

Haydam, Norbert; Purcarea, Theodor; Edu, Tudor; Negricea, Iliuta Costel

Article

Explaining Satisfaction at a Foreign Tourism Destination – an Intra-Generational Approach. Evidence within Generation Y from South Africa and Romania

Amfiteatru Economic Journal

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Bucharest University of Economic Studies

Suggested Citation: Haydam, Norbert; Purcarea, Theodor; Edu, Tudor; Negricea, Iliuta Costel (2017) : Explaining Satisfaction at a Foreign Tourism Destination – an Intra-Generational Approach. Evidence within Generation Y from South Africa and Romania, Amfiteatru Economic Journal, ISSN 2247-9104, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Vol. 19, Iss. 45, pp. 528-543

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/169087>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

EXPLAINING SATISFACTION AT A FOREIGN TOURISM DESTINATION – AN INTRA-GENERATIONAL APPROACH EVIDENCE WITHIN GENERATION Y FROM SOUTH AFRICA AND ROMANIA

Norbert Haydam¹, Theodor Purcarea², Tudor Edu^{3*}
and Iliuta Costel Negricea⁴

¹⁾ Cape Peninsula University of Technology, Cape Town, South Africa

^{2) 3) 4)} Romanian-American University, Bucharest, Romania

Please cite this article as:

Haydam, N., Purcarea, T., Edu, T and Negricea, I.C., 2017. Explaining Satisfaction at a Foreign Tourism Destination – an Intra-Generational Approach. Evidence within Generation Y from South Africa and Romania. *Amfiteatru Economic*, 19(45), pp. 528-542.

Article History

Received: 23 December 2017

Revised: 16 March 2017

Accepted: 5 April 2017

Abstract

Generation Y poses interesting consumption behaviour peculiarities comparing to the other generational groups. This paper focuses on two age layers of Generation Y, 20-24 years old and 25-29 years old, with the purpose of modelling satisfaction at a foreign tourism destination based on destination attributes and demographic variables. A mixed qualitative-quantitative research design was employed using equal samples of 30 and, subsequently, of 800 individuals from Romania and South Africa. Based on a comprehensive literature review on satisfaction and its constructs and on Generation Y, a model for explaining satisfaction was built and tested in Romania and South Africa on the two designated age layers using logistic regression. The findings show similarities and differences between the two countries enriching the literature on generational constituents and offering practical insights to tourism businesses. Finally, the model proposed and tested in this paper can be easily replicated in other parts of the world.

Keywords: Generation Y, satisfaction, tourism, logistic regression, Romania, South Africa

JEL Classification: D12, M31, Z32

Introduction

Satisfaction should be at the forefront of all business endeavours as it occurs after a purchase (Strydom, 2004) and based on an evaluation process (Cant, Brink and Brijbal, 2009) performed by the buyer. Individuals feel different levels of satisfaction for the same

* Corresponding author, **Tudor Edu**– tudoredu@yahoo.com

product or service because of the set of criteria used in the evaluation process (Cant, Brink and Brijbal, 2009). Because of these differences, analysing satisfaction within generational groups would render valuable perspectives about consumer behaviour constructs leading to a better understanding of how different age groups choose and purchase various goods and services. According to Pendergast (2010), there are 6 generational groups co-existing (GI, Silent, Baby Boomers, Generation X, Generation Y and Generation Z), each group displaying different consumer behaviour patterns in general and in tourism in particular. Ratten and Tsotsos (2010) believe that the generational groups will play a very important role in the future tourism consumer behaviour research. The current tourism literature displays evidence of various consumer behaviour comparisons between generational groups (Li, Li and Hudson, 2013; Xiang, Magnini and Fesenmaier, 2015; Huang and Petrick, 2010), Generation Y being covered just in a few studies (Nusair, Bilgihan and Okumus, 2013; Muskat et al., 2014) while evidence about tourist behaviour within different age layers of Generation Y are almost inexistent.

This paper focuses on two age layers of Generation Y (20-24 and 25-29 years old) as there is consistent heterogeneity within this generational group (Foscht, et al. 2009; Paul, 2001) with the purpose of explaining satisfaction at a foreign destination based on destination attributes and demographic variables, thus proposing a model to be tested in Romania and South Africa.

1. Review of the scientific literature

1.1. Satisfaction in tourism

Satisfaction was grounded in theory in several ways, some of the posited ideas being adapted and used in tourism as well. Briefly presented, satisfaction can be assessed based on comparisons between the actual purchase and expectations formed from previous purchases or collected information, based on comparisons between the actual purchase and preset standards, based on the effect-effort relationship or just based on the performance of the purchase itself. Satisfaction as a result of evaluations between expectations and the outcome of the buying process was detailed by Oliver (1980) in an expectation-disconfirmation model, the basic idea being that an individual is satisfied if the acquired product or service renders at least the expected performance, leading to a positive disconfirmation. In the case of the preset standards, a consumer can set standards called norms by Latour and Peat (1979), satisfaction occurring if the performance rendered by the purchase matches or exceeds these standards. The effect-effort relationship was grounded by Oliver and Swan (1989) in their equity theory, satisfaction occurring if the benefits rendered by the purchase surpass the effort put into the process. The purchase performance-based satisfaction is the result of Tse and Wilton (1988), positing that satisfaction depends solely on the performance of the purchased product or service.

