

# Role of Gender Difference in Travel Decision-Making Style of Millennials

Pooja Choudhary\*, Sandeep Walia\*\*

**Abstract** Consumer behavior and market segmentation is one of the most popular studies in marketing. But when we look at the studies of the tourism marketing in developing countries, it is still unexplored. In the academic filed of tourism marketing the consumer decision making styles are extremely important as it helps in determining consumer choice, preference and behavior and also helps in segmenting the market. Present study is an attempt to identify the Travel Decision Making Styles (TDMS) of Millennials' using consumer style inventory. The study is aimed to identify the difference in the perception of millennial males and females for identified travel decision-making styles. The study was conducted among the millennial males and females ranging between age group of 18 years and 35 years of Jammu district of Jammu and Kashmir Union Territory. Total 420 Millennials' participated for current study and an eight dimensional structured consumer style inventory was used to investigate about their travel decision-making styles. Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to find out travel decision-making styles of millennial respondents. Further "T" test was administered to find out the difference between the perception of millennial males and females for travel decision-making styles.

**Keywords:** Millennials', Travel Decision Making Style, Consumer

## INTRODUCTION

Underling the determinants of how people make their travel related decision has been a topic of study for many years. The previous study which has been done in the field of consumer behaviour have been successful in demonstrating that the decision making is influenced by the characteristic of individuals. The previous studies has also signifies that with the change in the technology the method of marketing and selling have also changed. Easy and economic availability of Internet has made shopping easy and marketing complicated. The Internet has turned into a social place which has created a new form of consume (Steinbauer, 2007) it has changed the purchase behavior of customer (Ricard, 2001). The regular development of the technology creates the need to study the consumer purchase decision-making behavior and the use of technology for the same. Multiple scales have been developed to study the consumer purchase behavior based on the characteristics, lifestyle, behavior and typology. Studying consumer typology is one of the most popular

methods of segmenting the consumer and it has been an effective tool to know the purchase behavior of consumer. The first taxonomy to understand the consumer typology was offered by Westbrook and Black in 1985. Sproles and Kendall developed consumer decision-making style inventory (CSI) to measure shopping orientation.

Consumer decision-making styles were defined as a mental orientation by Sproles and Kendall (1986) in their study and characterize it as a customer's approach for making choices (George B. Sproles, 1986; Fan & Xiao, 1998). This approach includes both cognitive and affective components of procurement process (Bakewell & Mitchell, 2003). Consumer decision-making styles were also explained by Walsh et al. (2001) as "a basic buying attitude which consumer adheres even when they make decision for different goods and services", which is based on 'consumer personality' (Sproles & Kendall, 1986).

A consumer decision-making style is characterized in three different ways consumer typology, Psychographic/lifestyles

\* Assistant Professor, School of Hotel Management and Tourism, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India.  
Email: poojajha023@gmail.com

\*\* Associate Professor and Head of Department, School of Hotel Management and Tourism, Lovely Professional University, Jalandhar, Punjab, India. Email: sndp.walia551@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

and customer characteristics (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). Psychographic segmentation approach means grouping the consumer on basis of their opinion, interest characteristics, personality (Zeng, 2008). Psychographic segmentation is an effective way to understand the consumer behavior and an effective marketing tool for many industries (Lastovicka et al., 1990). Psychographic segmentation gives the answer of “why” consumer are buying a particular product or service. This psychological segmentation includes consumer’s lifestyle, social standards, and his activities, interests and opinions (AIO).

The other approach, which is widely researched and acknowledges market segmentation, is consumer characteristics. This approach is based on the affective and cognitive aspects of consumer behavior and is considered to be very powerful and easily understood approach (Sproles & Kendall, 1986). Cognitive approach is also called mental approach, product of mind, which helps human to find the source of knowledge, his surrounding and self-control (Trandafilović. Igor, 2013). Anderson and Golden (1984), it is one’s characteristics pattern of feeling, perceiving and understanding. On the other hand affective reaction leads to behavior with no previous attitude formation system (Trandafilović. Igor, 2013). Affective consumer behavior is a spontaneous urge to purchase services or product. The characteristics of impulsive and affective customers are very much similar, emotional conflict and temporary loss of self-control are the result of affective reaction.

