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ABSTRACT

The effect of social status on visitors’ behaviour at one type of tourist event, a world’s fair, is examined. A model is developed which shows that:

1. Socialisation experiences can influence individuals positions in the social status hierarchy;
2. People who have had similar socialisation experiences may exhibit similar behaviours;
3. A basis of social status is the prestige awarded to an individual by society;
4. Tourism is associated with prestige;
5. Tourism experiences can affect an individual’s position in the social status hierarchy;
6. World’s fairs can be a destination or event where the experiences or ‘ritual transformations’ can occur.

These ideas that visitor’s behaviour at a tourist destination may differ depending on his/her level of social status. To test this thesis, hypotheses based on five constructs are developed and tested using data collected at Expo ’86 in Vancouver, Canada. The five constructs that are expected to vary with level of

7. Attending cultural events; social status are:
1. Mode of travel to Expo ’86;
2. Trip planning;
3. Expectations of Expo’86; and
4. Souvenir collecting.
Although the results are in general inconclusive, the viability of the hypotheses cannot be dismissed because of some limitation in the data; they were collected for reasons other than this research and the research instrument used was not meant to measure the constructs specified here. As well there is strong evidence in the research literature to support the main argument.

A model of social status and behaviour, adapted in this thesis to tourism behaviour, can be used in future investigations. Areas for further investigations are suggested including areas of the model that should be expanded and clarified and new methods to test the constructs.
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INTRODUCTION

This research examines the effect of one consumer characteristic, social status, on visitors' behaviours at world's fairs. World's fairs are a type of tourist destination; many visitors are on holiday and are from out-of-town. Tourism is one of the world's largest industries and many economies depend on it for their survival. Thus, it is an important consumer product to study. A greater understanding of many aspects of tourism is needed to help national, regional, local and private groups develop and implement profitable tourism programmes. Tourism planners need to know what types of activities, events and resources to develop, what image a destination should have and on which consumer characteristic(s) tourism marketers should focus their promotional strategies.

This research does not attempt to answer all these questions. Visitors' behaviours of interest to this study have been chosen on the basis of the availability of data to test them empirically. As such, the main emphasis is theoretical, not empirical. Visitor behaviours, (in relation to their position in the social status hierarchy), of interest are: residence-to-destination travel methods, depth of planning for the trip, expectations or desired features of the event, souvenir purchase, and cultural events patronage at and around the event. Hypotheses are established to test the relationship between these behaviours and social status.

First, an understanding of tourists' motivations is developed. A review of tourism in the context of economic, social and political changes in Western history illustrates the common characteristics of tourists throughout time. The review shows that:

1. tourism has always been prestigious;
2. tourists have always found ways of communicating their prestige; 
3. level of education is an influence on peoples' likelihood of travelling and probably affects their motives as well; and 
4. leisure is a dominant motive among modern tourists.

The second section, a review of world's fairs, does not consider visitors as tourists, but shows that the main features of worlds' fairs mirror tourists' needs, in particular the need to learn and the need to be entertained.

The third section begins to explain how behaviours can be shaped by socialisation experiences. This idea is developed, first, by reviewing the meaning of social status, in contrast to social class. For this research, the relevant point is that an individual's position in the social status hierarchy is based on the evaluation, by society, of his/her functional role in society. A review of social stratification theories illustrates that behavioural tendencies are influenced by socialisation experiences. Socialisation can affect individuals' orientations to travel and attitudes to entertainment and education.

Data collected during Expo '86, in Vancouver, Canada, are used to test hypotheses, The results of these statistical tests are limited by the data which were collected for other research not connected with this thesis. The effects of this limitation are discussed throughout the thesis and are summarised at the end of the results section. Suggestions for carrying out future research to retest these hypotheses are made. Implications for tourists operators and world's fairs organisers are discussed based upon the hypotheses that are supported or not found to be unsupportable.
CHAPTER 1. TOURISM

In this chapter travel motivations are reviewed from an historical perspective. Based on an historical understanding of tourism, tourists' reasons for visiting Expo '86 can be discussed. The review focuses on the behavioural dimensions of tourism within the context of tourists' social, political and economic environments. Economic and social effects on the host community while of great interest, will not be considered here. The concern in this chapter is with similarities in motivations and behaviours among tourists throughout history. The focus is on private tourism, that is, peoples' personal motivations and rationales for travelling.

