國立嘉義大學99學年度

觀光休閒管理研究所博士班招生考試試題

科目： 觀光休閒遊憩文獻評論

一、請閱讀以下文章，並回答問題　※請以中文作答

1. 請指出本文主要的「研究問題」為何？（10%）

2. 請提出本文的研究設計方式（research design）。（10%）

3. 請指出本文主要的原創價值定位。（10%）

4. 請指出本文在實務上的意涵。（10%）

5. 請為本文訂定一個適當的研究標題。（10%）

INTRODUCTION

Branding has existed for centuries as a way of distinguishing the goods of one producer from those of another, while modern branding finds its origins in the 19th century (Room 1992). According to this, a brand can be treated as a legal instrument, logo, company, identity system, image, personality, relationship, and/or as adding value. A combination of all these perspectives is embodied in the definition of de Chernatony and McDonald, which equates a successful brand to ''an identifiable product, service, person, or place, augmented in such a way that the buyer or user perceives relevant, unique added values which match their needs most closely [and] its success results from being able to sustain these added values in the face of competition''.

A significant amount of effort has been devoted to addressing the complex nature of a brand. In face of various interpretations, de Chernatony and McDonald argue that it should be understood from an input perspective as, for example, in the way managers emphasize the use of resources to achieve a customer response. Alternatively, a brand can be viewed from an output perspective, as in the way customers interpret and use it to enhance their personal experience. De Chernatony (1999) argues further that modern analysis should treat both the brand identity concept (Aaker and Joachimsthaler 2000; Kapferer 1998) and brand equity concept (Aaker 1991; Keller 1993) as interrelated. By equity is meant the sum of factors (or ''dimensions'') contributing to a brand's value in the consumer's mind.

Unlike the many scientific contributions covering the theme of product brands, the research line of destination brands is merely in its infancy (Cai 2002). Although this

branding appears to be one of the newest research areas (Cai 2002; Morgan and Pritchard 2002), the topic has been partly covered under the alternative label of destination image studies (Ritchie and Ritchie 1998), which have been investigated for more than 30 years (Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Crompton 1979; Echtner and Ritchie 1993; Gallarza, Gil and Calderon 2002; Gartner 1986, 1989, 1993; Hunt 1975; Phelps 1986). However, as Ritchie and Ritchie (1998) stated, the development of a coherent and commonly accepted framework is essential for using branding theory for destinations. According to Cai (2002), a major disadvantage of previous image studies is their inability to distinguish between the image and branding functions. Cai highlights the difference: ''image formation is not branding, albeit the former constitutes the core of the latter. Image building is one step closer, but there still remains a critical missing link: the brand identity''.

As destination branding becomes a fairly active area of research, the question remains as to whether already accepted branding principles can be transferred to destinations. A similar debate is also ongoing about the extent to which principles traditionally developed for product brands, can apply to service and corporate ones. In comparing products and services, de Chernatony and Dall'Olmo Riley (1999) concluded that the concept of a brand is similar for both, although different dimensions of branding strategy may be emphasized. Therefore, destination characteristics should be investigated before applying branding principles.

This paper is concerned with exploring the dimensions of the customer-based brand equity of a destination. Four proposed dimensions—awareness, image, quality, and loyalty—were identified, measured, and tested. While some may argue that the concepts of awareness, quality, and loyalty are inherent in the image dimension, statistically isolating them calls for a refinement of image research. Although dimensions are arguably contained within image, if the full concept of equity for destinations is operational, image is only part of something more inclusive.

The main purpose of this paper is to present the concept from the tourist's point of view. The question is whether a customer-based brand equity methodology traditionally developed for product (and partly for services and organizations) brands can be transferred to destinations. Excluding the numerous analyses on image as a whole, the other three dimensions have rarely been studied. Thus, it is relevant to ask whether a destination's image as a single measure brand equity represents the most vital element in destination evaluation. Alternatively, the question is whether the image concept studied in the last three decades also encompasses other branding dimensions which can be identified and measured.

