THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS

# Working Paper SERIES

WP # 0020MKT-578-2012

Date May 1, 2012

**THE EFFECT OF REGULATORY FOCUS ON THE PERCEIVED RISK IN MAKING SPRING BREAK TRAVEL DECISIONS**

David Bojanic
Anheuser-Busch Foundation Professor of Tourism
Department of Marketing
College of Business
University of Texas at San Antonio
One UTSA Circle
San Antonio, TX 78249
210-458-3113
david.bojanic@utsa.edu

# THE EFFECT OF REGULATORY FOCUS ON THE PERCEIVED RISK IN MAKING SPRING BREAK TRAVEL DECISIONS

David Bojanic
Anheuser-Busch Foundation Professor of Tourism
Department of Marketing
College of Business
University of Texas at San Antonio
One UTSA Circle
San Antonio, TX 78249
210-458-3113
david.bojanic@utsa.edu

*This research was funded by a summer grant from the College of Business at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

# THE EFFECT OF REGULATORY FOCUS ON THE PERCEIVED RISK IN MAKING SPRING BREAK TRAVEL DECISIONS


## Abstract

The student market for spring break travel represents a sizeable revenue source for hotels, cruises, and alternative spring break destinations. Therefore, it is important to understand students' motivations and decision-making processes as they apply to the spring break travel decision. This is even more important given the current increase in risk-related factors such as natural disasters, political unrest, and terrorism. The purpose of this paper is to determine if a student's regulatory focus is related to the importance of risk factors in the spring break travel decision. In addition, gender is examined as a potential moderator variable. The results indicate that there is a relationship between regulatory focus and the importance of risk factors for students planning a spring break vacation.



Keywords: regulatory focus, risk factors, spring break travel.

JEL Classification: M30; M31; L83

**The Effect of Regulatory Focus on the Perceived Risk in Making Spring Break Travel Decisions**

## 1. Introduction

The spring break travel market is estimated to be a billion dollar industry. Most of the top spring break vacation destinations are in Florida (e.g., Daytona Beach and Panama City) and Mexico (e.g., Acapulco and Cancun). Two other popular destinations are South Padre Island in Texas and Negril, Jamaica. Also, in addition to these standard spring break destinations, more and more students are looking into cruises, European vacations, and alternative spring break travel options that usually involve students volunteering for nonprofit organizations like Habitat for Humanity or United Way. The increase in travel by U.S. students to foreign spring break destinations has caused some concern for parents because of the additional issues associated with international travel.

Some of these issues revolve around the economic environment. The U.S. dollar is weak in relation to other foreign currencies, increased gas prices have resulted in higher travel costs, and there is an eminent threat of inflation, and a possible recession. These issues apply to both domestic and international travel. Another area of concern is the increase in physical threats such as natural disasters, diseases, and terrorism. These are associated closely with international travel. Finally, there are risks related to the actual travel package when purchased through third party providers such as online travel agents and spring break travel agents that specialize in student travel. These organizations offer service guarantees in order to decrease the risk associated with making a travel purchase. Some of the potential problem areas are unexpected expenses, inferior accommodations, and overbooking.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the decision-making process as it relates to students choosing a spring break destination. In particular, the importance of risk-related factors are evaluated for students planning a spring break vacation. In addition, students are categorized based on their regulatory focus – i.e., the extent to which they make decisions to avoid losses rather than achieve gains. The results of the study will provide valuable information for the travel industry, especially student travel.

## 2. Literature Review

The two most popular classifications for travel motivations are: "push vs. pull" and "escape vs. seeking" motivations. Crompton (1979) identified seven socio-psychological and two cultural factors, and proposed that non-destination-specific (push) factors can be the driving force behind a person's selection of where to travel. Iso-Ahola (1982) proposed a theory of leisure (tourism) motivation using "escape" and "seeking" as the primary factors used by tourists in choosing vacation destinations. In other words, escape factors "push" tourists towards choosing certain destinations and seeking factors "pull" tourists towards certain destinations based on both psychological (personal) and social (interpersonal) motivations. The combination of these factors results in four dimensions: personal seeking, personal escape, interpersonal seeking, and interpersonal escape.