Ancient travel, reviewed in the first section of the chapter, provides for an understanding of many modern tourists' motivations. The prestige element of travel is brought to light in the second section, where the motives and behaviours of religious pilgrims are discussed. The characteristics and motives of the Grand Tourists of the 15th century are discussed in the third section. Their successors, middle class travellers of the 19th century, are considered in the section that follows. The final section deals with the 20th century.

1.1. ANCIENT TRAVEL

The first accounts of tourism are of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Some of these people are among the first ones to travel not only for survival (i.e., in search of food, water or shelter) but for pleasure as well (Feifer 1985). Turner and Ash (1975) also relate that there was a great deal of travel within the Greek empire to festivals and games, or to consult the oracles at religious centres, or for professional or business reasons (e.g., artists seeking new patrons).
Romans also travelled widely throughout their empire, not only for trade, commerce and spiritual purposes, but also to see the arts and other attractions (e.g., the Pyramids). Even though they were more pleasure oriented than the Greeks, pleasure travel still took place largely in the context of economic, religious, military or administrative tasks. It was the privileged members of society who travelled in order to perform these tasks and who could enjoy some of the more pleasurable aspects of travel (Feifer 1985). The perception that travel is an activity associated with 'privileged' people still remains today.

Roman tales of leisure at home and abroad are also well known. Turner and Ash (1975) quote an ancient writer, Seneca: "Men travelled widely to different sorts of places seeking different distractions because they are fickle, tired of soft living and always seek something which eludes them" (p. 28). Seneca's explanation matches typologies of 18th century tourists discussed below. The Romans were similar to modern tourists in another way. They were known to bring home souvenirs of their travels, albeit somewhat different ones, such as the "mutilated limbs of saints" (Casson 1978). MacCannell (1976) discusses souvenir collecting as a marker of experiences among modern tourists. Examples are also presented in this chapter in relation to tourists from other time periods.

1.2. RELIGIOUS PILGRIMS

The only enduring form of personal travel between the fall of the Roman Empire and the Renaissance was the pilgrimage (Burkart and Medlik 1981). During this period pleasure travel was very uncommon. Travel was expensive, time consuming, physically demanding because of poor transportation methods and dangerous because
of bandits and thieves. As a result, people rarely travelled solely for pleasure or leisure. However, travel for spiritual or religious reasons persisted. Although pilgrims' aims were not specifically associated with those of other travellers, there are similarities. First, they travelled a long way from home. Second, although their apparent motive was to see sacred places, reveling and feasting were common. Rowling (1971) refers to their behaviour as "licentious living". Third, they had experiences which they could share with a select group of fellow pilgrims. Their experiences enabled them to attain a high level of prestige, or status, when they returned home and also served to differentiate them from other strata of society (Pearce P.L. 1982).

Pilgrims were spiritually motivated in the main and, like other travellers, their experiences became the high point of their lives. For Muslims, the pilgrimage, or Haj, to Mecca still represents the opportunity to fulfil the requirements for acceptance into the elite of their society. These pilgrims go through a transformation ritual leading to a fellowship with others. This fellowship provides them with safe "entry into the new kingdom"; that is, the elite society or Hadji (Moore 1980, p.207). Like tourists before and since, religious pilgrims were also ardent collectors of souvenirs that would serve as markers of their travel experiences (Pearce 1982, p.55).

The behaviours of pilgrims illustrate that the association between travel and prestige is rooted in other forms of travel besides pleasure-oriented travel. This association continues with the Grand Tourists as described below.
1.3. THE GRAND TOURISTS

In the late 1500's, during the Renaissance, there was a resurgence in tourism among the English aristocracy. Travel was safer, but because it was still very expensive and time consuming only those with money and time were able to take advantage. In a sense, the Grand Tour was like a pilgrimage for the young English aristocrat. It served as a kind of finishing school where he could learn the skills necessary for life in his own country: style and manner of dress, social skills and a set of experiences he could share with other aristocrats. Thus, it served as a rite of passage or transformation ritual. In general, "the Grand Tourist was not interested in the picturesque whether manifested in scenery or the habits and customs of the peasantry." The nobleman travelled as a "member of an international elite whose aim it was to safeguard and perpetuate the interests of the ruling class" (Turner and Ash 1975, p. 33).