The third segmentation is consumer typology is based on the shopping style of people (Gehrt & Shim, 1998). Zeng (2008) defined consumer typology as “general consumer types, which are further categorized as problem-solving buyers, convenience buyers and price oriented buyers.” Present study used consumer typology approach for studying Millennials’ Travel Decision Making Styles. The study was conducted by administering consumer style inventory (CSI) developed by Sproles and Kendall, (1986) to find the Travel Decision Making Styles of Millennial’s as travel consumers. The inventory contains eight different decision making styles naming 1. Brand conscious. 2. Fashion/Novelty conscious; 3. Consumer perfectionist/high quality conscious; 4. recreational/hedonistic conscious; 5. Loyalty/habitual conscious; 6. consumers confused by over choice; 7. Impulsive/reckless consumers; 8. price-conscious/value for money conscious. Consumer decision-making style inventory has been popular inventory of use to identify the customer purchase behavior. Previously studies have used the inventory to understand the purchase behavior of customer for retail, dinner and sports products (Bae, 2004; Hou & Lin, 2004; Decrop et al., 2005). Present study uses the consumer style inventory to identify the travel decision-making style

of millennials’ which is one of the biggest market segments of travel market, using social networking sites. UNWTO in its report published in the year 2008 mentioned that there is a great opportunity for the business organization and the official government tourism organizations to enhance their engagements with young travelers for social and economic benefits with long term tourism strategies and policies Millennials’ are generally considered people born between the years 1980 to 2000 and are of average age range between 15 to 35 years. This is the generation who have lived their intact life in digital environment or whose lives are affected by information technology (Bennett et al., 2008).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Westbrook and Black in the year 1985 offered first taxonomy of consumers and tried to understand shopper typology of adult female shoppers based on motivational factors (Westbrook & Black, 1985). They have identified four typologies and categorized them in personalising buyers, apathetic buyers, economic buyers and ethical buyers. Personalising shoppers or buyers are more influenced by the personal relationship with the suppliers/retailers. Personalising customers take their purchase decision considering the relationship they hold with the other party. On other hand economic shoppers hold careful approach for the purchase, giving attention to price and quality and merchandise assortment. Apathetic shoppers have no interest for shopping they do it for their necessity. Ethical shoppers purchase decision is based on factors other than price and they feel morally obliged to support their own beliefs pertaining to morality while buying

In contrast, of the foregoing typology Sproles and Kendall (1986) attempted to thoroughly measure purchasing orientation by using decision-making orientations. They also conceptualized the Consumer Style Inventory based on decision making. Decision-making styles may be defined as step by step psychological guidelines that helps in determining the way in which consumer will make their purchase decision for a different product. One of important assumption of consumer style inventory is that every customer has specific individual decision-making dimensions. Mesquita and Muylder (2015) revealed that decision-making styles effect on the purchase decision-making process like people who care for brand or who are impulsive can skip the evaluation stage or spend less time at this stage. And the people who are perfection conscious or price conscious would go through all the stages of decision making. It is important to understand that each consumer passes through the different context of purchase (Mesquita & Muylder, 2015). Below Table 1 presents the characteristics of eight decision making style and its characteristics.

**Table 1: Decision Making Styles and its Characteristics**

Decision Making Style	Characteristics
Brand Conscious	The consumer, who evaluates the brand with price, considers high price means better quality. They prefer more advertised or best-selling product.
Perfectionistic	Consumer who systematically and carefully look for all the details and want almost everything of high quality
Habitual	Consumer having habit of repetitively purchasing a particular brand or preferring any particular shop.
Recreational	Consumer finds purchasing as recreational and entertainment activity.
Novelty	Consumer looking for innovative and new product every time. Always seek to have some this different form previous.
Price Conscious	Consumer who are very particular about value for the money. They look for the discount offer and also wait for such offers.
Impulsive	Consumer who don't want to spend time in thinking and taken decisions. Impulsive buyers are the quick decision takers.
Confused by over Choice	Consumer who don't prefer more information regarding product. They find difficult to evaluate the too many information.

Source: Sproles & Kendall (1986); Cheng (2011)

The present study is aimed to find out the decision making styles of millennial males & females and also attempted to identify the difference in perception of Millennial male & females for common travel decision making styles.

The current study was conducted with the specific objectives mentioned below: -

1. To find out the travel decision making styles of Millennials' males & females.
2. To identify the difference among the perception of males & females for common travel decision making styles.

Table 2 represents the decision making styles found in previous studies used for consumer style inventory for the shopping of different products.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study was done in two phases. In the first phase the data collected was checked for the socio demographic profiles of the respondents whereas in the second phase the data was run by using exploratory factor analysis and administering 'T' test. The data was collected with the help of questionnaires.