This motivation research was then applied to the student travel market. Kim et al. (2006) defined "push" motivation as the decision "whether to go" and "pull" motivation as the decision "where to go." The authors examined the travel motivations of students using push factors and pull factors, and how they differed across 10 popular overseas

destinations. They found significant differences in the importance of the majority of the push and pull factors in choosing among the students' top ten international destinations. Kim et al. (2007) followed this with an attempt to test the applicability of a push motivational model developed by Cha et al. (1995) for the student travel market. The authors concluded that the model is suitable for the student travel market based on the results of their CFA.

Klenosky (2002) examined the relationship between push and pull factors using a means-end theory approach for students choosing a spring break destination. The pull attributes of the destination were considered the "means" and the motivating factors that push the individual to make the decision are the "ends." Mattila et al. (2001) took a slightly different view of tourism by focusing on the actual behavior of students while on spring break to determine if gender and religion were good predictors of the students' behavior. In particular, the study examined whether gender and religion were instrumental in the students' choice of a destination and their proclivity to engage in health-related risky behaviors. Males were found to be more likely to choose destinations that were known for having a party atmosphere, and they engaged more in risky behaviors like drinking and casual sex than females.

*2.1 Barriers to Travel and Perceived Risk*

There seems to be some consistency regarding the popular tourism motivations, but little has been done to determine why people don't choose to visit a destination. Hsu and Lam (2003) looked at barriers to visiting Hong Kong and found that there were important barriers to visiting. However, the authors concluded that the scores on importance and perceptions for the barriers indicate that the barriers were easily

overcome, especially for those who visited Hong Kong in the past. The authors only used 7 items, which represent a small subset of possible barriers for making travel decisions. Dolnicar (2005) conducted a study examining barriers to leisure travel and identified 4 "fear" segments using a cluster analysis based on 9 risk categories. The author found that the number of risk categories identified differed by the type of respondent and by the tourism context.

A similar area of research relates to tourists' risk perceptions in regard to international travel. Perceived risk involves the potential to incur an injury or lose something of value. Several authors have discussed the types of perceived risk as they relate to tourism, resulting in a number of similar categories: functional, financial, physical, psychological, time, social, and destination-specific risk (Maser and Weiermair, 1998; Roehl and Fesenmaier, 1992; Sonmez and Graefe, 1998). More recently, Reisinger and Movondo (2005) incorporated travel anxiety into the model examining perceived risk and intentions to travel. The authors found that terrorism risk and sociocultural risk have a significant effect on travel anxiety, and that travel anxiety has a significant effect on safety and intentions to travel.

The amount of information search also effects the travel decision and the perceived level of risk. Bai et al. (2004) found that the 'comfortability' of providing credit card information increased students' satisfaction with the online vacation planning process, However, the more time students used to search for an online vacation, the lower the rating of satisfaction, or at least the less likely to receive high ratings. Park and Kim (2009) used the spring break travel market to introduce the term "specialization concept" that combines behavioral factors, prior knowledge, and involvement into one concept that

can help destination marketers target consumers through different promotional vehicles to provide the information necessary to improve decisions and reduce risk. However, it should be noted that internal information and word of mouth were the most important information sources to students in all specialization groups.

Most of the research supports the notion that a perception of risk will affect a person's travel behavior (e.g., changing travel plans), and that the effects of negative incidents (e.g., natural disasters and terrorism attacks) will spread throughout the region with economic consequences (Chen and Noriega, 2004; Kozak et al., 2007). Reichel et al. (2007) examined perceived risk as it relates to student backpacking through Isreal, which is believed to be a relatively risky form of tourism. Once again, perceived risk was found to be a multidimensional construct that differed based on the profile of the traveler and the consumption pattern (e.g., traveling alone or with others). Finally, George and Yaoyuneyong (2010) examined the relationship between impulsiveness (including impulse buying) and cognitive dissonance and concluded that there wasn't a significant relationship, suggesting that impulse purchasers actually experience less cognitive dissonance and that impulse purchase might be a coping strategy used to avoid surprises.

*2.2 Regulatory Focus*

Higgins (1987) introduced the regulatory focus theory based on two distinct self-regulation strategies exhibited by individuals: promotion focus and prevention focus. Individuals with a promotion focus pursue gains and avoid "nongains" in the pursuit of their individual goals and aspirations. Conversely, individuals with a prevention focus strive to avoid losses, or pursue "nonlosses," in a quest to fulfill their obligations and handle their responsibilities. Several studies examined the relationship between a

person's regulatory focus and its compatibility, or "fit," with certain goals (Higgins 2000, 2002; Idson, Lieberman, and Higgins, 2000). Approach goals are a better fit with a promotion focus because they strive toward a desirable end state, whereas avoidance goals are a better fit with a prevention focus because they seek to avoid an undesirable end state.

