

Effects on the self-organization- satisfaction relationship of changes in the economic context

ABSTRACT

Noting increasingly independent traveling by tourists who use the Internet, as well as the changes on the tourist activity worldwide due to the 2008 economic crisis, this study analyzes the relationships between an economic crisis, tourist's self-organization in trip planning, and tourist's satisfaction with the trip. Data from a panel (2006-2011) on how residents in Spain complete their accommodation and transport bookings are used, including data on their trip satisfaction. The study identifies a negative relationship between the 2008 economic crisis and trip satisfaction, a positive relationship between self-organization and satisfaction, as well as positive moderating effects of the crisis on the relationship between self-organization and satisfaction. Managerial implications can be derived from these results.

Keywords: independent traveling, self-organized trips, Internet usage, trip planning, accommodation booking, transport booking, tourist satisfaction, economic crisis, economization, moderating effects

1. INTRODUCTION

A key tourism trend in recent years has been the increase in tourists' independent traveling, due to the spread of new technologies in different sectors, including the tourism industry (European Commission, 2014; Smith, 2004). Modern technology provides tourists with alternative trip-planning tools (Mokhtarian, Salomon, & Handy, 2006), such that travelers increasingly use the Internet to find travel information and book and pay for tourism services (Instituto de Estudios Turísticos [IET], 2006-2011; IPK International, 2013, 2015), while decreasing their use of traditional offline intermediaries (European Commission, 2015). We refer to such independent planning behaviour as tourists' *self-organization in trip planning*.

Complementarily, the September 2008 collapse of Lehmann Brothers triggered a financial crisis that altered the global economic development (IPK International, 2010). Adverse effects included unemployment, reduced incomes, savings insecurities, and difficulties in obtaining mortgages. Although there have been other financial crises, the 2008 crisis has been considered more harmful to the global economy and more difficult to overcome than any crisis since the Great Depression. This is due to the fact that the 2008 crisis had a sound impact worldwide, finally affecting all economic activities for several years (Li, Blake, & Cooper, 2010; Bronner & De Hoog, 2012; Rollins, Nickell, & Ennis, 2014).

The 2008 financial crisis eventually triggered a tourism crisis (Antonakakis, Dragouni, & Filis, 2015; Guizzardi & Mazzocchi, 2010). Thus, tourist consumption was seriously damaged (Bodosca, Gheorghe, & Nistoreanu, 2014; Bronner & De Hoog, 2011, 2012; Campos-Soria, Inchausti-Sintes & Eugenio-Martin, 2015; Eugenio-Martin & Campos-Soria, 2014; Li, Blake, & Cooper, 2010; Lu, Chen, & Kuo, 2018; Song et al., 2010). The first full year of the global crisis, 2009, was particularly negative regarding the travel and

tourism industry (IPK International, 2010; Li, Blake, & Cooper, 2010; Steiner et al., 2012). Two key tourism-related outcomes included a worldwide decline in the number of tourists and lower expenditure. In 2009, the number of international arrivals fell by 4%, the number of overnight stays dropped by 7%, and expenditures decreased by 9%, compared with 2008, leading to a dramatic loss of profitability for tourism providers, as well as bankruptcies and restructuring of airlines, hotels, tour operators, and travel agencies (IPK International, 2010; Steiner et al., 2012). In the particular case of Spain, which was particularly hard hit, high unemployment rates were especially harmful to domestic tourism expenditures (Alegre, Mateo, & Pou, 2013; Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE], 2017; Perles-Ribes et al., 2016).

In this context of reduced incomes, tourists endure greater hardships to go on vacation, although they often become quite resistant to the crisis, even giving up other products in favor of tourism (Bronner & De Hoog, 2014; Hajibaba et al., 2015). In any case, tourism is finally affected, people may have only one chance per year for a vacation and they try to economize (e.g. booking cheaper hotels, etc.) (Bronner & De Hoog, 2011, 2012; Campos-Soria et al., 2015). In this regard, in a context of economic crisis, tourists may try more intensely to be in charge of the planning of their own trips, in their search for economization. At the same time, during crises times, firms often reduce their marketing budgets. However, there is evidence that those that invest in marketing during recessions obtain good results after the crisis (Gulati, Nohria, & Wohlgezogen, 2010; Rollins et al., 2014; Srinivasan, Rangaswamy, & Lilien, 2005). In this sense, getting a better understanding of tourists' attitudes and behavior during crises periods would favor firms to be in better conditions to overcome economic crises (Bronner & De Hoog, 2011, 2012; Kaytaz & Gul, 2010; Rollins et al., 2014). Moreover, because crises occur cyclically, tourism providers must be prepared to face similar situations in the future.

We therefore jointly consider in this paper the crisis scenario, as a conditional framework for tourist behavior; the phenomenon of the increasingly self-organization in trip planning; and the formation of satisfaction. In this regard, no matter how tourists plan their trips or what the economic scenario is, tourists' satisfaction remains crucial; it is a key factor for tourism businesses and destinations (Eusebio & Vieira, 2013; Pulpanova & Simova, 2012; Song, van der Veen, Li, & Chen, 2012).

