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# ABSTRACT

The study examines the extent to which visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics such as nationality, age, gender and education influence “a priori” and “on situ” images of places. Throughout the analysis of data collected from 400 visitors to Linz, Austria it became evident that the respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s “a priori” and “on situ” images are interrelated, nevertheless, some of them are more influential than others. Nationality, age and gender were found to be of equal importance during the “a priori” destination image formation stage, whereas Linz’s “on situ” image was mainly influenced by respondents’ nationality and gender. The findings also suggest that cognitive image components are more plausible to changes as a result of the impact of the selected demographic characteristics compared to the affective image elements during the “a priori” and “on situ” stages of destination image formation.
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# INTRODUCTION

The importance of destination image for the overall success of a destination has been broadly recognised (Hanlan and Kelly, 2004) with the first studies dating back to the 70s and 80s of the last century (e.g. Hunt, 1975; Crompton, 1979; Gunn, 1982). Visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics such as age, nationality, gender and education are widely acknowledged as important image determinants in the literature surrounding destination image (MacKay and Fesenmaier, 1997; Baloglu, 2001; Beerli and Martin; 2004; Kim and Morrison, 2005; Gravili, 2014; Kim and Morrison, 2005; Guina and Giraldi, 2012; Gravili, 2014; Gyehee and Choong-Ki, 2009; Prayag and Ryan, 2011), because as Mayo and Jarvis (1981: 42) indicate“no two people see a destination in exactly the same way” implying that an amalgam of image determinants of a different nature play a role in the process of destination image formation and modification. However, the role of socio-demographic characteristics as a determining factor on destination image is analysed only on its “a priory” stage, whereas the impact they might have on the way visitors’ perceive destinations once they actually experience them has not yet been sufficiently explored. This suggests that there is a need for a better understanding, from practical point of view, of how a destination image is formed and what the socio-demographic characteristics influencing this process are. Knowing the strength of the relationship between visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics and destination image could prove beneficial for destination marketers in their efforts to attract new visitors and keep existing ones in time and cost effective ways by modifying and adjusting the image elements of the destination in response to the socio-demographic profile of the visitors. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to explore the degree to which socio-demographic characteristics influence the way visitors’ perceive a place prior and during their actual experience. Specifically, the current study examines the relationships among age, gender, nationality and education and cognitive and affective “a priori” and “on situ” image elements.

Linz, the third biggest Austrian town situated astride the Danube River was selected as a case study for this research because it is still staying in the shadow of Vienna and Salzburg despite the continuing efforts since 1985 to re-shape its image as a tourist destination and position it on the tourism market as a high-tech cultural town. Linz’s controversial historical background as the birthplace of Hitler, rich cultural heritage and a variety of museums for contemporary art attracted approximately 800 000 visitors in 2015. Nevertheless, Linz is still described as the most undervalued place in Austria ((Lewonig, 2007) and despite its growth as a tourist destination in the recent years as a result of the heavy investment in cultural attractions and events the development of its destination image has not yet to date received sufficient attention from tourism researchers.

# LITERATURE REVIEW

# Defining and conceptualising destination Image

Destination image, despite being widely researched, still produces a considerable degree of uncertainty in regards to how to define and conceptualise it. The ambiguity originates from the different ways the term image is applied and the “multidimensional and complex” nature of destination image (Gallarza et al., 2002). Indeed, the term image could be used to define a) the deliberately created and advertised image of a place and b) visitors’ perceived image of the place (Mazanec and Schweiger, 1981).

Echtner and Ritchie (1991) found in a comprehensive analysis of destination image studies that definitions of destination image are often missing or imprecise. Their conclusion was supported by other researchers (Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Gartner, 1993; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Rodrigues et al., 2011, Teodorescu et al., 2014) who also highlight that while the term “image” is widely used, it is lacking a theoretical and conceptual structure, thus confirming the elusiveness of this complex concept recognised initially by Mazanec and Schweiger (1981).

Three problematic areas in the existing destination image definitions were identified upon a thorough review of the current literature on destination image conducted by Iordanova (2015). Firstly, in a substantial number of studies in the past, destination image was defined as a static concept (e.g. Hunt, 1975; Bigne et al., 2001), while just recently academics have started to embrace its dynamic structure (e.g. [BongKoo](http://www.cabdirect.org:80/search.html?q=au%3A%22Lee+BongKoo%22) et al., 2014; Campo-Martınez et al., 2010; Choi et al., 2007; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Kim and Morrison, 2005; Smith et al., 2015; Yüksel and Akgül, 2007; Yuan et al., 2014). Secondly, some of the existing definitions portray individual’s image of a place (e.g. Coshall, 2000) while others concentrate on the stereotyped image shared by a larger number of people (e.g. Hall, 2006). Also, in many studies impressions and perceptions of a place are used interchangeably (e.g. Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000) or to complement each other despite their differences in nature.

This study’s primary aim is to analyse the influence of a set of socio-demographic characteristics and the strength of penetration power these intervening variables exert in the process of destination image formation in general and on the pre-travel and “on situ” stages in particular. Iordanova’s definition of destination image (2015), therefore, appeared as the most suitable one as she defines destination image as:

*…a construct consisting of impressions, beliefs, ideas, expectations and feelings accumulated towards a place over time gathered from a variety of information sources and shaped through an individual’s socio-demographic and psychological characteristics.*

In tourism studies, people’s “...awareness, knowledge or beliefs [towards a destination], which may or may not have been derived from a previous visit” (Pike and Ryan, 2004: 334) are referred as cognitive image components (Gartner, 1993; Baloglu, 1999; Pike and Ryan, 2004).

Affective image components, on the other hand, represent people’s “appraisal of the affective quality of environments” (Hanyu, 1993:161) or emotional reactions (excitement, pleasure, etc.) (Walmsley and Young, 1998), and feelings (Russel, 1980) towards tourist destinations. Another component called conative, which is not part of the current study, is also recognised in tourism studies (Gartner, 1993; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Gallarza et al., 2002; Tasci et al., 2007) and represents the “decision stage” of destination image formation, whereby it depends on the cognitive and affective image elements. Assaker (2014), for instance, developed and empirically proved a hierarchical model of destination image where destination image is operationalized as a second-order model, formed by six first-order attributes with the first order attribute components in turn being measured based on combinations and interactions of cognitive and affective components as well as common/specific and holistic/individual items.