二、請閱讀以下文章，並回答問題：※ 說明：中英文作答均可

1. 請指出本文的「研究問題」為何？（10%）

2. 請指出本研究中 3 個主要的「研究變數」為何？（10%）

3. 請指出本研究的 Knowledge gap 為何？（10%）

4. 請為本研究訂定一個適當的英文「研究標題」（title）。（10%）

5. 請以圖示方式繪製本研究的「觀念性架構」（Conceptual Framework）。（10%）

The year 2007 has started on a higher-than-expected note for global tourism. From January through April, international tourist arrivals worldwide rose by over 6% to 252 million, representing an additional 15 million arrivals as against the same period in 2006 (WTO 2007). Though travel is more popular than before, destination managers still worry because their locations' attractiveness seems to be spinning away even as they watch (Plog 2001:13). In practice, they usually question: "why do tourists hesitate or delay, even change their destination- and itinerary-related decisions?" Yet, for a long time, the research focus has been on factors influencing destination choices and purchasing intentions instead of finding the reasons and solutions for tourist hesitation.

Undoubtedly, tourist behavior and decision making has always been a central issue in the tourism management literature (Papatheodorou 2001). Numerous studies identified various factors causing people to visit a destination (Um and Crompton, 1990; Crompton and Ankomah, 1993; Nadeau, Heslop, O'Reilly, and Luk 2008) which basically can be categorized by pull and push factors (Crompton 1979; Dann 1977; Uysal and Jurowski 1994; Yoon and Uysal 2005; Beerli, Meneses, and Gil 2007). Subsequently, preceding research discovered other influencing factors to build travel models, such as tourist characteristics (Morley 1994; Papatheodorou 2001), destination preferences and awareness (Goodrich 1978), race (Philipp 1994), nationality (Pizam and Sussmann 1995), attitudes (Um and Crompton 1990), and other marketing and consumer variables (Mühlbacher and Botschen 1988). Yet, these models are similar in that they are based on past travel experiences, motivations, demands, preferences and lifestyles, and then use these traits to explain the evoked set of tourists, the final destination choice and other behavioral outcomes. Although the research models went to great lengths to extract elements of tourist behavior and decision making, from the perspective of decision making theory, one section is still not linked up--hesitation.

In fact, decisions in the trip-planning phase are typically being modified, sometimes even completely revamped; some factors easily affect tourists making destination decisions, such as issues related to health, safety, time, expenditure and travel distance (Bansal and Eiselt 2004). And in the final vacation-decision phase, travel risk would also

change tourists' minds (Boshoff 2002) when insufficient information makes consumers uneasy about their expected experience quality. Considering the intangibility of tourism products, tourists usually perceive uncertainty surrounding future purchase outcomes (Hsu and Lin 2006); furthermore, given the seasonality of the tourism industry, tourists will miss some tourism products with preferred price and itinerary details if they do not purchase at one certain time. Though they are provided similar purchase opportunities in the future, they may purchase products with unexpected price and items. Thus tourists typically face a dilemma- they want the products or services possibly that match their needs, but are also afraid of making wrong decisions and getting a bad purchase experience. Hence, tourists hesitate to make the final decision.

In decision making theory, hesitation is considered as a decision making style that it is a more stable characteristics of the decision maker in addition to a habitual behavior (Thunholm 2004:932). Therefore, the tourist's personality that is probed by destination behavior models is not appropriate to explain tourist hesitation as they are homogeneous. Moreover, other concepts, such as tourist motivation and benefits sought, that are probed by destination behavior models are either not appropriate to explain tourist hesitation because they are factors causing tourists to visit a destination. Instead of these concepts, the use of tourist knowledge is more central to informed decisions and policymaking (Xiao and Smith 2007:310); it is essential to understand tourists knowledge for marketing management decisions, designing effective communication, campaigns, and service delivery (Gursoy and McCleary 2004:353).

However, empirical evidence concerning how tourist risk perception influences consumers' hesitation in destination decision making is scant, leaving some vital issues unresolved in this important research arena. It either does not specify how tourist knowledge modifies the relationship between tourist risk perception and hesitation. Existing behavioral research has suggested that if consumers possess a higher level of product knowledge, it is possible that they will be more certain and confident in making their purchasing decisions (Berger and Mitchell 1989:277), and higher levels of product knowledge are better predictors of behavioral intention than attitudes based on low levels of product knowledge (Chiou 2000:107). Many tourists value the information essential because it enables them to reduce uncertainty if they are planning a vacation (Gursoy and McCleary 2004:356). For the above reasons, this study attempts to explore the roles and positions of tourist risk perception, tourist knowledge, and hesitation in tourist decision making theory.