For the purpose of data collection and obtaining responses from millennial males & females a standardized questionnaire was administered and responses were collected. All the items were measured on five-point Likert scale. The instrument was divided into two sections part A and part B. Part A of the questionnaire targets to find demographics of the respondents whereas part B was

designed to find out the travel decision making styles of millennial male & female respondents. The original instrument of consumer style inventory (CSI) was designed by Sproles and Kendall (1986), which contained 40 items. The instrument was further replicated by many studies to identify the decision making styles for general shopping, sports products and shopping styles of people of different countries. Cheng (2011) adopted and modified the CSI scale, which contains 26 items to identify decision making styles for dining and its association to social networking sites. To identify the travel decision making styles of young males & female respondents part B of questionnaire contained 28 questions based on original instrument of CSI considered by Sproles & Kendall in the year 1986 and which got further modified by Cheng during his study in the year 2011 for his study. The instrument was further modified for the current study according to the requirement of present research area.

To fulfill the objectives of the present study the respondents included are millennial male and females between the age group of 18 to 35 of district Jammu, of union territory Jammu and Kashmir (India). The sampling procedure used in the study is non-probability technique. Non-probability samples technique is in which the probability of selection is unknown. Non-probability sampling is based on the decision of selector rather than probability chance of getting selection (Churchill & Iacobucci, 2005). Total 460 Structured questionnaires were disseminated in the different areas of Jammu district on convenience and judgment basis. Among 460 responses 40 questionnaires were discarded due to not fulfilling age criteria and analysis were done on the basis of 420 responses. The demographic profiles of the respondents are represented in Table 3.

Table 2: Decision Making Styles Found in Pervious Study

Sr. No.	Author/Year	Perfectionist	Brand Conscious	Price Conscious	Novelty Conscious	Hedonic/ Recreational	Impulsive	Habitual/ Brand-loyal	Confused by over-choice
1.	Deepa Tanksale et al, (2014)	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2.	Srinivas Durvasula. et al, (1993)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3.	Cathy Bakewell. et al, (2006)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4.	Cheng Peng (2011)	X	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓
5.	ALICE S. Y. HIU. et al. 2015	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
6.	Lawrence Mandhlazi, 2012	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓
7.	Hafstrom, Chae, & Chung, 1992	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
8.	Radder, Li & Pietersen (2006)	✓	✓	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓
9.	Sproles & Sproles (1986) (1986)	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	X	✓	✓

Source: P. Choudhary, 2016; Mandhlazi, L., 2012

**Table 3: Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

Male Respondents		Female Respondents	
<b>Age:</b> 16.66% - 18 to 23 23.80% - 24 to 29 59.52% - 30 to 35	<b>Qualification:</b> 57.14% - Post Graduate, 28.57% - Graduate and 14.28% - Below Graduates	<b>Age:</b> 18.09% - 18 to 23, 20.0% - 24 to 29, 61.91% - 30 to 35	<b>Qualification:</b> 52.85% - Post Graduate, 25.71% - Graduate and 21.4% - below Graduates.
<b>Marital Status</b> Married: 68.57% Unmarried: 31.43%		<b>Marital Status</b> Married: 71.42% Unmarried: 28.57%	

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The results of the Table 2 indicated that out of total 420 responses were found valid and were taken into consideration for the study and further used for data analysis. Out of total 420 respondents 50% respondents were females and 50% respondents were males i.e. 210 males and 210 females participated in the current study and were perfect since the study was focused to find out the role of gender difference in travel decision making styles of millennials'. Further the data was analyzed for the different social and demographic items of the respondent's gender-wise. As the study was focused on the Millennials' who were falling between the age group of 18 to 35 years, therefore the filter question was asked about their age. The analyses revealed that out of total 210 male respondents 16.66% respondents were between the age group of 18 to 23 years, 23.80% respondents were between the age group of 24 to 29 years of age, whereas 59.52% respondents were between the age group of 30 to 35 years of age. While the data was analyzed to check the age group of female respondents the results indicated that out of 210 females who have participated for the study 18.09% female respondents were between the age group of 18 to 23 years, 20.0% females respondents were between the age group of 24 to 29 years, and 61.91% females respondents were between the age group of 30 to 35 years of age.