Despite the tendency in the past to concentrate mainly on the cognitive aspects of destination image (Gartner, 1989; Oppermann, 1996; Schroeder, 1996; Baloglu, 1997), more and more academics are focusing on both cognitive and affective destination image dimensions (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Uysal et al., 2000; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999a; Beerli and Martin, 2004; Kim and Richardson, 2003) in respond to Baloglu and Brinberg’s (1997) argument that concentrating only on the cognitive elements of destination image could lead to fragmented and partial understanding because “the meaning of a place is not entirely determined by its physical properties” (Ward and Russell, 1981:123).

The current study, therefore, aligns with this line of thought and sees destination image as a multi-dimensional concept consisting of both beliefs and knowledge about a destination and people’s attitudes toward it.

# Models of Destination Image Formation

The formation of destination image is one of the least investigated areas (Beerli and Martin, 2004), since there are only few empirical studies trying to explain its formation and determinants (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Mackay and Fesenmaier, 1997). The earliest models of destination image formation (Gunn, 1972; Gunn, 1988; Gartner, 1989; Selby and Morgan, 1996; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991) focus mainly on the importance of various information sources in the development of organic and induced/modified images, despite Gunn’s argument (1988) that “these images are always highly personal” (Gunn, 1988: 23), which implies that more personal and travellers specific factors (e.g. socio-demographic factors) could also contribute to the process of destination image formation.

Chon (1990), on the other hand, developed a model of destination image formation where the relationships between destination image, decision making process, traveller’s level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the destination and the process of comparison between performance expectancy and performance outcome are portrayed. Yet again, Chon’s model (1990) does not include the potential impact of visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics on the process of destination image formation.

Baloglu and McCleary (1997), Stabler (1988), Stylidis et al., (2010) and Tasci and Gartner (2007) are among the very few to acknowledge the importance of visitors’ psychological identity and socio-demographic characteristics in the process of destination image formation. Indeed, Beerli and Martin (2004) empirically confirmed a model where both information sources and socio-demographic and psychological characteristics are recognised as strong image determinants. Tasci and Gartner (2007), in contrast, created a model linking destination image with consumer behaviour, where destination image is presented as a complex construct influenced by different types of information sources, supply side (the destination itself) and demand side (visitor’s socio-demographic and psychological characteristics). The tourism destination image is then linked to the effects it has on pre-, during-, and post-trip consumer behaviour. The current study aligns with the majority of multi-staged model of destination image formation and suggests that socio-demographic characteristics influence not only cognitive and affective “a priory” image elements, but also penetrate to the next “on situ” stage and play an important role in the modification of both cognitive and affective “on situ” image elements.

## Socio-Demographic Characteristics

Visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics are believed to take part in the process of destination image formation and have been broadly explored in the literature.

For example, various studies have discussed the influence of age (MacKay and Fesenmaier, 1997; Walmsley and Jenkins, 1993; Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu, 1997; Beerli and Martin; 2004; Guina and Giraldi, 2012; Kim and Morrison, 2005), gender (Gravili, 2014; Guina and Giraldi, 2012; Walmsley and Jenkins, 1993; MacKay and Fesenmaier, 1997; Chen and Kerstetter, 1999), education (Chen and Kerstetter, 1999; Rittichainuwat et. al., 2001; Stern and Krakover, 1993; Kim and Morrison, 2005), geographic distance or country of origin (Beerli and Martin; 2004; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001; Chen and Kerstetter, 1999; Guina and Giraldi, 2012; Glenn, 2008; Gravili, 2014; Lee and Lee, 2009; Ramkissoon et al., 2011; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Hunt, 1975; Kim and Morrison, 2005; MacKay and Fesenmaier, 2000; Prayag and Ryan, 2011) on destination image, but with some inconclusive results. Besides, the role of socio-demographic characteristics as a determining factor on destination image is analysed only on its “a priory” stage, whereas the impact they might have on the way visitors’ perceive destinations once they actually experience them has not yet been investigated.

There appears to be an agreement in the literature that destination/country of origin has a significant impact over tourist destinations perceptions. According to Hunt’s empirically supported study (1975), destination image is partly affected by the spatial distance between the country of origin and the destination, because individuals are more likely to have visited destinations close to their countries of origin or regions, or to have passively gained information about them through the mass media and friends or relatives. Beerli and Martin (2004) and Hsu et al. (2004) confirmed that the distance from a destination significantly affects its attribute-based and affective-based components of image. Respondents living far away from a destination were found to lack a vivid image of it (Reilly, 1990). Similar results shows Fakeye and Crompton’ study (1991) in which differences caused by the distance in terms of infrastructure, food and friendliness of the locals were found. On this basis, the following hypotheses were made:

Hypothesis 1a: Nationality significantly influences “a priori” affective destination image

Hypothesis 1b: Nationality significantly influences “a priori” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 1c: Nationality significantly influences “on situ” affective destination image

Hypothesis 1d: Nationality significantly influences “on situ” cognitive destination image

On the other hand, the studies dealing with the rest of the socio-demographic image determinants show somewhat inconsistent results. Baloglu (1997) analysed image dissimilarities of the United States based on socio-demographic characteristics of West German tourists and suggested a few image differences due to age, marital status and occupation, but not due to gender, level of education and income. Baloglu (1997) also concluded that education does not significantly shape destination images. His findings were supported by Boo and Busser (2005) who have come to the same conclusion. Walmsley and Jenkins (1993) discovered that affective evaluations depend not only on gender, but also on age. The former was refuted by Hui and Wan (2003), whereas the latter was confirmed by Boo and Busser’s study (2005).

Despite Baloglu and McCleary’ suggestion (1999) that age and education seem to be major factors in the process of destination image formations, their findings suggest that age does not have a significant influence over the affective image dimensions, but over the perceptual/cognitive image dimensions. Their results also only partially support the hypothesis that education significantly influences both affective and cognitive image components as it was shown that only a moderate relationship exists between respondents’ education and attribute-based evaluations in terms of value/ environment. Similarly, Stern and Krakover (1993)also found some variations in respondents’ cognitive, affective and overall destination image to exist due to different educational level.