Thus, after discussing the relationships between economic crises, tourist self-organization, and tourist satisfaction, along with the moderating role of an economic crisis, we present assumptions, together with a proposed model. From the findings, we draw several conclusions and management implications, as well as offer suggestions for further research.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Self-organization and satisfaction

Analyses of tourists' behavioral patterns indicate a vast increase in their use of the Internet as well as declines in in-person sales for brick-and-mortar travel agencies (European Commission, 2015; Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE], 2016a; Law, Leung, & Wong,

2004; Maurer, 2002). Consequently, self-organization in trip planning is growing, that is, people more and more are in charge of the planning of their own trips.

Several benefits derived from using Internet support this growing trend. Internet reduces search costs by making easier the comparison between several offerings, facilitated by the existence of a great number of infomediaries on the Internet (Kim, Chung, & Lee, 2011; Nieto, Hernández-Maestro, & Muñoz Gallego, 2014), it offers availability and adaptability to personal schedules of all nature (Heung, 2003), and reduces purchasing risks by supplying customer reviews (Melo, Hernández-Maestro, & Muñoz-Gallego, 2017). Moreover, consumers are increasingly skilled in using the Internet, and Internet “surfing” has become an enjoyable part of planning a trip (Teichmann & Zins, 2009).

Self-organization in trip planning has been found to positively determine trip satisfaction for a particular year (Fernández-Herrero, Hernández-Maestro, & González-Benito, 2018). According to Fernández-Herrero et al. (2018) there are three main explanations underlying this relationship. First, the innate psychological need to feel that individuals are in control of their lives must be fulfilled for people to feel optimally satisfied (Bandura, 1997, p.3; Bandura, 2010; Deci, 1980; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ellen, Bearden, & Sharma, 1991; Hung & Petrick, 2012; Igarria & Iivari, 1995; Luszczynska, Gutiérrez-Doña, & Schwarzer, 2005; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Second, by organizing their own trips tourists should be able to obtain a better match between actual performance and expectations, due to greater familiarity with the whole planning process and the growing personalization options available (Kim et al., 2011; Piccoli, Lui, & Grün, 2017). Third, when tourists organize their trips for themselves, they take principal responsibility for the performance; there is no third party to blame, and they may be more benevolent in their comparison of expectations, that is, more prone to reducing dissonance (Oliver, 1997).

In line with this, we predict that for a wide period comprising both a pre-crisis scenario, a crisis scenario, and a built-up crisis scenario:

H1. Self-organization in trip planning has a positive impact on tourist satisfaction.

2.2. Economic crisis and satisfaction

Economizing behaviors and strategies are consequences of an economic crisis, mostly as a result of lower revenues (IPK International, 2014). Income has a positive, significant on tourism expenditures, which are significantly associated with variables such as accommodation, means of transport, destination distance, and length of stay (Brida & Scuderi, 2013). In recessions, tourists tend to choose nearer destinations (Lee, Jee, Funk, & Jordan, 2015; Mokhtarian & Chen, 2004), and/or shorten their vacations (Ferrer-Rosell, Martínez-García, & Coenders, 2014; Martínez-García & Raya, 2008; Pestaña & Pinto, 2010). Economizing tourists tend to choose more austere vacation options (IPK International, 2011; Marrocu, Pacci, & Zara, 2015). In Europe, trips taken at the height of the economic crisis were greater in number but shorter and cheaper (IPK International, 2011). Specifically, Spain registered a drop in the average number of overnight stays per journey for the 2008 crisis period, which can be linked to a decline in revenues (Ferrer-Rosell et al., 2014; IET, 2006–2011).

When *Item Response Theory*—a family of measurement models used to assess a latent trait such as satisfaction with a product or service (De Mars, 2010)—is applied to a specific tourist destination, it shows that along with factors linked to the destination itself, those associated with the trip’s characteristics—distance to destination, length of stay — also affect tourist satisfaction (Alegre & Pou, 2006; Alegre et al., 2013; Martínez-García & Raya, 2008; Nicolau & Más, 2006; Sarra, Di Zio, & Capucci, 2015). Some research proposes that distance can positively affect utility: the journey itself constituting an enjoyable part of the tourist experience (Nicolau & Más, 2006). Also, longer stays increase satisfaction (Sarra et al., 2015).

Although tourists want to pay less, they still may not expect less. Consumers use their past experiences to form references for their future experiences and to evaluate their satisfaction with new products or destinations. If customers experience a decrease in comfort, they may express dissatisfaction, because their expectations are based on their past experience. During a crisis, people’s expectations may be tinged by what they feel “entitled to”, reflecting what they could obtain in the past, but can no longer obtain, leading to frustration and dissatisfaction, even if they pay less than in the past (LaTour & Peat, 1979; Sarra et al., 2015; Thomassen, 1990, p. 111).

An economic crisis therefore may lead to reductions in various satisfaction indicators. Tourists choose more austere offers and lower comfort levels than those to which they have been accustomed and feel entitled to. Accordingly,

H2: An economic crisis has a negative impact on tourist satisfaction.