The data was further analyzed separately gender-wise for educational qualification of male and female respondents and the results depicted that 57.14% male respondents were postgraduate, 28.57% male respondents were graduate and 14.28% male respondents were undergraduate. Further in case of female respondents 52.85% female respondents were postgraduate, 25.71% female respondents were graduate and 21.4% female respondents were undergraduate. For the marital status of respondents the data was checked

separately gender-wise and the result indicated that out of total 210 male respondents 68.57% were married whereas 31.43% respondents were unmarried. For the female respondents 71.42% females were married and 28.57% female respondents who have participated for the study were unmarried.

## EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS

For the purpose of finding out the travel decision making styles of millennial males and females' respondents EFA with principle axis factoring and varimax rotation was conducted. EFA was run separately for obtaining the male & female respondent's responses. The final construct of travel decision making styles of young males is done on 210 samples and construct for females was done on 210 samples. Test of Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test of sphericity was run to check the sample adequacy and the scale validity. The test of KMO result to value .789 for males and .721 for females, which signified that sample, is sufficient. Further the Bartlett's test of sphericity resulted in ( $p < 0.001$ ) for both male and females respondents, which signify that the variables are correlated in the population and factor analysis is appropriate to analyze the data. Factor analysis for the male respondent resulted in seven components with eigen values greater than 1. 67.45% of variance is explained by the seven components, Table 4 presents seven travel decision making style of males, naming perfectionist high-quality, habitual, novelty seeker, impulsive recreational, and price conscious and confused by over choice. Factor analysis for female resulted in six components with Eigen value greater than 1. The six factors naming novelty seeker, recreational, impulsive and price conscious, perfectionist high quality and confused by over choice explain the 58.77% of variance. Table 3 presents the six travel decision-making style of females.

**Table 4: Factor Loading and Variance Explanation, Patten Matrix**  
 (\*F Denotes Female and M Denotes Male)

Factors and Variable Descriptions	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
<b>Confused by Overchoice</b>							
COC-1	.780(M) .822(F)						
COC-2	.742(M) .692(F)						
COC-3	.803(M) .640(F)						
COC-4	.737(M) .700(F)						
<b>Habitual Consumers</b>							
HAB-1		.857(M) .772(F)					
HAB-2		.872(M) .864(F)					
HAB-3		.880(M) .633(F)					
<b>Novelty Seeking</b>							
NOV-1			.814(M) .771(F)				
NOV-2			.744(M) .762(F)				
NOV-3			.704(M) .832(F)				
NOV-4			.628(M) .664(F)				
<b>Perfectionistic, High-Quality Conscious</b>							
PER-1				.737(M) .683(F)			
PER-2				.816(M) .808(F)			
PER-3				.732(M) .669(F)			
PER-4				.617(M) .666(F)			
<b>Impulsive</b>							
IMP-1					.851(M)		
IMP-2					.861(M)		
IMP-3					.621(M)		
<b>Price Conscious</b>							
PRIC-1						.867(M) .874(F)	
PRIC-2						.724(M) .823(F)	

Factors and Variable Descriptions	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
PRIC-3						.770(M) .881(F)	
<b>Recreational</b>							
REC-1							.790(M) .626(F)
REC-2							.820(M) .771(F)
REC-3							.750(M) .787(F)

### Common Factors

Seven factors for males and six factors for females were obtained after running EFA. The six common travel decision making styles were found among males and female respondents were price conscious, recreational

consciousness, novelty seeker, confused by over choice, perfectionist and habitual. Reliability is checked for each factor separately for males and females resulted < .700. Table 5 represents the list of various decision-making styles by (Sproles & Kendall, 1986) and travel decision making styles of millennial males and females.

**Table 5: Summary Table of Travel Decision Making Styles**

Decision Making Style (Sproles and Kendall, 1986)	Travel Decision Making Style of Males	Travel Decision Making Style of Females
Price consciousness	Yes	Yes
Impulsive	Yes	-----
Recreational consciousness	Yes	Yes
Novelty consciousness	Yes	Yes
Confused by over choice	Yes	Yes
Habitual	Yes	Yes
Brand consciousness	-----	-----
Perfectionism	Yes	Yes

### Hypothesis Testing

To see the difference between millennial males and females for six common Travel Decision Making Styles. ‘T’ test was done and mean value of factors was used to analyze the results. The result are presented in Table 5

*Hypothesis H1: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Perfectionist travel decision making styles.*

*H2: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Price conscious travel decision making styles.*

*H3: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Recreational travel decision making styles.*

*H4: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Confused by over choice travel decision making styles.*

*H5: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Novelty Conscious travel decision making styles.*

*H6: There is a significant difference in perception of male & female millennials’ for Habitual Conscious travel decision making styles.*

The proposed hypothesis were tested by administering ‘T’ test for identifying the difference in behavior of males and females respondents for travel decision making styles and results were documented. Table 6 represents the difference in behavior of the respondents participated for the study.