Beerli and Martin (2004) found a positive relationship between the affective image domain and female visitors and between the cognitive domains and age – the higher the age, the better the image. The affective domain, however, was found to be in a negative correlation with education – the higher the level of education, the lower the evaluations of this image element. It could, therefore, be concluded that even though enough evidence exists in the literature to conclude that socio-demographic characteristics exert an impact upon “pre-travel” destinations’ images, much uncertainty still exists about the relationship between this set of image determinants and destinations “on situ” images

The hypotheses on the influence of the rest of the factors on Linz’s image are the following:

Hypothesis 2a: Gender significantly influences “a priori” affective destination image

Hypothesis 2b: Gender significantly influences “a priori” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 2c: Gender significantly influences “on situ” affective destination image

Hypothesis 2d: Gender significantly influences “on situ” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 3a: Age significantly influences “a priori” affective destination image

Hypothesis 3b: Age significantly influences “a priori” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 3c: Age significantly influences “on situ” affective destination image

Hypothesis 3d: Age significantly influences “on situ” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 4a: Education significantly influences “a priori” affective destination image

Hypothesis 4b: Education significantly influences “a priori” cognitive destination image

Hypothesis 4c: Education significantly influences “on situ” affective destination image

Hypothesis 4d: Education significantly influences “on situ” cognitive destination image

# METHODS

## The case study

Linz was selected as a case study for this research as it represents a typical example of a small, under-estimated provincial town trying to reposition and differentiate itself from its main rivals that dominate the Austrian tourism market – Vienna and Salzburg. During the Nazi period, Linz was transformed from a small town into an industrial city with a potential to become a cultural metropolis on the Danube. After 1945 the main concern of Linz’s authorities was to distance themselves from Nazi’s culture and Hitler, in particular, while highlighting traditionally humanist cultural values (Cultural Development Plan, 2000). However, traces of Nazi’s past are still part of everyday life in Linz – in the appearance of the so-called “Hitlerbauten” (cheap homes that Hitler built for industrial workers) and in the materials used for buildings construction that raise an embarrassing point: Mauthausen (a concentration camp close to Linz) granite was paid for with the lives of concentration camp prisoners (Mission Statement, 2009, cited in Iordanova-Krasteva et al., 2010). Linz’s journey from chimneys stacks to contemporary culture with its iconic symbols “Ars Electronica”, “Cloud of Sound” and “International Street Artist Festival”, enabled Linz to stand out from the old-fashioned clichés of Austria as a whole - Alpine sunsets, the magic of mountain chalets, Mozart and Sissi and to develop an image as a modern, high-tech oriented cultural place that was visited by 777 292 visitors in 2015.

# Research design and data collection

The present research uses a mixed method approach endeavouring to gain a robust understanding of how destination image is formed and developed, and the role various socio-demographic characteristics (nationality, gender, age and education) play in this process.

A qualitative exploration of Linz’s destination image (both cognitive and affective) represents the first phase of this study. It was done by eliciting Linz’s destination image dimensions from 74 prospective domestic and international visitors through the use of an online questionnaire consisting of open-ended questions mainly about their spontaneous associations, knowledge and feelings towards Linz following Echtner and Ritchie’s study (1999). It was decided to rely on data received from both repeat and first-time domestic and international visitors of Linz, because the selection of a sample of only one of the groups, for example first-time visitors, could have deprived the results by leading to missing important image components of Linz that could be captured only by individuals that had experienced the destination. The first open-ended question focused on respondents’ spontaneous associations with the word Linz and was designed to allow respondents to freely share their overall spontaneous associations with Linz. The aim of the second question was to gain insights into respondents’ feelings and emotions in relation to Linz and attempted to capture the affective aspect of Linz’s image. The final question sought to elicit respondents’ knowledge about Linz and to determine some of its unique attractions.

Linz’s image was found to have been created through the mixture of Linz Nazi’s past, the heavy industry, its well-preserved old town and architectural beauty; of the modern face of Linz presented by its museums for Modern Art (Ars Electronica Centre, the Lentos Museum), its hallmark events (The Cloud of Sound, The Bruckner Festival, The International Street Artist Festival), of the natural and eternal beauty of Postingberg and the River Danube. Linz was mainly described as a pleasurable, enjoyable, beautiful, admirable and modern place. The themes that emerged from this phase were then included in a questionnaire along with a set of questions designed to collect demographic information. To study Linz’s image components identified in the first phase, respondents were asked to rate their agreement/disagreement with those components on a 6-point Likert Scale ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” before and during their visit. The questionnaire was initially designed in English and piloted with 23 undergraduate students studying business, tourism and sport studies. The pilot study did not reveal any confusing and unclear questions or flops in its structure. As the official language in Austria is German and domestic respondents were included in the population of interest, the questionnaire was then translated into German and tested again with German native speakers. Despite the use of non-random convenience sampling due to time constraints, data was collected at various places (e.g. various museums, attractions, events, restaurants) and at different times of the day (e.g. early in the morning or late in the evening) to increase the representativeness of the study.

In studies where no “hard facts” regarding the population of interest are available, it is still possible to evaluate the representativeness of the sample with some known population characteristics (Gilbert, 2001). After the required data was collected the demographic profile of the respondents was compared with the characteristics of Linz’s visitors in terms of their nationality. Data obtained from TourMIS indicate that foreign visitors account for between 51- 53% of the visitors to Linz and domestic visitors for 47% - 49 %. It could be, therefore, suggested that almost a perfect match was achieved between the collected data and the official statistics on Linz’s visitors’ nationality, which contributed significantly to the research representativeness.

# DATA ANALYSIS

Initially, Linz’s cognitive and affective “a priory” and “on situ” image components were factor analysed in order to bring them together into more unified, underlying categories and simplify the data analysis. The potential influence of nationality, gender, age and education were analysed using MANOVA.

# Linz’s “a priori” image analysis

## Data Reduction

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used for data reduction purposes for both cognitive and affective image components of Linz’s “a priory” and “on situ” destination image. 27 cognitive items were subjected to (PCA) using SPSS Version 21. Prior to performing the PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. The KMO value was 0.755, exceeding the recommended value of 0.5 (Field, 2005) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

PCA showed the existence of eight components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 66.95 % of the variance. An examination of the screeplot, however, showed a clear break after the fifth component, which led to the decision to keep five components for further analysis. This decision was also supported by the results of a Parallel Analysis (a software called Monte Carlo PCA was used) which generated five components with eigenvalues above the corresponding criterion values for a randomly generated data set of the same size (27 variables x 400 respondents).

The five-component solution explained a total of 54.47% of the variance (see Table 1). To aid in the interpretation of these five components, varimax rotation was used and only factor loadings of 0.45 were kept for further analysis following of Comrey and Lee’s (1992) suggestion. The reliability of the scale used was also tested by using Cronbach’s α. According to Pallant (2007), if alpha is .70 or higher, then it could be suggested that all of the items are reliable and the entire test is internally consistent (Pallant, 2007). The computation of Cronbach α indicated that all factors are stable with high internal consistencies (α for Factor 1=0.856, α for Factor 2= 0.742, α for Factor 3 = 0.885, α for Factor 4 = 0.714) except the last factor with α slightly below 0.7, which was still kept following Peterson’s suggestion (1994) that 0.6 should be the “criterion-in-use”.

