DEMOGRAPHIC INFLUENCES ON SOCIAL MEDIA USE ACROSS TOURIST LIFECYCLE PHASES

Ansted Iype Joseph* , S. Victor Anandkumar**

** (Corresponding author) Assistant Professor, Amity Global Business School, Kochi, Kerala, India. Email: ansted2000@yahoo.com*

***Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies Pondicherry University, Pondicherry. India. Email: victor.dms@pondiuni.edu.in*

ABSTRACT

Social media has evolved into a vital tool for tourists looking to not just plan their next vacation but also to use it during their holiday and post vacation. The purpose of this study is to understand the influences of critical demographic variables such as age and gender on the intention to use Social media platforms across the three phases of the tourist lifecycle; Pre-trip, In-Trip and Post-trip. About 600 respondents, including both domestic and international tourists visiting the state of Kerala, India were surveyed. The findings of the study indicate that while gender has minimal influence on which Social media platforms are being used, it is younger tourists who are prolific users of various Social media tools. Knowledge and understanding of the specific Social media platforms that are utilized by travellers across the Tourist lifecycle will enable destination marketing organizations and other tourism providers to engage tourists more proficiently using appropriate Social media tools.

Keywords: *Tourist Lifecycle, Social Media, Tourist Demographics, Tourism, Vacation Trips*

Introduction

Social media is a unique product in the evolution of Information technology in the sense that it has revolutionized the tourism and hospitality industry. The consequences of its use have been felt by both tourists as well as tourism service providers. There used to be a time when it was enough to rely on the abilities of traditional media to craft perceptions of tourism products and services. With the genesis and rapid proliferation of Social media platforms,

both the supply-side as well as the demand-side of tourism have experienced a remodelling of their understanding of the way in which the tourism industry operates. Social media is an expression which is used to portray a mushrooming list of tools that include social networking sites, blogs, video sharing sites, photo sharing sites, consumer review sites, microblogging sites, social bookmarking sites wikis and forums among others. The peculiarity of Social media lies in not just the myriad benefits that it offers but also the vast number of platforms that it represents each with its own specialities that both tourists and tourism organizations wish to exploit. The challenges for tourists lie in the decision of which platforms to use especially in an environment where the burgeoning number of Social media platforms might give rise to confusion. Leung, Law, Van Hoof and Buhalis (2013) expressed that Social media has become a vital instrument for tourists to browse, organize and share travel-related information and experiences through blogs (such as Blogger) and microblogging websites (such as Twitter), online communities (such as Facebook and Tripadvisor), media sharing websites (such as Flickr and YouTube), social bookmarking websites (such as Delicious), social knowledge sharing websites (such as Wikitravel) and other Social media platforms.

Review of Literature

The emergence of Social media has been meteoric with its ability to bring organizations and consumers together like no other communication channel. Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) have defined Social media as "a group of Internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of Web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content". Social media is an all-encompassing term which is used to describe an every growing list of tools that include social networking sites, blogs, video sharing sites, photo sharing sites, consumer review sites, microblogging sites, social bookmarking sites wikis and forums among others. Researchers point out that Social media is relied upon by tourists when planning their holidays (Gretzel, 2006; Gretzel & Yoo, 2008). This article investigates the influence of demographic characteristics on social media use by tourists in the three phases of the travellers' travel planning process (pre-trip, during-trip, and post-trip) suggested by Engel, Blackwell, and Miniard (1990) and Dasgupta (2011).

A multitude of studies have focused on the utility and function of Social media in the tourist lifecycle; pre-trip, in-trip and post trip stages (Cox, Burgess, Sellitto, & Buultjens, 2009; Xiang, 2010; Xiang and Gretzel, 2010; Yoo and Gretzel, 2010; Huang, Basu and Hsu, 2010; Burgess, Sellitto, Cox and Buultjens, 2011; Fotis, Buhalis and Rossides, 2011; Lee, 2011; Lo, McKercher, Lo, Cheung and Law, 2011; Papathanassis and Knolle, 2011;

Department of Hotel Management, BIT-Mesra, Ranchi-835215

Parra-López, Bulchand-Gidumal, Gutiérrez-Taño, and Díaz-Armas, 2011; Sparks and Browning, 2011; Tussyadiah, Park and Fesenmaier, 2010; Yoo and Gretzel, 2011; Zehrer, Crotts and Magnini, 2011).