**Table 6: Results of Hypothesis Testing**

Travel Decision Making Style (Common Factors)	Mean Values			Results
	Male	Female	Sig Value (2 tailed)	
Perfectionist/Quality Conscious	4.12	4.30	0.066	No difference
Price Conscious	3.71	4.38	0.041*	Difference
Recreational	4.00	3.71	0.021*	Difference
Confused by Over Choice	3.83	3.96	0.055	No difference
Novelty Conscious	3.64	3.07	0.034*	Difference
Habitual Conscious	4.11	4.02	0.012*	Difference

The results of the “T” test indicated that out of six common travel decision-making styles four decisions making styles are perceived differently by males and females. These four decision-making styles are Price conscious, Recreational, Novelty Conscious and Habitual Conscious.

## DISCUSSIONS

Six decision making styles suggested by Sproles & Kendall (1986) are common for males and females naming perfectionist/quality conscious, price conscious, recreational, confused by over choice, novelty conscious and habitual conscious. Brand conscious decision-making style was not applicable for both males and females in the present study which is similar to the previous study of Hiu et al. (2015). Absence of brand conscious in travel decision-making style of young male and females signifies that they don't give much attention on the popularity of the destination. The reason of absence of brand conscious can be that Millennials' are novelty seekers, when it comes to travel they prefer unknown or unexplored destination rather than the popular destination. Among the female respondents one more travel decision-making style is unidentified that is impulsive on other hand males are found impulsive travel decision-makers. The current findings are similar to the findings of the study done by Mai et al. (2003) who found that males are more impetuous buyers as compared to the women's. And the result is opposite to the findings of study of Coley and Burgess (2003). Partial explanation for this difference can be the cultural aspects and respondents of the study. A good amount of married females are the respondent of the present study and there are more responsible to budget and manage the household spending (Brigitte Burgess, 2014) and this responsibility may make them more careful while they spend on leisure activities (Brigitte Burgess, 2014). The result of present study signifies the existence of perfectionist/high quality conscious, similar to research findings of pervious study conducted by Deepa Tanksale et al. (2014), Srinivas Durvasula et al. (1993), Cathy Bakewell. et al. (2006) and no difference is found among the males and females the way they perceive this perfection/high

quality decision-making style. Both the male and female equally prefer for well-planned trip and the destination with excellent services and infrastructure. The other decision-making style found among young males and females are price conscious similar to the study (Choudhary & Gangotia, 2017, Durvasula et al., 1993). The high mean value of the price conscious dimension signifies that the female buyers are more price conscious than males. The results of the current study confirm the findings of pervious study Scales, T. D. (2017), (Miley, 2009). Partial explanation of this can be today's women are acting as a CEO of family and today mom are more conscious try to manage price and value (Miley, 2009). Other decision-making style for both male and female is recreational with difference among the males and perception. Males are more recreational conscious while making travel decisions. They are more interested to spend their leisure time for traveling and also enjoy traveling. The finding is opposite to the study conducted on UK which found females have great weekly mobility then men Tilley and Houston (2016).

Confused by over choice is also one of the travel decisions making styles among millennial males & females and the current study revealed that there is no difference between them for the way they prefer this decision-making style. The confirmation of this style suggested by Sproles and Kendall (1986) signifies that millennials' get confused when they explore the destination choices. This confirmed the findings of study done by Choudhary and Gangotia, 2017 previously, and the reason behind the existence of confused by over choice as one of travel decision-making style is because of availability of large amount of travel destinations of similar nature, and information overload on internet is the other reason of confused by over choice. Novelty conscious also emerged as a travel decision making styles for millennials' males & females. Both males & females like to explore the unexplored destination. But males are more novelty conscious as compared to females and for this the result is opposite to the study of Shokri (2008), which was conducted to know the gender difference on decision making styles for general shopping. Shokri (2008) found that females are more novelty conscious but in case of travel decision males were

found to be more novelty conscious. On the other hand the other decision-making style confirmed in the present study is habitual for males & females and the findings are similar to that of previous study of Cheng Peng (2011), Bakewell et al. (2006). Millennials' have some preferred destinations, which they prefer to visit again. In the present study males are found to be more habitual travel decision-makers than females. The decision-making style which is applicable for Millennials' males but not for females is impulsive and this signifies that males are quick travel decision maker than those of female travelers.