[Insert Table 1 About Here]

The same procedure was also conducted for the affective “a priory” image components. The KMO value was .868 and the Bartlett’s test was significant (p= .000). The Kaiser’s criterion and the “scree test” showed the existence of three components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 64.15% of the variance and with high internal consistencies (α for Factor 1=0.870, α for Factor 2= 0.796 and α for Factor 3 = 0.761) (see Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 About Here]

## Linz’s “on-situ” image analysis

### Data Reduction

PCA was also used for data reduction purposes for both “on-situ” cognitive and affective image dimensions of Linz. The Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy had values of 0.749 for the cognitive components and 0.743 for the affective components respectively and both domains had Barlett’s Test of Sphericity values of .000, thus proving that the data set is suitable for factor analysis.

The factor analysis of the cognitive components revealed the existence of seven factors with eigenvalues exceeding 1, which explain 60.19% of the variance. As in the case of Linz’s pre-travel image components factor analysis, varimax rotation was used and factor loadings below 0.45 were excluded (four components). The reliability factors using Cronbach α was also calculated and it showed that all factors apart from one (Traditions) are stable with values above 0.60 (Table 3).

[Insert Table 3 About Here]

Linz’s “on situ” affective image of Linz was also factor analysed and a set of five factors was identified with eigenvalues exceeding 1 and explaining 68,55% of the variance (Table 4). Again, one of the factors (Tranquillity) showed Chronbach α less than 0.6 and was eliminated from further analysis.

[Insert Table 4 About Here]

###

### **Socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s “a priori” image**

### Nationality and Gender

The possible relationship between socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s cognitive and affective image components was analysed using one-way MANOVA with post-hoc Scheffe test and t-test. With respect to the relationship between nationality and the associated image of Linz (H 1a and H 1b), there is a statistically significant correlation between nationality and the cognitive image elements “Pastime” (p= .000, < 0.05) and “Blemish” (p= .000, < 0.05). The Austrians were more likely to give higher levels of agreement with the “Pastime” dimension of Linz (M =3.36: SD = 1.28) than the Internationals who seemed not to be so familiar with it (M=3.94; SD = 1.07). Also the Austrians tended to agree more strongly with the dark history of Linz being one of its major image dimensions (M = 2.25; SD = 0.97) than the Internationals (M = 3.06; SD = 1.30) (Table 6). At the same time, no significant relationships with the affective dimensions were identified (Table 5).

The determinant “gender” was found to be in a significant relationship with Linz’s “a priori” Pastime, with female respondents generally having less positive associations with this dimension (Table 6). The rest of the cognitive and affective image dimensions displayed no significant differences between male and female respondents (Table 5) (H 2a and H 2b).

[Insert Table 5 About Here]

[Insert Table 6 About Here]

### Education level

The perceived image of Linz before actually visiting it was found to be only partially affected by respondents’ educational level, since this variable has only a significant influence over the cognitive dimension “Pastime” (p=0.014, < 0.05) and “Encouraging” (p=0.015, < 0.05). Education was found to be in a negative relationship with “Pastime” - the higher the level, the lower the evaluations, whereas education had a positive effect over “Encouraging” – the higher the level, the better the evaluation (Table 7) (H 4a and H 4b).

[Insert Table 7 About Here]

### Age

With respect to the relationship between gender and Linz’s “a priori” image (H 3a and H 3b), there are statistically significant relationships between age and Linz’s pastime (p=0.007*,* < 0.05), Contemporary Culture (p=0.032, < 0.05) and Aesthetics (p=0.033, < 0.05), whereas there are no significant relationships between the age factor and Linz’s affective “a priori” image. The younger respondents (18-30 years of age) were more likely to evaluate “Pastime” much higher compared to the rest of the respondents and to give lower scores for “Aesthetics” than the rest of the groups. Moreover, respondents below 40 years of age were more likely than the remaining respondents to associate Linz with its Contemporary Culture (Table 8).

[Insert Table 8 About Here]

### **Socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s “on situ” image**

### Nationality and Gender

The possible influence of socio-demographic characteristics Linz’s “on-situ” image was analysed using one-way MANOVA with post-hoc Scheffe test and t-test.

With respect to the relationship between nationality and Linz’s associated “on-situ” image (H 1c and H 1d), there is a statistically significant relationship between nationality and the cognitive image dimensions “Contemporary Culture” (p=0.011, < 0.05) and “Blemish” (p=0.042, < 0.05) and the affective image dimensions “Encouraging” (p=0.010, < 0.05) and “Discouraging” (p=0.009, < 0.05). The Austrians were more likely to give higher levels of agreement with the “Blemish” dimension of Linz (M = 3.00; SD = 1.00) than the Internationals who seemed not to be so familiar with it (M = 3.21; SD = 1.01). Also the Austrians tended to less agree with Linz’s contemporary culture being one of its major image dimensions (M = 1.65; SD = 0.71) than the Internationals (M = 1.47; SD = 0.63). At the same time, the international respondents were more likely to agree with associating Linz as an encouraging place to visit (M = 1.90; SD = 0.49) and as a consequence disagree with Linz being a discouraging place to visit (M=; SD = 0.41 than the Austrians (M= 2.04; SD = 0.54 and M=4.67; SD = 0.69) (Table 10).

The gender factor was found to be in a significant relationship with Linz’s “on-situ” cognitive dimension “Eventness”, with female respondents generally having a less positive evaluation of this image domain and “Relaxation” with females rating it more positively than males. The rest of the dimensions were not found to have any significant relationships with respondents’ gender (Table 9) (H 2c and H 2d).

[Insert Table 9 About Here]

[Insert Table 10 About Here]

### Education level

The statistical technique applied to test whether there are significant differences among the groups of Linz’s visitors with different educational level in terms of their perceptions of Linz’s “on-situ” image was multivariate MANOVA.

 The independent variable used to conduct the test was “Education” with three subgroups: primary, secondary and university. The multivariate significance tests (Pillai’s Trace, Hotellings’s Trace, Wilks’ Lambda and Roy’s Largest Root produced by MANOVA) showed that these three groups were not different at all across the “on-situ” image of Linz as they were not significant at 0.01 or 0.05 level (H 4c and H 4d). This result indicates that educational level does not play a role in the formation of Linz’s “on-situ” image.

### Age

With respect to the relationship between gender and Linz’s “on-situ” image, a statistically significant relationship (p=0.001, < 0.05) was found only between age and the factor representing Linz’s contemporary culture, whereas there were no significant relationships between the age factor and the affective dimensions of Linz’s “on situ” image (H 3c and H 3d). Younger respondents (18-30 years of age) tended to evaluate “Contemporary culture” image dimension much higher than the remaining respondents and especially the respondents above 50 years old (Table 11).

