

Visitors to Christchurch: Characteristics and Decision-Making

Kevin Moore

Senior Lecturer

**Environment, Society and Design Division, Lincoln University
moore@lincoln.ac.nz**

David G. Simmons

Professor of Tourism,

**Environment, Society and Design Division, Lincoln University
dsimmons@lincoln.ac.nz**

John R. Fairweather

**Principal Research Officer in the Agribusiness and Economics
Research Unit, Lincoln University
fairweat@lincoln.ac.nz**

July 2003

ISSN 1175-5385

**Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre
(TRREC)
Report No. 32**

Lincoln University

Contents

Contents	i
List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vii
Summary.....	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction: Research Objectives and Review of Key Literature	1
1.1 Objectives.....	1
1.2 Literature Review	1
Chapter 2 Methods.....	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Sampling.....	5
2.3 Surveying.....	5
2.4 Limitations.....	6
Chapter 3 Results	9
3.1 Introduction	9
3.2 General Characteristics.....	9
3.3 Prior Knowledge and Information Needs.....	14
3.4 Recommendations and Disappointments	19
3.5 Decision-making Timing.....	26
3.6 Influences on Decision-making.....	33
Chapter 4 Discussion and Conclusions.....	45
4.1 Summary of Findings	45
4.2 Discussion and Conclusions.....	49
4.3 Implications for Theory and Method.....	54
4.4 Implications for Policy	55
References.....	57
Appendix 1 Survey Questionnaire	59
Appendix 2 Quota Sampling Regime	83
List of Titles Published.....	85

List of Tables

Table 1	Gender Distribution.....	9
Table 2	Age Distribution.....	10
Table 3	Nationality.....	10
Table 4	Visitor Travel Type – Position of Christchurch in Trip.....	11
Table 5	Visitor Travel Type by Age Group.....	12
Table 6	Visitor Travel Type by Country/Region	12
Table 7	Visitor Travel Type by Group Type	13
Table 8	Group Type	13
Table 9	Previous Visits to New Zealand (Overseas Visitors).....	14
Table 10	Degree of Prior Knowledge of Christchurch	15
Table 11	Prior Knowledge by Gender	15
Table 12	Prior Knowledge by Travel Type.....	15
Table 13	Prior Knowledge by Country/ Region	16
Table 14	Prior Knowledge by Age.....	17
Table 15	Prior Knowledge and Group Type.....	17
Table 16	Desire for More Information About the Christchurch Region Prior to Current Trip.....	18
Table 17	Desire for More Information by Prior Knowledge	18
Table 18	Desire for More Information by Country/ Region.....	19
Table 19	Desire for More Information by Age	19
Table 20	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One Month Stay in New Zealand	20
Table 21	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One Month Stay in New Zealand by Travel Type.....	21
Table 22	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in New Zealand by Country/ Region	21
Table 23	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in New Zealand by Group Type.....	22
Table 24	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in South Island.....	23
Table 25	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Travel Type.....	23

Table 26	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Country/ Region.....	24
Table 27	Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Group Type	25
Table 28	Disappointments with the Experience of Christchurch.....	26
Table 29	Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch	26
Table 30	Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Travel Type.....	27
Table 31	Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Age.....	27
Table 32	Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Group Type.....	28
Table 33	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary	28
Table 34	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Age.....	29
Table 35	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Gender	29
Table 36	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Travel Type.....	29
Table 37	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Nationality	30
Table 38	Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Group Type.....	30
Table 39	Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary (Overseas Visitors)	31
Table 40	Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Age.....	32
Table 41	Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Nationality	32
Table 42	Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Group Type.....	33
Table 43	Influences on Decision to go to New Zealand.....	34
Table 44	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Type of Travel.....	35
Table 45	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Country/Region.....	35
Table 46	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Age	35
Table 47	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Group Type	36
Table 48	Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Type of Travel	36
Table 49	Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Country/Region.....	37
Table 50	Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Group Type.....	37
Table 51	Influence of Travel Books by Type of Travel.....	38
Table 52	Influence of Travel Books by Country/Region.....	38
Table 53	Influence of Travel Books by Group Type	39
Table 54	Influence of Internet by Age	39
Table 55	Influence of Internet by Group Type	40
Table 56	Influences on Decision to go to the Christchurch Region	40

Table 57	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Type of Travel.....	41
Table 58	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Country/Region.....	42
Table 59	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Age	42
Table 60	Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Group Type	42
Table 61	Influences on Decision to go to the Christchurch Region	43

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology; Tourism Strategic Portfolio Output. This report forms part of a series of eight constituent reports on Tourism in Christchurch, which in turn is one of four case studies in the programme 'Improved Management of Tourist Flows and Effects' (LINX 0203).

Ethical approval for the overall research programme was provided under Lincoln University Human Research Subjects Ethics Committee's ethical approval (Ref: HSEC 97/21) and verified for this case study.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of the many participants (overseas and domestic visitors to Christchurch, and local residents) who gave freely of their time to participate in this study.

The substantial efforts of the following in conscientiously administering the survey are also very much appreciated: Trudy Jones, Rachel Kirkbride, Melissa Renganathan, Roger Thomas, Palmer Moore, Nick Hadley, Jamie Kinchsular.

Finally we acknowledge the considerable typing and formatting efforts of Michelle Collings, the TRREC Project Administrator, and editorial review by Michael Shone, TRREC Research Assistant.

Summary

This report presents the results from a survey of visitors to Christchurch, New Zealand which investigated visitors' general characteristics (e.g., age, gender, origin country, group type, etc.), prior knowledge of Christchurch and perceived information needs, recommendations and decision-making processes (e.g., timing of itinerary planning, perceived influences on decisions).

A selective review of the literature on visitor decision-making is presented which emphasizes the various processes involved and the role of information. It also explores the affective and family contexts of visitor decision-making. An alternative understanding of decision-making is presented based upon discursive psychological approaches that emphasise the discursive work carried out by visitors' discourse about information and their decision-making. This approach helps to highlight the role that information-gathering activities have in the visitor experience and the interactions visitors have with information sources.

One survey instrument was used to collect the data reported here. Data collection occurred during two sampling periods: 25 September to 10 December 2002; 4 January to 9 February 2003. A quota sampling design was used based on previous years' visitor's data from the International Visitors Survey and Domestic Tourism Monitor/ Domestic Tourism Survey. Selected sites for surveying were in the centre of Christchurch and included the Arts Centre, Cathedral Square, Victoria Square and Cashel Street Mall. Surveyors approached passers-by, introduced themselves and, when consent was given, conducted the survey. From the two sampling periods a combined total of 930 surveys were completed of which 731 were of visitors to Christchurch and it is these latter that formed the basis of the findings reported in this report. The remaining 199 surveys were of locals who had had visitors stay with them in the previous three months.

A majority of the visitors in the study sample were female (54.0%), international in origin (89.6%). Of the overseas visitors (n=648) 80.9 per cent had not visited New Zealand before. The largest group type was those visiting alone (37.9%) and the predominant age groups were 20 to 24 years old (19.8%), 25 to 29 years old (17.4%) and 30 to 34 years old (12.9%).

Some 51.6 per cent of visitors believed they had less than adequate knowledge of Christchurch prior to arrival with those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination the most likely to report higher than adequate levels of prior knowledge (25.9%). Despite a majority reporting less than adequate levels of prior knowledge a total of 69.8 per cent did not believe that they needed more information about the region prior to the trip. Nevertheless, the greatest desire for more information was from those who had either no prior knowledge of the region (38.8%) or some knowledge but less than adequate knowledge (39.9%). Interestingly, while domestic visitors to Christchurch were the least likely to desire more information (17.3%) they were closely followed by visitors from Germany (17.7%). Visitors from Asia reported the greatest demand for more information prior to arrival (55.3%) followed by visitors from the United States (40.2%).

The most common recommended length of stay in the Christchurch region during a one-month stay in New Zealand was three to four days (45.5%) followed by 'about one week' (26.6%) and one to two days (23.3%). Those travelling to Christchurch as a sole destination gave the

lengthiest recommendations with 15.6 per cent recommending 'at least two weeks' and a further 30.5 per cent recommending 'about one week'.

When recommendations were based on a scenario of a one month trip in the South Island (rather than the whole of New Zealand) there was a marked increase in the recommended lengths of stay. Under this scenario, some 14.7 per cent recommended 'at least two weeks', 35.6 per cent recommended 'about one week' and 37.9 per cent recommended three to four days.

Some 64.6 per cent of respondents claimed to have no disappointments with Christchurch while 2.7 per cent mentioned the weather, 1.4 per cent 'shopping' and 1.2 per cent 'unfriendly people'. The remaining disappointments were expressed by seven or fewer respondents (i.e., less than 1% of the sample).

The decision to travel to Christchurch was overwhelmingly made while still at home (89.9%) but the planning of Christchurch stay itineraries was carried out mainly at home by 49.6 per cent of the sample and mainly while travelling in New Zealand by 43.2 per cent. Visitors from 'other Europe' (33.6%) and Germany (35.5%) were the least likely to plan their Christchurch itineraries while still at home, domestic visitors were the most likely (82.4%).

Some 76.5 per cent of overseas visitors planned their New Zealand itineraries while still at home but this tendency was least pronounced in the younger age groups (69.6% of 15 to 24 year olds and 68.2% of 25 to 34 year olds). Once again, those from 'other Europe' (65.3%) and Germany (71.0%) the least likely to have planned their New Zealand itineraries while at home.

Advice from friends and family (62.7%) and not having visited New Zealand before (58.8%) were the most often cited influences on overseas visitors' decisions to visit New Zealand. Travel books also rated highly (34.0%) but the next most cited information source from the industry was brochures at only 13.7 per cent of respondents. Interestingly, the internet was cited as an influence by 21.7 per cent of overseas respondents. These findings confirm a trend reported in previous related studies that show an emphasis by respondents on informal sources of information and those sources that can be controlled by the user and/or are portable (e.g., travel books).

A similar pattern was found for influences on the decision to visit Christchurch. Once again, advice from friends and family was the most often cited influence (42.4%) and not having visited Christchurch before was next most cited at 36.0 per cent. However, Christchurch's use as a convenient stopover was cited by 28.7 per cent of respondents perhaps reflecting the 'gateway' perception of Christchurch as a destination.

The implications of the findings were discussed in relation to theory and method. It was noted that, methodologically, the sampling of domestic visitors in a large centre such as Christchurch raises some difficulties. Domestic visitors to Christchurch do not appear to frequent the major tourist sites visited by overseas visitors (where sampling occurred). Strategies such as telephone sampling of locals to locate domestic visitors and the use of qualitative methods (e.g., focus groups) to identify domestic visitor sites were suggested. Qualitative methods were also suggested as a means to explore the ways in which information sources and other influences on

decision-making are used by visitors to construct their experiences and activities. These methods, if linked to alternative theoretical frameworks (such as discursive psychological approaches) could be used to investigate the multiple functions of information beyond its role as input into an assumed rational decision-making process. Similarly, the amount of information sought or desired by visitors should be understood using conceptualisations that go beyond notions of time and money 'investment' and incorporate such activities (and values) as 'discovery'.

Finally, some policy implications were identified. These included the implications of the marked differences between those for whom Christchurch represented a 'gateway' or 'stepping stone' function and those for whom Christchurch was a sole destination. The latter group is likely to have distinct needs and demands perhaps similar to those of locals. Their commitment to the region suggests these needs should be a focus wherever possible. Also, it was noted that recommended lengths of stay are connected to overall trip length. The more that longer overall trips throughout New Zealand or more focussed 'regional' trips can be encouraged, the more that word of mouth recommendations will include longer stays in the Christchurch region. Locally available, portable and interactive types of formal information sources were suggested as those most likely to result in influence on the decision-making process of visitors, especially in the formation of on-site itineraries.

Chapter 1

Introduction: Research Objectives and Review of Key Literature

1.1 Objectives

The overall objective of the research reported here are to provide base data on the decision-making processes of visitors to Christchurch, New Zealand. As the second most important 'gateway' destination for international visitors to New Zealand (after Auckland in the North Island), Christchurch is an interesting case study to examine visitor decision-making. In particular, the study was designed to investigate information sources and timing of itinerary planning and decision-making. In addition, the study was concerned with understanding the ranking of Christchurch, for visitors, as a recommended destination within New Zealand and the general characteristics of visitors to Christchurch.

The specific objectives of this study were:

- To provide an analysis of the general characteristics of visitors to the Christchurch region.
- To provide an analysis of the timing of decisions and itinerary planning of visitors to the Christchurch region.
- To assess prior knowledge of and levels of need for further information by visitors to the Christchurch region.
- To provide an account of the information sources and trip characteristics that influence the decision-making of visitors to the Christchurch region.

This report on visitor decision-making and perceptions should be read in combination with other reports from the overall research programme. These include reports on the routes and itineraries of visitors to Christchurch, their expenditure patterns and economic impacts on the region, infrastructure impacts and planning processes (Butcher, Fairweather and Simmons, 2003; Cullen, Dakers, McNicol, Meyer-Hubbert, Simmons and Fairweather, 2003; Simmons and Fairweather, 2003). Reports from previous case study sites (Kaikoura, Rotorua and the West Coast of the South Island of New Zealand) also add context and contrast to the findings presented in this report (Moore, Simmons and Fairweather, 1998; Moore, Fairweather and Simmons, 2000; Moore, Simmons and Fairweather, 2001). Together, these reports provide a foundation for considering the impacts of visitors, the effectiveness of marketing and promotional activities and the policy and planning options for local, regional and national planning and policy making agencies.

1.2 Literature Review

1.2.1 Introduction

The following is a brief overview of previous research that is pertinent to understanding the decision-making and perceptions of visitors to Christchurch. It is similar to the literature reviews

available in Moore *et al.* (1998), Moore *et al.* (2000) and Moore *et al.* (2001). This review, however, is more concise and focuses on the general decision-making process and the role of information in that process.

1.2.2 Tourist Decision-making Research

The decision-making behaviour of tourists has been extensively studied from a consumer behaviour perspective (e.g., Chon, 1990; 1991; Crompton, 1992; van Raaij and Francken, 1984) and from a broader psychological, often motivational, perspective (e.g., Gnoth, 1997; Mansfeld, 1992; Witt and Wright, 1992). Mansfeld (1992) emphasises the role of motivation as providing an impetus to travel but notes that there is, as yet, little understanding of how such an impetus gives rise to particular travel decisions. In this sense, motivational theories of travel provide little help, he suggests, in predicting tourist flows. It is partly for this reason that increasing emphasis is being placed on identifying the specific cognitive processes involved in the travel decision event such as those embodied in 'expectancy-value' type cognitive theories of decision-making (Witt and Wright, 1992). Given a particular expectation of the availability of desired attributes of a destination (the 'pull' to travel) and the particular 'force' of certain perceived needs and values (the 'push' of travel) the output of these cognitive models represents the likelihood of travel.

A major factor influencing such basic cognitive processes is the availability, accuracy and comprehensiveness of information about destinations (Chon, 1990; 1992; Mansfeld, 1992). Mansfeld (1992) notes that the information search process also has the potential to affect motivation (as well as the reverse) and will tend to become more specific to particular destinations as the decision-making activity progresses. Different sources of information could, therefore, exert more or less influence at different points in the decision-making process. One way of understanding this process is to see it as a development from original 'organic' images (and their corresponding motives and sources of information) – which are derived from past experience, word of mouth, etc. - to more 'induced' images (and motives and information sources) – which are derived from more formal, industry developed information sources - as the prospective traveller researches opportunities at particular destinations. The distinction between 'organic' and 'induced' images was made by Gunn (1989 cited in Chon, 1990).

In terms of an evaluation of the attributes of destinations, a distinction has been made between 'compensatory' and 'non-compensatory' decision rules relating to destination choice (Mansfeld, 1992). Compensatory rules apply where weighted values are assigned to each salient attribute of, for example, a destination. The decision to travel to that destination will therefore depend on the final total of the weighted attributes for rival destinations. A non-compensatory set of rules, in contrast, implies that certain desired attributes are 'non-negotiable' and the lack of these core attributes cannot be compensated for by high weightings on other attributes. In the context of tourism it is likely that non-compensatory rules would be used to eliminate the majority of possible destinations (e.g., 'I must go somewhere that has attractive natural scenery') but, as the decision process begins to be more focused, compensatory rules will apply so that ratings of destinations will be made on a number of attributes (e.g., 'What types of natural environments are present?', 'Are there other things to do there?', 'How does it fit into my overall itinerary?', etc.).

It is also possible to understand decision-making in terms of two broad strategies that correspond to 'rationalistic' and 'probabilistic' theories of decision-making (Mansfeld, 1992). The former assumes the typical economic model of 'rational man', while the latter is a more social scientific notion of a 'rough and ready' or 'satisficing' approach to decision-making, more suitable for situations where information is not always accurate or even available.