The use of Social media for trip purposes is however influenced by the demographic characteristics of tourists and has been highlighted in some studies (Xiang & Gretzel, 2010; Yoo & Gretzel, 2012; Ip, Lee & Law, 2012). Researchers have stated that the intentions of travellers to utilize Social media platforms in the various stages of the tourist lifecycle are influenced by age considerations (Cox et al., 2009; Fotis, Buhalis and Rossides, 2012). Other researchers have suggested that users and creators of Social media tend to be younger in comparison (Rodriguez, 2009; Zickuhr, 2010; Yoo and Gretzel, 2012). Those users who contribute on Social media are found to be young (Yoo and Gretzel, 2009) and male (Yoo and Gretzel, 2008; Verna, 2009). An interesting finding of Yoo and Gretzel (2009) is that younger users are more prominent users of photo sharing platforms after the trip. Murphy, Gil and Schegg (2010) have described that a majority of young travellers post content about the trip on social media in the post-trip stage of their holiday. Pan, MacLaurin, and Crotts (2007) have found that Social media users and creators were more likely to be younger males. Studies by other researchers have stated that younger users were more active users and creators of Social media (Jones and Fox, 2009; Lenhart, Madden, Macgill and Smith, 2007; Verna, 2009).

Research Methodology

A survey was conducted among the international and domestic inbound tourists at the international and domestic departure lounges of the international airport at Kochi, Kerala. For data collection, 600 respondents which included both domestic as well as international tourists were surveyed and complete responses were obtained from 412 respondents who fulfilled the inclusion criteria. The respondents were identified through a method of convenience sampling. Tourists were approached and given a questionnaire for self-completion upon obtaining consent. Randomization was incorporated into the times of the day and days of the week to avoid bias in data collection. The sample inclusion criteria such as tourists who are non-residents of the state of Kerala and those who use social media tools in their travel planning were applied. A structured questionnaire was developed after an extensive review of the relevant literature. The data collection instrument had two sections. The first part of the questionnaire was designed to collect data pertaining to the demographic characteristics of the respondents. A recent study by Simms and Gretzel (2013) indicated that age and gender were the biggest demographic

predictors of Social media use by tourists. This study therefore studies only the critical demographic variables age and gender.

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to understand the influence of various Social media platforms during the three phases of the tourist lifecycle. The level of influence was measured on a three-point scale with '1' representing never having used the particular Social media platform, '2' representing no influence of the Social media platform and '3' representing an influence of the particular Social media platform. The Social media platforms which were included in the study are listed in table 1.

Data Analysis and Findings

Age and use of Social media across the Tourist Lifecycle

In order to test the relationship between the intentions to use Social media and demographic characteristics the following hypothesis was conjectured.

H_1: Demographic characteristics (age & gender) have a significant impact on the tourists' intentions to use Social media

Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were performed to ascertain whether significant difference existed between the tourists' intentions to use Social media in the pre-trip, in-trip and post-trip phases of the tourist lifecycle on the demographic variable age. The *F* ratio indicates significant difference among the tourists on the basis of the demographic variable age (table 2). The hypotheses have been accepted specific to the variables as shown in table 2.

In terms of age, significant difference was observed on the platforms of Social media - pre-trip (*Social Networking Sites, Blogs By Seasoned Travellers, Video Sharing Sites, Photo Sharing Sites, Microblogging Sites, Review Sites, Social Bookmarking Sites, Wikis*); in-trip (*Social Networking Sites, Blogs By Seasoned Travellers, Video Sharing Sites, Photo Sharing Sites, Microblogging Sites, Review Sites, Social Bookmarking Sites, Wikis*) and post-trip (*Social Networking Sites, Video Sharing Sites, Photo Sharing Sites, Microblogging Sites, Review Sites, Social Bookmarking Sites, Wikis*) as shown in table 1. This was followed by the Duncan's test (post-hoc) to ascertain which of the group (age) means were significantly different from the others at significance level, $p < .05$. The results of post hoc comparison are detailed in tables 2.1 – 2.23.