2.3. *Moderating role of the crisis*

An economic crisis may moderate the relationship between self-organization and satisfaction, in three key ways. First, in periods of crisis that deter consumption, it is important to motivate consumers to acquire an optimistic perspective (Kaytaz & Gul, 2014). Personal well-being and satisfaction are especially needed. Thus, in times of crisis it is expected that self-efficacy linked to self-organized behavior leads to greater perceptions of well-being and satisfaction (Caroli & Sagone, 2014; Cid, Orellana, & Barriga, 2010; Gómez et al., 2007).

Second, when the tourist is in charge of the planning of his/her own trip, this derives in greater familiarity with the information involved in the planning process (different prices, providers, etc.). Thus, this also derives in greater likelihood of achieving a positive disconfirmation of expectations. An economic crisis accentuates the need to get the most at the lowest price, making efficient, self-organized trips an even wiser consumer choice. Highly accessible technological conveniences such as the Internet, apps, and mobile devices enable the process, and the crisis-driven development of new skills boosts the learning process, leading to even more self-organized and efficient behavior (Bodosca et al., 2014).

Third, consumers lose confidence in the economic system and they feel fear of the future during periods of economic crisis (Bodosca et al., 2014; Kaytaz & Gul, 2014; Simon,

2009). In particular, they mistrust companies during economic crises and, at the same time, people feel a higher need for safety (Simon, 2009). More than ever, tourists want to ensure that their vacations develop without incidents, avoiding uncertainty, because they may be limited to taking only one per year (Bronner & De Hoog, 2011, 2012, 2014; Campos-Soria et al., 2015; Simon, 2009). Thus, it is expected that, during crises, tourists greatly turn to plan their own trips, trying especially hard to get a better match between expectations and performance (Bronner & De Hoog, 2011, 2012; 2014; Campos-Soria et al., 2015; Simon, 2009). Consequently, we propose:

H3. An economic crisis positively moderates the relationship between self-organization in trip planning and tourist satisfaction.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. *Data collection*

The data for this research came from annual surveys of Spanish tourists' behavior, known as FAMILITUR, conducted for 2006-2011. This survey relies on a panel, conducted by the Institute of Tourism Studies of the Government of Spain. This nationwide statistical reference provides data about trips taken by Spanish residents, collected since 1996.

In addition to the availability of these official data, we choose Spain as our study setting for three main reasons. First, it is a major tourism destination for both international travelers (ranked third in receipts and arrivals in 2015; World Tourism Organization [WTO], 2016) and national travelers. More than 11% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) comes from tourism (as of 2015; INE, 2016b). Second, in line with global trends, Spanish tourists increasingly rely on the Internet to plan their trips, though some continue to use physical intermediaries (INE, 2016a). Third, Spain was particularly affected by the international crisis of 2008, as shown by adverse macroeconomic indicators for our study period of 2008–2011, including a sharp decline in GDP and the rise in unemployment to historic highs (INE, 2014, 2017).

From FAMILITUR, we gathered six separate databases, corresponding to the years 2006 to 2011, then aggregated them into a single database with 765,165 observations of specific trips, made by 66,173 households. To estimate our proposed model, our analyses refer to a sample of 40,013 observations (i.e., trips), representing 10,881 households, that meet our selection criteria. Specifically, we retained only those observations that included satisfaction measures and for which the tourist booked accommodation and transport simultaneously (Table 1). With these criteria, we can focus specifically on trips involving complex arrangements, such that they entailed at least two dimensions of trip planning, which better meet the demands of our proposed analysis.

Insert Table 1 about here

3.2. Measures

Table 2 contains the variable definitions. To study the relationships between the economic crisis and assessments of overall satisfaction, and the moderation by the crisis of the relationship between tourist autonomy in trip planning and overall satisfaction, we registered the onset and escalation of the crisis with three dichotomous variables in accordance with its progress in Spain: period 2006 -2007 (before the crisis), period 2008-2009 (crisis), period 2010-2011 (built-up crisis).

We measured self-organization in trip planning with the variable lack of use of offline intermediaries (for booking). Noting that accommodation and transport are two basic elements in the trip planning stage (Bansal & Eiselt, 2004; Hyde, 2008), the scale runs from 0–2 (0: both trip elements were booked by the customer directly; 1: one trip element was booked through an offline intermediary and the other directly; 2: both trip elements were booked through offline intermediaries).

We recorded the dependent variable of satisfaction directly from FAMILITUR for 2006–2011, maintaining the original 0–10 scale. This variable measures the (average) level of overall satisfaction of the household members that participated in each trip.

As control variables, we also included:

- Return to destination, or whether (at least one member of) the household is returning to the same vacation destination.
- Number of destinations visited, reflecting the maximum number of destinations visited by (at least one member of) the household.
- University education, which denotes whether someone in the household has a university education.
- Professional occupation, measured with a three-dummy set to indicate the highest professional occupation in the household according to its required qualifications (non-qualified, qualified or high qualified).
- Number of activities, indicating how many leisure activities were undertaken on each trip to a tourist destination.
- Destination, measured with a three-dummy set that denotes the type of destination (domestic coastal, domestic inland, or international).