More recent work in psychology beyond the mainstream cognitive approach, however, suggests that seeing information as simply input into a computationally modelled decision-making process may obscure other significant roles that the activities of information gathering and the interaction by an actor with information may have. In particular, the discursive psychological approach (e.g., Edwards and Potter, 1992; Potter and Wetherell, 1988; Harré and Gillett, 1994) argues that many so-called internal psychological processes actually have their reality in discursive practices that are aimed at achieving particular discursive 'work'. Recently, Moore (2002) has argued that the experiences and psychological processes putatively carried out by tourists could usefully be understood from this discursive perspective and that this would connect researchers' understanding of tourist psychology to processes enacted by tourists that reflect broader social and discursive phenomena. That is, tourists' expressions of such supposedly internal processes as decision-making could be understood as discursive actions aimed at particular discursive, tourist-related work. This possibility is explored in Chapter 4.

Decisions, of course, are not always made by lone individuals. Van Raaij and Francken (1984), for example, have emphasised that decision-making often occurs within a group and/or family context. Within a group different people will have greater or lesser control over the different decisions involved from the 'generic decision' to travel to the specific decisions related to destination selection, transport and accommodation used and specific attractions visited. These dynamics will alter from one type of group (e.g., family) to another (e.g., friends). That decision-making often occurs in group contexts represents a caution for any study that examines decision-making using a survey instrument administered to and completed by individuals, as is the case in this study. It can be argued, however, that individuals are still able to report on this process and the predominant reasons for the (group) decision.

The information search and decision-making processes have sometimes usefully been modelled using 'choice set theory' (e.g., Crompton, 1992). The basic principle underlying this approach is that, during the decision-making process, the prospective traveller carries out a winnowing of all possible destinations, gradually eliminating different 'sets' of destinations according to one or other attribute or, less rationally, according to the 'clarity', 'availability', etc. of particular destinations. So, for example, some destinations may 'drop out' of the process because of a lack of sufficient information about them for the decision maker to come to any clear understanding of what they have to offer (they thus are bundled into the 'fuzzy set' and sidelined from the remaining decision process). Ultimately, a single destination or sequence of destinations is left and it is to this end that remaining informational efforts and practical steps are taken (including contacting a travel agent if this has not already been done).

Overall, the literature emphasises the complexity of the decision process that leads individuals and groups of individuals to travel (in general as well as to particular destinations). Given this complexity, the present study focuses on discovering the principal information sources and

influences affecting decisions to travel to the Christchurch region (and, for international visitors, New Zealand), the type of decision rules employed and the affective aspect of the decisions made.

By examining prior expectations and informational sources and influences it is hoped to shed some light on some of the above mentioned features of the decision-making processes and perceptions of visitors to the Christchurch region.

The report first details in Chapter 2 the methods used to meet the objectives and discusses some of the limitations of the study. Second, the results are presented in Chapter 3. These results are largely quantitative in style, comprehensive in scope and are reported in considerable detail. The main statistical tool used is Pearson's χ^2 in order to examine the relationships between variables of interest. Simple frequencies and percentages are also reported. For readers seeking specific information without reading the entire results chapter, it may be useful to consult the contents page and the list of tables provided at the beginning of the report. Finally, the results are discussed in Chapter 4. Points of interest and importance in the context of the research objectives are summarised and emphasised and considered in relation to the research literature. There is also consideration of the implications arising from this study for theory, method and policy.

Chapter 2 Methods

2.1 Introduction

Data discussed in this report is the result of surveying visitors to Christchurch in two periods in late 2002 and January 2003. The research instrument used to collect data can be found in Appendix 1. The surveying was carried out at various inner city locations during these periods on a quota sampling basis. This sampling method aims to achieve a sample of visitors in line with known proportions of visitors to Christchurch and its region in previous years on particular dimensions. The dimension of most importance was determined to be nationality and so the quota sampling aimed to gain a sample with proportions of visitors consistent with prior, known, proportions of visitors to the region from different countries, including New Zealand.

The research instrument went through two stages of piloting before the surveying, proper, occurred. The piloting was carried out in May and June on ten respondents each time. They were told that they were involved in piloting the instrument and their comments on the process were collected in note form after and during completion of the questionnaire.

2.2 Sampling

As mentioned, sampling was based on a quota sampling approach. Given the known seasonality of visitation to Christchurch (and New Zealand) the decision was made to gather the overall sample during two distinct sampling periods to reflect, in part, this seasonality. Originally, the hope was to carry out a 'winter' and 'summer' sample to represent the 'low' and 'high' seasons of visitation. Owing to a number of factors including survey design difficulties, the need to incorporate input from end user groups and other commitments of researchers, the two sampling periods were in a 'shoulder' period (October to early December, 2002) and a 'high' period (January to early February, 2003).

Data sources on visitors to Christchurch including information from the International Visitor Survey (IVS) and the Domestic Tourism Monitor (DTM) and Domestic Tourism Survey (DTS) were examined for the most recent figures on visitation to Christchurch and the region. From analysis of these statistics, it was determined that the most significant variable that characterised differences in visitation profiles during previous years was nationality. Gender and age, for example, were not crucial variables in this respect. Two quota sampling frames, based on nationality, were derived for the summer 'high' season and the remainder of the year (Appendix 2).

2.3 Surveying

Surveying was carried out during two time periods. The first period was from 25 September to 10 December 2002. The second period was from 4 January to 9 February 2003. Both of these

periods included 'holiday periods' such as school holidays, the Canterbury Show and Christmas holidays.

The reason for the longer sampling period in 2002 was that surveyors were sampling, at the same time, for a second survey concerned with ecolabel awareness, environmental behaviours and Maori cultural tourism preferences. Four hundred and sixteen completed surveys were obtained in the first period and 514 during the second period.

Surveying was carried out at the following sites: Cathedral Square, Cashel Street, the Arts Centre and Victoria Square. All of these sites are in the centre of Christchurch, in and around the central business district. These sites were selected because of their high density of tourist attractions and general foot traffic. Other sites were considered – such as small lookout carparks on the Summit Road on the Port Hills overlooking Christchurch – but were eliminated on the basis of the most efficient use of surveyor time. Given the quota sampling approach adopted, the primary concern was to achieve a pre-determined cross section of visitors on the basis of nationality rather than sampling at the full range of visitor sites in Christchurch.

A total of eight surveyors were used over the two surveying periods. Surveying occurred on all days of the week and covered the period from 9:00am to 6:00pm. Surveyors approached people at the sites directly and asked if they were visitors to Christchurch. The survey instrument included a brief section suitable for locals to complete in relation to any visitors to Christchurch they may have hosted during the previous month. This meant that all passersby were potential participants. As sampling progressed during each sampling period a running count was kept of the number of respondents of different nationalities. This allowed surveyors to focus on particular nationalities, where possible, to ensure as close a sample profile, in relation to nationality, as indicated in the sampling frames. Of particular note was the difficulty of obtaining the quota of New Zealand domestic visitors. While the possible reasons for this are discussed later in this report, it did affect the length of time taken to complete the overall sample because of the need to target surveyor effort to particular groups.

2.4 Limitations

As was found by Moore et al. (2000) and Moore et al. (2001), the survey method employed is likely to under-sample certain types of tourists thus cautioning against direct generalisability of the findings. In particular, in this survey New Zealand (domestic) visitors seem to be under-represented (see Table 2). Attempts were made to manage this through a quota sampling procedure. However, locating New Zealand (domestic) visitors to Christchurch proved difficult. Clearly, they did not frequent the central city 'tourist sites' at the rate that international visitors appeared to, despite the historical estimates that indicated that domestic visitors were the largest singly nationality grouping. The focus on the main tourist sites was a strategy used to gain the most efficient use of surveyor resources, but this came at the cost of this under-representation. There was a section of the survey instrument (Section A) which was used to question locals who were sampled about any visitors they had had during the previous three months. However, this data is not reported here because no information on decision-making and information needs of visitors could reliably be collected in this way.

This survey was also carried out at the same time as another survey and, usually, by the same surveyors. This prolonged the 2002 sampling time so that there was only a short period of time between that sampling period and the summer sample. Ideally, a more marked break between sampling periods would have been useful for comparison reasons and to provide a better basis for generalizations.

There were also some concerns expressed by some respondents about the length of the survey instrument. Despite being reduced from its length after piloting it was clearly still too long in terms of administration time for some respondents. This may have affected the quality of the data collected, particularly in the latter sections of the survey. This feedback from surveyors, however, was anecdotal and there is no record of the number of respondents who mentioned the length of time it was taking.

Chapter 3 Results

3.1 Introduction

A total of 930 surveys were administered. In the results presented in this Chapter, however, the data collected directly from locals (see Chapter 2) is not included. Hence, only the data from domestic and international visitors to Christchurch were used. These data were extracted from a total of 731 questionnaires. In the following presentation of findings it should also be noted that totals for various questions do not always add up to 731 because of missing responses.

The presentation of findings begins with the general characteristics of the sample and then deals with levels of knowledge about Christchurch as a destination and the sorts of recommendations respondents would make about length of visit to the Christchurch region. Finally, there is a presentation of the timing of decisions and itinerary planning in relation to visiting New Zealand and the Christchurch region as well as the perceived influences of various information sources and trip characteristics on those decisions.

3.2 General Characteristics

The sample was slightly skewed towards females (54.0% were females and 46.0% were males) (Table 1). In terms of age, almost exactly half of the sample (50.1%) were between the ages of 20 and 34 years with 19.8 per cent of the sample between 20 and 24 years of ages (Table 2).

**Table 1
Gender Distribution**

Gender	Frequency	Per Cent
Male	335	46.0
Female	394	54.0
Total	729	100.0

Table 2
Age Distribution

Age	Number	%
15-19	32	4.4
20-24	145	19.8
25-29	127	17.4
30-34	94	12.9
35-39	50	6.8
40-44	46	6.3
45-49	28	3.8
50-54	44	6.0
55-59	44	6.0
60-64	55	7.5
65-69	32	4.4
70+	26	3.6
Missing	8	1.1
Total	731	100.0

Some 10.4 per cent of the sample were domestic visitors to Christchurch (Table 3). In terms of the quota sampling system described in Chapter 2, this represented the most undersampled nationality. Possible reasons for this are discussed in Chapter 4. Of the remainder of the respondents visitors from the United Kingdom comprised 20.2 per cent of the sample with those from the United States at 12.7 per cent and from Australia 11.5 per cent of the total. Apart from domestic visitors the proportions of other nationality visitors are within a reasonable range of the proportions of international visitors expected (see Appendix 2).

Table 3
Nationality

Country/Region of Origin	Number	%
New Zealand	76	10.4
Domestic	76	10.4
United Kingdom	148	20.2
United States	93	12.7
Australia	84	11.5
Germany	62	8.5
Other Europe	119	16.3
Asia	87	11.9
Other	62	8.5
International	655	89.6
Total	731	100.0

An important feature of the survey was to determine the point at which Christchurch entered into trip itineraries for visitors. In the following results, the term 'travel type' is used to designate the different possible positions of Christchurch in this sense. Table 4 shows that the respondents were fairly evenly distributed between the four possible options. The greatest proportion of the sample (28.9%) were visitors who were part way through this particular trip when they arrived in Christchurch while the smallest proportion (22.3 percent) were in Christchurch as a last stop on their trip. Less than one quarter (22.4 percent) were in Christchurch as a sole destination.

There was a significant difference in terms of the relationship between age and travel type (Pearson's $\chi = 39.44$, 15df, $p=0.001$) (Table 5), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 213.63$, 21df, $p<0.001$) (Table 6) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 117.80$, 218df, $p<0.001$) (Table 7). When age is recoded into six age periods it can be seen that the youngest age group (15 to 24 years) make up the largest proportion of visitors for whom Christchurch is a sole destination (29.3% of that age group), but that for the remaining types of travel it is the 25 to 34 year age group that is most numerous. Those aged 55 to 64 years are under-represented among those for whom Christchurch is a sole destination (only 5.5% of that travel type).

In terms of nationality, over one third of those for whom Christchurch is a sole destination are, unsurprisingly, from within New Zealand but, more surprisingly, the next most represented grouping are those visitors from Asia (22.6%) and the United States (13.4%) (Table 6).

Those travelling alone were over-represented, at 45.7 per cent, among those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination (Table 7). The next greatest proportion of this travel type was the 'Other' category which includes special interest groups, those visiting for a sport event, etc. (18.3%). Tour group respondents were most likely to be found in the 'Last Stop' travel type (8.0%). Only 8.5 per cent were visiting in groups composed solely of family members.

Table 4
Visitor Travel Type – Position of Christchurch in Trip

Travel Type	Number	%
Sole Destination	164	22.4
Starting Point	193	26.4
Part Way Through	211	28.9
Last Stop	163	22.3
Total	731	100.0

Table 5
Visitor Travel Type by Age Group

Age Group	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
15-24	48	29.3	47	24.9	45	21.6	37	22.8
25-34	33	20.1	56	29.6	72	34.6	60	37.0
35-44	32	19.5	1	11.1	24	11.5	19	11.7
45-54	26	15.9	6	8.5	16	7.7	14	8.6
55-64	9	5.5	4	18.0	32	15.4	24	14.8
65+	16	9.8	5	7.9	19	9.1	8	4.9
Total	164	100.1	119	100.0	208	99.9	162	99.8

Table 6
Visitor Travel Type by Country/Region

Country/ Region	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
New Zealand	58	35.4	2	1.0	10	4.7	6	3.7
United Kingdom	15	9.1	51	26.4	53	25.1	29	17.8
United States	22	13.4	19	9.8	33	15.6	19	11.7
Australia	16	9.8	28	14.5	17	8.1	23	14.1
Germany	7	4.3	15	7.8	19	9.0	21	12.9
Asia	37	22.6	16	8.3	20	9.5	14	8.6
Other Europe	6	3.7	39	20.2	41	19.4	33	20.2
Other	3	1.8	23	11.9	18	8.5	18	11.0
Total	164	100.1	193	99.9	211	99.9	163	100.0

Table 7
Visitor Travel Type by Group Type

Group Type	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Visiting Alone	75	45.7	76	39.4	74	35.1	52	31.9
Partner/ Spouse	26	15.9	64	33.2	62	29.4	52	31.9
Friends	12	7.3	23	11.9	36	17.1	27	16.6
Family	20	12.2	13	6.7	16	7.6	13	8.0
Tour Group	0	0.0	7	3.6	10	4.7	13	8.0
Friends and Partner/ Spouse/ Family	1	0.6	6	3.1	11	5.2	4	2.5
Other	30	18.3	4	2.1	2	0.9	2	1.2
Total	164	100.0	193	100.0	211	100.0	163	100.1

In Table 8 figures are presented of the proportions of respondents in each of the group types. Some 37.9 per cent of visitors were visiting alone while a further 27.9 per cent were travelling with a partner or spouse.

Almost a fifth (19.1%) of overseas visitors in the sample had visited New Zealand before (Table 9).

Table 8
Group Type

Group Type	Number	Per Cent
Visiting Alone	277	37.9
Partner/ Spouse	204	27.9
Friends	98	13.4
Family	62	8.5
Tour Group	30	4.1
Friends and Partner/ Spouse/ Family	22	3.0
Other	38	5.2
Total	731	100.0

Table 9
Previous Visits to New Zealand (Overseas Visitors)

Previous Visit?	Number	Per Cent
Yes	124	19.1
No	524	80.9
Total	648	100.0

3.3 Prior Knowledge and Information Needs

In Table 10 the self-reported levels of knowledge about the places to visit and activities available within the Christchurch region prior to arrival in Christchurch reveal that over half of respondents (51.6%) believed that they had less than adequate knowledge. Almost a third (32.5%), however, felt they had 'adequate' knowledge with a further 16.0 per cent reporting more than adequate knowledge levels prior to their visit.

There were significant differences discovered in terms of estimated prior knowledge in relation to gender (Pearson's $\chi = 10.59$, 4df, $p < 0.05$) (Table 11), type of travel (Pearson's $\chi = 38.88$, 12df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 12), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 121.00$, 28df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 13), age (Pearson's $\chi = 45.40$, 20df, $p = 0.001$) (Table 14) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 41.94$, 24df, $p < 0.05$) (Table 15).

Almost one in four male respondents (24.9%) acknowledged having no knowledge at all about Christchurch and its attractions while less than one in five (18.3%) of females said the same about their level of prior knowledge (Table 11). Similarly, almost twice the proportion of males (8.5%) than females (4.9%) reported 'excellent' prior knowledge of the Christchurch region. Overall, there was a greater tendency for females than for males to perceive their prior knowledge as being at an intermediate level.

Of the four travel types (Table 12), those travelling solely to the Christchurch region estimated their prior knowledge of the area as being generally greater than did those of the other travel types with 25.9 per cent reporting levels of knowledge greater than 'adequate'. The respondents who most often perceived their level of prior knowledge as non-existent were those for whom Christchurch was the last stop on their trip (29.4%). Those who were 'part way through' their itinerary, however, reported the highest levels of 'excellent' knowledge of the area (8.6%) followed by those who were visiting Christchurch as a sole destination (8.4%).