In the case of intention to use social networking sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.1); tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.65, 2.64 and 2.60 respectively) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean values of 2.90) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use blogs by seasoned travellers in the pre-trip stage (table 2.2); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.12) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.36, 1.37 and 1.24 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use video sharing sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.3); tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values ranging from 2.4 to 2.54) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean values of 2.80) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use photo sharing sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.4); tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values ranging from 2.44, 2.37 and 2.51 respectively) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean values of 2.83) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use microblogging sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.5); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.45) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values ranging from 1.64 to 1.74) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use review sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.6); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.18) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years (mean value of 2.56) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean value of 2.8 and 2.87 respectively) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use social bookmarking sites in the pre-trip stage (table 2.7); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.2) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years (mean value of 1.27) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean value of 1.48 and 1.39 respectively) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use wikis in the pre-trip stage (table 2.8); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.26) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years (mean value of 1.45) appear in subset 2.

Tourists in the age group 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.73 and 1.57 respectively) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use social networking sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.9); tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 2.16) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.53 and 2.46 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.81) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use blogs by seasoned travellers sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.10); tourists in the age group 20-30 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values ranging from 1.08 to 1.22) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years (mean value of 1.4) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use video sharing sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.11); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.22) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.45, 1.57 and 1.55 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use photo sharing sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.12); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.40) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.9, 1.87 and 2.06 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use microblogging sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.13); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.18) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years (mean value of 1.33) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.56 and 1.43 respectively) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use review sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.14); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.34) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.9 and 1.87 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 2.17) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use social bookmarking sites in the in-trip stage (table 2.15); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.13) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.27, 1.36 and 1.32 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use wikis in the in-trip stage (table 2.16); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 1.11) appear in subset 1.

Department of Hotel Management, BIT-Mesra, Ranchi-835215

Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.33 and 1.39 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 1.54) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use social networking sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.17); tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 2.28) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.56 and 2.49 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.79) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use photo sharing sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.18); tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 2.14) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.45 and 2.46 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.77) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use photo sharing sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.19); tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 1.94) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.09 and 2.19 respectively) appear in subset 2. Tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.70) appear in subset 3.

In the case of intention to use review sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.20); tourists in the age group 20-30 years (mean value of 2.11) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 2.45, 2.57 and 2.69 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use microblogging sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.21); tourists in the age group 20-30 years and 31-40 years (mean values of 1.16 and 1.29 respectively) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.5 and 1.46 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use social bookmarking sites in the post-trip stage (table 2.22); tourists in the age group 20-30 years and (mean values of 1.19) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 31-40 years, 41-50 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.38, 1.45 and 1.51 respectively) appear in subset 2.

In the case of intention to use wikis in the post-trip stage (table 2.23); tourists in the age group 20-30 years, 31-40 years and 51 years or more (mean values of 1.12, 1.18 and 1.24 respectively) appear in subset 1. Tourists in the age group 41-50 years (mean value of 1.46) appear in subset 2.

Gender and Use of Social Media across the Tourist Lifecycle

Independent-samples t-tests were conducted to ascertain whether a significant difference existed between the tourists' intentions to use Social media in the pre-trip, in-trip and post-trip phases of the tourist lifecycle on the demographic variable gender.

The relationship between the usage of Social media in the pre-trip phase of the tourist lifecycle and the gender of the traveller was tested. The group statistics are described in table 3 and the t-test values are shown in table 3.1. The t-test reveals that there is no significant difference in the use of Social media by male and female tourists in the case of all the platforms in the pre-trip stage of the tourist lifecycle.

The relationship between the usage of Social media in the in-trip phase of the tourist lifecycle and the gender of the traveller was tested. The group statistics are described in table 4 and the t-test values are shown in table 4.1. The t-test reveals that there is a significant difference in the use of Social media by male and female tourists in the case of social networking sites and review sites in the in-trip stage of the tourist lifecycle. Upon observing the mean values, we can infer that female tourists are more likely to using social networking sites during the trip compared to male tourists.

The relationship between the usage of Social media in the post-trip phase of the tourist lifecycle and the gender of the traveller was tested. The group statistics are described in table 5 and the t-test values are shown in table 5.1. The t-test reveals that there is no significant difference in the use of Social media by male and female tourists in the case of all the platforms in the post-trip stage of the tourist lifecycle.