## CONCLUSION

This present study provides enhanced understanding about one of major market segment of tourism industry i.e. the Millennials'. The study explains the different travel decision making styles of millennial males & females. The study also has contribution to the literature of consumer decision-making style. The findings confirmed the existence of seven decision making styles out of total eight decision-making styles of Sproles and Kendall (1986), for males naming perfectionist/quality conscious, price conscious, recreational, confused by over choice, novelty conscious, habitual conscious and impulsive. The study further confirms that in case of females six components out of eight components of Sproles and Kendall (1986), naming perfectionist/quality conscious, price conscious, recreational, confused by over choice, novelty conscious and habitual conscious are confirmed. In addition the study also found that, out of six common travel decision making styles males and females have difference in four travel decision making styles naming Perfectionist/quality conscious, Price conscious, Recreational, Confused by Over choice, Novelty Conscious and Habitual Conscious.

## Implications

In developing country like India, where tourism has recently got attention of government and marketers, most of the segments are unexplored and Millennials' are one of them. Ignoring this segment is one of the biggest mistake tourism marketers can do (Gronbach, 2000). Present study attempted to understand the decision making styles of biggest market segment of tourism. The study found perfectionist/high quality conscious travel decision making styles among Millennials', this segment wants their trip well planned and take suggestions from peers, the tourism suppliers need to adopt multiple mechanisms of communication to be in touch with this segment. As study find the existence of confused by over choice decision-making style among young male & females so, industry needs to be well aware of their customers choices and should be more specific while providing travel information's. They should adopt

mining/data analytical approach to provide important and limited information to the customers. Apart of confused by over choice millennial males and females are also Novelty seekers and Price conscious, they need new products on competitive pricing. So the company needs to introduce new products with reasonable price on regular basis to attract young tourists. The young Millennials' were also found recreational and habitual choices for their travel, which signifies that the Millennials' enjoys traveling and they also suggest their friends and family to travel to undertake travel to these places. The young tourists with recreational travel decision-making styles are the assets for tourism marketers as they influence others to undertake travel. On other hand targeting and satisfying the Millennials' with habitual decision-making style will give loyal customer to the company, who will prefer to pay repeat visit the same destination time and again.

## Limitations

Despite the contribution of present study in tourism marketing and segmentation, the present study also has some limitations. The present study is restricted to only one segment, i.e. Millennials' and the segment that is on the first stage of their career. Further study can be done on the different generations like generation X. The current study is limited to the characteristic basis of young travelers; further study can be done on personality or lifestyle basis. The study has also spatiotemporal limitations, as it was limited to only certain geographic region and with the change in the area generalization of the study can also change.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson Jr, W. T., & Golden, L. L. (1984). Lifestyle and psychographics: A critical review and recommendation. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11(1), 405-411.
- Cathy, B., & Vincent, W. M. (2006). Male versus female consumer decision making styles. *Journal of Business Research*, 59, 1297-1300.
- Bae, S. (2004). Shopping pattern differences of physically active Korean and American university consumers for athletic apparel.
- Bakewell, C., & Mitchell, V. W. (2003). Generation Y female consumer decision-making styles. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 31(2), 95-106.
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775-786.
- Burgess, B., Yaoyuneyong, G., & Gibbs, S. (2014). Gender, self-construal and impulse buying behavior of young Thai consumers. *Asian Journal of Business Research*, 4(1), 1-15.