These theories have a wide coverage in the tourism literature as well. In this paper the purchase performance-based satisfaction was used as the aim was to appraise satisfaction based on the holiday experience generated by a number of constituents. This approach is in sync with the ideas of Assaker, Vinzi and O'Connor (2011) and Moutinho (1987) based on which satisfaction should be evaluated first of all considering the overall experience at the destination. Also, Spreng, Mackenzie and Olshavsky (1996) argue that satisfaction is the result of the overall experience. Further on, Kozak (2001) posits the importance of

assessing satisfaction based only on the performance approach, holiday experiences being the most important determinants of satisfaction, as they are considerably emotional in nature (Artigas, Chasco and Pozo, 2015) and self-related (Matos, Mendes and Pinto, 2015) as they are linked to needs and desires (Matzler, et al., 2004). From another angle, tourists form expectations only once they interacted with the destination attraction (Radder and Han, 2013) thus pointing out the advantage of the performance-based approach in assessing satisfaction.

In conclusion, tourist experiences should be understood as results of interactions one might have with products and services sourced at destination (Chen and Chen, 2010) or, in other words, destination attributes are the ones assessed by tourists (Alegre and Garau, 2010). Della Corte, et al. (2015) underline that tourists seek unique experiences when choosing a destination, their overall satisfaction being the result of the experience had with each determinant (products and services provided at destination) (Romao et al., 2015).

1.2. Generation Y - main considerations

There are several studies proposing time frames for Generation Y based on birth years, the most common time intervals for this generation being 1977-1994 (Sheahan, 2005), 1978-2002 (Sommer and Trudy, 2006), 1980-2000 (Erickson, 2008) or 1982-2002 (McCrindle, 2003). Closely connected with this diversity of perspectives, a very interesting peculiarity of this generational group is its heterogeneity (Foscht, et al., 2009), three distinct groups looming (Paul, 2001), those born before 1983 as the first age group, those born between 1984 and 1989 as the second group and the individuals born after 1990 as the third group, or, according to Barton, et al. (2013), just two groups, 'Younger Millennials' (18-24 years old) and 'Older Millennials' (25-34 years old). In conjunction with this heterogeneity, Howe and Strauss (2000) point out that Generation Y is socially and ethnic diverse.

Generally speaking, the members of this generational group are better educated than other generational groups and are confident (Pendergast, 2010). They are very communicative (Jorgensen, 2003), relying heavily on technology to interact and for entertainment (Bolton et al., 2013). They build strong ties with their parents (Eisner, 2005), being actively involved in household decisions. From a consumption perspective, the Generation Y-ers seek excitement, entertainment (Muskat et al., 2014) and new experiences (Jorgensen, 2003), choosing brands based on identity and comfort although loyalty is not always certain (Noble, Haytko and Phillips, 2009). According to Parment (2013), an interesting peculiarity of Generation Y is that its members select products frequently based on emotions and shopping venues based on rational considerations. In a tourism context, the extant literature displays a small number of behavioural studies centred just on Generation Y (Huang and Petrick, 2010) but comparative studies between generational groups are found in greater numbers. According to some of these studies, the Generation Y members like to travel to foreign countries (Glover, 2010; Li, Li and Hudson, 2013) to visit new (Benckendorff and Moscardo, 2010) and unique venues (Richards, 2007). These individuals choose destinations based on various motives, such as shopping, entertainment, exploring the environment (Li, Li and Hudson, 2013), for fun and to relax and rest (Benckendorff and Moscardo, 2010), safety, value for money, easy access, domestic transportation, food, accommodation, cleanliness and services (Li, Li and Hudson, 2013). According to Huang and Petrick (2010), the Generation Y members also choose destinations based on beaches, theme parks, sports and weather, documenting themselves using TV and radio broadcasts and personal sources,

especially family and friends, as well as online sources based on Pearce and Coghlan (2008), thus proving to be thorough planners (Kim, Xiang and Fesenmaier, 2015).

Although comprehensive and insightful, these behavioural features prompted by the extant literature should be assessed in the context of the heterogeneity of Generation Y as the preferences and behaviour of individuals are influenced by their attitudes, generating market segments inside generational groups (Glover, 2010).

2. Research methodology

2.1. Research purpose and model presentation

This paper investigates two age layers within Generation Y from Romania and South Africa, one layer between 20 and 24 years old and the other layer including individuals between 25 and 29 years old, pursuing to identify the variables influencing the holiday experience had in a foreign destination. The holiday experience had in a foreign destination is assessed considering destination attributes and demographic variables (age, gender, education, marital status and source of funding the trip). Thus, a conceptual model is proposed to be tested. The destination attributes as independent variables are drawn from the work of Li, Li and Hudson (2013) in which 19 destination evaluation criteria were used to test differences between 4 generational groups (GI/Silent generation, Baby boomers, Generation X and Generation Y) in order to be filtered down to the peculiarities of the two age Generation Y layers from Romania and South Africa. As for the socio-demographic variables considered in the model, the tourism literature displays studies in which such variables are used as independent variables. According to Machado (2010), age, gender and education can help predict the duration of stay, age being also underlined as a factor in selecting destination attributes (Weaver, et al, 1994), while education being mentioned as a factor in the travelling decision-making process. The other two demographic variables augment the model through the impact of the family structure and financial side on satisfaction.