Discussion of Results

On the intention to use Social media in the pre-trip stage, tourist's aged 20-30 years are most likely to use social networking sites, photo sharing sites and video sharing sites and least likely to use review sites in the pre-trip stage. Tourists aged above 40 years are most likely to use review sites during this stage. All the tourists are, however, positively influenced by these platforms. Both male and female tourists are positively influenced by social networking sites, video sharing sites, photo sharing sites and review sites in the pre-trip stage. During the in-trip stage, all groups of tourists are influenced by social networking sites but 20-30 year old tourists are the most prolific

users. Those aged 41-50 years are least likely to use social networking sites but were marginally in favour of using review sites. Other groups of tourists were not influenced at all by review sites at this stage. Both male and female tourists are positively influenced by social networking sites during the trip but female tourists are more influenced to use this platform. In the post-trip stage, 20-30 year olds are most likely to use social networking, photo sharing and video sharing sites and least likely to use review sites. During the post-trip stage, review sites are mostly likely to be used by tourists aged above 30 years. Other groups of tourists are also influenced by social networking, photo sharing, video sharing and review sites. The only exception is tourists aged 41-50 who are not influenced by video sharing sites in this stage. Both male and female tourists are positively influenced by social networking sites, video sharing sites, photo sharing sites and review sites in the post-trip stage.

The influence of demographic characteristics on the intention to use Social media has been highlighted in numerous studies. This study has found that younger travellers are prolific users of most Social media websites in the pre-trip and post-trip stages. The literature reveals that social media users and creators are generally younger (Rodriguez, 2009; Zickuhr, 2010; Yoo and Gretzel, 2012; Fotis et al., 2012). This is congruous with the findings of our study. The literature also points out that Social media contributors are young (Yoo and Gretzel, 2009; Stoller, 2012) and male (Yoo and Gretzel, 2008). A study by Yoo and Gretzel (2012) has stated that there is influence of gender on Social media creation. Both male and female tourists are found to be active users of Social media platforms. This study has, however, found no influence of gender on the Social media usage of tourists except in the case of Social media use in the in-trip stage where female tourists were bigger users of social networking sites. In a recent study, Shankman (2014) has found that almost all younger travellers post on a Social network while travelling and nearly three-quarters of them post at least once a day. This is synonymous with the findings of this study which indicates that younger tourists use Social networking websites while travelling. According to Google Ipsos MediaCT (2014) tourists use social networking, video sharing and photo sharing websites the most for holiday inspiration in the pre-trip stage of their travel. Another important source of inspiration in this stage is travel review websites. A recent study by Tripadvisor (2014) has also suggested the prominence of review websites as an influential platform during the planning stage of the trip. The current study corroborates findings of these studies by confirming that the most prominent Social media platforms are social networking, photo sharing, video sharing and review websites.

Conclusion

This study highlights the use of various Social media platforms across the pre-trip, in-trip and post-trip stages of the tourist lifecycle. The key differences regarding the influence of critical demographic variables on the intention to social media yield insights into which platforms are utilized at different stages of the lifecycle. These findings offer directions to service providers on what kind of Social media platforms to employ for their marketing efforts. Social networking, Photo sharing, Video sharing and Review sites have emerged as the major Social media platforms that are utilized by tourists. Since this is a pioneering research on Social media use by tourists visiting the state of Kerala, several directions for future research can be identified.

References

- *Burgess, S., Sellitto, C., Cox, C., & Buultjens, J. (2011). Trust perceptions of online travel information by different content creators: Some social and legal implications. Information systems frontiers, 13(2), 221-235.*

- *Cox, C., Burgess, S., Sellitto, C., & Buultjens, J. (2009). The role of user-generated content in tourists' travel planning behaviour. Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 18(8), 743-764.*

- *Dasgupta, D. (2011). Tourism marketing. India: Dorling Kindersley.*

- *Engel, J., Blackwell, R., & Miniard, P. (1990). Consumer Behaviour. USA.*

- *Fotis, J., Buhalis, D., & Rossides, N. (2011). Social media impact on holiday travel planning: The case of the Russian and the FSU markets. International Journal of Online Marketing, 1(4), 1-19.*