Others used the opportunity to meet prominent people and to collect art. Even their homes began to emulate the Italian originals, "their interiors suitably adorned with Italian statues, busts and paintings" (Turner and Ash 1975 p. 36). Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton (1981) comment that "interaction with objects helps either to pass along a ... set of social values or to structure a new set of orientations, in which case the objects help to accomplish a 'status passage'" (p. 52).

The fact that only the aristocracy had the opportunity to make the Grand Tour reinforces the idea, once again, that travel is associated with privilege. Furthermore, the Grand Tour was similar to the travels of the Roman aristocrats, the Crusaders
and other pilgrims because it helped serve as an initiation or transformation into a specific stratum of society.

1.4. DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN TOURISM

Leisure-oriented tourism only became a reality in the 19th century, and with this orientation came a tremendous increase in the number of people who travelled. These changes came about primarily in Britain in the latter half of the 19th century, when the modern railway system appeared. Rail travel provided an efficient method of transporting vast numbers of people. Thomas Cook offered packaged rail-tours that middle-income people could afford (Pearce 1982). He offered literally millions of people the opportunity to take pleasure tours throughout Britain and the continent (Feifer 1985). Also more accommodations became available that offered lodgings and diversions for these new tourists. Perhaps people were stimulated to travel because of crowded living conditions, inducing a desire among many people to escape, if only temporarily. Or, their curiosity about other places may have been stimulated by education; the increase in travel occurred at the same time as access to education increased. The desire of the emerging middle class to travel may also have been stimulated by the realisation that by travelling they could communicate their social positions in society by implicitly forming an association with the highly regarded aristocratic Grand Tourists (Turner and Ash, 1975). Another factor may have been the shift in attitudes towards nature: "the landscape could then be seen not as raw material for the ingenious labours of man to refashion, but rather as evidence of a natural state in which man could refresh himself" (Burkart and Medlik 1981, p. 21). In other words, people began to see nature as something which could be enjoyed. The last factor explaining the advent of leisure-oriented travel was the establishment
in Britain of the statute holiday. This helped legitimise the notion that holidays could be secular events enjoyed by all.

Tourism for these people may have served some of the same purposes it served for earlier tourists: it provided them with a set of shared experiences which bound them together as a group. As a behaviour associated with a select group of society, travel helped to increase their prestige within their own group and to differentiate them from less privileged people.

1.5. TOURISM IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Tourism continued to develop in the 20th century with improvements in transportation methods, access to education and annual paid holidays. Luxury ocean-liner cruises provided the wealthy with a mode and style of travel in which others could not easily participate; it was one way the leisure class could demonstrate their status positions in society. Thus, even in the 20th century the association between privilege and travel is maintained. Veblen referred to this as "conspicuous consumption" (Veblen, 1899). The middle-income families of America and England could afford automobiles which provided them with the opportunity to get away from crowded cities to relax. Automobiles offered tremendous flexibility for short and inexpensive leisure trips, and, as the railway system served middle-income people in the 19th century, automobiles gave people in the 20th century the chance to participate in a prestigious activity. In addition, annual paid holidays gave all paid workers the opportunity to get away.

After World War II, commercial airlines enabled people with time constraints to
travel to distant locations quickly. This situation helped condition an entire
generation to international travel and, with it, the knowledge of many other
cultures. Wider access to and increased levels of education may have stimulated
curiosity and a desire for knowledge that could be partially satisfied through travel.
Increased education may also have provided individuals with the confidence and
skills to place themselves in 'alien' environments. Although access to money was
still necessary for travel, it became less important as travel costs decreased. In this
era educational attainment became associated with privilege and travel.

1.6. CONCLUSION

This chapter illustrates that motivations to travel have not changed substantially since
ancient times. Travel still provides people with prestige that can be communicated
through shared experience and through the display or use of possessions, such as
souvenirs, or through the acquisition of a set of socially required skills. In addition,
the association between privilege and travel was sometimes set intentionally to
rigidify and maintain social distinction.