Not surprisingly, the most knowledgeable visitors to Christchurch, based on self-reports, were domestic visitors (Table 13). Fully 48 per cent of this group reported greater than 'adequate' levels of prior knowledge with one in five (20.0%) reporting 'excellent' prior knowledge of the area. Interestingly, 16.9 per cent of visitors from the United States, 16.3 per cent of Australians and 13.9 per cent of Asian visitors to the Christchurch region believed they had more than 'adequate' prior knowledge – all of which represent greater proportions than that for visitors from the United Kingdom (10.9%).

Table 10
Degree of Prior Knowledge of Christchurch

Prior Knowledge	Number	Per Cent
No Knowledge (1)	153	21.4
(2)	216	30.2
Adequate Knowledge (3)	233	32.5
(4)	67	9.4
Excellent Knowledge (5)	47	6.6
Total	716	100.1

Table 11
Prior Knowledge by Gender

Prior Knowledge	Male		Female	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Percent
No Knowledge (1)	82	24.9	71	18.3
(2)	95	28.9	121	31.3
Adequate Knowledge (3)	99	30.1	134	34.6
(4)	25	7.6	42	10.9
Excellent Knowledge (5)	28	8.5	19	4.9
Total	329	100.0	387	100.0

Table 12
Prior Knowledge by Travel Type

Prior Knowledge	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	17	11.0	49	25.9	39	18.6	48	29.4
(2)	38	24.7	62	32.8	68	32.4	48	29.4
Adequate Knowledge (3)	59	38.3	55	29.1	71	33.8	48	29.4
(4)	27	17.5	14	7.4	14	6.7	12	7.4
Excellent Knowledge (5)	13	8.4	9	4.8	18	8.6	7	4.3
Total	154	99.9	189	100.0	210	100.1	163	99.9

Table 13
Prior Knowledge by Country/ Region

Prior Knowledge	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	2	2.7	33	22.6	19	21.3	13	16.3
(2)	14	18.7	48	32.9	30	33.7	17	21.3
Adequate Knowledge (3)	23	30.7	49	33.6	25	28.1	37	46.3
(4)	21	28.0	12	8.2	8	9.0	7	8.8
Excellent Knowledge (5)	15	20.0	4	2.7	7	7.9	6	7.5
Total	75	100.1	146	100.0	89	100.0	80	100.2

Prior Knowledge	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	11	17.7	9	10.5	42	35.3	24	40.7
(2)	21	33.9	31	36.0	38	31.9	17	28.8
Adequate Knowledge (3)	24	38.7	34	39.5	27	22.7	14	23.7
(4)	5	8.1	7	8.1	5	4.2	2	3.4
Excellent Knowledge (5)	1	1.6	5	5.8	7	5.9	2	3.4
Total	62	100.0	86	99.9	119	100.0	59	100.0

Overall, the two youngest age groups (15-24 years and 25-34 years) had the lowest levels of perceived prior knowledge of the Christchurch region with 27.3 per cent and 26.5 per cent, respectively estimating that they had 'no knowledge' of the region's attractions prior to arrival (Table 14). In fact, some 64.2 per cent of the youngest age group believed that they had less than 'adequate' knowledge of the region compared with only 35.2 per cent of those aged from 35 – 44 years of age. Interestingly, the oldest age group (over 65 years old) had the next highest proportion of respondents believing that they had 'no knowledge' of the area (19.6%).

Respondents travelling as part of a tour group reported the highest level of 'no knowledge' about the Christchurch region prior to arrival (30.0% – Table 15). However, of all the group types, those travelling as groups of friends had the greatest proportion of those believing themselves to have less than 'adequate' prior knowledge (62.8%). Curiously, this same group had the highest proportion of those believing that they had greater than 'adequate' levels of prior knowledge (21.0%).

Table 14
Prior Knowledge by Age

Prior Knowledge	15-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	48	27.3	58	26.5	13	14.3	8	11.4	14	14.3	11	19.6
(2)	65	36.9	54	24.7	19	20.9	24	34.3	34	34.7	18	32.1
Adequate Knowledge (3)	48	27.3	77	35.2	37	40.7	22	31.4	32	32.7	15	26.8
(4)	9	5.1	15	6.8	11	12.1	12	17.1	12	12.2	7	12.5
Excellent Knowledge (5)	6	3.4	15	6.8	11	12.1	4	5.7	6	6.1	5	8.9
Total	176	100.0	219	100.0	91	100.0	70	100.0	98	100.0	56	100.0

Table 15
Prior Knowledge and Group Type

Prior Knowledge	Visiting Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends		Family	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	67	24.6	37	18.2	24	24.7	9	14.5
(2)	90	33.1	55	27.1	37	38.1	15	24.2
Adequate Knowledge (3)	71	26.1	75	36.9	25	25.8	25	40.3
(4)	21	7.7	25	12.3	7	7.2	9	14.5
Excellent Knowledge (5)	23	8.5	11	5.4	4	4.1	4	6.5
Total	272	100.0	203	99.9	97	99.9	62	100.0

Prior Knowledge	Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Knowledge (1)	4	19.0	9	30.0	3	9.7
(2)	7	33.3	7	23.3	5	16.1
Adequate Knowledge (3)	8	38.1	9	30.0	20	64.5
(4)	0	0.0	3	10.0	2	6.5
Excellent Knowledge (5)	2	9.5	2	6.7	1	3.2
Total	21	99.9	30	100.0	31	100.0

In contrast to levels of reported inadequacy of prior knowledge, respondents resoundingly claimed that they did not believe that they needed more information about the region prior to their trip (69.8% – Table 16).

Perhaps not surprisingly, the desire for more information was significantly related to perceived levels of prior knowledge (Pearson's $\chi = 44.78$, 4df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 17), but it was also significantly related to nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 47.07$, 7df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 18) and age (Pearson's $\chi = 18.19$, 6df, $p < 0.01$) (Table 19).

Only 4.3 per cent of those who stated that they had 'excellent' knowledge of the region prior to visiting also reported a desire to have more information while 38.8 per cent of those who reported that they had 'no knowledge' and 39.9 per cent of those reporting marginally more knowledge would have liked more information about the Christchurch region (Table 17). Over one in four of those who had reported having 'adequate' knowledge prior to visiting would have also appreciated more information before arriving in the region.

Domestic visitors were the least likely to desire more information (17.3% – Table 18) closely followed by German visitors (17.7%). Visitors from Asia reported the greatest demand for more information, at 55.3 per cent of respondents in that grouping, with visitors from the United States revealing the next greatest level of demand (40.2%).

It was the youngest age group (15-24 years) that expressed the greatest demand for more information about the Christchurch region prior to arriving (41.7% – Table 19). The next highest demand was from the oldest age group (over 65 years – 32.7%).

Table 16
Desire for More Information About the Christchurch Region Prior to Current Trip

Desire More Information?	Number	Per Cent
Yes	214	30.2
No	495	69.8
Total	709	100.0

Table 17
Desire for More Information by Prior Knowledge

Desire More Information?	No Knowledge (1)		(2)		Adequate Knowledge (3)		(4)		Excellent Knowledge (5)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	59	38.8	85	39.9	62	26.7	6	9.2	2	4.3
No	93	61.2	128	60.1	170	73.3	59	90.8	45	95.7
Total	152	100.0	213	100.0	232	100.0	65	100.0	47	100.0

Table 18
Desire for More Information by Country/ Region

Desire More Information?	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	13	17.3	35	24.5	35	40.2	17	21.3
No	62	82.7	108	75.5	52	59.8	63	78.8
Total	75	100.0	143	100.0	87	100.0	80	100.1

Desire More Information?	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	11	17.7	47	55.3	34	28.6	22	37.9
No	51	82.3	38	44.7	85	71.4	36	62.1
Total	62	100.0	85	100.0	119	100.0	58	100.0

Table 19
Desire for More Information by Age

Desire More Information?	15-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	73	41.7	57	26.3	21	23.1	14	20.6	29	29.6	18	32.7
No	102	58.3	160	73.7	70	76.9	54	79.4	69	70.4	37	67.3
Total	75	100.0	143	100.0	87	100.0	80	100.0	62	100.0	85	100.0

3.4 Recommendations and Disappointments

Respondents were asked to suggest a length of stay in the Christchurch region that they would recommend if a visitor had a period of one month to travel around New Zealand. In Table 20 the most often suggested recommended length of stay was three to four days (45.5% of respondents made this recommendation). When those recommending one to two days and 'about one week' are included the total rises to 92.4 per cent of all recommendations. While only 7.3 per cent suggested a stay of 'at least two weeks' this is quite high given that it represents about one half of the overall trip length of one month in New Zealand.

Table 20
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One Month Stay
in New Zealand

Recommendation	Number	Per Cent
At least two weeks	51	7.3
About one week	166	23.6
3-4 days	320	45.5
1-2 days	164	23.3
As little time as possible	2	0.3
Total	703	100.0

Recommendations for length of stay in Christchurch in relation to a one month trip around New Zealand were found to be significantly related to travel type (Pearson's $\chi = 41.64$, 12df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 21), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 72.09$, 28df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 22) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 42.76$, 24df, $p < 0.05$) (Table 23).

In terms of travel type (Table 21), the most likely group to recommend a longer stay in Christchurch were those, perhaps unsurprisingly, who had Christchurch as their sole destination on this trip. Of this group 15.6 per cent would recommend a stay of at least two weeks (twice the average rate of suggesting this recommendation – see Table 20, above). They also showed the greatest rate of making a recommendation of 'about one week' (30.5%).

Of the different visitor nationalities, Asian visitors consistently gave the longest recommended stays in the Christchurch region for those who had one month within New Zealand (Table 22). Almost one in five Asian visitors (19.8%) would recommend 'at least two weeks' in the Christchurch region and a further 33.7 per cent would recommend a stay of 'about one week'. Visitors from Germany were noticeably more likely to recommend shorter stays in the region, with only 1.7 per cent recommending a stay of 'at least two weeks' and 15.0 per cent recommending 'about one week'.

The group type that recommended, overall, the longest stays in Christchurch during a one month trip around New Zealand was 'Other' which included those on sporting trips, travelling with business associates and travelling with special interest groups (Table 23). Of this category of group type, 16.7 per cent recommended 'at least two weeks' and a further 30.0 per cent recommended 'about one week'. Of the other group types only those visiting alone had a rate of recommendation for a two week stay of greater than ten percent (10.4%). Those travelling in a tour group overwhelmingly recommended a stay of three to four days (63.3%).

Table 21
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One Month Stay in
New Zealand by Travel Type

Recommandation	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	24	15.6	15	8.2	9	4.4	3	1.9
About one week	47	30.5	40	21.9	45	22.0	34	21.1
3-4 days	47	30.5	90	49.2	104	50.7	79	49.1
1-2 days	35	22.7	38	20.8	46	22.4	45	28.0
As little time as possible	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
Total	154	99.9	183	100.1	205	100.0	161	100.1

Table 22
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in
New Zealand by Country/ Region

Recommendation	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	3	4.1	7	4.9	4	4.5	3	3.9
About one week	22	29.7	28	19.4	24	27.0	20	26.3
3-4 days	32	43.2	79	54.9	39	43.8	39	51.3
1-2 days	17	23.0	29	20.1	21	23.6	14	18.4
As little time as possible	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	1.1	0	0.0
Total	74	100.0	144	100.0	89	100.0	76	100.0

Recommendation	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	1	1.7	17	19.8	14	12.0	2	3.5
About one week	9	15.0	29	33.7	20	17.1	14	24.6
3-4 days	22	36.7	29	33.7	54	46.2	26	45.6
1-2 days	28	46.7	11	12.8	29	24.8	15	26.3
As little time as possible	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	60	100.0	86	100.0	117	100.0	57	100.0

Table 23
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in New Zealand
by Group Type

Recommendation	Visiting Alone		Partner/Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	28	10.4	8	4.1	4	4.1
About one week	60	22.3	48	24.5	22	22.7
3-4 days	112	41.6	95	48.5	49	50.5
1-2 days	69	25.7	45	23.0	22	22.7
As little time as possible	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	269	100.0	196	100.0	97	100.0

Recommendation	Family		Friends/Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	5	8.1	1	5.3	0	0.0	5	16.7
About one week	17	27.4	4	21.1	6	20.0	9	30.0
3-4 days	30	48.4	9	47.4	19	63.3	6	20.0
1-2 days	9	14.5	5	26.3	5	16.7	9	30.0
As little time as possible	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3
Total	62	100.0	19	100.0	30	100.0	30	100.0

When the scenario was changed so that the context of making a recommended length of stay in the Christchurch region became a one month trip around the South Island only, the length of recommended stay increased (Table 24). Some 14.7 per cent of respondents for such a trip would recommend a stay of 'at least two weeks' in the Christchurch region with a further 35.6 per cent recommending 'about one week'.

Significant relationships were also found between recommendations for length of stay in the Christchurch region during a one month trip in the South Island and type of travel (Pearson's $\chi = 39.23$, 12df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 25), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 70.15$, 28df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 26) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 41.45$, 24df, $p < 0.05$) (Table 27).

Once again, those who had Christchurch as their sole destination on this trip were the most likely to recommend a longer stay (Table 25). More than one in four of these respondents (26.1%) would recommend 'at least two weeks' which was almost twice as much as the proportion of those for whom Christchurch was a starting point (13.7%) or were part way through their travel on arrival in Christchurch (13.8%) who made the same recommendation.

Respondents of Asian nationality were the most likely group to recommend a longer stay in the Christchurch region for a one-month trip around the South Island (Table 26). Some 34.9 per cent were willing to recommend a stay of 'at least two weeks' (up from 19.8% for a one month trip around New Zealand) and a further 36.0 per cent would recommend 'about one week'. Once again, visitors from Germany showed a marked reluctance to recommend prolonged stays in the

Christchurch region with only 26.2 per cent, in total, being willing to recommend more than three to four days stay.

In Table 27 it can be seen that recommendations for the longest stays in the Christchurch region are most often given by the 'Other' group type with 26.7 per cent of this group recommending 'at least two weeks'. The same proportion of this group recommended 'about one week' and an equal proportion only one or two days (both 26.7%). Respondents who were part of a tour group showed the least propensity to recommend a stay of 'at least two weeks' (only 6.9%) followed by those travelling with a partner or spouse (only 9.7%).

Table 24
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in South Island

Recommendation	Number	Per Cent
At least two weeks	103	14.7
About one week	249	35.6
3-4 days	265	37.9
1-2 days	81	11.6
As little time as possible	2	0.3
Total	700	100.1

Table 25
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Travel Type

Recommantation	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	40	26.1	25	13.7	28	13.8	10	6.2
About one week	50	32.7	66	36.3	78	38.4	55	34.0
3-4 days	41	26.8	73	40.1	81	39.9	70	43.2
1-2 days	21	13.7	18	9.9	15	7.4	27	16.7
As little time as possible	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
Total	153	100.0	182	100.0	203	100.0	162	100.0

Table 26
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Country/ Region

Recommendation	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	11	14.9	10	7.0	10	11.4	8	10.7
About one week	32	43.2	54	38.0	39	44.3	27	36.0
3-4 days	23	31.1	62	43.7	24	27.3	30	40.0
1-2 days	8	10.8	15	10.6	14	15.9	10	13.3
As little time as possible	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	1.1	0	0.0
Total	74	100.0	142	100.0	88	100.0	75	100.0

Recommendation	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	5	8.2	30	34.9	20	17.1	9	15.8
About one week	11	18.0	31	36.0	35	29.9	20	35.1
3-4 days	35	57.4	18	20.9	50	42.7	23	40.4
1-2 days	10	16.4	7	8.1	12	10.3	5	8.8
As little time as possible	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	61	100.0	86	100.0	117	100.0	57	100.0

Table 27
Recommendations for Stay in Christchurch Region for a One-Month Stay in the South Island by Group Type

Recommendation	Visiting Alone		Partner/Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	49	18.1	19	9.7	12	12.5
About one week	84	31.1	78	40.0	36	37.5
3-4 days	107	39.6	78	40.0	36	37.5
1-2 days	30	11.1	20	10.3	12	12.5
As little time as possible	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	270	100.0	195	100.0	96	100.0

Recommendation	Family		Friends/Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
At least two weeks	9	14.5	4	22.2	2	6.9	8	26.7
About one week	24	38.7	6	33.3	13	44.8	8	26.7
3-4 days	23	37.1	6	33.3	10	34.5	5	16.7
1-2 days	5	8.1	2	11.1	4	13.8	8	26.7
As little time as possible	1	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.3
Total	62	100.0	18	100.0	30	100.0	29	100.0

Respondents were asked to mention up to three disappointments they had experienced in their visit to Christchurch. Because of the lack of mentioned disappointments overall, only those first mentioned disappointments are reported below. A further point should be noted about the figures on disappointments. The question was open-ended which has meant that the replies have been categorised after the fact. While in the majority of cases this was unproblematic there were instances where a response could have been categorised in more than one category. For instance, the response 'reading in the newspapers about crimes against Asians' could express a disappointment about crime/ safety or about 'unfriendly people'. In that case it was categorised in 'unfriendly people' because of the implication that specifying 'Asians' was an attempt to highlight prejudice, primarily, rather than crime *per se*.