- *Fotis, J., Buhalis, D., & Rossides, N. (2012). Social media use and impact during the holiday travel planning process (pp. 13-24). Springer-Verlag.*

- *Google Ipsos MediaCT (2014, June). The 2014 Traveler's Road to Decision. Retrieved from* https://www.thinkwithgoogle.com/research-studies/2014-travelers-road-to-decision.html

Department of Hotel Management, BIT-Mesra, Ranchi-835215

- *Gretzel, U., Hwang, Y., & Fesenmaier, D. (2006). A behavioral framework for travel destination recommendation systems design. In D. Fesenmaier, H. Werthner and K. Wöber (Eds.), Destination recommendation systems: Behavioral foundations and applications (pp. 53-64). Cambridge, MA: CAB International.*

- *Gretzel, U., & Yoo, K. H. (2008). Use and impact of online travel reviews. Information and communication technologies in tourism 2008, 35-46.*

- *Huang, Y. H., Basu, C., & Hsu, M. K. (2010). Exploring motivations of travel knowledge sharing on social network sites: An empirical investigation of U.S. college students. Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 19(7), 717-734.*

- *Ip, C., Lee, H. A., & Law, R. (2012). Profiling the users of travel websites for planning and online experience sharing. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 36(3), 418-426.*

- *Jones, S., & Fox, S. (2009). Generations online in 2009. Washington DC: Pew Internet & American Life Project.*

- *Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2011). The early bird catches the news: Nine things you should know about micro-blogging. Business Horizons, 54(2), 105-113.*

- *Lee, S. W. (2011). To tweet or not to tweet: An exploratory study of meeting professionals' attitudes toward applying social media for meeting sessions. Journal of Convention & Event Tourism, 12(4), 271-289.*

- *Lenhart, A., Madden, M., Macgill, A. R., & Smith, A. (2007). Teens and social media. Pew Internet and American Life Project.*

- *Leung, D., Law, R., Van Hoof, H., & Buhalis, D. (2013). Social media in tourism and hospitality: A literature review. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 30(1-2), 3-22.*

- *Lo, I. S., McKercher, B., Lo, A., Cheung, C., & Law, R. (2011). Tourism and online photography. Tourism Management, 32(4), 725-731.*

- *Murphy, H. C., Centeno Gil, E. A., & Schegg, R. (2010). An investigation of motivation to share online content by young travellers -Why and Where. Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2010, 467-478.*

- *Pan, B., MacLaurin, T., & Crotts, J. C. (2007). Travel blogs and the implications for destination marketing. Journal of Travel Research, 46(1), 35-45.*

- *Papathanassis, A., & Knolle, F. (2011). Exploring the adoption and processing of online holiday reviews: A grounded theory approach. Tourism Management, 32(2), 215-224.*

- *Parra-López, E., Bulchand-Gidumal, J., Gutiérrez-Taño, D., & Díaz-Armas, R. (2011). Intentions to use social media in organizing and taking vacation trips. Computers in Human Behaviour, 27(2), 640-654.*

- *Rodríguez, I. L. (2009). Social media in tourism behaviour (Master degree dissertation, Bournemouth University and Université de Savoie). Retrieved from http://www.du.se/PageFiles/18846/RodrguezIreneLucena.pdf.*

- *Shankman, S. (2014, June). Three-Quarters of Millennial Travelers Update Social Media Once a Day. Retrieved from http://skift.com/2014/06/10/three-quarters-of-millennial-travelers-update-social-media-once-a-day/*

- *Simms, A., & Gretzel, U. (2013). Planning a vacation using social media: Influences of demographic, psychographic, and trip-related characteristics. In Proceeding of The 20th IFITT International Conference on Information Technology and Travel & Tourism, ENTER 2013.*

- *Sparks, B. A., & Browning, V. (2011). The impact of online reviews on hotel booking intentions and perception of trust. Tourism Management, 32(6), 1310-1323.*

- *Stoller, G. (2012, August). How Men, Women Travel Differently - And More. Retrieved from http://www.cnbc.com/id/48433282*

- *Tripadvisor (2014a, April). TripBarometer April 2014: Global Edition. Retrieved from http://www.tripadvisor.com/TripAdvisorInsights/n2200/tripbarometer-april-2014-global-edition*