The need to relax, to have fun and to be entertained are also connected with the
travellers discussed in this chapter. Although leisure-oriented tourism has only gained
wide popularity recently, the desire for entertainment and fun was as popular
among Greeks travellers and Grand Tourists as it is among contemporary tourists.
However today, changes in society's attitudes to leisure permit everyone to
participate in leisure activities. Also, changes in technology and more flexible work
schedules give all members of society access to leisure-oriented tourist activities. As
a result tourism has become an integral component in our lives. A more recent
feature in the phenomenon of privilege and tourism is the role of education: level of educational attainment may differentiate people on the basis of their tourism behaviours; mainly educated people are known to travel more often. (Canada 1979; British Columbia 1979, 1985) The next chapter on social stratification also shows that level of education varies with level of social status.
CHAPTER 2. SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter concluded that the association between travel and social opportunity came about because those who traveled were usually privileged people. As a result, travel has come to be associated with prestige. This suggests that people with prestige learn that travel is an appropriate behaviour. It is also possible that people with lower levels of social status may travel as a means of attaining a higher or a more secure position in their own social group or as a means of differentiating themselves from other, lower social groups. Therefore the types of tourism behaviours in which an individual engages may depend on his/her position in the social stratification hierarchy. An understanding of social stratification, and social status in particular, can help provide a basis for predicting tourist behaviours and motives. A review of two theories of social stratification presented below provides an understanding of what social status is and how it differs from social class. These two theories are important because they form the foundation of the study of social stratification today.

Socialisation is also discussed and an understanding of that process sheds light on the association between social status and behaviour. Some examples from the consumer behaviour literature are provided that support the notion that there is a meaningful relationship between social status and behaviour.
2.2. CONFLICT THEORY-MARX

The 'conflict' view of social stratification was developed by Marx. He associated class with the exploitation of man’s labour and defined social classes in terms of people’s relationship to the means of production. He reasoned that some people own property and could control others through the use of that property (e.g., a farm or factory); some people do not own property and may thereby be exploited; some people possess assets but not a sufficient amount to hire labour (e.g., peasant farmers). The Marxist view also envisioned classes as being comprised of individuals who share common economic interests, and who are tied by class consciousness and common antagonisms to other classes (Ossowski 1966, p. 86).

Marx's theory fails to explain how today's society is stratified. The reasons why are important to consider in the choice of a stratification variable for this study. As well, a better understanding of the flaws in conflict theory helps to provide an understanding of how our society is now stratified and how social stratification relates to behaviour.

One major criticism of Marxist theory is that there is not a lot of class consciousness in Western society. This may be the result of:

1. welfare state reforms that provide guaranteed incomes and social services for all members of society;
2. labour unions which helped workers achieve more power to improve their working conditions and pay and ultimately, their standards of living;
3. a mass communication system that helps to legitimize our economic, political and social system; and
4. A large white-collar class who provide the dream of social mobility to the lower classes. (Kerbo 1983, p. 144)

This does not suggest that people are unaware of the existence of a class system or that groups are not based on economic characteristics. It does imply that peoples' behaviours are unlikely to be affected by class association because a shared consciousness with other class members is not strong. Therefore, Marx's conception of social stratification does not adequately explain why people share behavioural similarities based on socioeconomic criteria that may in turn, affect their positions in the social hierarchy.

2.3. FUNCTIONALIST THEORY

Weber (1946; 1970) expanded on Marx's theory. Weber indicated that while social stratification clearly included the class dimension it also focused on two other factors: status and party. Party refers to the relationships between individuals or groups in society and the manner in which decisions are made. It governs situations ranging from government bureaucracies, political parties, business organisations and families. This study does not consider the decision making aspects of behaviours, nor the power dimension in relationships. Status, on the other hand, is of substantial interest in this research.

For the purposes of this thesis, status is defined as the degree of social honour, respect or prestige awarded to an individual by others (Weber 1970). Weber believed that an individual's style of life was evaluated by others (some members of his social group and some not). Furthermore, he believed that status was a
multidimensional concept and that many behaviours had status implications.

Weber's concept of status became the basis of the functionalist view. The functionalists believe that a society must distribute its members so that the essential functions of that society are performed—even if the rewards associated with those functions are delayed. To fill the most essential of these positions, individuals must often devote, in some fairly elaborate manner, demanding years of training under difficult conditions such as low or no salary and long hours of study (Davis and Moore 1970). As Kerbo (1983) explains, to induce people to make the necessary sacrifices associated with such functions, the position must carry some rewards in the form of prestige and esteem commensurate with the lost opportunities (e.g., time, money) associated with attaining that position. All occupational and social positions may be differentiated on the basis of the prestige associated with that position. Generally, the longer the period of 'delayed gratification' involved in qualifying for a given position, the greater the amount of prestige that position will carry.