As just mentioned, there was a general reluctance for respondents to report disappointments with their visit to Christchurch with almost two thirds (64.6%) claiming that they had, at that point in their visit, had no disappointments (Table 28). Those disappointments mentioned more than once are recorded in descending order except for the 'Other' category (the largest category at 24.1% of respondents) that is comprised by what can only be called a range of idiosyncratic experiences and concerns, each having only been mentioned by individual respondents.

The most often mentioned disappointment, in terms of number of mentions was the weather (2.7% of respondents) followed by 'shopping' (1.4%) and 'unfriendly people' (1.2%). If the categories of 'Public Transport' and 'Roads/Traffic' are combined they account for the primary disappointments of 1.6 per cent of the sample. It was considered useful, however, to differentiate the two categories as they represent, in one sense, a problem (roads/ traffic) and an attempted or

possible solution (Public Transport) to that problem. Interestingly, in those terms, the solution was a more often cited as a disappointment than was the problem. Of course, neither category ranks highly as a concern.

Table 28
Disappointments with the Experience of Christchurch

Disappointment	Number	Per Cent (of n=731)
None	472	64.6
Weather	20	2.7
Shopping	10	1.4
Unfriendly People	9	1.2
Boring	7	0.9
Expensive	6	0.8
Public Transport	7	0.9
Roads/Traffic	5	0.7
Information/Service	4	0.5
Parking	3	0.4
Appearance/Environment	3	0.4
Crime	3	0.4
Food	3	0.4
Accommodation	3	0.4
Other	176	24.1
Total	731	100.0*

*After rounding of small percentages

3.5 Decision-making Timing

Visitors were asked at what point they had made the decision to travel to Christchurch (Table 29). Overwhelmingly, visitors had made the decision mainly while still at home (89.9%).

Table 29
Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch

When Decided	Number	%
Mainly at home	641	89.9
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	63	8.8
Half and half	9	1.3
Total	713	100.0

Significant relationships were found between the timing of the decision to travel to Christchurch and travel type (Pearson's $\chi = 40.71$, 6df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 30), age (Pearson's $\chi = 39.73$, 12df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 31) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 31.61$, 12df, $p < 0.01$) (Table 32).

While for all travel types the decision to travel to Christchurch tended to be made at home this was least true for those who were 'part way through' their trip (80.1% – Table 30). The highest was for those for whom Christchurch was a 'starting point' (96.8%). The surprising point here is that it would be expected that 100.0 per cent of those in this travel type would have decided to travel to Christchurch while still at home. Possibly, some people in this group had been travelling more widely than New Zealand and so the decision to travel to Christchurch may have been made while travelling outside New Zealand but not at home.

In Table 31 it is clear that, while all ages tended to make their decision to visit Christchurch at home, the most likely to make it while travelling were the two youngest age groups (16.2% and 12.3% for 15 to 24 and 25 to 34 year olds, respectively).

Perhaps similarly, those travelling alone are also more likely to have made the decision while travelling in New Zealand (15.1% of this group – Table 32). The next most likely group to make their decision while travelling were groups of friends (10.3%).

Table 30
Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Travel Type

When Decided	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	143	96.0	184	96.8	169	80.1	145	89.0
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	6	4.0	4	2.1	38	18.0	15	9.2
Half and half	0	0.0	2	1.1	4	1.9	3	0.4
Total	149	100.0	190	100.0	211	100.0	163	100.0

Table 31
Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Age

When Decided	15-24		25-34		35-44	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	143	82.7	187	85.4	86	94.5
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	28	16.2	27	12.3	3	3.3
Half and half	2	1.2	5	2.3	2	2.2
Total	173	100.0	219	100.0	91	100.0

When Decided	45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	69	100.0	95	96.0	56	100.0
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	0	0.0	4	4.0	0	0.0
Half and half	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	69	100.0	99	100.0	56	100.0

Table 32
Time of Decision to Travel to Christchurch by Group Type

When Decided	Visiting Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	225	83.0	192	94.1	85	87.6
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	41	15.1	10	4.9	10	10.3
Half and half	5	1.8	2	1.0	2	2.1
Total	271	100.0	204	100.0	97	100.0

When Decided	Family		Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	62	100.0	21	95.5	30	100.0	26	96.3
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	0	0.0	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	3.7
Half and half	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	62	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	27	100.0

Visitors were also asked at what point they had mainly planned their itinerary for their Christchurch visit. As Table 33 shows there was a relatively even split between those who had planned it before travelling (49.6%) and those who had done most of their itinerary planning for their visit to Christchurch while travelling (43.2%).

Table 33
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary

When Itinerary Planned	Number	%
Mainly at home	353	49.6
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	307	43.2
Half and half	51	7.2
Total	711	100.0

Table 34
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Age

When Decided	15-24		25-34		35-44	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	63	36.6	91	41.6	57	62.6
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	95	55.2	108	49.3	25	27.5
Half and half	14	8.1	20	9.1	9	9.9
Total	172	100.0	219	100.0	91	100.0

When Decided	45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	38	55.1	59	59.6	42	75.0
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	27	39.1	37	37.4	13	23.2
Half and half	4	5.8	3	3.0	1	1.8
Total	69	100.0	99	100.0	56	100.0

Table 35
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Gender

When Itinerary Planned	Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	168	51.2	185	48.3
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	146	44.5	161	42.0
Half and half	14	4.3	37	9.7
Total	328	100.0	383	100.0

Table 36
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Travel Type

When Decided	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	111	75.0	90	47.4	86	41.0	66	40.5
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	29	19.6	88	46.3	106	50.5	84	51.5
Half and half	8	5.4	12	6.3	18	8.6	13	8.0
Total	148	100.0	190	100.0	210	100.0	163	100.0

Table 37
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Nationality

When Itinerary Planned	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	61	82.4	62	42.5	55	62.5	44	54.3
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	12	16.2	75	51.4	31	35.2	26	32.1
Half and half	1	1.4	9	6.2	2	2.3	11	13.6
Total	74	100.0	146	100.0	88	100.0	81	100.0

When Itinerary Planned	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	22	35.5	47	56.6	40	33.6	22	37.9
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	37	59.7	29	34.9	67	56.3	30	51.7
Half and half	3	4.8	7	8.4	12	10.1	6	10.3
Total	62	100.0	83	100.0	119	100.0	58	100.0

Table 38
Time of Planning Christchurch Itinerary by Group Type

When Decided	Visiting Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	119	44.1	92	45.1	39	40.6
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	137	50.7	92	45.1	47	49.0
Half and half	14	5.2	20	9.8	10	10.4
Total	270	100.0	204	100.0	96	100.0

When Decided	Family		Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	43	69.4	12	54.5	26	86.7	22	81.5
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	14	22.6	9	40.9	4	13.3	4	14.8
Half and half	5	8.1	1	4.5	0	0.0	1	3.7
Total	62	100.0	22	100.0	30	100.0	27	100.0

Overseas visitors tended to have planned their New Zealand itineraries mainly at home with 76.5 per cent doing so overall (Table 39). Nevertheless, close to a fifth (17.4 %) mainly did so while travelling.

Significant relationships were found between New Zealand itinerary planning and age (Pearson's $\chi = 46.78$, 10df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 40), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 39.13$, 14df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 41) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 52.44$, 12df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 42).

Visitors between the ages of 15 and 24 years and between 25 and 34 years were once again the most likely to plan their itineraries while travelling with 26.7 per cent and 23.9 per cent, respectively stating they had done so (Table 40). Over three quarters of all the other age groups had planned their New Zealand itineraries mainly while at home.

Australian visitors (87.7%) were the most likely to have planned their New Zealand itineraries while still at home with 86.3 per cent of Asian respondents and 84.3 per cent of visitors from the United States reporting the same (Table 41). The group most likely to have planned their itineraries while travelling were those from 'Other Europe' (27.1%) followed by German visitors (25.8%).

As was the case with the planning of the Christchurch itinerary, it was those travelling alone (25.0%) or with friends (23.3%) who reported the greatest frequency of itinerary planning while travelling (Table 42).

Table 39
Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary (Overseas Visitors)

When Itinerary Planned	Number	%
Mainly at home	484	76.5
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	110	17.4
Half and half	39	6.2
Total	633	100.0

Table 40
Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Age

When Decided	15-24		25-34		35-44	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	112	69.6	137	68.2	56	77.8
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	43	26.7	48	23.9	11	15.3
Half and half	6	3.7	16	8.0	5	6.9
Total	161	100.0	201	100.0	72	100.0

When Decided	45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	51	89.5	78	87.6	46	95.8
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	2	3.5	4	4.5	1	2.1
Half and half	4	7.0	7	7.9	1	2.1
Total	57	100.0	89	100.0	48	100.0

Table 41
Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Nationality

When Itinerary Planned	United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
Mainly at home	107	74.3	75	84.3	71	87.7
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	21	14.6	12	13.5	6	7.4
Half and half	16	11.1	2	2.2	4	4.9
Total	144	100.0	89	100.0	81	100.0

When Itinerary Planned	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	44	71.0	69	86.3	77	65.3	41	70.7
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	16	25.8	9	11.3	32	27.1	13	22.4
Half and half	2	3.2	2	2.5	9	7.6	4	6.9
Total	62	100.0	80	100.0	118	100.0	58	100.0

Table 42
Time of Planning New Zealand Itinerary by Group Type

When Decided	Visiting Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends		Family	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	163	69.1	147	79.5	64	71.1	41	87.2
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	59	25.0	20	10.8	21	23.3	4	8.5
Half and half	14	5.9	18	9.7	5	5.6	2	4.3
Total	236	100.0	185	100.0	90	100.0	47	100.0

When Decided	Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mainly at home	18	85.7	30	100.0	21	87.5
Mainly while travelling in New Zealand	3	14.3	0	0.0	3	12.5
Half and half	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	21	100.0	30	100.0	24	100.0

3.6 Influences on Decision-making

Table 43 reports the frequency with which a range of information sources and trip characteristics were judged to be 'Influential' by overseas visitors on their decision to travel to New Zealand. This judgment was calculated by adding the frequency with which respondents indicated either '1' or '2' on a five point Likert scale that varied from 1 = 'Very Influential' to 5 = 'Not Influential at All'. This was done to ensure that the respondent had made a strong endorsement of the source or trip characteristic as being an influence.

The results show that the most often cited influence was 'Advice from Friends and Family' (with 62.7% of overseas respondents perceiving it to be an influence) followed by not having visited New Zealand before (58.8%), 'Travel Books' (34.0%) and, interestingly, the 'Internet' (21.7%).

Table 43
Influences on Decision to go to New Zealand

Influence	Number	%
Advice from Friends and Family	411	62.7
Not Visited NZ Before	385	58.8
Travel Books	223	34.0
Internet	142	21.7
Cost (Benefit)	92	14.0
Previous Visit to NZ	91	13.9
Brochures	90	13.7
Travel Agent	81	12.4
Package Deal	76	11.6
Stopover	71	10.8
TV Show	54	8.2
Magazine/ News Article	39	6.0
Magazine Advertisement	19	2.9
TV Advertisement	18	2.7

Note: Multiple response question. Percentages do not total 100.

While many significant relationships were discovered, only those related to the four most often cited influential factors are reported here. 'Advice from Friends and Family' was found to be significantly related to type of travel (Pearson's $\chi = 14.32$, 3df, $p < 0.01$) (Table 44), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 24.43$, 7df, $p = 0.001$) (Table 45), age (Pearson's $\chi = 15.00$, 6df, $p < 0.01$) (Table 46) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 29.28$, 6df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 47).

While the majority of respondents engaged in all types of travel reported 'Advice from Friends and Family' as an influence on their decision to travel to New Zealand this was least so for those who were visiting Christchurch as a sole destination on their visit (64.6%) (Table 44).

The lowest levels of reported influence from friends and family were from visitors from the United States (62.9%) (Table 45). The visitors who reported the highest levels of this influence were from 'Other' countries (93.6%) and from the United Kingdom (87.2%).

The two youngest age groups reported 'advice from friends and family' most often as an influence with 86.7 per cent of those from 25 to 34 years and 82.1 per cent of those aged from 15 to 24 years (Table 46). Conversely, 'only' 70.0 per cent of those aged 35 to 44 years cited this factor as an influence.

'Other' (43.5%) and 'Tour Group' (58.3%) respondents were least likely to cite 'advice from friends and family' as an influence on their decision to travel to New Zealand (Table 47). Those travelling in 'Family' groups had the highest reporting of this factor as an influence (85.0%).

Table 44
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Type of Travel

Influence	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	51	64.6	126	84.6	121	79.6	113	83.1
Not an Influence	28	35.4	23	15.4	31	20.4	23	16.9
Total	79	100.0	149	100.0	152	100.0	136	100.0

Table 45
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Country/Region

Influence	United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	102	87.2	39	62.9	51	73.9
Not an Influence	15	12.8	23	37.1	18	26.1
Total	117	100.0	62	100.0	69	100.0

Influence	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	39	81.3	59	73.8	76	82.6	44	93.6
Not an Influence	9	18.8	21	26.3	16	17.4	3	6.4
Total	48	100.0	80	100.0	92	100.0	47	100.0

Table 46
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Age

Influence	15-24		25-34		35-44	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	115	82.1	150	86.7	35	70.0
Not an Influence	25	17.9	23	13.3	15	30.0
Total	140	100.0	173	100.0	50	100.0

Influence	45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	30	66.7	54	76.1	24	72.7
Not an Influence	15	33.3	17	23.9	9	27.3
Total	45	100.0	71	100.0	33	100.0

Table 47
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Group Type

Influence	Travelling Alone		Partner/Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	159	80.7	118	84.9	64	83.1
Not an Influence	38	19.3	21	15.1	13	16.9
Total	117	100.0	62	100.0	69	100.0

Influence	Family		Friends/Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	34	85.0	12	75.0	14	58.3	10	43.5
Not an Influence	6	15.0	4	25.0	10	41.7	13	56.5
Total	48	100.0	80	100.0	92	100.0	47	100.0

The influence of 'not having visited New Zealand before' was found to be significantly related to type of travel (Pearson's $\chi = 70.19$, 3df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 48), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 24.49$, 6df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 49) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 18.49$, 6df, $p = 0.005$) (Table 50).

It is very noticeable that the lowest reported influence from not having visited New Zealand before was from those overseas visitors for whom Christchurch is a sole destination (41.5%) (Table 48). This was half the proportion of those for whom Christchurch occupied some other position in their trip.

Visitors from Germany cited not having visited New Zealand before as an influence on their decision to visit New Zealand more often than other visitors (91.7%) (Table 49). Asian (64.1%) and then Australian (70.9%) visitors were the least likely to cite this factor as an influence.

In terms of group type, those travelling with friends reported the influence of not having visited New Zealand before most often (87.3%) (Table 50). The 'Other' category reported this factor as an influence the least often (50.0%).

Table 48
Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Type of Travel

Influence	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	27	41.5	122	84.7	120	85.7	116	87.9
Not an Influence	38	58.5	22	15.3	20	14.3	16	12.1
Total	65	100.0	144	100.0	140	100.0	132	100.0

Table 49
Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Country/Region

Influence	United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	92	86.0	45	72.6	39	70.9
Not an Influence	15	14.0	17	27.4	16	29.1
Total	107	100.0	62	100.0	55	100.0

Influence	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	44	91.7	41	64.1	84	84.8	40	87.0
Not an Influence	4	8.3	23	35.9	15	15.2	6	13.0
Total	48	100.0	64	100.0	99	100.0	46	100.0

Table 50
Influence of Not Visited New Zealand Before by Group Type

Influence	Travelling Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	141	77.9	112	84.8	69	87.3
Not an Influence	40	22.1	20	15.2	10	12.7
Total	181	100.0	132	100.0	79	100.0

Influence	Family		Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	22	71.0	9	75.0	22	84.6	10	50.0
Not an Influence	9	29.0	3	25.0	4	15.4	10	50.0
Total	31	100.0	12	100.0	26	100.0	20	100.0

'Travel Books' as an influence on the decision to travel to New Zealand was significantly related to type of travel (Pearson's $\chi = 36.95$, 3df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 51), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 33.09$, 6df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 52) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 16.26$, 6df, $p = 0.012$) (Table 53).

The main difference in perceived influence of travel books as it relates to travel type is that those for whom Christchurch is a sole destination are less than half as likely to report it as an influence than any other type of traveller (only 18.3% of this type) (Table 51).