- *Tussyadiah, I. P., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2008). Marketing Places through First-Person Stories: An Analysis of Pennsylvania Roadtripper Blog. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 25(3-4), 299-311.*

- *Verna, P. (2009). User-generated content: More popular than profitable. eMarketer Reports, Jan.*

- *Xiang, Z. (2010). Modeling the persuasive effects of search engine results. Information Technology & Tourism, 12(3), 233-248.*

- *Xiang, Z., & Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. Tourism management, 31(2), 179-188.*

- *Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2008, January). Understanding differences between online travel review writers and non-writers. In Proceedings of the 13th Annual Graduate Education and Student Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism, Orlando, FL (pp. 21-29).*

- *Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2009, June). Generational differences in CGM perceptions and use for travel planning. In Proceedings of the 40th annual conference of the travel and tourism research association, Honolulu, HI.*

- *Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2010). Antecedents and impacts of trust in travel-related consumer-generated media. Information Technology & Tourism, 12(2), 139-152.*

- *Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2011). Influence of personality on travel-related consumer-generated media creation. Computers in Human Behaviour, 27(2), 609-621.*

- *Yoo, K. H., & Gretzel, U. (2012). Use and creation of social media by travellers. Social media in travel, tourism and hospitality: Theory, practice and cases, 189.*

- *Zehrer, A., Crotts, J. C., & Magnini, V. P. (2011). The perceived usefulness of blog postings: An extension of the expectancy-disconfirmation paradigm. Tourism Management, 32(1), 106-113.*

- *Zickuhr, K. (2010). Generations 2010. Pew internet & American life project. Pew Research Center, Washington, DC.*

Table 1: List of Social Media Platforms for Measuring their Influence on the Tourist Lifecycle

Social media platforms
Social Networking sites (Facebook, Google+ and so on)
Blogs maintained by seasoned travellers and tourism organizations
Video sharing sites (Youtube, Vimeo and so on)
Photo sharing sites (Flickr, Picasa and so on)
Microblogging sites (Twitter and so on)
Review sites (Trip Advisor, HolidayIQ, Raahi and so on)
Social Bookmarking sites (Delicious, Digg, Reddit and so on)
Wikis (Wikipedia, Wiki Travel and so on)

Table 2: Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) – Demographic Characteristic - Age

	Age					
	Pre-Trip		**In-Trip**		**Post-Trip**	
Dependent Variable	**F**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**	**F**	**Sig.**
Social Networking Sites	6.895	.000	16.501	.000	11.960	.000
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	4.612	.003	6.410	.000	2.835	.038
Video Sharing Sites	10.164	.000	12.962	.000	27.369	.000
Photo Sharing Sites	13.450	.000	16.840	.000	15.519	.000
Microblogging Sites	4.751	.003	10.598	.000	12.135	.000
Review Sites	16.657	.000	24.096	.000	10.246	.000
Social Bookmarking Sites	6.016	.001	8.046	.000	7.289	.000
Wikis	8.120	.000	14.422	.000	10.235	.000
df	3		3		3	

Post-hoc tables

Table 2.1: Post hoc – Age vs Social Networking Sites – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
51 years or more	63	2.6032	
41 - 50 years	70	2.6429	
31 - 40 years	55	2.6545	
20 - 30 years	224		2.9018
Sig.		.624	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.2: Post hoc – Age vs Blogs by Seasoned Travellers – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.1205	
51 years or more	63	1.2381	1.2381
31 - 40 years	55		1.3636
41 - 50 years	70		1.3714
Sig.		.228	.198

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.3: Post hoc – Age vs Video Sharing Sites– Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
31 - 40 years	55	2.4000	
41 - 50 years	70	2.4000	
51 years or more	63	2.5397	
20 - 30 years	224		2.8036
Sig.		.231	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.4: Post hoc – Age vs Photo Sharing Sites – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
41 - 50 years	70	2.3714	
31 - 40 years	55	2.4364	
51 years or more	63	2.5079	
20 - 30 years	224		2.8348
Sig.		.223	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.5: Post hoc – Age vs Microblogging Sites– Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.4464	
51 years or more	63	1.6349	1.6349
31 - 40 years	55	1.6364	1.6364
41 - 50 years	70		1.7429
Sig.		.086	.333