Regulatory focus has also been used to evaluate the effectiveness of heath-related campaigns to reduce cigarette smoking (Kim, 2006) and to promote certain dieting plans (Keller, 2006). Kim (2006) studied the effectiveness of antismoking advertising messages targeting adolescents. The researcher determined that it is beneficial to frame the type of message to match the adolescent's regulatory focus. The practical implication is that the advertiser can prime the adolescent's regulatory goals based on the type of advertising vehicle (e.g., television show, magazine, etc.), and then frame the message to fit those goals. Keller (2006) examined whether promotion-related willingness to take risks fits better with self-efficacy appraisals, and prevention-related vigilance to avoid risks fits better with response efficacy. It was found that self-efficacy is weighed more than response efficacy when the regulatory focus is promotion, and response efficacy is weighed more than self-efficacy when the focus is prevention. The two behaviors being observed were dieting (e.g., using the South Beach diet or the Atkins diet) and the use of sunscreen.

Boesen-Mariani et al. (2010) provided a good overview of the literature related to the use of regulatory focus in a marketing context, including the various scales. Atorough and Donaldson (2011) proposed a regulatory focus model (REFCOS) that can be used to evaluate online shopping behavior (e.g., travel planning) using a holistic framework that

includes motivations, actual behavior (i.e, outocomes), and perceptions (i.e., evaluation and affect). The REFCOS model includes the relationship between regulatory focus and perceived risk through the evaluation/affect component. Micu and Chowdhury (2010) looked at the effect of a message's regulatory focus and product type on persuasion. They used students in an experimental design that included two hedonic products (chocolate and ice cream) and two utilitarian products (vacuum cleaners and vitamin water). The results showed that matching the message with one's goals (e.g., hedonic product and promotion focus) creates more positive responses in terms of persuasion and recall. In terms of brand value, promotion-oriented individuals are more sensitive to differences in established brands than prevention-oriented individuals, and they have a greater preference for new brands (Love et al., 2010).

Lockwood et al. (2002) developed a measure of regulatory focus that assesses chronic promotion and prevention goals directly. The scale consisted of 18 items and the study participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they endorse items relevant to promotion goals and prevention goals. The rating scale for the items was a 9-point scale ranging from "Not at all true of me" to "Very true of me." The use of the scale enabled the researchers to measure the extent to which the participants are chronically preoccupied with promotion or prevention goals. The other approach used in regulatory focus studies, as well as part of the Lockwood et al. (2002) study, temporarily enhances or reduces the individual's promotion or prevention goals by priming the participant through exposures to positive and negative words or statements.

The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between a student's regulatory focus and the importance of risk factors in choosing a spring break

travel destination. In addition, the researchers attempt to determine if gender plays a role in the relationship between regulatory focus and the importance of risk factors. The first hypothesis to be tested is:

**H1**: The greater the prevention focus, the more importance placed on risk factors in choosing a spring break destination.

This hypothesis is based on the fact that people who are prevention focused typically try to avoid, or prevent, losses and falling short of responsibilities and obligations. Therefore, it is logical to expect that the students with a higher prevention focus will place more importance on avoiding risks and taking them into consideration when planning a trip.

The other area of interest is whether there is a difference between males and females when it comes to the impact of risk factors on travel decisions. There is no definitive evidence regarding a relationship between gender and risk avoidance in the travel literature, so this is an exploratory aspect of the research and there is no proposed relationship.

**H2**: There is no difference between males and females when it comes to the importance of risk factors in choosing a spring break destination.

Finally, there is a possibility of an interaction effect between gender and prevention focus when it comes to the importance of the risk factors in choosing a travel destination. In other words, gender is being considered as a possible moderator in the relationship between regulatory focus and the importance of risk. Once again, there is no existing evidence of a relationship between gender and prevention focus in regard to travel planning. Therefore, the hypothesis is that there is no relationship.