Only just over one third of visitors from the United States (35.6%) perceived travel books to have been an influence on their decision to travel to New Zealand (Table 52). This contrasts with the 68.8 per cent of visitors from 'Other' parts of the world who reported travel books as an influence most often.

Some 69.2 per cent of those travelling in mixed groups of friends, family members and partners reported travel books as an influence on their decisions to travel to New Zealand with only 13.6 per cent of those travelling in 'other' types of groups reporting the same. Surprisingly, 50.0 per cent of those in Tour Groups claimed that travel books had been an influence on their decision.

Table 51
Influence of Travel Books by Type of Travel

Influence	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	13	18.3	68	50.7	75	61.0	67	57.3
Not an Influence	58	81.7	66	49.3	48	39.0	50	42.7
Total	71	100.0	134	100.0	123	100.0	117	100.0

Table 52
Influence of Travel Books by Country/Region

Influence	United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	54	55.7	21	35.6	16	27.6
Not an Influence	43	44.3	38	64.4	42	72.4
Total	97	100.0	59	100.0	58	100.0

Influence	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	31	64.6	32	42.1	47	62.7	22	68.8
Not an Influence	17	35.4	44	57.9	28	37.3	10	31.3
Total	48	100.0	76	100.0	75	100.0	32	100.0

Table 53
Influence of Travel Books by Group Type

Influence	Travelling Alone		Partner/Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	84	50.6	73	55.3	30	51.7
Not an Influence	82	49.4	59	44.7	28	48.3
Total	166	100.0	132	100.0	58	100.0

Influence	Family		Friends/Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	13	40.6	9	69.2	11	50.0	3	13.6
Not an Influence	19	59.4	4	30.8	11	50.0	19	86.4
Total	32	100.0	13	100.0	22	100.0	22	100.0

Finally, significant relationships were found between reporting the internet as an influence on the decision to travel to New Zealand and age (Pearson's $\chi = 26.04$, 6df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 54) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 15.68$, 6df, $p = 0.016$) (Table 55).

The highest reported rate of influence of the internet on making the decision to travel to New Zealand was from those aged 25 to 34 years (47.7%) (Table 54). This rate was followed by those aged from 45 to 54 years (43.9%). Only 12.2 per cent of those aged 55 to 64 years and 19.2 per cent of those over 65 years of age reported the internet as an influence.

Family groups (14.8%), those travelling in 'Other' groups (17.4%) and those in tour groups (18.2%) were significantly less likely to report the internet as an influence on their decision to travel to New Zealand than were those travelling in other types of groups (Table 55).

Table 54
Influence of Internet by Age

Influence	15-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	34	34.0	63	47.7	16	37.2	18	43.9	6	12.2	5	19.2
Not an Influence	66	66.0	69	52.3	27	62.8	23	56.1	43	87.8	21	80.8
Total	100	100.0	132	100.0	43	100.0	41	100.0	49	100.0	26	100.0

Table 55
Influence of Internet by Group Type

Influence	Travelling Alone		Partner/ Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	56	40.9	46	39.7	21	37.5
Not an Influence	81	59.1	70	60.3	35	62.5
Total	137	100.0	116	100.0	56	100.0

Influence	Family		Friends/ Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	4	14.8	7	53.8	4	18.2	4	17.4
Not an Influence	23	85.2	6	46.2	18	81.8	19	82.6
Total	27	100.0	13	100.0	23	100.0	22	100.0

The frequency of reported influences on visitor decisions to travel to the Christchurch region are reported in Table 56. Once again, the most often reported influence was 'Advice from Friends and Family' (42.4% of respondents). This was followed by not having visited Christchurch before (36.0%), the convenience of Christchurch as a stopover in a longer trip (28.7%) and travel books (23.1%).

Table 56
Influences on Decision to go to the Christchurch Region

Influence	Number	%
Advice from Friends and Family	310	42.4
Not Visited Christchurch Before	263	36.0
Stopover	210	28.7
Travel Books	169	23.1
Package Deal	95	13.0
Travel Agent	84	11.5
Internet	83	11.4
Previous Visit to Christchurch	78	10.7
Brochures	66	9.0
Cost (Benefit)	58	7.9
TV Show	26	3.6
Magazine/ News Article	23	3.1
Magazine Advert	10	1.4
TV Advertisement	10	1.4

Note: Multiple response question. Percentages do not total 100.

Significant relationships are reported for the first four factors in Table 56. In relation to 'Advice from Friends and Family' significant relationships were discovered for travel type (Pearson's $\chi = 11.39$, 3df, $p=0.01$) (Table 57), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 16.56$, 7df, $p=0.02$) (Table 58), age (Pearson's $\chi = 19.21$, 6df, $p=0.004$) (Table 59) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 16.32$, 6df, $p=0.012$) (Table 60).

Those who had Christchurch as a starting point in their travel in New Zealand were the most likely to cite 'Advice from Friends and Family' as an influence on their decisions to visit the Christchurch region (79.6%) (Table 57). Least likely to see this factor as influential were those for whom Christchurch was a 'Last Stop' (59.4%).

Visitors from the United States were notable for being the least likely to cite 'Advice from Friends and Family' as an influence on their decisions to visit the Christchurch region (44.0%) (Table 58). Visitors from elsewhere were relatively similar in their citing of this factor as an influence.

In Table 59, those aged 45 to 54 were least likely to cite 'Advice from Friends and Family' as an influence on their decision (47.4%) (Table 59). The youngest age group – 15 to 24 year olds – were most likely to cite this factor (79.5%) as an influence on decisions to visit the Christchurch region.

'Advice from Friends and Family' was most often cited as an influence by those travelling in family groups (82.2%) and least cited by members of tour groups (45.0%) (Table 60).

Table 57
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Type of Travel

Influence	Sole Destination		Starting Point		Part Way Through		Last Stop	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	75	64.1	90	79.6	82	67.2	63	59.4
Not an Influence	42	35.9	23	20.4	40	32.8	43	40.6
Total	117	100.0	113	100.0	122	100.0	106	100.0

Table 58
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Country/Region

When Itinerary Planned	New Zealand		United Kingdom		United States		Australia	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	34	69.4	71	71.7	22	44.0	37	64.9
Not an Influence	15	30.6	28	28.3	28	56.0	20	35.1
Total	49	100.0	99	100.0	50	100.0	57	100.0

When Itinerary Planned	Germany		Asia		Other Europe		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	24	64.9	55	74.3	43	72.9	24	72.7
Not an Influence	13	35.1	19	25.7	16	27.1	9	27.3
Total	37	100.0	74	100.0	59	100.0	33	100.0

Table 59
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Age

Influence	15-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	97	79.5	94	64.4	33	66.0	18	47.4	41	67.2	26	70.3
Not an Influence	25	20.5	52	35.6	17	34.0	20	52.6	20	32.8	11	29.7
Total	122	100.0	146	100.0	50	100.0	38	100.0	61	100.0	37	100.0

Table 60
Influence of Advice from Friends and Family by Group Type

Influence	Travelling Alone		Partner/Spouse		Friends	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	124	70.1	83	69.2	40	63.5
Not an Influence	53	29.9	37	30.8	23	36.5
Total	177	100.0	120	100.0	63	100.0

Influence	Family		Friends/Family		Tour Group		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Influence	37	82.2	7	70.0	9	45.0	10	43.5
Not an Influence	8	17.8	3	30.0	11	55.0	13	56.5
Total	45	100.0	10	100.0	20	100.0	23	100.0

The influence of 'Not Visited Christchurch Before' on the decision to visit the Christchurch region was found to be significantly related to travel type (Pearson's $\chi = 36.06$, 3df, $p < 0.001$) (Table 61), nationality (Pearson's $\chi = 21.06$, 7df, $p = 0.004$) (Table 62), age (Pearson's $\chi = 13.76$, 6df, $p = 0.032$) (Table 63) and group type (Pearson's $\chi = 13.68$, 6df, $p = 0.033$) (Table 64).

It is clear that those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination are the least influenced by not having visited Christchurch before than are respondents engaged in the other travel types (only 27.8%) (Table 61).

With the exception of New Zealanders (14.8%), not having visited Christchurch before was a significant influence on the decision to visit the region (Table 62). This was particularly the case for Asian visitors (61.7%).

Curiously, it is the 45 to 54 year old age group that, once again, is least likely to cite not having visited Christchurch before as an influence on the decision to visit the Christchurch region (34.3%) (Table 63). This compares with those over 65 years of age of whom 72.7 per cent cited this factor as an influence.

Of the named group types, those travelling alone were least likely to identify not having visited Christchurch before as an influence on their decision to visit the Christchurch region (47.5%) (Table 64). Those on a tour group, by contrast, were the most likely to cite this factor (70.8%).

Table 61
Influences on Decision to go to the Christchurch Region

Influence	Number	%
Advice from Friends and Family	310	42.4
Not Visited ChCh Before	263	36.0
Stopover	210	28.7
Travel Books	169	23.1
Package Deal	95	13.0
Travel Agent	84	11.5
Internet	83	11.4
Previous Visit to ChCh	78	10.7
Brochures	66	9.0
Cost (Benefit)	58	7.9
TV Show	26	3.6
Magazine/ News Article	23	3.1
Magazine Advert	10	1.4
TV Advertisement	10	1.4

Note: Multiple response question. Percentages do not total 100.

Chapter 4

Discussion and Conclusions

4.1 Summary of Findings

The findings presented in this report are from a survey of visitors to Christchurch carried out in two broad sampling periods, the first from October to early December 2002 (a 'shoulder' period) and the second from January to early February 2003 (a 'peak' period). The survey was concerned with understanding the general visitor characteristics, routes taken and places visited in the region, expenditure in the region, decision-making and demand for Maori cultural attractions and activities.

Only those findings from the survey related to visitor characteristics and decision-making are presented here. Other data concerning travel routes, expenditure and demand for Maori cultural attractions and activities are presented in other reports in this series. Further details of sampling methods and timing are provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

Some 731 usable questionnaires were analysed to produce the findings reported here. This represents an aggregation of the questionnaires from the two sample periods.

The overall sample of respondents described in this report were slightly skewed towards females (54.0% females and 46.0% males). Almost one fifth of the sample were between 20 and 24 years of age (19.8%) with almost half between the ages of 20 and 34 years (50.1%). One in ten were domestic visitors from other regions in New Zealand (10.4%) and one in five (20.2%) were from the United Kingdom, 12.7 per cent from the United States, 11.5 per cent from Australia, 8.5 per cent from Germany, 16.3 per cent from 'Other Europe' and 11.9 per cent from Asia.

In terms of the role that the Christchurch region played in respondents' travels, 28.9 per cent of respondents were visitors who were part way through a trip on arrival at Christchurch. Just over one in four (26.4%) respondents had Christchurch as a starting point, 22.3 per cent were in the Christchurch region as a last stop on a longer trip and 22.4 per cent had Christchurch as a sole destination. Perhaps surprisingly, it was the youngest age group in the sample (15 to 24 years) who made up the largest proportion of visitors for whom Christchurch was a sole destination (some 29.3% of this group). In terms of the other travel types it was the 25 to 34 year age group that predominated. Over one third (35.4%) of those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination were domestic visitors and 45.7 per cent were travelling alone.

Overall, 37.9 per cent of respondents were travelling alone and a further 27.9 per cent were travelling with a partner or spouse while almost a fifth (19.1%) of overseas visitors had visited New Zealand before.

An important area of focus in the survey was on the prior knowledge and information needs of visitors to Christchurch. Self-reported levels of knowledge of the Christchurch region showed that over half of respondents (51.6%) claimed to have less than adequate knowledge, 32.5 per cent believed their knowledge to have been 'adequate' and only 16.0 per cent believed they had

had more than adequate levels of knowledge. More males than females reported 'no knowledge' of the region (24.9% and 18.3%, respectively) but, seemingly paradoxically, twice as many males than females reported 'excellent knowledge' of the region (8.5% versus 4.9%). Respondents visiting Christchurch as a sole destination were most likely to report more than adequate levels of knowledge (25.9%) while 29.4 per cent of those who had Christchurch as their last stop on a trip were the most likely to report 'no knowledge' of the region.

Unsurprisingly, 48.0 per cent of domestic visitors reported greater than 'adequate' levels of prior knowledge of the Christchurch region. More surprisingly, of the overseas visitors those from the United Kingdom, at 10.9 per cent, were less likely to report greater than adequate levels of prior knowledge than were those from the United States (16.9%), Australia (16.3%) and Asia (13.9%).

Those aged 15 to 24 years and 25 to 34 years had the lowest reported levels of prior knowledge of the region with 27.3 and 26.5 per cent, respectively, estimating that they had 'no knowledge' of the region at all. Almost two thirds (64.2%) of the youngest age group (15 to 24 years of age) reported less than 'adequate' knowledge. In terms of group type it was those who were travelling as part of a tour group who reported the highest level of 'no knowledge' (30.0%) while groups of friends reported both the highest levels of, overall, less than adequate knowledge (62.8%) but also the highest rate of greater than adequate prior knowledge levels (21.0%).

A curious twist in relation to the above findings concerning the high levels of less than adequate knowledge was that 69.8 per cent of respondents nevertheless believed that they did *not* need more information about the Christchurch region. While only 4.3 per cent of those who had reported 'excellent knowledge' of the region desired more information some 38.8 per cent of those reporting 'no knowledge' and 39.9 per cent of those reporting marginally more than 'no knowledge' would have liked more information. This still, however, represents less than half of those respondents in the low knowledge categories.

Surprisingly low levels of desire for more information continue in relation to other relevant variables. Visitors from Asia, for example, were the most likely to desire more information (55.3%) but were the only group in which a majority so desired. In terms of desire for more information, Asian visitors were followed by those from the United States (40.2%) but, at the other end of the spectrum, only 17.7 per cent of German visitors and 17.3 per cent of domestic visitors would have liked more information. Similarly, while 41.7 per cent of the youngest age group (15 to 24 years of age) would have liked more information, only the 65 years and over group of the remaining age groups had more than 30 per cent of their category desiring more information.

Findings related to recommendations about the length of stay in the Christchurch region showed that 45.5 per cent of respondents would recommend a stay of from three to four days for visitors who had one month to spend in New Zealand and a further 23.3 per cent would recommend a stay of only one to two days. Only 7.2 per cent of respondents recommended a stay of 'at least two weeks' for such a trip.

Groups who were most likely to recommend longer stays in the region for a one month trip in New Zealand were those who had Christchurch as a sole destination (15.6% recommending a

stay of 'at least two weeks', 30.5 per cent recommending 'about one week'), Asian visitors (19.8% recommending 'at least two weeks', 33.7% recommending 'about one week') and those travelling in 'Other' groups (groups involving sporting trips, business associates, special interest groups, etc.) (16.7% recommending 'at least two weeks' and 30.0% 'about one week').

In line with expectations, when the recommended length of stay in the region was in the context of a one-month trip in the South Island only, it increased in length. Overall, 14.7 per cent of respondents now recommended 'at least two weeks' with a further 35.6 per cent recommending 'about one week'.

Once again it was those who had Christchurch as a sole destination, Asian visitors and the 'Other' group type who made recommendations of the greatest length of stay (26.1%, 34.9% and 26.7%, respectively, recommending a stay of 'at least two weeks' and 32.7%, 36.0% and 26.7%, respectively, recommending a stay of 'about one week').

Levels of reported specific disappointments with their stay in the Christchurch region were low overall. Almost two thirds (64.6%) specified that they had no disappointments at all while 24.1 per cent mentioned a wide range of largely idiosyncratic experiences and concerns (each only mentioned by one respondent). Of disappointments mentioned by more than one respondent, the most common was 'weather' (2.7% of respondents), 'shopping' (1.4%) and 'unfriendly people' (1.2%).

Decisions to travel to Christchurch were overwhelmingly made while still at home (89.9% of respondents). Those part ways through their trip reported the lowest level of decision-making at home, but this was still the case for 80.1 per cent of this group. The most likely age groups to make a decision while travelling were the two youngest (16.2% and 12.3% for 15 to 24 year olds and 25 to 34 year olds, respectively) and the most likely group type to do the same were those travelling alone (15.1%) or in groups of friends (10.3%).

The picture is different, however, where the timing of the itinerary planning for Christchurch are concerned. There was a much more even split between those planning their itineraries in the region mainly while at home (49.6%) or mainly while travelling (43.2%). Itinerary planning is clearly related to age with only 36.6 per cent of the youngest age group (15 to 24 year olds) planning their itineraries in the Christchurch region mainly while at home as compared with 75.0 per cent of those 65 years and older. Similarly, the majority of those aged 15 to 24 years mainly planned their itineraries while travelling (55.2%) and almost half (49.3%) of those aged 25 to 34 years did the same. New Zealanders (at a rate of 82.4%) and visitors from the United States (62.5%) were most likely to have already planned their Christchurch itineraries before leaving home with German visitors (at a rate of 59.7%) were most likely to make their plans while travelling.