2.2. Research hypotheses

Based on logistic regression, two types of relationship can be tested between the dependent and independent variables pertaining to the tourist experience: direct (same direction evolution or increase-increase relationship) and inverse (opposite direction evolution or increase-decrease relationship).

The holiday experience at a foreign destination is modelled based on destination attributes and 5 demographic variables for which 6 hypotheses were formulated. For ease of measuring the respondents were asked to refer only to their last tourist experience in a foreign country, the hypotheses being:

H1 There is a direct relationship between the holiday experience at a foreign destination and destination attributes

H2 Men are more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than women

H3 The 20-24 year old individuals are more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than the ones aged between 25 and 29 years old

H4 The individuals funding the trip from their own sources are more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than the ones funding the trip from other sources

H5 Married individuals are more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than unmarried ones

H6 The individuals with a high school level and below are less likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than the ones with a post high school level.

2.3. Research instruments

The research methodology used in this paper entails a qualitative step first and a subsequent quantitative one. The qualitative methodology was used to adapt the independent variables drawn from the tourism literature to the peculiarities of the two age Generation Y groups from Romania and South Africa. In order to attain this task, based on Kozak (2001), 30 semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted both in Romania and South Africa with Generation Y individuals asking them to select amongst the 19 destination criteria drawn from Li, Li and Hudson (2013) (table no. 2) the ones actually used in the assessment of destinations and allowing, also, the respondents to express their thoughts about the presented variables and to mention new variables. For destination attributes, only the variables mentioned by both samples were retained in the model, the final stage being presented in table no. 2. Continuing with the quantitative research, semantic differentials with 5 levels (from very satisfied to very dissatisfied for destination attributes and overall holiday experience were used for collecting data (Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Chen and Chen, 2010). For ease of measuring the respondents were asked to refer only to their last tourist experience in a foreign country.

In testing the model, for a thorough comprehension of the implications and a complete perspective of the model, forward, backward and enter logistic regressions were performed, retaining the variants with the largest number of predictors for which the Hosmer-Lemeshow test for the goodness of fit displayed a significance value greater than 0.05.

The dependent variable was converted into categorical variables with two categories by combining the positive levels of the semantic differential into one category and the negative and neutral ones into another category (Chon, 1991, Allison, 2008). In the case of “Holiday experience at a foreign destination”, the positive levels were combined into a category named “Satisfied” and the negative and neutral levels into a category named “Dissatisfied”. As zero frequencies were encountered in at least one category of some independent variables, these variables were transformed into categorical variables by combining the negative and neutral levels of the semantic differential scales into one category (i.e. dissatisfied) and the positive levels into one category (i.e. satisfied) (Allison, 2008)

2.4. Sampling methodology

A two-step sampling methodology was used to cover both qualitative and quantitative steps. A sample of 30 individuals was considered for each country in the case of the qualitative research. Using a quota sampling procedure and resembling the population structure for age (using two age groups: 20-24 years old and 25-29 years old) and gender (STATS SA, 2014; National Institute of Statistics, 2015, 2014), the sample for each country

included 8 men between 20 and 24 years old, 8 men between 25 and 29 years old, 7 women between 20 and 24 years old and 7 women between 25 and 29 years old. Samples of 800 individuals for each country, Romania and South Africa, were used, the sampling procedure being a random multiple-layer one using the two abovementioned age layers and gender, the sample structures being presented in table no. 1 (STATS SA, 2014; National Institute of Statistics, 2015, 2014).

Table no. 1: Sample structure- South Africa/Romania

South Africa/ Romania	20-24 years old	25-29 years old	Total
Male	208/210	197/202	405/412
Female	204/196	191/192	395/388
Total	412/406	388/394	800/800

Note- numbers in italics are for the Romanian sample

2.5. Data collection

The data collection in the qualitative study was performed through face-to-face in-depth interviews based on a study guide about destination criteria used to choose a tourism destination. Thus, each respondent was asked to select amongst the 19 destination criteria drawn from Li, Li and Hudson (2013) (table no. 2) the ones actually used in the assessment of destinations. The respondents could also express their opinions about the presented variables and to mention new ones. In the quantitative study, the data were collected by administering in 3 malls in Bucharest and Cape Town questionnaires comprising semantic differential scales about the destination criteria retained based on the qualitative research.

3. Results and discussions

The qualitative study performed based on in-depth interviews rendered 9 common destination attributes (table no. 2) for both samples which were used in the questionnaire to collect quantitative data.