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.6: Post hoc – Age vs Review Sites – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	2.1875		
31 - 40 years	55		2.5636	
41 - 50 years	70		2.8000	2.8000
51 years or more	63			2.8730
Sig.		1.000	.087	.597

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.7: Post hoc – Age vs Social Bookmarking Sites – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	1.2009		
31 - 40 years	55	1.2727	1.2727	
51 years or more	63		1.3968	1.3968
41 - 50 years	70			1.4857
Sig.		.410	.155	.308

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.8: Post hoc – Age vs Wikis – Pre-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	1.2589		
31 - 40 years	55	1.4545	1.4545	
51 years or more	63		1.5714	1.5714
41 - 50 years	70			1.7286
Sig.		.113	.343	.202

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.9: Post hoc – Age vs Social Networking Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
41 - 50 years	70	2.1571		
51 years or more	63		2.4603	
31 - 40 years	55		2.5273	
20 - 30 years	224			2.8125
Sig.		1.000	.565	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.10: Post hoc – Age vs Blogs by Seasoned Travellers – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.0804	
41 - 50 years	70	1.2143	
51 years or more	63	1.2222	
31 - 40 years	55		1.4000
Sig.		.107	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.11: Post hoc – Age vs Video Sharing Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.2232	
31 - 40 years	55		1.4545
51 years or more	63		1.5556
41 - 50 years	70		1.5714
Sig.		1.000	.188

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.12: Post hoc – Age vs Photo Sharing Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.4018	
41 - 50 years	70		1.8714
31 - 40 years	55		1.9091
51 years or more	63		2.0635
Sig.		1.000	.161

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.13: Post hoc – Age vs Microblogging Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	1.1786		
31 - 40 years	55	1.3273	1.3273	
51 years or more	63		1.4286	1.4286
41 - 50 years	70			1.5571
Sig.		.086	.242	.138

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.14: Post hoc – Age vs Review Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	1.3393		
51 years or more	63		1.8730	
31 - 40 years	55		1.9091	
41 - 50 years	70			2.1714
Sig.		1.000	.784	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.15: Post hoc – Age vs Social Bookmarking Sites – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.1295	
31 - 40 years	55		1.2727
51 years or more	63		1.3175
41 - 50 years	70		1.3571
Sig.		1.000	.225

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.16: Post hoc – Age vs Wikis – In-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
20 - 30 years	224	1.1116		
31 - 40 years	55		1.3273	
51 years or more	63		1.3968	1.3968
41 - 50 years	70			1.5429
Sig.		1.000	.416	.088

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.17: Post hoc – Age vs Social Networking Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
41 - 50 years	70	2.2857		
51 years or more	63	2.4921	2.4921	
31 - 40 years	55		2.5636	
20 - 30 years	224			2.7991
Sig.		.059	.512	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.18: Post hoc – Age vs Photo Sharing Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
41 - 50 years	70	2.1429		
31 - 40 years	55		2.4545	
51 years or more	63		2.4603	
20 - 30 years	224			2.7723
Sig.		1.000	.960	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.19: Post hoc – Age vs Video Sharing Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset		
		1	2	3
41 - 50 years	70	1.9429		
31 - 40 years	55	2.0909	2.0909	
51 years or more	63		2.1905	
20 - 30 years	224			2.7009
Sig.		.208	.397	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.20: Post hoc – Age vs Review Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	2.1161	
31 - 40 years	55		2.4545
41 - 50 years	70		2.5714
51 years or more	63		2.6984
Sig.		1.000	.107

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.21: Post hoc – Age vs Microblogging Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.1607	
31 - 40 years	55	1.2909	
51 years or more	63		1.4603
41 - 50 years	70		1.5000
Sig.		.101	.616

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.22: Post hoc – Age vs Social Bookmarking Sites – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.1964	
31 - 40 years	55		1.3818
41 - 50 years	70		1.4571
51 years or more	63		1.5079
Sig.		1.000	.203

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 2.23: Post hoc – Age vs Wikis – Post-Trip

Age	N	Subset	
		1	2
20 - 30 years	224	1.1250	
31 - 40 years	55	1.1818	
51 years or more	63	1.2381	
41 - 50 years	70		1.4571
Sig.		.138	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Table 3: Group statistics – Gender * Intention to Use Social Media Pre-Trip