When just overseas visitors are considered, New Zealand itineraries overall are made largely while at home (76.5% of overseas respondents) with about a fifth (17.4%) mainly doing their planning while travelling. Once again, younger visitors are the likeliest to plan their New Zealand itineraries while travelling (26.7% and 23.9%, respectively, for 15 to 24 year olds and 25 to 34 year olds). Australian visitors, at 87.8 per cent, were the most likely to have planned

their New Zealand itineraries while at home with those from 'Other Europe' (27.1%) and Germany (25.8%) the most likely to make their plans while travelling. As was the case with Christchurch itinerary planning, those travelling alone (25.0%) and those travelling with friends (23.3%) had the greatest levels of itinerary planning while travelling.

Of a range of possible influences on the decision of overseas visitors to visit New Zealand the most often cited influence was 'Advice from Friends and Family' (62.7% of overseas respondents citing it as an influence). The next most reported influences were not having visited New Zealand before (58.8%), Travel Books (34.0%) and the internet (21.7%).

In relation to other variables, the least likely to report 'Advice from Friends and Family' as an influence were those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination ('only' 64.6%), those from the United States ('only' 62.9%), those aged 35 to 44 years old ('only' 70.0%) and those travelling in 'Other' groups (43.5%) or tour groups (58.3%). Not having visited New Zealand before was least likely to have been seen as an influence on the decision to visit New Zealand by those overseas visitors who had Christchurch as a sole destination (41.5%). Conversely, visitors from Germany were the nationality most likely to report this factor as an influence (91.7%) while visitors from Asia were the least likely (64.1%). Travel Books were cited least often as an influence by overseas visitors on their decision to visit New Zealand if they had Christchurch as a sole destination with those from 'Other' parts of the world the most likely nationality to cite it as an influence (68.8%). It was perhaps surprising that a full 50.0 per cent of those in tour groups cited Travel Books as an influence on their decision while only 13.6 per cent of the 'other' group type perceived them as an influence. The internet was most often perceived as an influence by those aged 25 to 34 years (47.7%) while only 12.2 per cent of those aged 55 to 64 years so perceived it.

Finally, the decision to travel to Christchurch (rather than New Zealand) was principally perceived by the respondents to be influenced by 'Advice from Friends and Family' (42.4% of respondents), not having visited Christchurch before (36.0%), the convenience of Christchurch as a 'stopover' (28.7%) and travel books (23.1%).

'Advice from Friends and Family' was most frequently cited as an influence by those who had Christchurch as the starting point on their trip (79.6% of those travelling by this travel type) but, notably, only 44.0 per cent of visitors from the United States reported it as an influence. The youngest age group (15 to 24 year olds) were the most likely to cite this factor as an influence on their decision to visit Christchurch (79.5%) and yet the most likely group type to cite it as an influence a family group (82.2%).

Not having visited Christchurch before was least frequently cited as an influence by those who were visiting Christchurch as a sole destination (27.8%), New Zealand visitors to the region (14.8%) and those aged from 45 to 54 years old (34.3%). This latter finding contrasts with the fact that 72.7 per cent of those over 65 years of age cited not having been to Christchurch before as an influence on their decision to visit. Only 47.5 per cent of those travelling alone rated not having visited Christchurch before as an influence on their decision to visit while those who were part of a tour group were the most likely to cite this factor (70.8%).

Christchurch's role as a 'stopover' was least likely to be mentioned by New Zealanders (21.9%) followed by visitors from Asia (41.9%). 'Other' groups (12.5%) and tour groups (26.7%) were significantly less likely to cite this factor as an influence than were members of other types of groups.

Finally, travel books were least likely to be cited as an influence on the decision to visit the Christchurch region by those for whom Christchurch was a sole destination (11.7%) and most likely to be cited by those for whom Christchurch was 'Part Way Through' their trip (62.3%). Similarly, domestic visitors reported the least influence of travel books (only 3.2%) as compared with visitors from Germany (70.7%). 'Other' groups (4.8%) and tour groups (22.2%) were the least likely to cite travel books as an influential factor while those travelling with a partner or spouse reported it as an influence most often (53.9%).

4.2 Discussion and Conclusions

Especially when read in conjunction with previous findings on visitor decision-making to be found in Moore, Simmons and Fairweather (1998), Moore, Fairweather and Simmons (2000) and Moore, Simmons and Fairweather (2001), the findings reported in this report have important implications for both the nature of visitor decision-making in New Zealand and for the study of visitor decision-making in general. In particular, findings related to degree of prior knowledge and the desire for more information prior to arrival (discussed below) raise major questions about the role of information in the overall visitor experience.

In this case study it has also been possible to 'close the loop' to some extent on the decision-making and influence process by pursuing the question of likely ('word of mouth') recommendations visitors to Christchurch may make to potential future visitors. It has also been possible to examine the links between the role of Christchurch in a more extensive trip (sole destination versus Christchurch as a starting point, last stop or intermediate destination) and decision-making.

However, perhaps the greatest dissimilarity between the findings in this report and those in the three previously mentioned reports is the relatively low proportion of domestic visitors in the sample. Only 10.4 per cent of the sample were New Zealanders as compared with Kaikoura at 23.4 per cent (Moore *et al.*, 1998), Rotorua at 57.3 per cent in the 'Visitors to Rotorua Questionnaire' and 28.1 per cent in the 'Rotorua Visitor Flows and Decision-Making Questionnaire' (Moore *et al.*, 2000) and the West Coast at 44.7 per cent (Moore *et al.* 2001). This low result is despite the deliberate attempt, through quota sampling, to gain close to a 60 per cent sample of domestic visitors in the Christchurch sample. The failure to achieve this, in itself, perhaps indicates something interesting about the pattern of visitation of New Zealand visitors to Christchurch. That is, if it is assumed that the proportion of domestic visitors to Christchurch is similar to the most recent previous years (see Appendix 2), then, clearly, these visitors are not frequenting the centre of Christchurch and the established 'high profile' visitor attractions to the same extent as overseas visitors. It may be that, as was the case in Rotorua, but even more so, (Moore *et al.*, 2000) domestic visitors to Christchurch may have markedly different spatial

patterns of on-site visitation during their stay than do overseas visitors. It would be useful, in future research, to try to discover the reasons for such a differentiated pattern.

Domestic visitors aside, the quota sampling approach was relatively successful. As was the case in Kaikoura, Rotorua and the West Coast, the most frequently sampled group of overseas visitors once again is that of visitors from the United Kingdom (20.2% of the sample). This is perhaps less surprising in a destination like Christchurch than it has been at the other case study sites, given the historic pattern of immigration to the area from England, in particular, and the United Kingdom in general. This proportion is also explicable given that numbers of United Kingdom visitors to Christchurch are known to peak from October through to February (the months for the survey) (Sleeman and Simmons, 2003). Proportions of Australians are also lower than expected despite efforts to target them. This suggests, although does not confirm, that they may have visitation patterns more like domestic visitors than like other nationalities.

It is clear that one of the major findings, in relation to visitor characteristics, in this report, is that those who are visiting Christchurch as a sole destination represent a distinct type of visitor overall. They are disproportionately domestic (34.5%), young (29.3% are between the ages of 15 and 24 years, 78.9% are younger than 45 years) and lone travellers (45.7%). They have the greatest degree of perceived prior knowledge and recommend longer lengths of stay than do other travel types (15.6% recommend a stay of 'at least two weeks' for those travelling for one month in New Zealand and 26.1% recommend the same for a one month trip in the South Island). They also, not surprisingly, have a high tendency to plan their Christchurch itineraries at home but, more surprisingly, only 64.6 per cent of overseas visitors in this travel type perceive advice from friends and family to have been an influence (15% less than any other travel type). As overseas visitors they are also less likely to perceive influence from not having visited New Zealand before – suggesting that they have, perhaps. They are also far less likely than other travel types to perceive travel books as an influence on the decision to visit New Zealand. Similarly, those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination are also far less likely to cite not having visited Christchurch before (only 27.8%) or travel books (only 11.7%) as an influence on their decision to visit the region as are other travel types.

The explanation for this distinctive profile of visitors for whom Christchurch is a sole destination may well be that they are people, of whatever nationality (although primarily New Zealanders), who perceive that they have had and will have in the future, more than one chance to travel in New Zealand. This perception of the accessibility of New Zealand in general for this group would explain the lower reliance on advice from others or travel books (perhaps because of their own past experience in New Zealand or Christchurch) on their decision-making. It would also explain the longer recommendations for length of time in the region as perceived accessibility may 'allow' them to see the advantages (rather than the disadvantages) of staying longer in the region.

One area that was explored more deeply in this case study than was the case in previous case studies in this series (Kaikoura, Rotorua and the West Coast), was that of the degree of perceived prior knowledge and desire for information about the destination. It is often assumed that information is a vital resource for decision-making by tourists (e.g., Mansfeld, 1992). Information gathering stages are typically given a place of priority in models of the decision-

making process. Clearly, there is a certain level of information which all tourists will inevitably need in order to travel (anywhere). Without knowing a place exists, that it can be travelled to and that it offers possibilities to be a tourist it is hard to imagine how anyone could end up travelling to different places. Certainly, in previous reports in this series (Moore, *et al.*, 1998; Moore *et al.*, 2000; Moore *et al.*, 2001), questions concerning the various influences on decision-making were asked on the assumption that information from different types of sources would be used primarily to enhance the effectiveness of decision-making. Hence, the more information available, the better the decision-making and, ultimately, the more satisfying the experience as expectations would be accurate and, therefore, more likely to be fulfilled.

It seems from the present study, however, that the role of information on the tourist experience may well be more ambiguous. As noted in the findings, while only 16.0 per cent of respondents believed that they had more than adequate knowledge of the Christchurch region and only an additional 32.5 per cent believed they had 'adequate' levels of knowledge, a full 69.8 per cent of respondents would not have wanted any more information. There are several possible explanations for these findings. First, it may be that respondents misunderstood one or other of the questions. However, this seems unlikely given the straightforward wording of the questions. Second, It may be that all those respondents who believed that they had 'adequate' or more than adequate levels of knowledge (a total of 48.5% of respondents) desired no more. In that case, only 21.0 per cent of respondents would need to have expressed no desire for further knowledge (of the 51.5% who believed that they had less than adequate knowledge). If this were the case, it still is surprising that over one in five respondents seemed happy with 'less than adequate' knowledge – in fact it seems almost irrational to be satisfied with a level of knowledge acknowledged to be 'inadequate' for the purposes of decision-making. Further, given the assumption that more information should produce better decisions it remains difficult to explain why all those respondents (32.5% of them) who only felt they had 'adequate' knowledge should have had no desire to improve their knowledge levels.

A third explanation is one that suggests a rather different notion of the role of information in the tourist experience than that assumed in such a standard decision-making model of tourist behaviour and experience. It seems reasonable to suggest that since tourist activity is based around the notion of 'discovery' to varying degrees, there may well be an incentive to minimise the information about a destination to which a potential tourist exposes him or herself. The probability of surprises, serendipity and spontaneity, that is, may best be enhanced by deliberately avoiding too much information. In fact, there is some evidence (apart from the intuitive appeal of such a notion) that tourists value most highly their unplanned and entirely fortuitous experiences while travelling. Over two decades ago, Pearce (1982) analysed the motivation and experiences of a sample of tourists and discovered that the most highly valued experiences were those that had indeed arisen largely serendipitously (so far as the tourist was concerned). He noted in the final chapter on 'The Tourist Experience' that this may be linked to MacCannell's (1976) well-known idea of authenticity. More authentic experiences, that is, are deemed by the tourist to be those that happen unexpectedly and, certainly, without any prior planning.

Irrespective of the possible relationship between authenticity and valued experiences, it is clear that there is a relationship between valued experiences and lack of planning. Discovery, as a

working concept, summarises this relationship well. A discoverer, by definition has the experience of discovery by virtue of not knowing the nature of a new place, people, etc. prior to encountering these phenomena. Given a level of prior knowledge that assures a tourist of basic safety factors and the ability to maintain some reasonable level of control over an experience, there is actually no reason for a tourist to know much more. Of course, there are always subtleties such as desired knowledge about features of a destination of particular interest to quite specifically motivated tourists (e.g., highly committed 'eco-tourists') but, for the vast bulk of tourists who are simply visiting a place to 'see what's there' or 'have a look around' too much information – and therefore effort spent on information gathering – may not be just an unnecessary burden but may, in fact, diminish the likelihood of the most valued experiences tourists seek.

There is a further interesting aspect to this seemingly paradoxical relationship between levels of prior knowledge and levels of desire for more information. In the previous case studies, it was noted that 'informal' sources of information, such as 'advice from friends and family', were always cited markedly more often as perceived influences on decision-making than were more 'formal' (e.g., industry developed) sources of information. This was also found to be the case in this study and so represents a resoundingly consistent finding. In Moore *et al.* (2001) this was explained in terms of the degree of control visitors may feel over the informal sources of information, on the basis that people have a bias to perceive their own behaviour as being the result of an internal locus of control. There is, however, an alternative explanation in keeping with the above suggestion about the role of information in the tourist or visitor experience. It is possible that 'informal' sources of information allow potential visitors to engage actively in anticipatory behaviours that foreshadow the actual on-site experience itself. To put it simply, gathering information may be as much – if not more – a case of an aspect of the tourist experience itself rather than being an instrumental process to achieve the tourist experience on-site. There is enjoyment to be had in talking with friends and family about the possibility of travel quite apart from any 'information' that may have value in some rational decision-making process.

This suggestion links to ideas at the heart of discursive psychology (see 'Literature Review' in Chapter 1). As Moore (2002) has argued, supposed accounts by tourists of their psychological experiences, attitudes and decision-making processes, seen from a discursive perspective, actually should be understood as constructive of such experiences, etc.. That is, they are not so much 'reports' on internal psychological events (such as on a more or less private decision-making process) but are themselves the actions in which such events come to exist. If this is correct, then reports on information gathering and on the influence of information sources themselves construct the tourist experience and carry out such discursive 'work' as justifying choices, emphasizing the 'freedom' and 'discovery' aspects of the trip and making the particular tourist's actions coherent and understandable. Further, information and its role prior to a visit to a destination can come to be seen as part of Clawson and Ketch's (1966) anticipation phase of a recreational experience and thus as very much part of the overall experience. It is reasonable to suggest, therefore, that for a tourist experience to be had right from the beginning of the process it may be necessary for a potential visitor or tourist to constrain both the types and amount of information accessed. Typically, this may constrain it in such a way as to emphasise informal

sources of information and to minimize emphasis on the kinds of detailed information that may be seen as useful for careful, rational planning of a visit.

A further innovative aspect of the current study was the attempt to gain some understanding of the likely 'word of mouth' recommendations visitors to the Christchurch region would make to other potential visitors. The findings show that, as was suspected, the length of stay recommendations increased when more time was available for a visitor. The rate of recommending 'at least two weeks' in the region increased from 7.2 per cent when a trip of one month in New Zealand was involved to 14.7 per cent when a one month trip in the South Island, only, was involved. Overall, there was an increase in the rate at which longer stays would be recommended between these two scenarios.

This suggests that the role of Christchurch as a 'gateway' destination is partly a function of visitors' perceived limitation of time and, perhaps, of the possibility of repeat visitation. It may also be a function of levels of prior knowledge of what is available in the region which, as just discussed, were quite low. However, also as just discussed, given the surprisingly low expressions of interest in more information about the region, the difficulty of convincing visitors to New Zealand (or to the South Island) to stay longer in the Christchurch region may be greater than that resulting simply from time pressure.

There was, perhaps, more positive news for the region in that very few respondents reported disappointments with their stay. Those that were reported were often very particular, idiosyncratic disappointments which are presumably inevitable in any activity and are probably difficult to eliminate completely. Of course, if expectations of the visit to the Christchurch region were either relatively low (as compared to other destinations within the present trip of a respondent) or unformed this may not be surprising. In particular, if Christchurch was being seen by a sizable proportion of the sample simply as a 'gateway/exit' point to or from other places then there may not have been high expectations for or concerns about levels of enjoyment during the stay. Nevertheless, the low level of disappointment does provide a foundation upon which more enhanced experiences can be developed.

Perhaps also reflecting the 'gateway' perceptions of the region, respondents made their decisions to visit the Christchurch region overwhelmingly while at home (89.9%). The interesting finding, however, was that devising itineraries within the region while actually travelling was at quite a high rate (43.2%). As well as reinforcing the notion that visitors may well enjoy open-ended, 'discovery' experiences during a trip (and hence leaving detailed decisions to the on-site phase of a trip) it also reveals the increasing importance for destinations such as the Christchurch region of both informal and formal sources of information within the region, rather than marketing efforts beyond the region. This is particularly true in the case of younger visitors (55.2% of those aged 15 to 24 years) and visitors from Germany (59.7%).