Table no. 2: Destination attributes collected from the literature and qualitative research

Destination attribute	Retained/added for quantitative research (+ encoding in the questionnaire)
Shopping	
Cultural/historical sites	
Natural scenery	
Climate	
Food	Yes- retained as Quality of food offered (Q7.5)
Accommodations	Yes- retained as Accommodation used (Q7.1)
Service quality	Yes- retained as Service delivery at tourist attractions (Q7.6)
Convention & exhibition facilities	
Friendliness of people	
Ease of getting to the country	
Domestic transportation/ease of getting around in the destination	Yes- retained as Public transport (Q7.2)
Safety & security	Yes- retained as Personal safety (Q7.9)

Nightlife/entertainment	
Recreational opportunities	Yes- retained as Events attended (music, food markets, sport etc.) (Q7.7)
Language differences	
Value for money	Yes (Q7.8)
Tourist information	
Cleanliness	
Environmental quality	
Sightseeing	Added from own qualitative research (Q7.3)
Superstructure (i.e. tourist infrastructure, hotels, attractions etc.)	Added from own qualitative research (Q7.4)

Source: Li, Li and Hudson, 2013 and own research

The data analysis for the quantitative study was performed for each country, the model being analysed and discussed distinctively. For each country, the logistic regression assumptions were checked and briefly presented in a table for the entire model.

3.1. Romania - analysis and discussion

The model for Romania is statistically significant Chi-square = 345.619, $p=0.000$, explaining 49.7% (Nagelkerke R Square) of the variance in holiday experience and correctly classifying 83.4% of the cases. Based on forward, backward and enter actions and on a non-significant Hosmer-Lemeshow test for the goodness of fit of the model, from the 9 satisfaction criteria and 5 demographic variables, the most comprehensive model includes 5 satisfaction criteria (accommodation, public transportation, sightseeing, service delivery and events attended) expressed on a categorical scale, being transformed from the 5-level semantic differential scales because of levels with no answers (Satisfied- for the very satisfied and satisfied levels and Dissatisfied- for the very dissatisfied, dissatisfied and neutral levels) and 2 demographic variables (marital status and gender). All these variables are statistically significant based on the sig value of the Wald test (<0.05). Also, the Hosmer-Lemeshow test with a value of 0.098 shows that the model fits the data at an acceptable level (table no. 3).

Table no. 3: Logistic regression- Holiday experience at a foreign destination- Romania

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Q7.1_cat	-,957	,361	7,025	1	,008	,384	,189	,779
	Q7.2_cat	-,983	,256	14,736	1	,000	,374	,226	,618
	Q7.3_cat	1,949	,339	33,097	1	,000	7,025	3,616	13,648
	Q7.6_cat	,670	,250	7,197	1	,007	1,955	1,198	3,191
	Q7.7_cat	2,492	,261	90,926	1	,000	12,089	7,243	20,179
	Q15_cat	-,914	,328	7,777	1	,005	,401	,211	,762
	Q20	,541	,214	6,403	1	,011	1,718	1,130	2,612
	Constant	-,717	,583	1,516	1	,218	,488		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Q7.1_cat, Q7.2_cat, Q7.3_cat, Q7.6_cat, Q7.7_cat, Q15_cat, Q20.

After checking the logistic regression assumptions (table no. 4), 4 satisfaction criteria are retained in the model (Accommodation, Public transportation, Sightseeing and Service

delivery) and the 2 demographic variables (Marital status and Gender). Accommodation, with an odds ratio of 0.384, shows that a satisfied tourist with the accommodation at the destination is 2.6 times more likely to have a dissatisfying holiday experience. On the same length, public transportation, with an odds ratio of 0.374, shows that a satisfied tourist with the public transport is 2.67 times more likely to have a dissatisfying holiday experience. These two odds ratio should be interpreted from the perspective that young Romanians between 20 and 29 years old do not consider accommodation and public transport as being important in the appraisal of the overall holiday experience. Sightseeing, with an odds ratio of 7.025, displays that a satisfied tourist with the sightseeing part is 7.025 more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience. Service delivery, with an odds ratio of 1.995, shows that a satisfied tourist with the service delivery at tourist attractions is 1.995 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience. Marital status, with an odds ratio of 0.401, displays that unmarried individuals are 2.49 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than married ones. Gender, with an odds ratio of 1.718, shows that men are 1.718 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than women.

Table no. 4: Logistic regression assumptions for the Romanian model

Assumption	Holiday experience at a foreign destination
The errors should be independent (Field, 2009)	Met
Linear relationship between continuous predictors and their logs- Box Tidwell test (Wuensch, 2014)	Not applicable as all predictors are categorical
Absence of multicollinearity- Variance Inflation Factors for continuous variables (Menard, 2002) and Phi coefficient for categorical variables (Muir et al., 2010)	Removal of Q7.7_cat (Events attended)
Strongly Influential Outliers- Standardised/Studentised Residuals, Cook's distances, Average Leverage, DfBeta values for continuous variables (Field, 2009) and Scatter Plots for categorical variables (Friendly, 2000)	Met
Sample size- 10-15 events per predictor (Babyak, 2004; Peduzzi et al., 1996; Peduzzi et al., 1995)	Met (558-satisfied respondents/242-dissatisfied respondents)

In conclusion, the Romanian respondents are rather interested in the higher self-involvement attributes (sightseeing and service delivery) than the lower self-involvement attributes (accommodation and public transportation) in the building of the holiday experience, while unmarried men being more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than married women. Based on the findings, hypothesis H1 was partially retained, as the variables 'Sightseeing' and 'Service delivery at tourist attractions' displayed a direct relationship with the dependent variable while 'Accommodation used' and 'Public transport' displayed an inverse relationship with the dependent variable, 'Events attended (music, food markets, sport etc.)' was removed for not meeting the assumptions and 'Superstructure (i.e. tourist infrastructure, hotels, attractions etc.)', 'Quality of food offered', 'Value for money' and 'Personal safety' did not show a relationship with the dependent variable by not being included in the model at any stage. H2 was retained as men were more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than women while H5 was rejected as unmarried individuals were more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience

than married ones. H3, H4, H6 were rejected as the respective variables did not show a relationship with the dependent variable by not being included in the model at any stage.