**H3**: There is no interaction between gender and prevention focus that affects the level of importance for risk factors in choosing a spring break destination.

## 3. Method

A survey instrument was developed to obtain information about spring break travel intentions and motivations from students. The purpose of the first section of the questionnaire was to determine the spring break travel behavior of students during their time at college, and more specifically, if they are planning a trip for the upcoming spring semester. The booking time and destination of choice for students planning a trip was examined. In addition, the students were asked to provide information on the method they used, or will use, to book their spring break trip.

The second section of the questionnaire focused on the importance of 12 risk-related items that would serve as barriers to travel. A factor analysis was performed on these items in order to identify the dimensions of risk and reduce the number of items into factors so that an index can be formed for each dimension of risk. The index was formed based on the items that loaded on each factor by adding all of the ratings for each item and dividing by the number of items to obtain an average rating that can be interpreted using the original 7-point scale.

The final section of the questionnaire focused on the profile of the respondents, including their gender, academic class, age, and passport status. In addition to this general background information, students were also asked to indicate their levels of agreement with ten items that measure regulatory focus (see Higgins et al., 2001). There were five statements that measure promotion focus and five statements that measure

prevention focus. The categories were used to evaluate the difference in the importance of risk factors in making travel decisions based on regulatory focus.

The sample for this study consisted of the students enrolled in a large lecture class at a major public university in the northeast United States. It is not unusual for tourism studies to sample students when it comes to travel behaviors, motivations, and intentions, especially in regard to spring break travel (Kim et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2007; Mattila et al., 2001). The students in the class were given the link to the web-based survey that was created and placed on SurveyMonkey. They were required to complete a series of surveys as a requirement for the class, thereby ensuring a high response rate. There are approximately 500 students in the class each semester, and they represent students from all four undergraduate classes (i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior). Therefore, the sample was deemed representative of the student population at the university.

The GLM statistical function in SPSS was used to construct a multivariate analysis of variance model (MANOVA) with multiple dependent variables (i.e., risk factors) and two fixed factors (i.e., regulatory focus and gender). The MANOVA was used to examine the relationships between the independent variables and the linear combinations of the dependent variables that provide the strongest evidence of overall group differences. Then, the univariate models were used to evaluate the relationship between regulatory focus and gender with each of the dependent variables separately. Finally, there was an analysis to determine the potential moderating effect of gender in the relationship between prevention focus and the importance of risk factors.

## 4. Results

A total of 492 students participated in the survey. However, only 462 students completed all of the items on the questionnaire and are used in the final analysis. The total for each of the separate analyses differs because of the variables involved in the analysis, and whether or not the student completed all of the relevant ratings. Approximately 65% of the respondents were female, which is slightly higher than the percentage for the university, and approximately 65% of the respondents were upperclassmen (juniors and seniors). The university takes many transfer students from community colleges and other universities in the state (and region), which explains the higher percentage of upperclassmen in the class and at the university. Over 70% of the respondents had an active passport and 87.4% had traveled outside the United States.

### *4.1 Prevention Focus*

The students were asked to complete the Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ) developed by Higgens et al. (2001) with one adjustment. The original RFQ had 11 items, but one of them didn't load well in the original study (-.37), so it was not included in this study. Both Higgins et al. (2001) and Lockwood et al. (2002) utilized a questionnaire to examine the chronic regulatory focus instead of using an experimental design with random assignments to groups and framing the regulatory focus. Table 1 contains the 10 items, their means, standard deviations, and their focus (including whether they had to be reverse coded).

[Insert Table 1 here]

A factor analysis was conducted to determine if the prevention items and promotion items loaded properly for a two-factor solution. Unfortunately, the best fit resulted in a model that could only explain 45.75% of the variance between the respondents, and some of the regulatory focus items didn't load clearly on one factor. Upon further analysis, it was determined that the reliabilities, based on Cronbach's Alpha, were .7319 for the prevention items and .5759 for the promotion items. Therefore, only the five prevention items are used to develop categories for "low" and "high" prevention focus based on a median split. This method was chosen since that is the main focus of the study (i.e., risk and prevention), and most students will score high on the promotion focus scales given their age, level of experience, and current outlook of the future based on completing their college degrees (i.e., there isn't much variance).