[Insert Table 11 About Here]

# DISCUSSION

It was unveiled throughout the course of the literature review that despite the considerable number of studies on the role of socio-demographic characteristics as a determining factor on destinations “a priori” image, the degree to which these image determinants penetrate to and influence the next, “on situ” stage of destination image formation has yet not received sufficient attention and still represents a grey area in tourism research. The current study, therefore, aimed at examining the extent to which visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics such as nationality, age, gender and education influence destination images in terms of their cognitive and affective “a priori” and “on situ” elements.

Through the data analysis it became evident that the respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s “a priori” and “on situ” images are interrelated; but some of them are more influential than others. “Nationality”, in general, appeared as the most influential image determinant in terms of the total number of Linz’s cognitive and affective both “a priori” and “on situ” image elements found to be influenced by it, whereas education is the least persuasive one impacting only Linz’s “a priori” image. These findings support Um and Crompton’s conclusion (1990) that beliefs about the attributes of a destination are formed by individuals, but the nature of those beliefs varies depending on their inner world.

The findings verified the results of previous studies (Beerli and Martin; 2004; Guina and Giraldi, 2012; Glenn, 2008; Gravili, 2014; Lee and Lee, 2009; Ramkissoon et al., 2011; Hunt, 1975; Kim and Morrison, 2005; MacKay and Fesenmaier, 2000; Prayag and Ryan, 2011) that “nationality”, in general, has a direct effect over destination images. Beerli and Martin (2004) and Hsu et al., (2004), nevertheless have made the point that the distance from a destination significantly affects its attribute-based and affective-based components of image which did not find full support in the current study, as nationality was found to affect Linz’s cognitive “a priori” image only (Pastime and Blemish) (H 1b). This finding is rather adherent to Fakeye and Crompton’s (1991) conclusion where differences caused by the distance in terms of attribute-based (cognitive image) elements were found. On the other hand, both cognitive and affective “on situ” image components (Contemporary Culture, Blemish, Encouraging and Discouraging) (H 1c and H 1d) were found to be in a direct relationship with nationality which points out the gap in the existing literature concerning the strength of penetration power this intervening variable exerts in the process of destination image formation and development. The rest of the hypotheses regarding the relationship between destination image and visitors’ nationality were refuted.

Crompton (1979) made a claim that individuals who live away from a destination have a tendency to hold more positive images of it, which also came across from the current study in which the Austrians were found to have more negative image of Linz than the Internationals. The Internationals rated Linz’s “a priori” cognitive image dimension “Contemporary Culture” higher than the Austrians (not significantly though), showing that the Austrians tend to underestimate Linz’s place on the European cultural map of Modern Art. Additionally, the Austrians were more likely to link Linz with Hitler than the Internationals. These two findings are in contrast to that of Reilly’s study (1990) according to which respondents living far away from a destination were found to lack a vivid image of it.

Gender was not found to be a major determinant in the process of Linz’s “a priori” and “on-situ” images creation since gender as an intervening variable was found to affect only one cognitive component - Pastime - of Linz’s “a priori” destination image (H 2b), but none of the affective ones (H 2a, H 2c and H 2d were disproved) where female respondents were more likely to give less positive answers to this attribute-based image component. Hence, Walmsley and Jenkins’ (1993), and Beerli and Martin’s (2004) positions that affective evaluations depend on gender did not receive support in the current study.

The research findings related to the relationship between the variable “education” and Linz’s destination image formation process partially support Baloglu and McCleary’s (1999) view that education has only a moderate relationship with destination image and do not actually shape the formation of destination images as it was found to negatively affect only one of Linz’s “a priori” cognitive image components (Pastime) (H 4b). In contrast, the higher the respondents’ education the more positive Linz’s “a priori” “encouraging” affective image domain was evaluated (H 4a)., which in turn, confirmed Beerli and Martin’s (2004) finding. Hypothesis 4c and Hypothesis 4d were disproved.

Respondents’ age was found to be a major determinant for Linz’s “a priori” image (H 3a and H 3b were confirmed, H 3c and H 3d were refuted), but only for its cognitive domain which was in harmony with Beerli and Martin’s (2004), and Baloglu and McCleary’s (1999) findings. Nevertheless, such a position is contrary to that held by Walmsley and Jenkins (1993), and to Boo and Busser’s (2005) belief about the possible effect of age on affective evaluations of destinations. The results suggest that age affects in a negative way Linz’s “Contemporary Culture” (both “a priori” and “on situ) and “Pastime” components – the older the respondent, the more negative the evaluation. Nonetheless, older respondents were found to be more appreciative of Linz’s “aesthetics”.

The literature review unveiled that very little is written about the impact socio-demographic factors might have over the formation of the “on situ” destination image. The current research provided sufficient evidence to conclude that socio-demographic factors do not only shape “pre-travel” destination images, but some of them also penetrate to the destination’s “on situ” image and significantly affect its cognitive and affective components.

# CONCLUSION

Throughout the data analysis it became evident that the respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics and Linz’s “a priori” and “on situ” images are interrelated, nevertheless, some of them are more influential than others.

This research contributes to the field of study by firstly, explicitly showing the influence of a set of travellers’ socio-demographic characteristics on destinations’ images in terms of both cognitive and affective image elements and secondly, by proving that socio-demographic characteristics not only influence “a priori” images of places as the abundance of studies suggest, but also penetrate and influence the “in situ” stage of destination image formation which so far appears to be a grey area in the existing studies. In addition, these findings support the current body of literature claiming that destination image is a dynamic construct that evolves in visitors’ minds while they explore a particular place.

There is a need for better understanding, from practical point of view, of how a destination image is formed and what the factors determining this process are. Knowing and working with all these factors presents a valuable, strategic instrument to strengthen and improve the image of a destination in a more effective way Therefore, this research provides vital implications for destination marketers and planners. It was unveiled throughout this research that not only the “knowledge-based” Linz’s “a priori” and “on situ” image, but also the emotional responses towards its image appear to be seen and evaluated differently by Linz’s visitors depending on their socio-demographic background. Therefore, promotional campaigns showing the emotional side of Linz’s image and focusing on the targeted audience feelings towards Linz can be used for effective destination differentiation and positioning.

