and intra-gender similarities and differences in motivations for casino gambling. *Leisure Sciences*, 27(2), 111-130.
- Walker, D. , & Kelly, S. (2011). The roots of modern ‘social cost of gambling’ estimates. *Economic Affairs*, 31(1), 38-42.
- Wan, Y. (2012). The social, economic and environmental impacts of casino gaming in macao: The community leader perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(5), 737-755.

- Weinstock, J. , Massura, C. , & Petry, N. (2013). Professional and pathological gamblers: Similarities and differences. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 29(2), 205-216.
- Welte, J. , Wieczorek, W. , Barnes, G. , Tidwell, M. , & Hoffman, J. (2004). The relationship of ecological and geographic factors to gambling behavior and pathology. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 20(4), 405-423.
- Wong, I. A., & Fong, V. H. I. (2010). Examining casino service quality in the Asian Las Vegas: An alternative approach. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 19(8), 842–865. doi:10.1080/19368623.2010.514553
- Wong, I. A., In Veronica Fong, H., & Tingchi Liu, M. (2012). Understanding perceived casino service difference among casino players. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 24(5), 753–773.
doi:10.1108/09596111211237282
- Wong, I. , & Rosenbaum, M. (2011). Beyond hardcore gambling: Understanding why mainland chinese visit casinos in macau. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(1), 32-51.
- Yip, S. W., Desai, R. A., Steinberg, M. A., Rugle, L., Cavallo, D. A., Krishnan-Sarin, S., & Potenza, M. N. (2011). Health/Functioning Characteristics, Gambling Behaviors, and Gambling-Related Motivations in Adolescents Stratified by Gambling Problem Severity: Findings from a High School Survey: Adolescent Problem Gambling Severity Correlates. *The American Journal on Addictions*, 20(6), 495–508. doi:10.1111/j.1521-0391.2011.00180.x
- Yi, S., & Busser, J. (2008). The Influential Attributes that Affect Resident Slot Gamblers' Repatronage Intentions and Willingness to Recommend Casinos to Others.

Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 16(4), 343–367.

doi:10.1080/10507050801949712

Zeithaml, V.A., Rust, R.T. and Lemon, K.N. (2001), “The customer pyramid: creating and serving profitable customers”, *California Management Review*, Vol. 43 No. 4, pp. 118-42.

Zeng, Z. and Forrest, D. (2009), “High rollers from mainland China: a profile based on 99 cases”,

UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 29-43

Appendix:

Casino Motivation Survey Questionnaire

Section 1 (Casino Past Experience)

This survey section is about your casino past experience. It is designed to measure your gambling behavior at California Indian and Las Vegas casinos. Please, write your answers below each question or check one box that best describes your level of satisfaction with the following aspects of your past casino experience.

California Indian casino: Casino gambling operations on California Indian reservations or tribal land.

Las Vegas casino: Casino gambling operations on the Las Vegas strip, in Clark County, Nevada.

1. Are you a California resident?
2. How long have you been living in California State?
3. Are you at least 21 years of age?
4. Have you gambled at California Indian casinos in the past 12 months?
5. Have you gambled at Las Vegas casinos in the past 12 months?
6. Which casino are you more emotionally attached to?
7. On average, how much do you bet on casino table games per visit?
\$ _____
8. On average, how much do you spend on slot machines per visit?
\$ _____
9. How did you hear about the casino you go to?
 - Friends/Family
 - Casino advertisement
 - Internet
 - Colleagues
 - Casino hosts
 - Other (Please specify): _____

10. How satisfied were you about your past casino experience?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral
- Very dissatisfied

11. Please, rate the following casino motivations from 1 to 5 with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least important you would consider when gambling at casinos.

_____ Casino Rewards Programs

_____ Proximity to Casino

_____ Casino Non-gaming Amenities

_____ Financial Needs

_____ Casino Employee Service

_____ Variety of Games

_____ Casino promotions

_____ Atmosphere

_____ Smoking or Non-smoking

Section 2

Casino Motive Attribute

This survey section is designed to measure how much you agree or disagree with different casino motive attributes.

	Casino Motivations	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
72	Rewards	1. I gamble at this casino to higher my membership loyalty tier level 2. I gamble at this casino to receive different membership benefits 3. I gamble at this casino because I am a loyal customer						
	Non-gaming Amenity	4. I gamble at this casino because I can also enjoy non-gaming activities 5. This casino provides spa, pool, or nightlife activities that excites my casino visit 6. I gamble at this casino to have fun with my family, friends, or relatives						
	Service	7. I gamble at this casino because employees are friendly and polite 8. I gamble at this casino because they provide consistent quality service 9. I gamble at this casino because employees are always prepared to be responsive 10. I gamble at this casino to have an interpersonal relationship with employees 11. I gamble at this casino because employees are knowledgeable about						

	different game rules 12. I gamble at this casino because the service is always kept up-to-date
Promotions	13. I gamble at this casino because its casino advertisements are appealing 14. I gamble at casino because they provide complimentary dining and lodging services 15. I gamble at this casino when it provides promotional gaming offers
Proximity	16. I gamble at this casino because it's in close proximity to my home 17. I gamble at this casino because its proximity ensures my safety and security 18. I gamble at this casino because of transportation costs 19. I gamble at this casino because my neighborhood has an attractive gambling opportunity 20. I gamble at this casino because it's easier to drive to a casino
Hardcore gambling	22. I gamble at this casino because I tend to stay longer playing games 22. I gamble at this casino because I win more often compared to other casinos 23. I continue to gamble at this casino even though I lose 24. I gamble at this casino because I can place large bets on games
Games	25. I gamble at this casino because I like to play games with the use of dice

	<p>and roulette</p> <p>26. I gamble at this casino to play different types of slot machine games</p> <p>27. I gamble at this casino to play different types of table games</p> <p>28. This casino has a wide selection of casino games</p> <p>29. This casino provides games that other casinos do not have</p>
Atmosphere	<p>30. I gamble at this casino because it makes me comfortable with visually attractive furniture</p> <p>31. I gamble at this casino because its facility design, including ceiling height and theme is attractive</p> <p>32. I gamble at this casino because I like their floor layouts, including where the games are located</p>
Smoking Policy	<p>33. I gamble at this casino because they have non-smoking areas</p> <p>34. I gamble at this casino because of its overall air quality</p> <p>35. I gamble at this casino because I can avoid secondhand smoke</p> <p>36. I gamble at this casino because they provide both smoking and non-smoking areas</p>

Section 3 (Casino Gambler Socio-Demographic)

This survey section is designed to collect demographical characteristics of casino gamblers. Please, write your answer or check a mark next to the one that best describes you for each question below.

1. What year were you born? _____ (e.g., 1982, 1985, etc.)
2. What is your gender? Male _____ Female _____
3. What is your ethnicity?
 - Caucasian African American
 - Mexican American Hispanic / Spanish American
 - American Indian / Native American Asian / Pacific Islander
4. What is your highest level of education?
 - High school diploma or less Two-year college degree (Associate)
 - Four-year college degree (Bachelor) Post Graduate Studies
 - Other(Please specify: _____)
5. What is your annual income before tax in 2014?
 - \$10,000 ~ 20,000 \$ 61,000 ~ 80,000
 - \$20,001 ~ 40,000 \$ 81,000 ~ 100,000
 - \$41,000 ~ 60,000 \$ 100,001 and above
6. What is your current occupation?
 - Part-time employee - Full-time employee - homemaker
 - Professional jobs - Manual jobs - Office/clerical
 - Student - Unemployed - Retired
 - Other (please specify): _____

Thank you for your participation