Entirely consistent with previous studies in this series, it was informal sources of information that were perceived to be the most influential on visitor decision-making, whether in relation to visiting New Zealand (for overseas visitors) or the Christchurch region. 'Advice from Friends and Family' once again was the most important perceived influence on both of these decisions with not having visited either New Zealand or Christchurch, respectively, being the next most

important perceived influences. Similarly, trip characteristics such as convenience as a 'stopover' or 'cost benefits' rate again in this study more highly than do formal (industry) sources of information (magazine, television advertising). Interestingly, the perceived influence of the internet, especially in relation to international visitors' decisions to visit New Zealand, is once again high (in fact an almost identical percentage of overseas respondents cited the internet as an influence on this decision as was found for the same question posed to visitors to the West Coast – 21.7% in this study as compared to 21.8% on the West Coast (Moore *et al.* (2001)).

The interactive nature of the internet may well support both the explanation offered by Moore *et al.* (2001) and the above discussion about the discursive uses of information. Moore *et al.* (2001) argued that the internet, along with informal sources of information offer a greater degree of personal control over the decision-making process and so may be favoured in terms of being perceived as an influence on decision-making because of the well-documented phenomenon in social psychology that people tend to posit an internal locus of control over behaviour perceived to be 'successful' (e.g., Ross, 1977). Since enjoyable experiences such as tourist experiences tend to be perceived to have been 'successful' – and include a high level of money and time investment – there is likely to be a tendency to see the decision to visit as resulting from uses of information over which one can exercise discretion and control. Also, however, it is possible that the internet allows more interactive participation in the discourses surrounding the tourist experience than do other sources of information. Thus, interactive sources would contribute to the production of the pre-visit experience. In simple terms, the internet may allow potential visitors to interactively 'get into the mood' of the visitor experience through more direct and flexible engagement with the discourses of being a tourist, making decisions and experiencing particular destinations (similar to the 'interactive' experiences that are available through discussions with friends and family).

4.3 Implications for Theory and Method

Several interesting and useful implications arise from this study which relate to theoretical and methodological issues.

- There are methodological difficulties in effectively surveying domestic visitors in New Zealand destinations. It appears that domestic visitors to destinations are not always to be found at visitor attractions and sites. While speculative in relation to the Christchurch surveying it seems clear in Moore *et al.*'s (2000) data that domestic visitors to Rotorua had distinct spatial visitation patterns. Future sampling of visitors to a region, to be comprehensive needs to include strategies to capture as much of this 'hidden' domestic visitation pattern as possible. Such strategies might include telephone sampling of locals who may have had domestic visitors stay, identification through on-site qualitative methods (focus groups, informant interviews) possible sites favoured by domestic visitors, etc..
- The influence of information sources may need to go beyond ratings of strength of perceived influence. It is clear that it is the actual role of information in the decision-making process rather than its assumed role (as input into a rational and logical decision-making process) that should be explored using methods that are capable of providing an understanding of that role.

Qualitative methods such as in-depth interviewing would be more appropriate than rating scales for that purpose.

- As Popper (2002) has argued, economic rationality is an assumption rather than a discovery in economics. That is, it provides a useful means of organizing and interpreting people's actions under conditions of scarcity. While this may be appropriate to understand decision-making within the context of economic behaviour, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the activity and functions of tourist decision-making beyond its economic role it is suggested that alternative conceptualizations of the process need to be explored. In particular, it is suggested that a conceptualization based upon theorizing in discursive psychology (e.g., Moore, 2002) would be useful to understand the multiple functions that the activity of tourist decision-making sustains (such as decision-making being itself part of the tourist experience).
- Related to the previous point, there is also a need to reconceptualise the role of the amount of information sought in tourist decision-making. Theories should be developed which consider more than issues of time and money investment in the information gathering process. What is known about a destination, for example, clearly effects what is not known. Given the strong possibility that 'discovery' is a central value of much tourist experience, the amount of information accessed may say as much about tourists' understandings of what a tourist experience involves as it does about the availability of time and financial resources for information gathering.

4.4 Implications for Policy

- Visitors to the Christchurch region are distinguished most markedly between those for whom the region (often presumably just Christchurch) has primarily a 'gateway/ exit' or 'stepping stone' function and those for whom it functions as a sole destination. While there may be opportunities to change the balance of visitor numbers in these two principal groupings (see below) there is also a need to be aware of the likely different needs and expectations of each of these groupings. Those visiting Christchurch as a sole destination, for example, may have needs and demands more similar to locals than would be the case for the other grouping of visitors. There is an incentive to provide as much as possible for this group since they have already shown a commitment to visit the region for its own value rather than for its instrumental value in relation to travelling to other destinations.
- The findings related to recommended lengths of stay suggest that overall trip length has a major impact on the amount of time visitors would be advised (by other visitors) to spend in a 'gateway' destination such as Christchurch. So long as the typical length of time traveling within New Zealand is closer to one month than two months, for example, recommendations for length of stay in Christchurch are likely to average around two to four days. There is potential for repeat visitors (to both New Zealand and the Christchurch region itself) to spend much longer times, as indicated by the longer length of stay recommendations made by those in the sample who had Christchurch as a sole destination.
- Information sources that are portable, interactive (in the sense of the user having a good deal of control over timing of access, development of 'query pathways', etc.) and locally available would be the most likely way in which the supply of formal information sources would

influence visitor on-site itineraries. Decisions to visit are, themselves, overwhelmingly made at point of origin but itineraries involve a degree of open-endedness that could be exploited on-site. However, the disadvantage of on-site sources of information for a destination such as Christchurch is that they would be available at a point when discretionary time may already have been limited by overall trip length. This study raises the question - but has not answered it - as to whether or not more diverse, locally available information that, importantly, can be accessed and used in a way controlled by the visitor, would increase the length of stay in Christchurch. While this is unknown, it is likely that it will at least result in word of mouth recommendations for longer stays in the region.

References

- Chon, K.S. (1990). The role of destination image in tourism: A review and discussion. *The Tourist Review*, 44, 2-9.
- Chon, K.S. (1992). The role of destination image in tourism: An extension. *The Tourist Review*, 47, 2-8.
- Crompton, J. (1992). Structure of vacation destination choice sets. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 420-434.
- Echtner, C.M and Ritchie, J.R. B. (1991). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 2(2): 2-12.
- Edwards, M. and Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 283-304.
- Harré, R. and Gillett, G. (1994). *The discursive mind*. London: Sage.
- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). From motivation to actual travel. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 399-419.
- Moore, K. (2002). The discursive tourist. In, Dann, G. (ed.) *The tourist as a metaphor of the social world*. New York: CABI Publishing.
- Moore, K.; Simmons, D.G.; Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Visitor decision-making, on-site spatial behaviours, cognitive maps and destination perceptions: A case study of Kaikoura*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 4.
- Moore, K.; Fairweather, J.R.; Simmons, D.G. (2000). *Visitors to Rotorua: Characteristics, activities and decision-making*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC). Lincoln University, Report No. 12.
- Moore, K.; Simmons, D.G.; Fairweather, J.R. (2001). *Visitors to the West Coast: Characteristics, Attractions and Decision-Making*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC). Lincoln University, Report No. 22.
- Popper, K. (2002). *The poverty of historicism*. London: Routledge.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1988). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.

- Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In, L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*. (Vol. 10). New York: Academic Press.
- Sleeman, R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *Christchurch and Canterbury Visitor Profile and Forecasts*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University. Report No. 30.
- van Raaij, W.F., & Francken, D.A. (1984). Vacation decisions, activities and satisfactions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 11, 101-112.
- Witt, C.A., & Wright, P.L. (1992). Tourist motivation: Life after Maslow. In P. Johnson & B. Thomas (Eds.), *Choice and demand in tourism* (pp. 33-55). London: Mansell.

Appendix 1
Survey Questionnaire

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

Good Morning/afternoon/evening. This survey is concerned with gaining a better understanding of how Christchurch fits into visitors' decisions on what to do and where to go on their holidays. Responses are anonymous and will remain so.

Ask Q1 and Profile for all respondents, and also the specific section of the survey relevant to each.

Q1 Do you live in or close to Christchurch?

YES GOTO Part A

NO GOTO Part B

PART A

A1: Have you had a friend or relative to stay with you as a visitor to Christchurch in the last 3 months?

NO Thank participant and conclude questionnaire

YES Continue

A2: When was this? Month _____ Year _____

A3: Had they been to Christchurch before? (circle one) YES NO

A4: How long did they stay in Christchurch? Days: _____

A5a: Did you take them to see any particular places, including day trips to places such as Hanmer Springs , Akaroa or Kaikoura? (circle one)

YES

Continue NO

Skip to A6

A5b: If YES, which ones?

A6: Where else did they go while actually staying in Christchurch that you know of?

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

A7: About the visitors, can you tell me how many there were, what ages were involved and where they came from?

Origin: _____

Age:								
Number:								

GO TO PROFILE

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

PART B

B1: Where do you normally live? (If you are a long term visitor to New Zealand, such as a student, please identify your normal main New Zealand base)

B2: What are your main purposes for being in the Christchurch region at present? (Identify all that significantly apply)

a. Visiting friends and relatives

b. On holiday

c. Business/Conferences/Meetings

d. Other (please specify): _____

B3: What stage are you at in your visit in New Zealand? (tick which applies)

a.	Have arrived in Christchurch as a sole destination? (Do Section 1, Part C, and profile – XXXX white/yellow)	
b.	Just arrived in Christchurch as the starting point of a trip? (Do Section 2, Part C, and profile – XXXX pink/yellow)	
c.	Visiting Christchurch as part of an itinerary that has already begun but will not end in Christchurch? (Do Section 3, Part C, and profile...XXXX blue/yellow)	
d.	In Christchurch at the end of a trip and just prior to returning home? (Do Section 4, Part C, and profile- XXXX green/yellow)	

SECTION I: SOLE DESTINATION

1A: Where do you normally live? Town: _____ Country: _____

1B: What were the major reasons for choosing to visit Christchurch?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

1C: How long do you plan to stay? (Just record hours for day visitors only)

Hours? _____ Days? _____

1D: Using Christchurch as a base, where have you been and where do you plan to visit within Canterbury (including full day trips)? Could you also provide details of transport, accommodation, activities and expenditure for these visits and for your time in Christchurch?

For the expenditure part of the following table we want to know how much the average person spends, and what they spend it on. If you are in a group (e.g. family or friends) where spending by one person is not representative of each person (e.g. if one person pays for most of the food or petrol or accommodation), please tell us all the spending by the group and note above the table how many people the spending covers. If you are on your own, or you pay your own share of joint spending, please tell us only your own spending and note above the table that the spending only covers one person. If it is more convenient or more accurate to give the expenditure for the entire stay (e.g. accommodation) give us that answer.

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

[Note for Interviewer: Please mark places visited in sequence on the table and indicate the point at which data changes from actual places visited to date to places intended to visit. All costs in NZ\$]

Spending is for how many people?

Place	Day Trip?	No. of Nights	Transport		Accommodation		Entertainment/ Activities/ Attractions		Food & beverages at takeaway, café, hotel, etc.		Retail (including groceries and souvenirs)		Miscell./ any other spending	
			Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Name	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost

Transport Types	
1.Private car	2.Private van/Campervan
3.Hire car	4.Hire campervan
5.Tour coach	6.Bus
7.Motorbike	8.Bicycle
9.Plane	10.Train
11.Other (please specify)	

Accommodation Types	
1.Bed and Breakfast	2.Motor camp
3.Campervan (not motorcamp)	4.Motel
5.Backpackers hostel	6.Private home
7.Hotel	8.Other (please specify)

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

1E: Are there any things in the Canterbury region you would like to do but do not expect to have the time?

1F: Where are you staying in Christchurch (suburb, street or location) and in what kind of accommodation?

Place? _____

Accommodation?

1. Bed and Breakfast
2. Motor camp
3. Campervan (not motorcamp)
4. Motel
5. Backpackers hostel
6. Private home
7. Hotel
8. Other (please specify): _____

1G: How did you travel to Christchurch?

Transport?

1. Private car
2. Private van/Campervan
3. Hire car
4. Hire campervan
5. Tour coach
6. Bus
7. Motorbike
8. Bicycle
9. Plane
10. Train
11. Other (please specify): _____

1H: From the following list, which have you used to travel within Christchurch?

1.	Private car	
2.	Private van/Campervan	
3.	Hire car	
4.	Hire campervan	
5.	Tour coach	
6a.	Orbiter	
6b.	City Shuttle	
6c.	Other public buses	
7.	Motorbike	
8.	Bicycle	
9.	City Tram	
10.	Taxi	
11.	Other (please specify): _____	

GO TO PART C

SECTION II: ENTRY GATEWAY TO HOLIDAY

2A: How did you get to Christchurch? _____

2B: How long do you think you will stay in Christchurch? (Just record hours for day visitors only)

Hours? _____ Days? _____

2C: Using Christchurch as a base, where have you been and where do you plan to visit within Canterbury (including full day trips)? Could you also provide details of transport, accommodation, activities and expenditure for these visits and for your time in Christchurch?

For the expenditure part of the following table we want to know how much the average person spends, and what they spend it on. If you are in a group (e.g. family or friends) where spending by one person is not representative of each person (e.g. if one person pays for most of the food or petrol or accommodation), please tell us all the spending by the group and note above the table how many people the spending covers. If you are on your own, or you pay your own share of joint spending, please tell us only your own spending and note above the table that the spending only covers one person. If it is more convenient or more accurate to give the expenditure for the entire stay (e.g. accommodation) give us that answer.

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

[Note for Interviewer: Please mark places visited in sequence on the table and indicate the point at which data changes from actual places visited to date to places intended to visit. All costs in NZ\$]

Spending is for how many people?

Place	Day Trip?	No. of Nights	Transport		Accommodation		Entertainment/ Activities/ Attractions		Food & beverages at takeaway, café, hotel, etc.		Retail (including groceries and souvenirs)		Miscell./ any other spending	
			Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Name	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost

Accommodation Types	
1. Bed and Breakfast	2. Motor camp
3. Campervan (not motorcamp)	4. Motel
5. Backpackers hostel	6. Private home
7. Hotel	8. Other (please specify)

Transport Types	
1. Private car	2. Private van/Campervan
3. Hire car	4. Hire campervan
5. Tour coach	6. Bus
7. Motorbike	8. Bicycle
9. Plane	10. Train
11. Other (please specify)	

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

2D: Why start your holiday at Christchurch rather than anywhere else?

2E: What are your main reasons for spending time in Christchurch?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

2F: What are the main places, outside Canterbury, you plan to visit on your holiday in NZ?
(Code into main regions in sequence)

Region	Route/Transport mode	Duration

2G: Do you think you will return to Christchurch on this holiday?

Yes

Continue

No

Skip to 2J

2H: Why will you return?

2I: For how long? _____

2J: Are there any things in Christchurch and the Canterbury region that you would like to do but have not had the time?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

GO TO PART C

SECTION 3: CHRISTCHURCH AS INTERMEDIATE SITE

3A: Were you in Christchurch for an overnight stop on this holiday before now?

Yes

Continue

No

Skip to 3C

3B: Please give brief details. (e.g., When, duration, where come from, where did you go next?)

3C: Using Christchurch as a base, where have you been and where do you plan to visit within Canterbury (including full day trips)? Could you also provide details of transport, accommodation, activities and expenditure for these visits and for your time in Christchurch?

For the expenditure part of the following table we want to know how much the average person spends, and what they spend it on. If you are in a group (e.g. family or friends) where spending by one person is not representative of each person (e.g. if one person pays for most of the food or petrol or accommodation), please tell us all the spending by the group and note above the table how many people the spending covers. If you are on your own, or you pay your own share of joint spending, please tell us only your own spending and note above the table that the spending only covers one person. If it is more convenient or more accurate to give the expenditure for the entire stay (e.g. accommodation) give us that answer.

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

[Note for Interviewer: Please mark places visited in sequence on the table and indicate the point at which data changes from actual places visited to date to places intended to visit. All costs in NZ\$]

Spending is for how many people?

Place	Day Trip?	No. of Nights	Transport		Accommodation		Entertainment/ Activities/ Attractions		Food & beverages at takeaway, café, hotel, etc.		Retail (including groceries and souvenirs)		Miscell./ any other spending	
			Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Name	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost

Accommodation Types	
1. Bed and Breakfast	2. Motor camp
3. Campervan (not motorcamp)	4. Motel
5. Backpackers hostel	6. Private home
7. Hotel	8. Other (please specify)

Transport Types	
1. Private car	2. Private van/Campervan
3. Hire car	4. Hire campervan
5. Tour coach	6. Bus
7. Motorbike	8. Bicycle
9. Plane	10. Train
11. Other (please specify)	

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

3D: How long will be your stay in Christchurch this time? (Just record hours for day visitors only)

Hours? _____ Days? _____

3E: Could you please tell us about the main places on your holiday itinerary **before Christchurch**?