This research also points out the importance of nationality as an image determinant, and therefore, the need to develop different promotional campaigns based on both cognitive-based attributes of Linz and their affective evaluation for different target markets. The Austrian market, for instance, requires more intensive promotion of Linz’s natural beauty and rich cultural life to weaken the shadow of Linz Nazi’s past and industry which were found to be well known by the Austrian respondents, and to make Linz a strong competitor on the Austrian holiday market. Linz’s policy makers should also invest in improving Linz’s “Pastime” and “Eventness” in the eyes of its female visitors through developing attractions and hosting events purposefully designed for the female taste, as these image attributes were found to be the main differences between male and female visitors. These findings also suggest that marketers should not only analyse and promote the cognitive image elements of a place, but also incorporate any emotions and feelings visitors have towards it since both cognitive and affective image elements were found to be reliant on visitors’ socio-demographic characteristics. Also, marketers’ attention should not be focused entirely on developing an attractive, positive and strong destination image used in the “pre-travel” visitors’ decision making process, but should focus on ensuring that the “on site” image reverberates it.

It needs to be mentioned that the sample was perceived as mainly homogenous in terms of distance (country of origin) from Linz as the majority of respondents came from other European countries Results generalization could be seen as another research limitation since the research of a destination allows the results to be generalized only for the research sample and Linz. Also, the “a priory” image of Linz, was evaluated “looking backwards” and the reliability of the collected data depends on respondents’ memory which could be positively or negatively affected by respondents’ first-hand experience in Linz, which may result in distorted results of Linz’s “pre-travel” image. A similar constraint occurred in Martin and Bosque’s study (2007) on the linkage between and perceived image of a tourist destination and visitors’ psychological factors. The use of a questionnaire for collecting data also restricted the number of variables and types of questions applied in order to avoid lengthy and unappealing, from the respondents’ point of view, questions. Financial and time constraints also considerably affected the amount of collected and analysed data. Therefore, the results should be considered more as a “snapshot” of Linz’s image as a tourism destination rather than a longitudinal research.

It would be, worthwhile to replicate this research at a different destination in a different context to prove its feasibility and validity. The validity of this research could be also increased by empirically testing it during a different period of the year as some of Linz’s image components related to winter sports and snow did not show to be part of its’ image, despite the fact that Austria is traditionally most deeply perceived as a popular winter destination. Moreover, the study could be further developed and refined by investigating the effect of cultural values on visitors’ “pre-“ and “on-site” images of destinations and exploring the role of “country of origin” with more heterogeneous sample including respondents from different parts of the world and not only Europe.
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Table 1: Summary of the PCA for the pre-travel cognitive image components

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image Factors and Dimensions**  | **Factor Loading** | **% of Variance Explained**  | **Cumulative % of Variance Explained**  | **Factor Alpha Value** |
| **Factor I: Contemporary Culture** |  | 18.955 | 18.955 | 0.856 |
| Lentos  | .879 |  |  |  |
| Modern Art | .795 |  |  |  |
| Ars Electronica Center | .766 |  |  |  |
| **Factor II: Pastime**  |  | 11.722 | 30.678 | 0.742 |
| Snow/Winter | .796 |  |  |  |
| Alps | .748 |  |  |  |
| Bicycle Paths | .713 |  |  |  |
| Football | .535 |  |  |  |
| **Factor III: Traditions**  |  | 10.275 | 40.952 | 0.885 |
| Museums | .719 |  |  |  |
| Monuments | .647 |  |  |  |
| ECC | .602 |  |  |  |
| Cultural heritage | .595 |  |  |  |
| Bruckner | .593 |  |  |  |
| **Factor IV: Aesthetics**  |  | 7.686 | 48.738 | 0.714 |
| Churches | .836 |  |  |  |
| The Old Town | .825 |  |  |  |
| Architecture | .689 |  |  |  |
| Postlingberg  | .496 |  |  |  |
| **Factor V: Blemish** |  | 5. 838 | 54.576 | 0.674 |
| Heavy Industry | .926 |  |  |  |
| Steel Industry | .921 |  |  |  |

Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 7 iterations

Table 2: Summary of the PCA for the pre-travel affective image components

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image Factors and Dimensions** | **Factor Loading** | **% of Variance Explained** | **Cumulative % of Variance Explained** | **Factor Alpha Value**  |
| **Factor I: Encouraging dimension** |  | 42.299 | 42.299 | 0.870 |
| Enjoyable | .813 |  |  |  |
| Interesting | .784 |  |  |  |
| Modern | .740 |  |  |  |
| Admirable | .704 |  |  |  |
| Beautiful | .697 |  |  |  |
| Pleasurable | .655 |  |  |  |
| **Factor II: Unappealing dimension** |  | 13.585 | 55.884 | 0.796 |
| Cold | .890 |  |  |  |
| Poor  | .818 |  |  |  |
| Dark | .763 |  |  |  |
| Unpleasant | .556 |  |  |  |
| Old-fashioned | .461 |  |  |  |
| **Factor III: Tranquillity**  |  | 8.271 | 64.155 | 0.761 |
| Calm | .876 |  |  |  |
| Neat  | .713 |  |  |  |

Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 5 iterations

**Table 3: Summary of the PCA for the “on situ” cognitive image components**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image Factors and Dimensions** | **Factor Loading** | **% of Variance Explained** | **Cumulative % of Variance Explained** | **Factor Alpha Value**  |
| **Factor I: Pastime** |  | 18.860 | 18.955 | 0.786 |
| Alps | .829 |  |  |  |
| Snow/Winter | .742 |  |  |  |
| Monuments | .701 |  |  |  |
| Museums | .614 |  |  |  |
| Bicycle Paths | .539 |  |  |  |
| Ancient Origin | .500 |  |  |  |
| **Factor II: Blemish** |  | 10.577 | 29.437 | 0.842 |
| Heavy Industry | .929 |  |  |  |
| Steel Industry | .898 |  |  |  |
| Hitler  | .757 |  |  |  |
| **Factor III: Contemporary Culture** |  | 8.076 | 37.513 | 0.757 |
| Lentos | .852 |  |  |  |
| Modern Art | .780 |  |  |  |
| Ars Electronica Center | .777 |  |  |  |
| **Factor IV: Eventness** |  | 7.368 | 44.881 | 0.701 |
| International Street Artist Festival | .781 |  |  |  |
| Bruckner Festival | .780 |  |  |  |
| Bruckner | .633 |  |  |  |
| Football | .487 |  |  |  |
| **Factor V: Aesthetics** |  | 5.591 | 50.472 | 0.677 |
| Old Churches | .814 |  |  |  |
| Old Town | .722 |  |  |  |
| Architecture  | .713 |  |  |  |
| **Factor VI: Traditions** |  | 5.051 | 55.523 | .484 |
| Cultural Heritage | .680 |  |  |  |
| ECC | .568 |  |  |  |
| Austrian Cuisine | .537 |  |  |  |
| **Factor VII: Relaxation**  |  | 4.670 | 60.193 | .611 |
| Postlingberg | .807 |  |  |  |
| Shopping | .769 |  |  |  |

Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 10 iterations

**Table 4: Summary of the PCA for Linz’s “on-situ” cognitive image components**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image Factors and Dimensions** | **Factor Loading** | **% of Variance Explained**  | **Cumulative % of Variance Explained** | **Factor Alpha Value**  |
| Factor I: Unsympathetic |  | 29.416 | 29.416 | 0.764 |
| Dark | .862 |  |  |  |
| Cold | .851 |  |  |  |
| Poor | .672 |  |  |  |
| Factor II:Encouraging |  | 13.281 | 42.698 | 0.733 |
| Modern | .812 |  |  |  |
| Interesting | .803 |  |  |  |
| Enjoyable  | .659 |  |  |  |
| **Factor III: Discouraging**  |  | 9.757 | 52.455 | 0.642 |
| Unpleasant  | .831 |  |  |  |
| Boring  | .794 |  |  |  |
| **Factor IV: Exquisite** |  | 8.736 | 61.191 | 0.736 |
| Admirable | .876 |  |  |  |
| Beautiful  | .801 |  |  |  |
| **Factor V: Tranquillity**  |  | 7.363 | 68.554 | 0.597 |
| Calm | .843 |  |  |  |
| Neat  | .794 |  |  |  |

Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 6 iterations

Table 5: Results of the independent samples t-test on the differences between Austrians and Internationals and male and female respondents in terms of Linz’s “a priori” image

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions** | **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances** | **t-test for Equality of Means** |
| **Nationality**  | **Gender** | **Nationality** | **Gender**  |
| **F** | **Sig.** | **F** | **Sig.** | **T** | **Df** | **(Sig.2-tailed)** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error Difference** | **T** | **Df** | **(Sig.2-tailed)** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error Difference** |
| **Contemporary culture** | 2.066 | .151 | .033 | .855 | 1.650 | 398 | .100 | .21016 | .12739 | .458 | 398 | .647 | .05858 | .12792 |
| **Pastime** | 6.501 | .011 | 1.220 | .270 | -4.860 | 365.16 | **.000** | -.58051 | .11945 | 2.271 | 398 | **.024** | .27489 | .12103 |
| **Traditions**  | 10.18 | .002 | 4.300 | .039 | .096 | 337.19 | .924 | .00857 | .08963 | -.855 | 356.599 | .393 | -.07635 | .08927 |
| **Aesthetics** | 2.393 | .123 | .079 | .779 | -1.026 | 398 | .305 | -.06747 | .06575 | -.917 | 398 | .360 | -.06037 | .06584 |
| **Blemish** | 34.52 | .000 | .161 | .689 | -7.152 | 386.80 | **.000** | -.81564 | .11405 | -.255 | 398 | .799 | -.03138 | .12314 |
| **Encouraging Dimension** | 1.027 | .311 | .636 | .425 | .972 | 398 | .332 | .06475 | .06664 | .571 | 398 | .568 | .03811 | .06676 |
| **Unappealing Dimension** | 4.93 | .027 | 1.023 | .312 | -.369 | 397.69 | .713 | -.02579 | .06997 | -.714 | 398 | .476 | -.05041 | .07063 |
| **Tranquillity**  | .010 | .920 | .188 | .665 | .337 | 398 | .736 | .02113 | .06265 | -.934 | 398 | .351 | -.05852 | .06266 |

Table 6: Linz’s “a priori” image differences in terms of nationality and gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions**  | **Nationality** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Gender** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
| **Contemporary Culture** | Austrians | 2.5230 | 1.32800 | Female | 2.4388 | 1.26591 |
| Internationals | 2.3129 | 1.21951 | Male | 2.3802 | 1.28686 |
| **Pastime** | Austrians | 3.3617 | 1.28916 | Female | 3.7965 | 1.16242 |
| Internationals | 3.9422 | 1.07283 | Male | 3.5216 | 1.25659 |
| **Traditions** | Austrians | 2.3840 | 1.01474 | Female | 2.3442 | .79381 |
| Internationals | 2.3755 | .73618 | Male | 2.4205 | .96538 |
| **Aesthetics** | Austrians | 1.7061 | .61597 | Female | 1.7140 | .65311 |
| Internationals | 1.7736 | .69017 | Male | 1.7743 | .66047 |
| **Blemish** | Austrians | 2.2535 | .97021 | Female | 2.6713 | 1.21409 |
| Internationals | 3.0692 | 1.30234 | Male | 2.7027 | 1.24379 |
| **Encouraging Dimension** | Austrians | 2.2872 | .63161 | Female | 2.2705 | .64111 |
| Internationals | 2.2225 | .69369 | Male | 2.2324 | .69333 |
| **Unappealing Destination** | Austrians | 4.1138 | .64784 | Female | 4.1042 | .68436 |
| Internationals | 4.1396 | .75145 | Male | 4.1546 | .72689 |
| **Tranquillity**  | Austrians | 1.5824 | .58717 | Female | 1.5442 | .62961 |
| Internationals | 1.5613 | .65745 | Male | 1.6027 | .61921 |

Table 7: Results of univariate analysis of variance with post-hoc Scheffe test on respondents’ education and its relationship with Linz’s “a priori” image

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions** | **Primary** | **Secondary** | **University** | **F-value** | **Significance**  |
| N=29 | N=142 | N=229 |
| **Contemporary Culture** | 2.264 | 2.453 | 2.405 | .271 | 0.763 |
| **Pastime** | 3.422 | 3.474a | 3.822a | 4.335 | **0.014** |
| **Traditions** | 2.421 | 2.497 | 2.301 | 2.234 | 0.108 |
| **Aesthetics** | 1.888 | 1.759 | 1.713 | .988 | 0.373 |
| **Blemish** | 2.506 | 2.739 | 2.675 | .455 | 0.635 |
| **Encouraging Dimension** | 2.293 | 2.376a | 2.172a | 4.239 | **0.015** |
| **Unappealing Dimension** | 4.179 | 4.070 | 4.156 | .737 | 0.479 |
| **Tranquillity** | 1.500 | 1.669 | 1.520 | 2.732 | 0.066 |

a Mean scores with different letters are significantly different at 0.05 probability level from each other.