*4.2 Prevention Focus, Risk Importance, and Gender*

The first stage in this analysis consisted of a factor analysis of the 12 risk items to determine if there were underlying dimensions that adequately represent the overall list of risk items. A principal components factor analysis was conducted using a Varimax rotation in order to obtain the best orthogonal fit for the data. This resulted in a two-factor solution that explained 81.7% of the variance in the data. Table 1 contains the results of the analysis.

[Insert Table 2 here]

The two factors were labeled "physical threats" and "travel issues" based on the six items that loaded on each one, respectively. Cronbach's alpha was computed for each of the factors to assess the internal consistency and they both showed a high level of

reliability. The score for "physical threats" was 0.9574 and the score for "travel issues" was 0.9519, indicating a good fit for the data.

The next step in the analysis is to examine the relationship between the level of prevention focus, gender, and the level of importance for the two risk factors. Table 3 contains the descriptive statistics for all of the combinations in the factorial design. There are two genders (male and female), two prevention focus categories (low and high), and the two risk factors (physical threats and travel issues).

[Insert Table 3 here]

The results indicated that students in the high prevention category placed more importance on the risk factors in planning a spring break vacation. The travel issues were rated as more important than the physical threats. As for gender, the importance ratings for the two risk factors were higher for the females. The results were very similar to those for the prevention focus analysis. Overall, the travel issues risk factor received a higher importance rating than the physical threats risk factor.

*4.3 Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)*

The last step in the analysis process involves examining the impact of prevention focus and gender on the dependent variables, physical threats and travel issues. The MANOVA procedure is useful for looking at two or more dependent variables simultaneously. It also enables the researcher to test for an interaction effect between two or more independent variables (i.e., prevention focus and gender). As mentioned above, Table 3 contains the means, standard deviations, and cell sizes for all of the possible combinations in the factorial design.

All of the cell sizes were greater than the minimum required of 30 to 40 observations for medium effect sizes. The power for the various components of the MANOVA model was greater than the minimum, .80, for all of the analyses except the interaction effect between prevention focus and gender. Table 4 contains all of the results for the MANOVA. The main effects were significant for both the prevention focus and gender for the multivariate model that combines the two risk factors. The F values for the multivariate tests (Pillai's Trace, Wilkes' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, and Roy's Largest Root) were significant (at the .001 level) for both of the main effects. However, the interaction model was not significant for any of the multivariate test statistics. This supported the first hypothesis that stated the students in the high prevention category should place more importance on the risk factors than the students in the low prevention category. Also, based on the MANOVA results, the second hypothesis was rejected, indicating that there is a significant relationship between gender and the importance of risk in choosing a spring break destination.

[Insert Table 4 here]

One of the assumptions of the MANOVA model is that the variance-covariance matrices for the dependent variables are equivalent. Box's M was calculated and the value was significant at the .05 level. This would suggest that the variance-covariance matrices are not equivalent. However, the group sizes are similar for the prevention focus groups and the sizes for the gender groups are within the standard of the larger group being less than 1.5 times the smaller group. Therefore, the equivalency assumption should not pose a major problem.

The final part of the analysis is to look at the univariate models for prevention focus and gender with each of the risk factors separately. Once again, the relationships were all significant at the .05 level (actually the .003 or better) for each of the risk factors and prevention focus, and for each of the risk factors and gender (see Table 5). This further supported the hypotheses for the main effects. However, the model for the interaction effect between prevention focus and gender with each of the risk factors was not significant. Therefore, neither the MANOVA or univariate models provided support for the third hypothesis.

[Insert Table 5 here]

## 5. **Conclusion**

This study had a few objectives. First, the importance ratings of various barriers to travel, or de-motivators, were examined to determine if they could be grouped into fewer, more encompassing factors, or dimensions, and then evaluated to see which factors were the most important for students in planning a spring break vacation. Second, the importance of de-motivators was examined to determine if there were any significant differences based on the student's level of prevention focus and gender, and if there were any significant interactions between these classification variables.

Students that rated higher on the prevention focus scale placed more importance on the risk factors than the students who rated lower on the scale. Apparently, there is a relationship between a student's approach to attaining goals (i.e., regulatory focus) and the importance of barriers to travel. High prevention focus students were more concerned

about physical threats and potential travel-related issues that could affect their spring break vacations. It should also be noted that females are more likely to exhibit a prevention focus than males, but there is no significant difference between the various class levels when it comes to regulatory focus. In addition, females placed significantly more importance on the full satisfaction service guarantee and the risk factors than males. However, there is no interaction effect between gender and prevention focus for either full satisfaction guarantees or the two risk factors.