All variables relate to the same analysis period of 2006–2011, which corresponds to the six FAMILITUR surveys for the period. Tables 2 and 3 provide detailed descriptions.

Insert Table 2 and Table 3 about here

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

We tested the two proposed causal relationships—crisis and satisfaction, and autonomy in trip planning and satisfaction—using SPSS v20 software and regression analysis in Ordinary Least Squares (OLS).

For the regression analysis, we created four models (see Table 4):

- a. Test for the direct relationship between the control variables as independent variables and satisfaction as the dependent variable.
- b. Add to Model a the potential direct relationships of two of the variables related to crisis escalation with the dependent variable: period 2006-2007 (pre-crisis), and period 2010-2011 (built-up crisis). Period 2008-2009 (crisis) is the baseline (reference) category and consequently is the one excluded from the regression.
- c. Add to Model b the potential direct relationship with the dependent variable of the variable related to self-organization (lack of use of offline intermediaries).
- d. Add to Model c the potential moderating effect of the variables related to crisis escalation on the main causal relationship between self-organization and satisfaction.

With regard to the effect of trip planning self-organization on overall satisfaction, we find a direct, positive relationship between the lack of use of offline intermediaries and satisfaction, in line with H1 (Table 4).

With regard to the impact of the crisis on satisfaction, Table 4 reveals that period 2006-2007 (pre-crisis) represents a positive effect on satisfaction in relation to the effect of the period 2008-2009 (crisis, baseline category). And period 2010-2011 (built-up crisis) does not show a different effect from that of the baseline category (2008-2009). Complementarily, in Table 5 the baseline category is the period 2006-2007 and in Table 6 the baseline category is the period 2010-2011. The results contained in Tables 4, 5 and 6 are congruent and support a direct, negative relationship between the 2008 economic crisis and the satisfaction assessment, confirming H2.

Insert Table 4, Table 5, and Table 6 about here

Among the moderating effects, we find that the self-organization–satisfaction link is positively moderated by the crisis (Tables 4, 5 and 6). Model d in Table 4 shows that, in comparison with the baseline category - period 2008-2009 (crisis), the impact of lack of use of offline intermediaries was inferior for the period 2006-2007 (pre-crisis), what is congruent with a positive moderating effect of the crisis on the relationship lack of use of offline intermediaries-satisfaction. Period 2010-2011 (built-up crisis) is also different from period 2006-2007 (pre-crisis), but it does not represent a difference in the effect in comparison with period 2008-2009 (crisis). Similarly, Table 5 (baseline category: period 2006-2007) and Table 6 (baseline category: period 2010-2011) show consistent results, supporting the argument that with the 2008 economic crisis tourists became more effective in organizing their own trips, as we predicted in H3.

Finally, with regard to the control variables, the qualification of household members, measured in terms of both university education and type of professional occupation, has a direct, negative effect on satisfaction, suggesting that high qualified individuals are more demanding regarding the fulfilment of their expectations. Moreover, trips that include a higher number of recreational activities are linked to higher levels of satisfaction. Similarly, international destinations and domestic inland destinations, versus domestic coastal destinations, are linked to higher levels of satisfaction. However, the effect of experience on satisfaction is not significant for any of the two control variables considered in this respect (return to destination and number of destinations visited).

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A review of the literature reveals that both the progressive development and use of new technologies and a scenario characterized by an economic crisis have an effect on tourists' behavioral patterns. On the one hand, new technologies have favored self-organization in trip planning, altering tourists' buying process. For example, there has been a decline in in-person sales for brick-and-mortar travel agencies. On the other hand, research has also shown that the pessimistic climate surrounding an economic crisis generates that people are less inclined to consume and triggers economization. Thus, during an economic crisis, the tourism industry faces a difficult competitive environment due to fewer customers, higher price sensitivity, and nearer and shorter stays.

The study of consumers' attitudes and behaviors in a context characterized by these two phenomena will help firms to approach tourists and to gain a competitive advantage. Therefore, considering the 2006-2011 timespan, for the Spanish context, this research analyzes the effects on tourists' satisfaction of self-organization in trip planning as well as of the 2008 economic crisis, what constitutes a novelty.

Our results confirm the proposed hypotheses, indicating that self-organization increases satisfaction and that, although the economic crisis has a negative effect on tourists' satisfaction, however, in times of crisis, self-organization shows a greater positive effect on satisfaction.

In general, and especially in a context of economic difficulties, to compete, tourism providers need to gather complete and updated information about their customers—how they process information and how and why they buy. Tourist operators should develop systems to capture market information that they can analyze and apply to provide better solutions for tourists. However, firms often cut spending in economic crisis scenarios (Rollins et al., 2014). In this regard, this research suggests ways to allocate resources in times of economic difficulties. Thus, to counteract the a priori negative effects of crisis on satisfaction, firms may invest in improving satisfaction, in facilitating self-organization as well as in potentiating tourists' self-efficacy in trip planning. Consequently, some implications derive from the results.