Table 8: The results of univariate analysis of variance with post-hoc Scheffe test on respondents’ age and its relationship with Linz’s “a priori” image

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions** | **18-30** | **31-40** | **41-50** | **50+** | **F-value** | **Significance**  |
|  | **N=76** | **N=89** | **N=119** | **N=116** |  |  |
| **Contemporary Culture** | 2.250a | 2.172b | 2.457 | 2.655a,b | 2.958 | **.032** |
| **Pastime** | 3.289a | 3.708 | 3.901a | 3.651 | 4.064 | **.007** |
| **Traditions** | 2.484 | 2.319 | 2.466 | 2.269 | 1.503 | .213 |
| **Aesthetics** | 1.888a | 1.758 | 1.765 | 1.610a | 2.930 | **.033** |
| **Blemish** | 2.789 | 2.779 | 2.804 | 2.425 | 2.493 | .060 |
| **Encouraging Dimension** | 2.419 | 2.172 | 2.211 | 2.249 | 2.187 | .089 |
| **Unappealing Dimension** | 3.976 | 4.180 | 4.245 | 4.066 | 2.781 | .051 |
| **Tranquillity** | 1.618 | 1.567 | 1.542 | 1.573 | .231 | .874 |

Table 9: Results of the independent samples t-test on the differences between Austrians and Internationals and male and female respondents in terms of Linz’s “on-situ” image

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions** | **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances** | **Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances** | **t-test for Equality of Means** | **t-test for Equality of Means** |
|  | **Nationality** | **Gender** | **Nationality** | **Gender** |
|  | **F** | **Sig.** | **F** | **Sig.** | **T** | **Df** | **(Sig.2-tailed)** | **Mean Difference** | **Std. Error Difference** | **t** | **Df** | **(Sig.2-tailed)** | **Mean Dif.** | **Std. Error Dif.** |
| **Pastime** | 9.438 | .002 | .819 | .366 | -1.690 | 356.268 | .092 | -.14577 | .08624 | .503 | 392.319 | .616 | .04285 | .08526 |
| **Blemish** | .050 | .822 | .023 | .879 | -2.040 | 398 | **.042** | -.20674 | .10133 | 1.444 | 391.294 | .149 | .14666 | .10154 |
| **Contemp. Culture** | 1.649 | .200 | .049 | .825 | 2.557 | 398 | **.011** | .17292 | .06762 | 1.496 | 393.758 | .135 | .10145 | .06781 |
| **Eventness** | 3.851 | .050 | .709 | .400 | -1.451 | 377.455 | .148 | -.17001 | .11719 | 2.477 | 398 | **.014** | .28712 | .11593 |
| **Aesthetics** | .008 | .928 | 1.907 | .168 | .790 | 396.280 | .430 | .02864 | .03627 | -.956 | 376.141 | .340 | -.03503 | .03666 |
| **Relaxation** | 1.828 | .177 | .009 | .926 | .590 | 397.174 | .555 | .02890 | .04895 | -2.334 | 398 | **.020** | -.11414 | .04891 |
| **Unsympathetic** | 4.285 | .039 | 2.341 | .127 | -1.437 | 379.672 | .152 | -.07554 | .05257 | .918 | 370.719 | .359 | .04852 | .05287 |
| **Encouraging** | .022 | .882 | .308 | .579 | 2.574 | 398 | **.010** | .13355 | .05188 | -.425 | 385.557 | .671 | -.02229 | .05247 |
| **Discouraging** | 24.349 | .000 | 1.820 | .178 | -2.625 | 398 | **.009** | -.14788 | .05633 | 1.139 | 374.679 | .255 | .06518 | .05720 |
| **Exquisite** | 1.999 | .158 | .914 |  | -.023 | 383.161 | .982 | -.00166 | .07169 | -.649 | 389.140 | .517 | -.04632 | .07139 |

Table 10: Linz’s “on situ” image differences in terms of nationality and gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Nationality** | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** | **Gender**  | **Mean** | **Std. Deviation** |
| **Pastime** | Austrians | 3.0665 | .94651 | Female | 3.1636 | .86407 |
| Internationals | 3.2123 | .75275 | Male | 3.1207 | .83811 |
| **Blemish** | Austrians | 3.0071 | 1.00973 | Female | 3.1845 | 1.02339 |
| Internationals | 3.2138 | 1.01302 | Male | 3.0378 | 1.00320 |
| **Contemporary Culture** | Austrians | 1.6525 | .71386 | Female | 1.6078 | .69312 |
| Internationals | 1.4796 | .63851 | Male | 1.5063 | .66129 |
| **Eventness** | Austrians | 3.2899 | 1.23036 | Female | 3.5128 | 1.14289 |
| Internationals | 3.4599 | 1.09752 | Male | 3.2257 | 1.17119 |
| **Aesthetics** | Austrians | 1.2252 | .35257 | Female | 1.1938 | .34731 |
| Internationals | 1.1965 | .37236 | Male | 1.2288 | .38055 |
| **Relaxation** | Austrians | 1.5053 | .47106 | Female | 1.4372 | .48290 |
| Internationals | 1.4764 | .50768 | Male | 1.5514 | .49323 |
| **Unsympathetic** | Austrians | 4.6383 | .54866 | Female | 4.7008 | .49175 |
| Internationals | 4.7138 | .49630 | Male | 4.6523 | .55585 |
| **Encouraging** | Austrians | 2.0408 | .54188 | Female | 1.9597 | .51502 |
| Internationals | 1.9072 | .49568 | Male | 1.9820 | .53016 |
| **Discouraging** | Austrians | 4.6729 | .69232 | Female | 4.7814 | .53923 |
| Internationals | 4.8208 | .41414 | Male | 4.7162 | .59596 |
| **Exquisite** | Austrians | 1.9229 | .74083 | Female | 1.9023 | .71188 |

**Тable 11: The results of univariate analysis of variance with post-hoc Scheffe test on respondents’ age and its relationship with Linz’s “on situ” image**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image dimensions** | **18-30****N=76** | **31-40****N=89** | **41-50****N=119** | **50+****N=116** | **F-value** | **Significance** |
| **Pastime** | 3.068 | 3.055 | 3.278 | 3.158 | 1.459 | .225 |
| **Blemish** | 3.179 | 3.196 | 3.134 | 3.009 | .692 | .557 |
| **Contemporary Culture** | 1.353a | 1.475b | 1.584 | 1.757 a,b | 5.939 | **.001** |
| **Eventness** | 3.533 | 3.385 | 3.500 | 3.252 | 1.208 | .306 |
| **Aesthetics** | 1.271 | 1.212 | 1.211 | 1.171 | 1.094 | .351 |
| **Relaxation** | 1.457 | 1.476 | 1.517 | 1.504 | .268 | .849 |
| **Unsympathetic** | 4.638 | 4.694 | 4.709 | 4.675 | 2.96 | .828 |
| **Encouraging** | 2.024 | 1.961 | 1.875 | 2.032 | 2.162 | .092 |
| **Discouraging** | 4.696 | 4.747 | 4.782 | 4.761 | .348 | .791 |
| **Exquisite** | 1.812 | 1.829 | 1.991 | 1.948 | 1.411 | .239 |