From a practical standpoint, travel firms should match their advertising messages to the type of vehicle. For example, if an ad is prevention-framed, then it should be placed in advertising mediums and vehicles that are commonly exposed to students who exhibit a chronic prevention focus, and ads that are promotion-framed should be placed in mediums and vehicles that are exposed to students who exhibit a promotion focus. Overall, students tend to be more promotion focused and expend more effort trying to attain their goals, and achieve gains, rather than trying to avoid losses.

Finally, a chi-square analysis was performed to determine if there was a relationship between prevention focus and gender, without including the risk factors in the analysis. Interestingly, a higher percentage of females (49.5%) were in the high prevention category than males (36.8%). This relationship was found to be significant (chi-square = 6.674, p= .010), even though there wasn't an interaction effect between the two variables in the MANOVA or univariate models with the risk factors as the dependent variables. Another practical implication would be to take this into account in advertising spring break vacations to females. It would be advisable to provide service guarantees and promote the safety and security of the destination in advertising media

that appeal to females. This is consistent with the findings of Mattila et al. (2001) regarding the fact that females choose destinations that are less "party-oriented" and engage less in risky behaviors like binge drinking and casual sex. In other words, females are more prevention focused than males.

*5.1 Study Limitations and Future Research*

The results of this analysis should be taken with some caution because there are limitations based on the research design. First, the sample consisted only of students, and they all attended the same university. This would have an impact on the representativeness of the sample and the ability to make inferences about the entire population of students, or all travelers. Second, the study is only a cross-section of the travel market since it was only administered at one point in time – late fall. This is the time when most students make their decisions regarding spring break, but it is entirely possible that their importance ratings for risk could vary throughout the year. Finally, the study only looked at prevention focus and gender as independent variables, or classifying variables. There are many other variables that could be related to the importance ratings for risk such as world events and economic conditions. In the future, the effect of chronic regulatory focus should be examined for more types of travel situations with different samples (e.g., international travel) and more dependent variables (e.g., push and pull motivators). In addition, the experimental design approach could be used to identify the relationship between regulatory focus and travelers' reactions to travel ads when the respondents are primed and the focus of the ad is manipulated.

## REFERENCES


Atorough, P. and Donaldson, B. (2011). Can regulatory focus help explain why we shop differently online? – A proposed model and research agenda. *Contemporary Management Research*, 7(3), 231-242.

Bai, B., Hu, C., Elsworth, J., and Countryman, C. (2006). Online travel planning and college students: the spring break experience. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17(2/3), 79-91.

Boesen-Mariani, S., Gomez, P., and Gavard-Perret, M. (2010). Regulatory focus: a promising concept for marketing research. *Recgercge et Apllications en Marketing*, 25, 87-106.

Cha, S., McCleary, K., and Uysal, M. (1995). Travel motivations of Japanese overseas travelers: a factor-cluster segmentation approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34 (1), 33-39.

Chen, R. and Noriega, P. (2004). The impacts of terrorism: perceptions of faculty and students on safety and security in tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Travel Marketing*, 15 (2/3), 81-97.

Crompton, J. (1979). Motivations for Pleasure Vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6, 408-424.

Dolnicar, S. (2005). Understanding barriers to leisure travel: Tourist fears as a marketing basis. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11 (3), 197-208.

George, B. and Yaoyuneyong, G. (2010). Impulse buying and cognitive dissonance: a study conducted among the spring break student shoppers. *Young Consumers*, 11(4), 291-306.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94, 319-340.

Higgins, E. T. (2000). Making a good decision: Value from fit. *American Psychologist*, 55, 1217-1233.

Higgins, E. T. (2002). How self-regulation creates distinct values: The case of promotion and prevention decision making. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 12, 177-191.

Higgins, E. T., Friedman, R., Harlow, R., Idson, L., Ayduk,, O., and Taylor, A. (2001). Achievement orientations from subjective histories of success: promotion pride versus prevention pride. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31 (1), 3-23.