First, the negative effects of an economic crisis on satisfaction result mainly from tourists' selections of more austere vacations. That is, an economic crisis leads to reduced expenditures, shorter distances to the destination, and shorter lengths of stay. These

factors, a priori, prompt an overall reduction in the levels of comfort to which tourists are accustomed. In response, tourism providers should explore satisfaction-inducing initiatives such as added-value services and increased personal attention that reward customers for their economizing efforts and sacrifices. Providers should work to identify customers' wishes and priorities in times of crisis, to find ways to add value and, if possible, without significantly increasing costs.

Second, to promote self-organization itself and to potentiate tourists' self-efficacy in trip planning, tourism operators could attempt several tactics at moderated costs. For example, tourism providers may try to improve their websites. It is important that they offer complete and clear information to facilitate that tourists, during the trip experience, fulfill or even excel their expectations. In this regard, it should be noted that price sensitivity increases in times of crisis; therefore, it is particularly important that customers do not feel that what they receive does not match the money paid in return. Also, tourism providers could establish alliances with others (ej. accommodation, transport, leisure activities), what would favor greater tourists' self-efficacy. Finally, tourism operators may use search engine optimization tools effectively and efficiently. They should try to improve accessibility by achieving better positions in search engines.

Third, for tourism intermediaries in particular, the increasingly tourists' self-organization is a threat. Because complex decision-making may deter independent planning behavior, traditional off-line travel agencies could boost their market positions by acting as trip consultants that specialize in planning the more complicated trips; customers should perceive that it is worth using their services. At the same time, online travel agencies should incorporate value-added options for the consumer, such as facilitating price comparisons. Thus, in an economic crisis scenario, both kinds of intermediaries could gain business by specializing in one type of product.

Finally, although our findings likely are of interest to the global tourism industry, which was nearly universally affected by the 2008 economic crisis, some limitations should be taken into account. First, the crisis effect was measured by comparing different periods of time, what impedes the isolation of the crisis from other possible factors that could also vary in the periods analyzed, such as the familiarity of tourists with new technologies. Second, the evidence is specific to our sample, gathered for Spain. The national database that we used is rigorous in its data collection standards, providing advantages regarding sample representativeness but, at the same time, it also limits the kind of measures that we use. Third, the conditions that we applied at the outset of our analysis—such that we considered only cases in which tourists booked both accommodation and transport—restricted our assessments to more complex scenarios. Further research could investigate travelers who booked only one of these elements, or those who did not make reservations prior to taking their trip. Such consumers may exhibit distinct travel behaviors and levels of satisfaction. Additionally, further research could also test if posterior economic crises lend support to the results found in this study.

References

- Alegre, J., & Pou, L. (2006). The length of stay in the demand for tourism. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1343–1355. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2005.06.012
- Alegre, J., Mateo, S., & Pou, L. (2013). Tourism participation and expenditure by Spanish households: The effects of the economic crisis and unemployment. *Tourism Management*, 39(0), 37–49. DOI:10.106/j.tourman.2013.04.002
- Antonakakis, N., Dragouni, M., & Filis, G. (2015). How strong is the linkage between tourism and economic growth in Europe? *Economic Modelling*, 44(0), 142–155. DOI: 10.1016/j.econmod.2014.10.018
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy. The exercise of control*. New York: W H. Freeman & Company.
- Bandura, A. (2010). Self-efficacy. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead (Eds.), *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 4th ed. (pp. 1534–1536). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: John Wiley & Sons. DOI:10.1002/9780470479216.corpsy0836
- Bansal, H., & Eiselt, H. A. (2004). Exploratory research of tourist motivations and planning. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 387–396. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00135-3
- Bodosca, Ş., Gheorghe, G., & Nistoreanu, P. (2014). Tourist consumption behaviour before and after the crisis from 2008. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 16(0), 77–87. DOI:10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00777-1
- Brida, J. G., & Scuderi, R. (2013). Determinants of tourist expenditure: A review of microeconomic models. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6(0), 28–40. DOI:10.1016/j.tmp.2012.10.006
- Bronner, F., & de Hoog, R. (2011). Economizing behaviour during travel: Strategies and information sources used. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 17(3), 185–195. DOI:10.1177/1356766711409180
- Bronner, F., & de Hoog, R. (2012). Economizing strategies during an economic crisis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 1048–1069. DOI:10.1016/j.annals.2011.11.019
- Bronner, F., & de Hoog, R. (2014). Crisis resistance of tourist demand: The importance of quality of life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(2), 190–204. DOI:10.1177/0047287514541006
- Campos-Soria, J.A., Inchausti-Sintes, F., & Eugenio-Martin, J.L. (2015). Understanding tourists' economizing strategies during the global economic crisis. *Tourism Management*, 48, 164-173.

Caroli, M. E. D., & Sagone, E. (2014). Generalized self-efficacy and well-being in adolescents with high vs. low scholastic self-efficacy. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 141(0), 867–874. DOI:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.152

Cid, H.P., Orellana, Y.A., & Barriga, O. (2010). General self-efficacy scale validation in Chile. *Revista Médica de Chile*, 138(5), 551–557.