3.2. South Africa- analysis and discussion

The model for South Africa is statistically significant, Chi-square = 67.140 ($p = 0.000$), explaining 11.8% (Nagelkerke R Square) of the variance in holiday experience and correctly classifying 73.3% of the cases. Based on forward, backward and enter logistic regressions and a non-significant Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness of fit test, from the 9 satisfaction criteria and 5 demographic variables considered as independent variables, the most comprehensive model comprises 8 satisfaction criteria (Accommodation, Sightseeing, Superstructure, Public transport, Quality of food offered, Service delivery, Events attended and Value for money) and 4 demographic variables (Source of funding, Age, Gender and Marital status). The independent variables with no cases in at least one level of the 5-level Semantic Differential scale were transformed into categorical scales with two categories (Satisfied- for the very satisfied and satisfied levels and Dissatisfied- for the very dissatisfied, dissatisfied and neutral levels). Out of the 8 satisfaction criteria and 4 demographic variables included in the model, 3 satisfaction variables and 2 demographic ones had a non-significant Wald test ($p > 0.5$) and were removed from the model (table no. 5).

Table no. 5: Logistic regression- Holiday experience at a foreign destination – South Africa

Variables in the Equation									
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I. for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1 ^a	Q7.1_cat	-,288	,284	1,028	1	,311	,750	,430	1,308
	Q7.3_cat	,337	,289	1,363	1	,243	1,401	,795	2,467
	Q7.4_cat	,637	,236	7,303	1	,007	1,892	1,191	3,004
	Q7.2	,242	,107	5,115	1	,024	1,274	1,033	1,572
	Q7.5	-,177	,103	2,959	1	,085	,837	,684	1,025
	Q7.6	,645	,120	28,911	1	,000	1,905	1,506	2,410
	Q7.7	-,413	,126	10,755	1	,001	,662	,517	,847
	Q7.8	,214	,090	5,718	1	,017	1,239	1,039	1,477
	Q17_cat	-,650	,302	4,633	1	,031	,522	,289	,944
	Q21	,325	,180	3,254	1	,071	1,385	,972	1,972
	Q22	,389	,180	4,687	1	,030	1,476	1,038	2,098
	Q16_cat	,310	,185	2,813	1	,093	1,363	,949	1,957
Constant		-1,431	,729	3,858	1	,050	,239		
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: Q7.1_cat, Q7.3_cat, Q7.4_cat, Q7.2, Q7.5, Q7.6, Q7.7, Q7.8, Q17_cat, Q21, Q22, Q16_cat.									

After checking the logistic regression assumption (table no. 6), the final model includes 3 satisfaction criteria and 2 demographic variables. Superstructure, with an odds ratio of 1.892, shows that an individual satisfied with the superstructure is 1.892 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience. Public transport, with an odds ratio of 1.274 displays that an increase with one unit on the 5-level Semantic Differential scale increases the odds of having a satisfying holiday experience by a multiplicative factor of 1.315. Events attended, with an odds ratio of 0.662, shows that an increase with one unit on the 5-

level Semantic Differential scale decreases the odds of having a satisfying holiday experience by 1.51 times. Source of funding the trip, with an odds ratio of 0.522, displays that individuals funding the trip from other sources are 1.916 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than the ones funding the trip from their own sources. Gender, with an odds ratio of 1.476, shows that men are 1.476 times more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than women.

Table no. 6: Logistic regression assumptions for the South African model

Assumption	Holiday experience at a foreign destination
The errors should be independent (Field, 2009)	Met
Linear relationship between continuous predictors and their logs- Box Tidwell test (Wuensch, 2014)	Removal of Q7.6 (Service delivery at tourist attractions) and Q7.8 (Value for money)
Absence of multicollinearity- Variance Inflation Factors for continuous variables (Menard, 2002) and Phi coefficient for categorical variables (Muir et al., 2010)	Met
Strongly Influential Outliers- Standardised/Studentised Residuals, Cook's distances, Average Leverage, DfBeta values for continuous variables (Field, 2009) and Scatter Plots for categorical variables (Friendly, 2000)	Met
Sample size- 10-15 events per predictor (Babak, 2004; Peduzzi et al., 1996; Peduzzi et al., 1995)	Met (590-satisfied respondents/210-dissatisfied respondents)