Idson, L. C., Lieberman, N., and Higgins, E. T. (2000). Distinguishing gains from nonlosses and losses from nongains: A regulatory focus perspective on hedonic intensity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 252-274.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1982). Toward a Social Psychological Theory of Tourism Motivation: A Rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.

Keller, P. (2006). Regulatory Focus and Efficacy of Health Messages. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 33 (1), 109-114.

Kim, Y. (2006). The Role of Regulatory Focus in the Message Framing in Antismoking Advertisements for Adolescents. *Journal of Advertising*, 35 (1), 143-151.

Kim, K., Jogaratnam, G., and Noh, J. (2006). Travel decisions of students at a US university: Segmenting the international market. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12 (4), 345-357.

Kim, K., Oh, I., and Jogaratnam, G. (2007). College student travel: A revised model of push motives. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 13 (1), 73-85.

Klenosky, D. (2002). The "Pull" of Tourism Destinations: A Means-End Investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40 (4), 385-395.

Kozak, M., Crotts, J., and Law, R. (2007). The Impact of the Perception of Risk on International Travellers. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9, 233-242.

Lockwood. P., Jordan, C. H., and Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by Positive or Negative Role Models: Regulatory Focus Determines Who Will Best Inspire Us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83 (4), 854-864.

Love, E., Staton, M., Chapman, C., and Okada, E. (2010). Regulatory focus as a determinant of brand value. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 19(7), 512-517.

Maser, B. and Weiermair, K. (1998). Travel Decision-Making: From the Vintage Point of Perceived Risk and Information Preferences. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7 (4), 107-121.

Mattila, A., Apostolopoulos, Y., Sonmez, S., Yu, L., and Sasidharan, V. (2001). The Impact of Gender and Religion on College Students' Spring Break Behavior. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40 (November), 193-200.

Micu, C. and Chowdhury, T. (2010). The effect of message's regulatory focus and product type on persuasion. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 18(2), 181-190.

Reichel, A., Fuchs, G., and Uriely, N. (2007). Perceived Risk and the Non-Institutionalized Tourist Role: The Case of Israeli Student Ex-Backpackers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46 (November), 217-226.

Reisinger, Y. and Mavondo, F. (2005). Travel Anxiety and Intentions to Travel Internationally: Implications of Travel Risk Perception. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (February), 212-225.

Roehl, W. and Fesenmaier, D. (1992). Risk Perceptions and Pleasure Travel: An Exploratory Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30 (4), 17-26.

Sonmez, S. and Graefe, A. (1998). Determining Future Travel Behavior from Past Travel Experience and Perceptions of Risk and Safety. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37 (4), 171-177.

Table 1. Regulatory Focus Questionnaire (RFQ)

| Question/Statement | Mean | Std. Dev. | Focus |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Compared to most people, are you typically unable to get what you want out of life? | 3.24 | 1.019 | Promotion (R) |
| 2. Growing up, would you ever "cross the line" by doing things that your parents would not tolerate? | 3.26 | 1.025 | Prevention (R) |
| 3. Did you get on your parents' nerves often when you were growing up? | 3.01 | 1.011 | Prevention (R) |
| 4. How often did you obey rules and regulations that were established by your parents? | 3.65 | .932 | Prevention |
| 5. Growing up, did you ever act in ways that your parents thought were objectionable? | 3.38 | 1.054 | Prevention (R) |
| 6. Do you often do well at different things that you try? | 3.69 | .834 | Promotion |
| 7. Not being careful enough has gotten me into trouble at times. | 3.15 | 1.128 | Prevention (R) |
| 8. When it comes to achieving things that are important to me, I find that I don't perform as well as I ideally would like to do. | 3.46 | 1.044 | Promotion (R) |
| 9. I feel like I have made progress toward being successful in my life. | 3.92 | 1.009 | Promotion |
| 10. I have found very few hobbies or activities in my life that capture my interest or motivate me to put effort into them. | 3.59 | 1.167 | Promotion (R) |

(R) - refers to items that are reverse-scaled

Scale for items 1,2,3,5,6, and 7: 1 (never or seldom), 2, 3 (sometimes), 4, 5 (very often)
Scale for item 4: 1 (never or seldom), 2, 3 (sometimes), 4, 5 (always)
Scale for item 8: 1 (never true), 2, 3 (sometimes true), 4, 5 (very often true)
Scale for items 9 and 10: 1 (certainly false), 2, 3, 4, 5 (certainly true)