De Mars, C. (2010). *Item Response Theory. Understanding statistics measurement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Deci, E. L. (1980). *The psychology of self-determination*. Lexington, MA: Health.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. DOI:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Ellen, P. S., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (1991). Resistance to technological innovations: An examination of the role of self-efficacy and performance satisfaction. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19(4), 297–307. DOI:10.1007/BF02726504

Eugenio-Martin, J. L., & Campos-Soria, J. A. (2014). Economic crisis and tourism expenditure cutback decision. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44(0), 53–73. DOI:10.1016/j.annals.2013.08.013

European Commission. (2014). *Preferences of Europeans towards tourism*. Eurobarometer No. 392. European Union.

European Commission. (2015). *Preferences of Europeans towards tourism*. Eurobarometer No 414. European Union.

Eusebio, C., & Vieira, A. L. (2013). Destination attributes' evaluation, satisfaction and behavioural intentions: A structural modelling approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 66–80. DOI:10.1002/jtr.877

Fernández-Herrero, M., Hernández-Maestro, R.M., & González-Benito, Ó. (2018). Autonomy in trip planning and overall satisfaction. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(2), 119–129. DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2017.1350250

Ferrer-Rosell, B., Martínez-García, E., & Coenders, G. (2014). Package and no-frills air carriers as moderators of length of stay. *Tourism Management*, 42, 114–122. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2013.11.002

Floater, G., & Mackie, L. (2016). *Travel distribution: The end of the world as we know it?* London: London School of Economics and Political Science.

Gómez, V., Villegas, C., Barrera, F., & Cruz, J.E. (2007). Predictive factors of subjective well-being in a Colombian sample. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 39(2), 311–325.

Guizzardi, A., & Mazzocchi, M. (2010). Tourism demand for Italy and the business cycle. *Tourism Management*, 31, 367–377. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2009.03.017

Gulati, R., Nohria, N., & Wohlgezogen, F. (2010). Roaring out of recession. *Harvard Business Review*, 63–69.

Hajibaba, H., Gretzel, U., Leisch, F., & Dolnicar, S. (2015). Crisis-resistant tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 53, 46-60.

Heung, V. (2003). Internet usage by international travellers: Reasons and barriers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(7), 370–378. DOI:10.1108/09596110310496015

Hung, K., & Petrick, J. F. (2012). Testing the effects of congruity, travel constraints, and self-efficacy on travel intentions: An alternative decision-making model. *Tourism Management*, 33(4), 855–867. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2011.09.007

Hyde, K. F. (2008). Information processing and touring planning theory. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(3), 712–731. DOI:10.1016/j.annals.2008.05.001

Igbaria, M., & Iivari, J. (1995). The effects of self-efficacy on computer usage. *Omega*, 23(6), 587–605. DOI:10.1016/0305-0483(95)00035-6

Instituto de Estudios Turísticos [IET] (2006—2011). *The Survey on Tourist Movements of Residents in Spain (FAMILITUR)*. Annual Reports. Madrid: IET. Retrieved from <http://www.iet.tourspain.es>.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (1995). *National Classification of Occupations CNO94*. Available at www.ine.es

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (2014). *Annual Spanish National Accounts. 2000—2012 Series*. Available at www.ine.es

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (2016a). *Resident Tourism Survey*. Available at www.ine.es.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (2016b). *Spanish Tourism Satellite Account*. Available at www.ine.es

Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE] (2017). *Economically Active Population Survey. Historical series*. Available at www.ine.es

IPK International (2010/11-2015/16). *ITB world travel trends report*. Berlin: Messe Berlin GmbH.

- Kaytaz, M., & Gul, M. C. (2014). Consumer response to economic crisis and lessons for marketers: The Turkish experience. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2701–2706. DOI:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.019
- Kim, M.-J., Chung, N. & Lee, C.-K. (2011). The effect of perceived trust on electronic commerce: Shopping online for tourism products and services in South Korea. *Tourism Management*, 32, 256–265. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2010.01.011
- LaTour, S. A., & Peat, N. C. (1979). Conceptual and methodological issues in consumer satisfaction research. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 6, 431–437.
- Law, R., Leung K., & Wong, J. (2004). The impact of the Internet on travel agencies. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 100–107. DOI:10.1108/09596110410519982
- Lee, S. K., Jee, W. S. F., Funk, D. C., & Jordan, J. S. (2015). Analysis of attendees' expenditure patterns to recurring annual events: Examining the joint effects of repeat attendance and travel distance. *Tourism Management*, 46, 177–186. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.07.001
- Lettice, F., Tschida, M., & Forstenlechner, I. (2014). Managing in an economic crisis: The role of market orientation in an international law firm. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2693–2700. DOI:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.018
- Li, S., Blake, A., & Cooper, C. (2010). China's tourism in a global financial crisis: A computable general equilibrium approach. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 435–453. DOI:10.1080/13683500.2010.491899
- Lu, Ch.-L., Chen, S.-T., & Kuo, H.-I. (2018). International tourism demand in Asia: Before and after the economic crisis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(11), 1073-1085.
- Luszczynska, A., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40(2), 80–89. DOI:10.1080/00207590444000041
- Marrocu, E., Paci, R., & Zara, A. (2015). Micro-economic determinants of tourist expenditure: A quantile regression approach. *Tourism Management*, 50(0), 13–30. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2015.01.006
- Martínez-García, E., & Raya, J. M. (2008). Length of stay for low-cost tourism. *Tourism Management*, 29(6), 1064-1075. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.02.011
- Maurer, E. (2002). *Internet for the retail travel industry*. London: Delmar Cengage learning.
- Melo, A.J.D.V.T., Hernández-Maestro, R.M., & Muñoz-Gallego, P.A. (2017). Service quality perceptions, online visibility, and business performance in rural lodging

establishments. *Journal of Travel Research*, 56(2), 250–262. DOI:10.1177/0047287516635822