Talcott Parsons also believed that society was ordered on functional lines and that positions are filled according to society's needs (Kerbo 1983). He suggested that these needs are shaped by the common value system a society adopts. Those who best live up to those values will receive honour and prestige and other secondary rewards such as wealth. The critics point out that a society's common value system may be influenced by people in positions of power (Kerbo 1983). Nevertheless, regardless of how a society adopts these values, there is a shared set of values on which members are evaluated.
In summary, the functionalist view states that:

1. people fill roles according to the needs of society;
2. society rewards individuals in the form of honour and prestige depending on the importance of their role;
3. the importance of the role depends on the values and norms of society; and
4. skills must be acquired in order to develop the talents to fill the most respected roles (Ossowski 1966).

2.4. CONCLUSIONS ON THE CONFLICT-FUNCTIONAL THEORY COMPARISON

One difference between the conflict and functionalist theories hinges on their explanations for how behaviours are learned. Both theories would agree that people can inherit position from parents. However, the conflict theory suggests that society is made up of groups of people whose members are attached by their common relationships to the means of production and a shared consciousness. Each group develops antagonisms to other groups. The combination of these factors may influence the individual's behaviours. The functionalists believe that behaviours may be learned in the process of acquiring skills to fill positions in society. This functionalist explanation seems more applicable in our society and begins to explain the connection between behaviours and social status. The link between behaviour and social status is made more clear through an understanding of the process of personal development or socialisation as described below.
2.5. SOCIALISATION

Status can be achieved through inheritance or by learning to meet the goals of society or of the group (Kerbo 1983). Even if the goals are only connected with occupational position as Davis and Moore (1970) posit, there are many skills that have to be learned in order to perform the requirements of the occupation. These skills are acquired within a larger frame that can be labelled personal development. Socialisation is the process whereby an individual who "is born with behavioural potentialities of wide range, is led to develop behavior which is confined within a much narrower range; the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group" (Child 1954).

"Group" is defined as one's family, peers and educators, or in short, the people with whom we have regular contact in our formative years and who have the opportunity to influence us. These 'others' have an interest in changing or shaping our behaviour to be more in accord with their own values and norms, and they impose sanctions when we do not conform. Some of these relationships are foisted upon us (for instance, we cannot choose our parents), but others we do choose. Among the latter are our friends and others who, for one reason or another, have strong influences on us.

The research of Rokeach (1973) and Fishbein (1967) and others suggests that an individual's normative concepts, value systems and attitudes lead to a set of behaviours. If behaviour may be 'learned' in this way, then people who have had similar socialisation experiences will exhibit similar behaviours. Although the process can and likely does occur over an entire lifespan, perhaps socialisation experiences
at younger ages are most influential in governing subsequent behaviour (Moschis 1987). Moschis summarizes many views and concludes that many influences governing consumer behaviours are learned by early adolescence.

Status may be related to socialisation through occupational choice. Some values and beliefs acquired in socialisation may directly influence the range of occupational opportunities one considers. These values and beliefs may operate indirectly on occupational choice through the level and type of educational attainment (Powers 1982).

2.6. APPLICATIONS

Recently, researchers have tried to use social status theories to explain or predict behaviour. Specific hypotheses regarding status recognition were tested by Dawson and Cavell (1987). Results indicated that within status groups (defined by level of occupational prestige), there is a high degree of agreement on the inherent status of retail stores. This provides one explanation for why people with similar levels of social status patronise the same stores. In a study of possessions, some respondents cited status as a reason for ownership (Furby 1978). In that study and others (e.g., Belk 1982) experiences are included in the definition of possessions. Experiences are explored in greater detail by Kelly (1987), who focused on the status-enhancing characteristics of cultural experiences. He suggests that it is the "possession" of the experience that has status-symbolic significance. Kelly's theory includes categories of persons distinguished by their motives for acquiring the experience. He suggests that their motives are derived from their "socialization and appropriate educational experiences."
2.7. CONCLUSION