Table 2. Factor Analysis of Risk Importance

| Risk Item | Physical Threats | Travel Issues |
|---|---|---|
| Food Safety | 0.760 | |
| Crime | 0.777 | |
| Diseases | 0.825 | |
| Terrorism | 0.885 | |
| Natural Disasters | 0.872 | |
| Political Unrest | 0.749 | |
| Bad Location | | 0.774 |
| Unexpected Expenses | | 0.853 |
| Inferior Accommodations | | 0.801 |
| Travel Difficulties | | 0.817 |
| High Costs | | 0.833 |
| Rowdy Behavior | | 0.719 |

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Factorial Design

| Risk Factor | Prevention Focus | Gender | Mean | Std. Dev. | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Physical Threats | Low Prevention | Male | 4.36 | 1.78 | 95 |
| | | Female | 5.06 | 1.54 | 146 |
| | | Total | 4.78 | 1.67 | 241 |
| | High Prevention | Male | 4.97 | 1.68 | 55 |
| | | Female | 5.57 | 1.33 | 144 |
| | | Total | 5.40 | 1.46 | 199 |
| | Total | Male | 4.58 | 1.77 | 150 |
| | | Female | 5.31 | 1.46 | 290 |
| | | Total | 5.06 | 1.61 | 440 |
| Travel Issues | Low Prevention | Male | 4.44 | 1.47 | 95 |
| | | Female | 5.02 | 1.46 | 146 |
| | | Total | 4.79 | 1.49 | 241 |
| | High Prevention | Male | 5.25 | 1.49 | 55 |
| | | Female | 5.53 | 1.27 | 144 |
| | | Total | 5.45 | 1.34 | 199 |
| | Total | Male | 4.74 | 1.53 | 150 |
| | | Female | 5.28 | 1.39 | 290 |
| | | Total | 5.09 | 1.46 | 440 |

Table 4. MANOVA Multivariate Results

| Effect | Statistic | Value | F | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Power |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prevention | Pillai's Trace | 0.045 | 10.367 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.987 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | 0.955 | 10.367 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.987 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 0.048 | 10.367 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.987 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 0.048 | 10.367 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.987 |
| Gender | Pillai's Trace | 0.037 | 8.267 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.961 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | 0.963 | 8.267 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.961 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 0.038 | 8.267 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.961 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 0.038 | 8.267 | 2 | 435 | 0.000 | 0.961 |
| Interaction | Pillai's Trace | 0.005 | 0.986 | 2 | 435 | 0.374 | 0.222 |
| | Wilks' Lambda | 0.995 | 0.986 | 2 | 435 | 0.374 | 0.222 |
| | Hotelling's Trace | 0.005 | 0.986 | 2 | 435 | 0.374 | 0.222 |
| | Roy's Largest Root | 0.005 | 0.986 | 2 | 435 | 0.374 | 0.222 |

Table 5. MANOVA Univariate Results

| Source | Dependent Variable | Type III SS | df | MS | F | Sig. | Power |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | Physical Threats | 11365.760 | 4 | 2841.440 | 1180.541 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| | Travel Issues | 11477.574 | 4 | 2869.393 | 1444.296 | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Prevention | Physical Threats | 29.297 | 1 | 29.297 | 12.172 | 0.001 | 0.936 |
| | Travel Issues | 41.234 | 1 | 41.234 | 20.755 | 0.000 | 0.995 |
| Gender | Physical Threats | 39.561 | 1 | 39.561 | 16.437 | 0.000 | 0.981 |
| | Travel Issues | 17.510 | 1 | 17.510 | 8.814 | 0.003 | 0.842 |
| Interaction | Physical Threats | 0.195 | 1 | 0.195 | 0.081 | 0.776 | 0.059 |
| | Travel Issues | 2.284 | 1 | 2.284 | 1.150 | 0.284 | 0.188 |
| Error | Physical Threats | 1049.407 | 436 | 2.407 | | | |
| | Travel Issues | 866.204 | 436 | 1.987 | | | |
| Total | Physical Threats | 12415.167 | 440 | | | | |
| | Travel Issues | 12343.778 | 440 | | | | |

a Computed using alpha = .05
b R Squared = .915 (Adjusted R Squared = .915)
c R Squared = .930 (Adjusted R Squared = .929)