Mokhtarian, P., & Chen, C. (2004). TTB or not TTB, that is the question: A review and analysis of the empirical literature on travel time (and money) budgets. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 38(9), 643–675. DOI:10.1016/j.tra.2003.12.004

Mokhtarian, P., Salomon, I., & Handy, S. (2006). The impacts of ICT on leisure activities and travel: A conceptual exploration. *Transportation*, 33(3), 263–289. DOI:10.1007/s11116-005-2305-6

Nicolau, J. L., & Más, F. J. (2006). The influence of distance and prices on the choice of tourist destinations: The moderating roles of motivations. *Tourism Management*, 27(5), 982–996. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2005.09.009

Nieto, J., Hernández-Maestro, R.M., & Muñoz-Gallego, P.A. (2014). Marketing decisions, customer reviews and business performance: The use of the Toprural website by Spanish rural lodging establishments. *Tourism Management*, 45, 115–123. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.009

Oliver, R. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. New York: Irwin-McGraw-Hill.

Perles-Ribes, J.F., Ramón-Rodríguez, A.B., Sevilla-Jiménez, M., & Moreno-Izquierdo, L. (2016). Unemployment effects of economic crises on hotel and residential tourism destinations: The case of Spain. *Tourism Management*, 54, 356–368.

Pestaña, C., & Pinto, L. (2010). The length of stay in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3), 692–706.

Piccoli, G., Lui, T.-W., & Grün, B. (2017). The impact of IT-enabled customer service systems on service personalization, customer service perceptions, and hotel performance. *Tourism Management*, 59, 349–362. DOI:10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.015

Pulpanova, L., & Simova, J. (2012). Factors of customers' satisfaction in tourism. *Ekonomie a Management*, 15(4), 160–170.

Rollins, M., Nickell, D., & Ennis, J. (2014). The impact of economic downturns on marketing. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(1), 2727–2731. DOI:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.022

Sarra, A., Di Zio, S., & Cappucci, M. (2015). A quantitative valuation of tourist experience in Lisbon. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 53(0), 1–16. DOI:10.1016/j.annals.2015.04.003

Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(3), 482–497. DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.76.3.482

- Simon, H. (2009). The crisis and customer behavior: Eight quick solutions. *Journal of Customer Behaviour*, 8(2), 177–186. DOI:10.1362/147539209X459796
- Smith, A. (2004). Information exchanges associated with internet travel marketplaces. *Online Information Review*, 28(4), 292–300. DOI:10.1108/14684520410553787
- Song, H., van der Veen, R., Li, G., & Chen, J. L. (2012). The Hong Kong tourist satisfaction index. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 459–479. DOI:10.1016/j.annals.2011.06.001
- Song, H., Lin, S., Zhang, X., & Gao, Z. (2010). Global financial/economic crisis and tourist arrival forecast for Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(2), 223-242.
- Srinivasan, R., Rangaswamy, A., & Lilien, G. (2005). Turning adversity into advantage: Does proactive marketing during a recession pay off? *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 22, 109–125.
- Steiner, C., Richter, T., Dörry, S., Neisen, V., Stephenson, M. L., Lemma, A. F., & Mitchell, J. G. B. (2012). *Economic crisis, international tourism decline and its impact on the poor*. Madrid: WTO.
- Teichmann, K., & Zins, A. H. (2009). Planning and exploratory buying behavior. In M. Kozak, M. & A. Decrop (Eds.), *Handbook of tourist behavior: Theory and practice* (pp. 83–96). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Thomassen, J. J. A. (1990). Economic Crisis, Dissatisfaction and Protest. In M. Kent Jennings et al. *Continuities in Political Action* (pp. 103–134). New York: de Gruyter. DOI:10.1515/9783110882193.103
- World Tourism Organization [WTO] (2016). *Tourism highlights*. Retrieved from www.e-unwto.org

Table 1. Number of trips analyzed per year

Year	Number of trips
2006	5,953
2007	6,005
2008	5,662
2009	7,168
2010	7,586
2011	7,639
Total	40,013