Region	Route/Transport mode	Duration

3F: Could you please tell us about the main places on your holiday itinerary **after Christchurch**?

Region	Route/Transport mode	Duration

3G: What were the main reasons for including Christchurch as a stop on your itinerary?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

3H: Are there any things in the Canterbury region you would like to do but have not had the time?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

GO TO PART C

SECTION 4: CHRISTCHURCH AS EXIT GATEWAY

4A: Were you in Christchurch before on this holiday?

Yes

Continue

No Skip to 4C

4B: Please give details. (e.g., When, duration, where come from, where did you go next?)

4C: How long will be your stay in Christchurch this time? (Just record hours for day visitors only)

Hours? _____ Days? _____

4D: Using Christchurch as a base, where have you been and where do you plan to visit within Canterbury (including full day trips)? Could you also provide details of transport, accommodation, activities and expenditure for these visits and for your time in Christchurch?

For the expenditure part of the following table we want to know how much the average person spends, and what they spend it on. If you are in a group (e.g. family or friends) where spending by one person is not representative of each person (e.g. if one person pays for most of the food or petrol or accommodation), please tell us all the spending by the group and note above the table how many people the spending covers. If you are on your own, or you pay your own share of joint spending, please tell us only your own spending and note above the table that the spending only covers one person. If it is more convenient or more accurate to give the expenditure for the entire stay (e.g. accommodation) give us that answer.

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

[Note for Interviewer: Please mark places visited in sequence on the table and indicate the point at which data changes from actual places visited to date to places intended to visit. All costs in NZ\$]

Spending is for how many people?

Place	Day Trip?	No. of Nights	Transport		Accommodation		Entertainment/ Activities/ Attractions		Food & beverages at takeaway, café, hotel, etc.		Retail (including groceries and souvenirs)		Miscell./ any other spending	
			Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Name	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost	Type	Cost

Accommodation Types	
1. Bed and Breakfast	2. Motor camp
3. Campervan (not motorcamp)	4. Motel
5. Backpackers hostel	6. Private home
7. Hotel	8. Other (please specify)

Transport Types	
1. Private car	2. Private van/Campervan
3. Hire car	4. Hire campervan
5. Tour coach	6. Bus
7. Motorbike	8. Bicycle
9. Plane	10. Train
11. Other (please specify)	

4E: Why are you choosing Christchurch as the last place on your stay?

4F: Could you please tell us about the main places on your holiday itinerary outside of Canterbury?

Region	Route/Transport mode	Duration

GO TO PART C

PART C: INFORMATION AND DECISION-MAKING

C1: When did you make your decision to come to **Christchurch**? (Circle one)

- a. Mainly while at home
- b. Mainly while travelling
- c. 'Half and half'

C2: When did you plan the details of your itinerary in **Christchurch**? (Circle one)

- a. Mainly while at home
- b. Mainly while travelling
- c. 'Half and half'

If this participant is an overseas visitor

Continue

If this participant is NOT an overseas visitor

Skip to C5

C3: When did you plan your itinerary for travel to **New Zealand**?

- a. Mainly while at home
- b. Mainly while traveling
- c. 'Half and half'

C4: Please indicate how influential each of the following information sources and trip characteristics were on your decision to travel to **New Zealand**. Use the following scale to indicate the level of influence by circling the appropriate number.

Information Sources	Very Influential		Somewhat Influential		Not Influential at all	Does not apply
Advice from travel agent	1	2	3	4	5	9
Brochures	1	2	3	4	5	9
TV travel show	1	2	3	4	5	9
TV ads	1	2	3	4	5	9
Magazine ads	1	2	3	4	5	9
Travel books	1	2	3	4	5	9
Magazine/newspaper article	1	2	3	4	5	9
Friends or family advice	1	2	3	4	5	9
Internet/WWW	1	2	3	4	5	9

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

Trip Characteristics	Very Influential		Somewhat Influential		Not Influential at all	Does not apply
Good stop-over destination	1	2	3	4	5	9
Visited New Zealand before	1	2	3	4	5	9
Not visited New Zealand before	1	2	3	4	5	9
Cost benefits	1	2	3	4	5	9
Part of the package deal	1	2	3	4	5	9
Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	9

C5: How influential were the following on your decision to come to **Christchurch**? Use the following scale to indicate the level of influence by circling the appropriate number.

Information Sources	Very Influential		Somewhat Influential		Not Influential at all	Does not apply
Advice from travel agent	1	2	3	4	5	9
Brochures	1	2	3	4	5	9
TV travel show	1	2	3	4	5	9
TV ads	1	2	3	4	5	9
Magazine ads	1	2	3	4	5	9
Travel books	1	2	3	4	5	9
Magazine/newspaper article	1	2	3	4	5	9
Friends or family advice	1	2	3	4	5	9
Internet/WWW	1	2	3	4	5	9

Trip Characteristics	Very Influential		Somewhat Influential		Not Influential at all	Does not apply
Good stop-over destination	1	2	3	4	5	9
Visited Christchurch before	1	2	3	4	5	9
Not visited Christchurch before	1	2	3	4	5	9
Cost benefits	1	2	3	4	5	9
Part of the package deal	1	2	3	4	5	9
Other (please specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5	9

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

- C6: How would you have rated your knowledge of the places to visit and the activities available within the Christchurch region before you arrived in Christchurch on this trip?
(Read out scale)

	No knowledge at all		Adequate knowledge		Excellent knowledge
Knowledge of places to visit and activities available	1	2	3	4	5

- C7: Would you have liked more information about the Christchurch region before you began your present trip?

Yes **No**

- C8: Based on your impressions of the Christchurch region so far, choose **one** of the following statements that you would be **most likely** to use in giving advice to someone thinking of visiting the Christchurch region during a **one month** trip in *New Zealand*.

(Note: The 'Christchurch Region' refers to the area that could be visited during a day trip from central Christchurch)

- a. You will need at least two weeks in the Christchurch region
 - b. You will need about one week in the Christchurch region
 - c. You will need about 3 to 4 days in the Christchurch region
 - d. Spend only 1 or 2 days in the Christchurch region as a convenient starting point or stop-over before going elsewhere in New Zealand
 - e. Spend as little time as possible in the Christchurch region as your time would be best spent elsewhere in New Zealand
- C9: Based on your impressions of the Christchurch region so far, choose **one** of the following statements that you would be **most likely** to use in giving advice to someone thinking of visiting the Christchurch region during a **one month** trip in *the South Island of New Zealand, only*.
- a. You will need at least two weeks in the Christchurch region
 - b. You will need about one week in the Christchurch region
 - c. You will need about 3 to 4 days in the Christchurch region
 - d. You will need only 1 or 2 days in the Christchurch region as a convenient starting point or stop-over before going elsewhere in the South Island
 - e. Spend as little time as possible in the Christchurch region as your time would be best spent elsewhere in the South Island

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

C10: If possible, list **three** aspects of your visit to Christchurch that most disappointed you and rank them from 1 to 3 where '1' is the most disappointing.

	Ranking

PART D: PROFILE

D1: What is your gender? M F

D2: What is your home town?

D3: What is your home country? _____

If domestic (New Zealand) visitor go to D6

If international visitor go to D4

D4: Have you been to New Zealand before? Yes No

D5: What is the total length of your stay in New Zealand? _____ day

D6: What is your age group?

- 15-19 20-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65-69
70+

D7: What size is the group you are with?

Adults _____ Children _____

D8: How would you describe your group?

- a. Visiting alone
- b. Partner/spouse
- c. Friends
- d. Family
- e. Friends and partner/spouse
- f. Friends and family
- g. Business associates
- h. Special interest group
- i. Other (please specify): _____

Christchurch Visitor Itinerary Planning and Perception Survey (VIPPS)

D9: What is your approximate income level (NZ Dollars if known. If not, write income level in 'home' currency in box provided.)?

- a. Under \$20,000
- b. \$20-\$40,000
- c. \$40-60,000
- d. \$60-\$80,000
- e. \$80-\$100,000
- f. \$100-\$150,000
- g. Over \$150,000

Home currency income level

Appendix 2 Quota Sampling Regime

First Sample – Christchurch Visitor Surveys

These figures are rounded from percentages of visitors to the Christchurch region from the IVS and DTM/DTS.

Origin	Out of 100	Out of 200	Out of 300	Out of 400
Australia	11(28.6)*	22	33	44
Japan	6(15.5)*	12	18	24
USA	5(11.8)*	10	15	20
UK	5(11.9)*	10	15	20
Germany	1(1.1)*	2	3	4
Other Asia	4(9.3)*	8	12	16
Other Europe	2(4.3)*	4	6	8
Other	6(15.5)*	12	18	24
International	40	80	120	160
Domestic	60	120	180	240
Total	100	200	300	400

*Figures in brackets are the percentage of international visitors.

Second Sample – Christchurch Visitor Surveys

Origin	Out of 100	Out of 200	Out of 300	Out of 400
Australia	9(21.9)*	18	27	36
Japan	6(14.1)*	12	18	24
USA	6(14.8)*	12	18	24
UK	5(11.9)*	10	15	20
Germany	2(5.7)*	4	6	8
Other Asia	3(7.3)*	6	9	12
Other Europe	2(5.4)*	4	6	8
Other	7(17.5)*	14	21	28
International	40	80	120	160
Domestic	60	120	180	240
Total	100	200	300	400

* Figures in brackets are the percentage of international visitors.

List of Titles Published

Kaikoura Case Study (1998)

- McAloon J., Simmons D. G., and Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Kaikoura – Historical Overview*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.1.
- Fairweather J. R., Horn C. M., and Simmons, D.G. (1998). *Estimating the Number of Visitors to Kaikoura Over One Year By Developing A Vehicle Observation Method*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.2.
- Simmons D. G., Horn C. M., and Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Summertime Visitors to Kaikoura: Characteristics, Attractions and Activities*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.3.
- Moore K., Simmons D. G., and Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Visitor Decision Making, On-Site Spatial Behaviours, Cognitive Maps and Destination Perceptions: A Case Study of Kaikoura*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.4.
- Fairweather J. R., Swaffield S., and Simmons, D.G. (1998). *Understanding Visitors' Experience in Kaikoura Using Photographs of Landscapes and Q Method*, Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.5.
- Horn C. M., Simmons D. G., and Fairweather, J. R. (1998). *Evolution and Change in Kaikoura: Responses to Tourism Development*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.6.
- Henley M., Poharama A., Smith A., Simmons D. G., Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *The Impact of Tourism on the Maori Community in Kaikoura*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.7.
- Butcher G., Fairweather J. R., and Simmons D.G. (1998). *The Economic Impact of Tourism on Kaikoura*. , Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.8.
- Ward J., Booth K., Barton K., Simmons D. G., and Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Tourist and New Zealand Fur Seal Interactions Along the Kaikoura Coast*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.9.
- Simmons D. G., and Fairweather, J.R. (1998). *Towards a Tourism Plan for Kaikoura*, Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No.10.

Rotorua Case Study (2000)

- Moore K. Fairweather, J. R. and Simmons, D.G. (2000). *Visitors to Rotorua: Characteristics, Activities and Decision-Making*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 12.

- Fairweather, J. R., Swaffield, S., and Simmons, D.G. (2000). *Understanding Visitors' and Locals' Experiences of Rotorua Using Photographs of Landscapes and Q Method*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 13.
- Horn, C. M., Simmons, D.G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2000). *Evolving Community Response to Tourism and Change in Rotorua*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 14.
- Tahana, N., Te O Kahurangi Grant, K., Simmons, D. G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2000). *Tourism and Maori Development in Rotorua*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 15.
- Ward, J., Burns, B., Johnson, V., Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J.R (2000). *Interactions Between Tourists and the Natural Environment: Impacts of Tourist Trampling on Geothermal Vegetation and Tourist Experiences at Geothermal Sites in Rotorua..* Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 16.
- Butcher, G., Fairweather, J. R., and Simmons, D.G. (2000). *The Economic Impact of Tourism in Rotorua*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 17.
- Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J.R. (2000). *Tourism in Rotorua: Destination Evolution and Recommendations for Management*. Tourism Research and Education Centre (TREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 18.

West Coast Case Study (2001)

- Moran, D., Sleeman, R. and Simmons, D.G. (2001). *West Coast Visitor Report*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 20.
- Moore, K., Simmons, D.G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2001). *Visitors to the West Coast: Characteristics, Attractions and Decision-Making*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 22
- Fairweather, J. R., Newton, B., Swaffield, S.R. and Simmons, D. G. (2001). *Visitors' and Locals' Experiences of Westland, New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 23
- Moran, D., Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J. R. (2001). *Evolving Community Perceptions of Tourism in Westland*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 24.
- Zygadlo, F.K., Matunga, H.P., Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J. R. (2001). *Tourism and Maori Development in Westland*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 25.

- Butcher, G., McDonald, G., Fairweather, J. R., and Simmons, D. G. (2001). *The Economic Impact of Tourism on Westland District*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 26.
- Cullen, R., Dakers, A., Fairweather, J.F. and Simmons, D.G. (2001). *Tourism, Water and Waste in Westland: Implications of Increasing Demand on Infrastructure*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 27.
- Cameron, A.M., Memon, A., Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J. R. (2001). *Evolving Role of Local Government in Promoting Sustainable Tourism Development on the West Coast*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 28.
- Simmons, D. G., and Fairweather, J. R. (2001). *Tourism in Westland: Challenges for Planning and Recommendations for Management*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 29.

List of Christchurch Reports (2003)

- Sleeman, R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *Christchurch and Canterbury Visitor Profile and Forecasts*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 30
- Moore, K., Simmons, D.G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2003). *Visitors to Christchurch: Characteristics and Decision-Making*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 32
- Fairweather, J.R., Maslin, C., Swaffield, S.R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *Visitors' and Locals' Views of Environmental Management in Christchurch, New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 33.
- Shone, M.C., Simmons, D.G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2003). *'Community Perceptions of Tourism in Christchurch and Akaroa'*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 34.
- Zygadlo, F.K., McIntosh, A., Matunga, H.P., Fairweather, J.R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *The Values Associated with Maori-Centred Tourism in Canterbury*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 35.
- Zygadlo, F.K., McIntosh, A., Matunga, H.P., Fairweather, J.R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *Maori Tourism: Concepts, Characteristics and Definition*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 36.
- Butcher, G., Fairweather, J.R. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *The Economic Impact of Tourism on Christchurch City and Akaroa Township*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 37.

Cullen, R., Dakers, A., McNicol, J., Meyer-Hubbert, G., Simmons, D.G. and Fairweather, J.R. (2003). *Tourism: Waste and Water in Akaroa (Kaikoura, Hanmer)*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 38.

Simmons, D.G., Fairweather, J.R. and Shone, M.C. (2003). *Tourism in Christchurch and Akaroa: Challenges for planning and recommendations for management*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 39.

List of Environment Reports

Sleeman, R., and Simmons, D.G. (1999). *Christchurch and Canterbury Visitor Profile*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 19.

Johnson, V., Ward, J., and Hughey, K. (2001). *Issues and Indicators of Acceptable Change: A study of visitors' and stakeholders' concerns about three natural attractions in the Paparoa area, West Coast, South Island, New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 40.

Crawford, K. Phillips, J., Ward, J., and Hughey, K. (2001). *Biophysical Impacts of tourism: An annotated Bibliography*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 41.

Ulrich, S., Ward, J., and Hughey, K. (2001). *Environmental Indicators of Tourism Impacts on Natural West Coast Assets, Aotearoa New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 42.

Hawke, N., and Booth, K. (2001). *Conflict between sea-kayakers and motorized watercraft users along the Abel Tasman National Park coastline, New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 50.

A Commissioned Report. Not for resale. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 51.

Sleeman, R., Hindson, A. and Simmons, D.G. (2003). *Hokitika Wildfoods Festival: Business and Marketing Plan*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 52.

McNicol, J., Shone, M. and Horn, C. (2001). *Green Globe 21 Kaikoura Community Benchmarking Pilot Study*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 53.

Becken, S. (2002). *Tourism and Transport in New Zealand: Implications for Energy Use*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 54.

Hughey, K.F.D. and Ward, J. (2002). *Sustainable Management of Natural Assets Used for Tourism in New Zealand*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 55.

Jones, T., Shone, M. and Memon A. (2003). *Emerging Tourism Planning Processes and Practices in New Zealand: A local and regional perspective*. Tourism Recreation Research and Education Centre (TRREC), Lincoln University, Report No. 56.

List of Tourism Educational Resources

Tourism in Kaikoura: Educational Resource Book

Poster: Tourism Planning in Kaikoura

Poster: Tourism in New Zealand: International Visitors on the Move

To Order Publications Please Contact:

Michelle Collings
Research Administrator
Tourism, Recreation Research and Education Centre
PO Box 84
Lincoln University
Canterbury
New Zealand

Phone: 64(3) 325-3838 x 8744
Fax: 64(3) 325-3857
Email: collingm@lincoln.ac.nz