In conclusion, the South African respondents tend to be satisfied if the destination stands out on the lower self-involvement attributes, such as superstructure and public transport, being less interested in higher self-involvement attributes, such as events attended, trying mainly to fund the trip from other sources than theirs and with men being more likely than women to be satisfied at the destination. Based on the findings, hypothesis H1 was partially retained, as the variables 'Public transport' and 'Superstructure (i.e tourist infrastructure, hotels, attractions etc)' displayed a direct relationship with the dependent variable, while 'Events attended (music, food markets, sport etc)' displayed an inverse relationship with the dependent variable, 'Service delivery at tourist attractions' and 'Value for money' were removed from the model for not meeting the assumptions and 'Accommodation used', 'Sightseeing', 'Quality of food offered' and 'Personal safety' did not show a relationship with the dependent variable by not being included in the model at any stage. H2 was retained as men were more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience than women, while H4 was rejected as individuals funding their trips from other sources were more likely to have a satisfying experience than those using their own money. H3, H5, H6 were rejected as the respective variables did not show a relationship with the dependent variable by not being included in the model at any stage.

Conclusions

The findings prompt that the Romanian Generation Y members between 20 and 29 years old tend to value highly in their holidays in a foreign country the destination attributes entailing higher self-involvement, such as sightseeing and service delivery, rather than attributes, such as accommodation or public transportation, reflecting a significant emotional load when it comes to satisfaction at destination. From a socio-demographic perspective, it appears that men are more likely to have a satisfying holiday experience in a foreign country than women, while unmarried individuals tend to have a more satisfying holiday experience than married ones. Then, the South African Generation Y members between 20 and 29 years old tend to value highly in their holidays the destination attributes entailing lower self-involvement, such as superstructure and public transport in comparison to higher self-involvement attributes, such as events, displaying an opposite reality to that of their Romanian counterparts. From a socio-demographic perspective, the South African young individuals tend to have a more satisfying holiday experience if they do not fund the trip from their own money, and, on the same length with the findings for the Romanian respondents, men tend to have a more satisfying holiday experience in a foreign country than women.

Considering managerial implications, this study provides significant insights about the importance of destination attributes in building the overall holiday experience at a foreign destination of the Generation Y members aged between 20 and 29 years old. Also, this paper proposes a comprehensive model which can easily be replicated in other parts of the world to study different age layers of one generation but especially Generation Y. The model offers several benefits, such as easy adaptation of the destination criteria based on qualitative research, the absence of normality requirements and the possibility of using data collected through non-parametric scales or the conversion of data collected through parametric scales into categorical data for the purpose of being included in the model. The results rendered by the comparison between Romania and South Africa show, first of all, what destination attributes are most valued by each group and the uncovered differences reinforce the findings of Edu, et al. (2014) where the differences in sourcing and spending between Romanian and South African groups were explained based on cultural differences. The managerial value of these results is increased by the demographic variables considered as independent factors for explaining satisfaction. Decision makers in tourism can make use of these findings and the model to build adequate offers based on the strengths of one specific destination in order to meet effectively the more demanding needs (Epuran, et al., 2015) and exclusive desires of foreign and, also, domestic tourists, considering that Generation Y is expected to reach 50% of all travellers before 2025 (Tutek, et al., 2015). This statement is in sync with Walker's belief (Walker, 2016), that only those tourism providers comprehending that good customer experience is more than customer service could attain significant competitive advantages when targeting Generation Y.

Discussing research limitations and future research directions, one limitation of this study could be the focus on the tourist behaviour at a foreign destination instead of the focus on a particular destination. The 2 age layers would probably prompt different outcomes in the case of a specific destination and, especially, in a comparative analysis as one destination tries to sell itself based on particular attributes which might be judged differently by people from different parts of the world. Of course, this idea could be considered as a suitable goal for future research, as the model proposed in this paper can be easily tailored to the traits of

one destination. The second limitation of this research lies in the number and type of predictors for holiday experience, based on attribute-performance assessment, satisfaction being measured considering 9 factors pertaining to the destination. Although they are the outcome of a prior qualitative research performed in South Africa and Romania, if another satisfaction theory had been used, such as expectations-disconfirmation theory or norm theory or even the effect-effort relationship, the battery of independent variables would have looked different in number and type. Definitely, this idea could represent a suitable future research direction.

As a final remark, the findings of this paper should be judged with caution if Generation Y is considered in its entirety, as they focus on 2 age layers, and based on Paul (2001) they should not be automatically extended to the entire Generation Y because of its heterogeneity. The proposed model in this paper should be applied, also, to the other age layers of Generation Y for acquiring a comprehensive image of this generation about satisfaction (understood as holiday experience) at a foreign destination assessed based on destination attributes.