Table 2. Variable definitions

Description	Measurement
Satisfaction	Scale from 0 (highly unsatisfactory) to 10 (highly satisfactory) for each household/trip.
Lack of use of offline intermediaries	0–2 scale, reflecting if accommodation and transport bookings took place, such that 0 = both through offline intermediary 1 = one direct and one through offline intermediary 2 = both directly
Return to destination	0 = all household members visit destination for the first time 1 = at least one member of the household repeats visit to the destination
Number of destinations visited	Maximum number of destinations visited by at least one household member during the period under analysis
University education	0 = no university-educated household members 1 = at least one university-educated household member
Professional occupation	The highest professional occupation in the household, measured by required qualification: non-qualified occupation, qualified occupation, or high qualified occupation (3-dummies)
Number of activities	Number of leisure activities undertaken at the tourist destination
Destination	Type of destination visited, measured as domestic coastal, domestic inland, or international destination (3dummies)
Time period	3 dummies: Period 2006-2007 (P1) Period 2008-2009 (P2) Period 2010-2011 (P3)

Note: The professional occupation levels are based on the National Classification of Occupations (INE, 1995), as used in the 2006–2011 FAMILITUR (IET, 2006-2011). For example, managers, professors, and scientists are highly qualified occupations, accountants, clerks, and similar occupations are qualified occupations, and housemaids or doorkeepers are non-qualified occupations.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics (N=40,013)

Variables	Mean or %	Minimum	Maximum	Standard Deviation
Satisfaction	8.62	.00	10	1.126
Lack of use of offline intermediaries	.64	.00	2	.910
Return to destination	.43	.00	1.00	.495
Number of destinations visited	1.52	1.00	8.00	.845
University education				
No university degree	57.30 %			
University degree	42.70 %			
Professional occupation				
Non-qualified occupation	10.84 %			
Qualified occupation	52.20 %			
High qualified occupation	36.96 %			
Number of activities	4.08	.00	13.00	1.681
Destination				
Domestic destination (coastal)	52.48 %			
Domestic destination (inland)	8.80 %			
International destination	38.72 %			

Table 4. OLS Regression Analysis results. Dependent variable: Satisfaction. (N=40,013)

Variables	Model a	Model b	Model c	Model d
Return to destination	.005	.009	.008	.008
Number of destinations visited	-.007	-.009	-.009	-.009
University education	-.018***	-.019***	-.021***	-.021***
Qualified occupation	-.037***	-.039***	-.038***	-.038***
High qualified occupation	-.051***	-.048***	-.047***	-.048***
Number of activities	.063***	.068***	.069***	.069***
Domestic destination (inland)	.019***	.019***	.018***	.018***
International destination	.059***	.062***	.061***	.061***
Period 2006–2007 (P1)		.074***	.075***	.086***
Period 2010–2011 (P3)		-.009	-.010	-.007
Lack of use of offline intermediaries			.015***	.030***
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2006–2007				-.023***
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2010–2011				-.008
R ²	.008	.014	.014	.014
Test F	38.770	56.201	51.841	44.679
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000

*** p<0.01

Note: For professional occupation, destination, and period, the baseline (reference) category is the one excluded from the regression. The effects of the categories that enter the regression represent the added effect, beyond that of the excluded category.

Table 5. OLS Regression Analysis results. Dependent variable: Satisfaction. (N=40,013)

Variables	Model a	Model b	Model c	Model d
Return to destination	.005	.009	.008	.008
Number of destinations visited	-.007	-.009	-.009	-.009
University education	-.018***	-.019***	-.021***	-.021***
Qualified occupation	-.037***	-.039***	-.038***	-.038***
High qualified occupation	-.051***	-.048***	-.047***	-.048***
Number of activities	.063***	.068***	.069***	.069***
Domestic destination (inland)	.019***	.019***	.018***	.018***
International destination	.059***	.062***	.061***	.061***
Period 2008–2009 (P2)		-.076***	-.077***	-.088***
Period 2010–2011 (P3)		-.087***	-.090***	-.099***
Lack of use of offline intermediaries			.015***	-.012
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2008–2009				.027***
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2010–2011				.024**
R ²	.008	.014	.014	.014
Test F	38.770	56.201	51.841	44.679
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000

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

Note: For professional occupation, destination, and period, the baseline (reference) category is the one excluded from the regression. The effects of the categories that enter the regression represent the added effect, beyond that of the excluded category.

Table 6. OLS Regression Analysis results. Dependent variable: Satisfaction. (N=40,013)

Variables	Model a	Model b	Model c	Model d
Return to destination	.005	.009	.008	.008
Number of destinations visited	-.007	-.009	-.009	-.009
University education	-.018***	-.019***	-.021***	-.021***
Qualified occupation	-.037***	-.039***	-.038***	-.038***
High qualified occupation	-.051***	-.048***	-.047***	-.048***
Number of activities	.063***	.068***	.069***	.069***
Domestic destination (inland)	.019***	.019***	.018***	.018***
International destination	.059***	.062***	.061***	.061***
Period 2006–2007 (P1)		.082***	.084***	.093***
Period 2008–2009 (P2)		.008	.009	.007
Lack of use of offline intermediaries			.015***	.020**
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2006–2007				-.018**
Lack of use of offline intermediaries x Period 2008–2009				.007
R ²	.008	.014	.014	.014
Test F	38.770	56.201	51.841	44.679
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000

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

Note: For professional occupation, destination, and period, the baseline (reference) category is the one excluded from the regression. The effects of the categories that enter the regression represent the added effect, beyond that of the excluded category.