This chapter has argued that a relationship exists between level of social status and behaviours. Earlier, the notion that tourism or the opportunity to travel is associated with a high degree of prestige was established. This suggests that tourism behaviours may be related to tourists' desires for prestige or to experiences that communicate their level of social status. In addition, choice of behaviours or activities may be influenced by socialisation experiences which are reflected in one's position in the social status hierarchy. The next chapter illustrates that world's fairs are an event at which some concepts relating social status, prestige and tourism can be studied. World's fairs were chosen primarily because a study of visitors' behaviour at Expo '86 was made available as a resource for this thesis. Other reasons are that world's fairs are events with important political and cultural repercussions and as an expensive and potentially profitable economic activity warrant much more study than they have received. A review of the history of world's fairs with specific examples of some better-known expositions will help acquaint the reader with the nature of these events (and Expo '86 in particular) and their relevance from the point of view of tourism and social status.
CHAPTER 3. WORLD’S FAIRS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Previous chapters have suggested that individuals can 'signal' their positions in the social status hierarchy by participating in certain tourist activities at certain destinations. A world's fair, Expo '86, held in Vancouver, Canada, represented an ideal opportunity to study some relationships between social status and tourist behaviours. Data collected by Kelly (1986) on some behaviours of visitors to Expo '86 provided an opportunity to explore some of these relationships. The tourist orientation of world's fairs is easily established, based on the fact that they are events people travel great distances to attend. Expo '86, in particular, was well publicised and attracted people from across Canada, the United States and abroad. This chapter provides information which attempts to resolve questions regarding the diversity of visitors to world's fairs in terms of their levels of social status. In addition, an historical review of world's fairs shows their development as major tourist attractions, and their association with prestige. The discussion proceeds chronologically, highlighting some of the more important and better-known modern fairs. The chapter begins with a short section describing how world's fairs came into being, starting with ancient fairs. It continues with descriptions of fairs of the 18th and 19th centuries, especially the first international exhibition of 1851 in London. Finally, some better-known modern fairs are discussed, up to and including Expo '86.
3.2. **EARLY HISTORY**

The first known fairs took place more than two thousand years ago in Asia and Africa. They were festive occasions often held in conjunction with religious celebrations. The large crowds attracted traders, and markets surrounded the event which gave people an opportunity to purchase rare or hard-to-find goods. These fairs were a great change of pace from the often isolated and dreary lives most people experienced. As transportation improved, people came from more distant locations, which gave the fairs a more cosmopolitan atmosphere (Fleming Roesch 1962). This atmosphere was lost as nation states evolved and tended to isolate themselves from outside influences (Mandell 1984). In the Middle Ages a variety of fairs evolved: local trade fairs, international craft and trade fairs (e.g. Leipzig Fair, established in 1165, Frankfurt Fair established in 1240) and industrial exhibitions (Nuremberg, established in 1569) (Alles 1973). Although the latter fairs were mostly for local artisans, they attracted some international attention and helped to establish an association between fairs and travel.

A new type of fair only began to emerge in the mid-1700’s in Paris, France. Initially they were intended to display French fine art (e.g., painting, sculpture) in order to promote sales for the artists, to educate the public, to create competition for excellence and to instill national pride in the arts. By the late 1700’s similar fairs were held to display the best of French industry. The two types of fairs merged in the 19th century. This new fair was much larger and attracted many foreign visitors (Mandell 1984). The prestige of the show was created by being invited to participate as an exhibitor and through the prizes that were awarded to organisers and to the best and most talented exhibitors. However, these fairs were
limited exclusively to French exhibitors.

Other European countries had similar fairs, but they were organized privately and were only for the benefit of the exhibitors. At all these fairs, sales promotion was a major objective. Entertainment was featured in the form of musical bands and lotteries offering products of the exhibitors as prizes (Mandell 1984).

3.3. THE INTERNATIONAL FAIRS

3.3.1. London-The Crystal Palace

In 1851 the first international fair took place in London, England. It was known as the Crystal Palace because it was housed in a huge glass building. This fair was designed to be a showcase of modern industrial progress with international exhibitors competing for prizes based on their displays. Thirty foreign countries were represented at the fair (Gibbs-Smith 1950). The organizers hoped that the competitive atmosphere would bring out the best in British ability and would demonstrate the superiority of British industry (Fay 1951). The organizers wanted to give the British people the confidence to enter into free trade with the rest of Europe, which could only be achieved with the support of the people. Their confidence could be raised if they had a chance to see what their society could and had produced and if they believed, as Queen Victoria did, that it was something "which we English may indeed be proud of" (Fay 1951, p.44). The organisers hoped that the exhibition would give the British the chance to show off and as a result give their social and political system the credibility the government sought (Allwood 1977). Among the hits at the Crystal Palace were agricultural
implements like McCormick's Reaper, and a weapon, the Colt Revolver. In terms of attendance, the fair was a success: it attracted more than six million visits. The fact that more than half the visitors came from outside Britain and the colonies signifies that the fair was an important tourist destination. The organisers of the fair recognised that the fair would attract visitors from a wide variety of economic classes so they raised the price of an admission ticket on certain days of the week in order to isolate wealthier visitors from others less wealthy. Although the lower classes could not attend the fair on the same days as the upper classes, the fact that they were able to be in the same environment may have held some prestige for the lower-classed fair visitors.