References

- Alegre, J. and Garau, J., 2010. Tourist satisfaction and dissatisfaction. *Annals of tourism research*, 37(1), pp. 52-73.
- Allison, P.D., 2008. Convergence Failures in Logistic Regression. *SAS Global Forum*. Cary, NC, USA, n.d. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Artigas, E.M., Chasco, C. and Pozo, V.V., 2015. Benefit Perceived by Tourists. Role of the Hospitality Offered by the Tourist Destination. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6(2), pp. 53-64.
- Assaker, G., Vinzi, V.E. and O'Connor, P., 2011. Examining the effect of novelty seeking, satisfaction, and destination image on tourists' return pattern: A two factor, non-linear latent growth model. *Tourism Management*, 32, pp. 890-901.
- Babiyak, A.M., 2004. What You See May Not Be What You Get: A Brief, Nontechnical Introduction to Overfitting in Regression-Type Models. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 66, pp. 411-421.
- Barton, C., Haywood, J., Jhunjhunwala, P. and Bhatia, V., 2013. *Traveling with Millennials*. [online] Available at: <https://www.bcgperspectives.com/content/articles/transportation_travel_tourism_consumer_insight_traveling_with_millennials/> [Accessed 15 June 2016].
- Benckendorff, P. and Moscardo, G., 2010. Understanding Generation-Y Tourists: Managing the Risk and Change Associated with a New Emerging Market. In: P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo and D. Pendergast eds., 2010. *Tourism and Generation Y*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International, pp. 1-15.
- Bolton, R.N., Parasuraman, A., Hoefnagels, A., Migchels, N., Kabadayi, S., Gruber, T., Lovreiro, Y.K. and Solnet, D., 2013. Understanding Generation Y and their use of social media: a review and research agenda. *Journal of Service Management*, 24(3), pp. 245-267.
- Cant, M., Brink, A. and Brijball, S., 2009. *Consumer Behaviour*. Cape Town: Juta & Co.
- Chen, C.F. and Chen, F.S., 2010. Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioural intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31, pp. 29-35.

- Chon, K.S., 1991. Tourism destination image modification process: Marketing implications. *Tourism Management*, 12(1), pp. 68-72.
- Della Corte, V., Sciarelli, M., Casiella, C. and Del Gaudio, G., 2015. Customer satisfaction in tourist destination: The case of tourism offer in the city of Naples. *Journal of Investment and Management*, 4(1-1), pp. 39-50.
- Edu, T., Lotter, W.A., Negricea, I.C. and Avram, E.M., 2014. Current Cross-cultural Personal Financial Behaviour Coordinates: Evidence from Romania and South Africa with a Focus on Young and Educated Individuals. *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 13(2B (32B)), pp. 833-852.
- Eisner, S.P., 2005. Managing Gen Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 70(4), pp. 4-15.
- Erickson, T., 2008. *Plugged In: The Generation Y Guide to Thriving at Work*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Field, A., 2009. *Discovering Statistics using SPSS*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Foscht, T., Schloffer, J., Maloles, C. and Chia, S.L., 2009. Assessing the outcomes of Generation Y customers' loyalty. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 27(3), pp. 218-241.
- Friendly, M., 2000. *Visualising Categorical Data*. Carry, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Glover, P., 2010. Generation Y's Future Tourism Demand: Some Opportunities and Challenges. In: P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo and D. Pendergast eds., 2010. *Tourism and Generation Y*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International, pp. 1-15.
- Howe, N. and Strauss, W., 2000. *Millennials Rising: The Next Greatest Generation*. NY: Vintage Books.
- Huang, Y.C. and Petrick, J.F., 2010. Generation Y's Travel Behaviours: a comparison with Baby Boomers and Generation X. In: P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo and D. Pendergast eds., 2010. *Tourism and Generation Y*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International, pp. 27-37.
- Jorgensen, B., 2003. Baby boomers, Generation X and Gen Y. *Foresight*, 4, (4), pp.41-49.
- Kim, H., Xiang, Z. and Fesenmaier, D.R., 2015. Use of The Internet for Trip Planning: A Generational Analysis. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(3), pp.276-289.
- Kozak, M., 2001. Repeaters' behaviour at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), pp. 784-807.
- Kozak, M. and Rimmington, M., 2000. Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of travel research*, 38(3), pp. 260-269.
- Latour, S.A. and Peat, N.C., 1979. *Conceptual and methodological Issues in consumer satisfaction research*. Ralph day, Bloomington Wilkie, W.L., eds., 1979. IN: Indiana University Press, pp. 31-35.
- Li, X., Li, X.R. and Hudson, S., 2013. The application of generational theory to tourism consumer behaviour: An American perspective. *Tourism Management*, 37, pp. 147-164.
- Machado, L.P., 2010. Does destination image influence the length of stay in a tourism destination. *Tourism Economics*, 16(2), pp. 443-456.
- Matos, N., Mendes, J. and Pinto, P., 2015. The Role of Imagery and Experiences in the Construction of a Tourism Destination Image. *Journal of Spatial and Organizational Dynamics*, 3(2), pp. 135-154.