- Choudhary, P., & Gangotia, A. (2017). Do travel decision-making styles and gender of generation Y have any association with travel information share on social networking sites? *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*, 8(2), 152-167.
- Choudhary, P. (2016). Role of social networking sites (SNS) in travel information search: Perspective of travel decision making style of generation Y (Unpublished M.Phil dissertation). Central University Jammu, Jammu.
- Coley, A., & Burgess, B. (2003). Gender differences in cognitive and affective impulse buying. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 7(3), 282-295.
- Decrop, A., & Snelders, D. (2005). A grounded typology of vacation decision-making. *Tourism Management*, 26(2), 121-132.
- Durvasula, S., Lysonski, S., & Andrews, J. C. (1993). Cross-cultural generalizability of a scale for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 27(1), 55-65.
- Fan, J. X., & Xiao, J. J. (1998). Consumer decision-making styles of young-adult Chinese. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 32(2), 275-294.
- Gupta, M., & Pant, S. (2016). Gender difference in decision making style of middle age consumers of clothing. *International Journal of Research in Business Management*, 4(2), 17-28.
- Hafstrom, J. L., Chae, J. S., & Chung, Y. S. (1992). Consumer decision-making styles: Comparison between United States and Korean young consumers. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 26(1), 146-158.
- Hou, S. C., & Lin, Z. H. (2006, July). Shopping styles of working Taiwanese female. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Business and Information, Singapore* (pp. 12-14).
- Mai, N. T. T., Jung, K., Lantz, G., & Loeb, S. G. (2003). An exploratory investigation into impulse buying behavior in a transitional economy: A study of urban consumers in Vietnam. *Journal of International Marketing*, 11(2), 13-35.
- Mandhlazi, L. (2012). *Decision-making styles of generation Y consumers in the purchase of fashion apparel in Kempton Park* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Miley, M., & Mack, A. (2009). *The new female consumer: The rise of the real mom*. Advertising Age.
- Walsh, G., Mitchell, V. W., & Hennig-Thurau, T. H. O. R. S. T. E. N. (2001). German consumer decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(1), 73-95.
- Radder, L., Li, Y., & Pietersen, J. J. (2006). Decision-making styles of young Chinese, Motswana and Caucasian consumers in South Africa: An exploratory study. *Journal of Consumer Sciences*, 34(1).
- Ricard, L., Préfontaine, L., & Sioufi, M. (2001). New technologies and their impact on French consumer behaviour: An investigation in the banking sector. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 19(7), 299-311.
- Scales, T. D. (2017). *Differences between men and women regarding decision-making styles for sport apparel* (theses and dissertations).
- Shokri, O., Moradi, A., Daneshpour, Z., & Tarkhan, R. (2008). The role of gender differences in coping styles and mental health. *ContPsyol*, 3(1), 51-61.
- Sprotles, G. B., & Kendall, E. L. (1986). A methodology for profiling consumers' decision-making styles. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20(2), 267-279.
- Steinbauer, A., & Werthner, H. (2007). Consumer behaviour in e-tourism. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2007* (pp. 65-76). Springer, Vienna.
- Tilley, S., & Houston, D. (2016). The gender turnaround: Young women now travelling more than young men. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 54, 349-358.
- UNWTO. (2008). *The power of youth*. Madrid: Javier Blanco, UNWTO.
- Westbrook, R. A., & William, C. (1985). Black (1985). A motivation-based shopper typology. *Journal of Retailing*, 61(1), 78-103.
- Zloch, D. (2015). The perception of the millennial generation and their engagement in climate change activism.

## APPENDIX-INSTRUMENT FOR MILLENNIALS

Statements
I always want my trip to be well planned.
I will prefer the destination with excellent services.
I will prefer the destination with excellent infrastructure.
I make efforts to choose the best travel destination by consulting my friends & relatives.
I prefer travelling to well know popular destination.
I believe higher the price of tourism destination the better is the quality.
I believe branded tourism destination offers great tourism experiences.
I believe that most advertised tourism destination offers great tourism experience.
I would prefer visiting destination that has been popular recently.
Visiting an unexplored destination is what, I prefer.
I like to follow all the travel related news and stories.
I feel excited when I visit new destination that my friends have not visited yet.
In my leisure time, I prefer to travel.
I consider travelling as a pleasant activity for me.
I recommend my friends and family to utilize their vacation by traveling.
To get best value for my money, I try to find best deal offered by travel agents.
Before making my final decision for travel destination. I prefer to compare the price offered by different travel agent.
I prefer to wait for less expensive packages offered by travel agents.
If i find any attractive travel deal, I quickly purchase that.
I prefer making quick decision on where to travel.
I should select my travel destination more carefully then I do.
I often feel confused when I have to make decision on where to travel.
The more I consult my friends and family about my travel destination, more I feel confused.
The more I read about destination on internet, harder it seems to choose the best destination to visit.
More the options available to travel, more it confuses me to choose one to visit.
The destination that gives good travel experience, I like to visit it again and again.
Once, I like a destination, I want to visit that place again.
I have some favorite destination; I like to visit over and over.