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social Networking Sites	Male	142	2.7535	.64342	.05399
	Female	270	2.7926	.59859	.03643
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	Male	142	1.2676	.66221	.05557
	Female	270	1.1852	.57436	.03495
Video Sharing Sites	Male	142	2.5493	.73008	.06127
	Female	270	2.6889	.67308	.04096

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Photo Sharing Sites	Male	142	2.5704	.69851	.05862
	Female	270	2.6963	.65977	.04015
Microblogging Sites	Male	142	1.5845	.68668	.05763
	Female	270	1.5333	.63128	.03842
Review Sites	Male	142	2.5211	.85650	.07188
	Female	270	2.4074	.91494	.05568
Social Bookmarking Sites	Male	142	1.2958	.56855	.04771
	Female	270	1.2852	.53516	.03257
Wikis	Male	142	1.4296	.78458	.06584
	Female	270	1.4037	.77363	.04708

Table 3.1: t-test for Equality of Means

Social media Platform	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social Networking Sites	-.613	410	.540
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	1.255	253.818	.210
Video Sharing Sites	-1.894	267.241	.059
Photo Sharing Sites	-1.772	272.872	.078
Microblogging Sites	.758	410	.449
Review Sites	1.251	303.692	.212
Social Bookmarking Sites	.187	410	.852
Wikis	.321	410	.748

Table 4: Group statistics – Gender * Intention to Use Social media In-Trip

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social Networking Sites	Male	142	2.4930	.84842	.07120
	Female	270	2.6704	.69428	.04225
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	Male	142	1.1620	.51416	.04315
	Female	270	1.1704	.52507	.03195

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Video Sharing Sites	Male	142	1.4296	.58828	.04937
	Female	270	1.3296	.50153	.03052
Photo Sharing Sites	Male	142	1.7606	.84994	.07133
	Female	270	1.5926	.82522	.05022
Microblogging Sites	Male	142	1.2606	.51474	.04320
	Female	270	1.3222	.56859	.03460
Review Sites	Male	142	1.7817	.91571	.07684
	Female	270	1.5630	.84578	.05147
Social Bookmarking Sites	Male	142	1.2042	.40456	.03395
	Female	270	1.2222	.41651	.02535
Wikis	Male	142	1.3099	.60942	.05114
	Female	270	1.2296	.51650	.03143

Table 4.1: t-test for Equality of Means

Social media Platform	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social Networking Sites	-2.143	242.067	.033
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	-.155	410	.877
Video Sharing Sites	1.722	250.235	.086
Photo Sharing Sites	1.943	410	.053
Microblogging Sites	-1.114	312.563	.266
Review Sites	2.365	267.666	.019
Social Bookmarking Sites	-.421	410	.674
Wikis	1.337	249.028	.183

Table 5: Group statistics – Gender * Intention to Use Social media Post-Trip

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Social Networking Sites	Male	142	2.6197	.74121	.06220
	Female	270	2.6407	.67387	.04101

Social media Platform	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	Male	142	1.0915	.31296	.02626
	Female	270	1.1037	.36121	.02198
Video Sharing Sites	Male	142	2.3521	.83536	.07010
	Female	270	2.4444	.76315	.04644
Photo Sharing Sites	Male	142	2.5352	.80479	.06754
	Female	270	2.5963	.71364	.04343
Microblogging Sites	Male	142	1.3028	.53248	.04468
	Female	270	1.2704	.49256	.02998
Review Sites	Male	142	2.4155	.89318	.07495
	Female	270	2.2815	.91377	.05561
Social Bookmarking Sites	Male	142	1.3310	.63828	.05356
	Female	270	1.3037	.55580	.03382
Wikis	Male	142	1.2183	.47812	.04012
	Female	270	1.2000	.44471	.02706

Table 5.1: t-test for Equality of Means

Social media Platform	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Social Networking Sites	-.291	410	.771
Blogs by Seasoned Travellers	-.339	410	.734
Video Sharing Sites	-1.098	265.166	.273
Photo Sharing Sites	-.761	258.554	.447
Microblogging Sites	.618	410	.537
Review Sites	1.426	410	.155
Social Bookmarking Sites	.450	410	.653
Wikis	.387	410	.699