- Matzler, K., Bailom, F., Hinterhuber, H.H., Renzl, B. and Pichler, J., 2004. The asymmetric relationship between attribute-level performance and overall customer satisfaction: a reconsideration of the importance–performance analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(4), pp. 271-277.
- McCrindle, M., 2003. Understanding Generation Y. *Principal Matters*, 55, pp. 28-31.
- Menard, S., 2002. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publication.
- Moutinho, L., 1987. Consumer behaviour in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), pp. 5-44.
- Muir, S.W., Berg, K., Chesworth, B., Klar, N. and Speechley, M., 2010. Balance Impairment as a Risk Factor for Falls in Community-Dwelling Older Adults Who Are High Functioning. A Prospective Study. *Physical Therapy*, 90(3), pp. 338-347.
- Muskat, M., Muskat, B., Zehrer, A. and Johns, R., 2014. Generation Y: evaluating services experiences through mobile ethnography. *Tourism Review*, 68(3), pp. 55-71.
- National Institute of Statistics, 2015. *Romania in Figures- Statistical Abstract*. [online] Available at: <http://www.insse.ro/cms/files/publicatii/Romania_in_cifre_2015_final.pdf> [Accessed 10 May 2015].
- National Institute of Statistics, 2014. *Romanian Statistical Yearbook 2013*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.insse.ro/cms/en/content/romanian-statistical-yearbook-2013>> [Accessed 12 May 2015].
- Noble, S.M., Haytko, D.L. and Phillips, J., 2009. What drives college-age Generation Y consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 62, pp. 617-628.
- Nusair, K.K., Bilgihan, A. and Okumus, F., 2013. The role of online social network travel websites in creating social interaction for Gen Y travelers. *International journal of tourism research*, 15(5), pp. 458-472.
- Oliver, R.L., 1980. A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, pp. 46-49.
- Oliver, R.L. and Swan, J.E., 1989. Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: A field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 53, pp. 21–35.
- Parment, A., 2013. Generation Y vs. Baby Boomers: Shopping behaviour, buyer involvement and implications for retailing. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Studies*, 20(2), pp. 189-199.
- Paul, P., 2001. Getting Inside Gen Y. *American Demographics*, 1 Sep.
- Pearce, P.L. and Coghlan, A., 2008. The dynamics behind volunteer tourism. *Journeys of discovery in volunteer tourism: International case study perspectives*, pp. 130-143.
- Peduzzi, P.N., Concato, J., Holford, T.R. and Feinstein, A.R., 1995. The importance of events per independent variable in multivariate analysis, II: accuracy and precision of regression estimates. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 48, pp. 1503-1510.
- Peduzzi, P. N., Concato, J., Kemper, E., Holford, T. R., and Feinstein, A. R., 1996. A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis, *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 49, pp. 1373-1379.

- Pendergast, D., 2010. Getting to know the Y Generation. In: P. Benckendorff, G. Moscardo and D. Pendergast eds., 2010. *Tourism and Generation Y*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International, pp. 1-15.
- Radder, L. and Han, X., 2013. Perceived Quality, Visitor Satisfaction And Conative Loyalty In South African Heritage Museums. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal (Online)*, 12(10), pp. 1261-1272.
- Ratten, V. and Tsiotsou, R., 2010. Future research directions in tourism marketing. *Marketing intelligence & planning*, 28(4), pp. 533-544.
- Richards, G., 2007. *New Horizons II: The Young Independent Traveller, 2007*. Madrid: World Youth Student & Educational Travel Confederation.
- Romao, J., Neuts, B., Nijkamp, P. and Van Leeuwen, E., 2015. Culture, product differentiation and market segmentation: a structural analysis of the motivation and satisfaction of tourists in Amsterdam. *Tourism Economics*, 21(3), pp. 455-474.
- Sheahan, P., 2005. *Generation Y: thriving (and surviving) with Generation Y at work*. Prahran: Hardie Grant Books.
- Sommer, K. and Trudy, S., 2006. Managing Generation Y: Stop resisting and start embracing the challenges Generation Y brings to the workplace. *Human Resources Magazine*, 51(5).
- Spreng, R.A., MacKenzie, S.B. and Olshavsky, R.W., 1996. A reexamination of the determinants of consumer satisfaction. *The Journal of Marketing*, pp. 15-32.
- Stats S.A., 2014. *Stats in Brief*. Available at: <www.statssa.gov.za/publications/StatsInBrief/StatsInBrief2014.pdf> [Accessed 5 May 2015].
- Strydom, J., 2004. *Introduction to Marketing*. 3rd ed. Cape Town: Juta & Co.
- Tse, D.K. and Wilton, P.C., 1988. Models of consumer satisfaction: An extension. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, pp. 204-212.
- Tutek, E., Gebbie, M., Chan, K.Y.G. and Durand, S., 2015. *Tourism Megatrends- 10 things you need to know about the future of Tourism*. [online] Available at: <<http://horwaththl.com/files/2015/12/Tourism-Mega-Trends4.pdf>> [Accessed 5 July 2016]
- Walker, B., 2016. *Millennials Force Travel Brands to ReThink what it means to be Customer Centric*. [online] Available at: <<http://customerthink.com/millennials-force-travel-brands-to-rethink-what-it-means-to-be-customer-centric/>> [Accessed 10 October 2016]
- Weaver, P.A., McCleary, K.W., Lapisto, L. and Damonte, L.T., 1994. The relationship of destination selection attributes to psychological, behavioral and demographic variables. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 2(2), pp. 93-109.
- Wuensch, K.L., 2014. *Binary Logistic Regression with SPSS*. [online] Available at: <<http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/wuenschk/MV/MultReg/Logistic-SPSS.pdf>> [Accessed 15 December 2015].
- Xiang, Z., Magnini, V. and Fesenmaier, D.R., 2015. Information technology and consumer behavior in travel and tourism: Insights from travel planning using the Internet. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 22, pp. 244-249.