Some characteristics of the Crystal Palace demonstrated features of historic fairs and modern world's fairs. Like all fairs, it gave people a chance to be in a social environment and to be entertained. Like commercial fairs, it allowed manufacturers, from around the world, to exhibit their products but on a larger scale than ever before; even to potential export markets. Like modern world's fairs it attracted visitors from around the world. The major differences between the international fair and the previous national fairs were political. Starting with the Crystal Palace, invited foreign governments could set up displays to promote goodwill and trade with their countries. Of course the host country also had the opportunity to fulfil a vast array of political objectives.
3.3.2. International Bureau of Exhibitions

Although the 1851 fair did not manage to encourage free trade, it was still a very prestigious coup for Britain. This had two effects. First, it set off a chain of other international fairs in Europe and America. Second, the fact that world's fairs offered visitors the chance to see and learn a great deal about the world and its future helped to establish them as a prestigious tourist destination for all tourists including those who were financially incapable of taking extended voyages 'a la Grand Tour'. However, the high number of fairs between 1875 and 1925 (almost 100) had the effect of diluting the prestige value of the fair. To ensure their continuing vitality, the International Bureau of Exhibitions (IBE) was established in 1928 to regulate various features of world's fairs, such as their location, frequency, timing and themes. This helped guarantee that the organisers of world's fairs would maintain high standards. Fair organizers were also encouraged to forego their national aspirations and to display "the progress made by the different countries in one or more branches of production" in order to promote understanding between nations and people through education (International Bureau of Exhibitions 1967). Production meant not only products of a commercial nature, but also art, technology and cultural ideologies. Furthermore, the IBE intended these world's fairs to be non-commercial environments: "a forum for the interchange of ideas and cultures in a dynamic environment" (Canada 1986).

3.3.3. The American Fairs of the Great Depression

Some American fairs, notably the Chicago (1933-34) and New York (1939-40) world’s fairs did not follow these ideals. Because they were held over a two year period, these fairs were not sanctioned by the IBE. Organisers strayed from the global
purpose of the fairs that the IBE tried to establish. Like the British in 1851, the American leaders had a vision of the future of America. They believed the future would be guided by science. The American people, however, had to be convinced that science would enable their society to achieve standards such as the major metropolitan city with all its superior modern amenities. Scientists had been making persistent efforts "to popularize science, to mold a 'true' American culture with scientific values and to affirm the hegemony of the corporate state" (Rydell 1985, p. 525). They had used previous American world's fairs for this purpose, as well as other arenas. At the fairs held in Chicago and New York, scientists were given the grand opportunity to "exemplify 'the idea of scientific and industrial unity' and to inject 'system and order'...into American culture as a whole" (Rydell 1985, p. 535).

At the Chicago and New York's world's fairs they attempted to express, explicitly, what the future held in store for America, how it was going to be achieved, and the role and place of Americans in that future. Although these fairs, like the others before them, had other attractions (art and amusement) and other objectives (to help the regional economy, urban redevelopment or "to strengthen the bonds of peace throughout the world") (Fay 1951, p. 95), the main thrust of both these fairs was to promote the role of technology in the future of America. Although the theme was serious, they were often presented in a glamorous, even dazzling manner. For instance, at the Chicago fair, light from a nearby star was used, indirectly, to energize photoelectric cells that in turn carried impulses along the telegraph lines to the exposition to open the fair. At the New York fair (1939), cosmic rays, fed through a switch opened by Albert Einstein, were used to illuminate the main buildings on opening night (Rydell 1985). The 'showbiz'
atmosphere of the opening ceremonies was effective partly because they were conducted in front of large audiences. The presence of distinguished invitees to these ceremonies probably also heightened the prestige value of the fair by providing the message with the voice of authority.

In summary, these two fairs provided visitors with a sense of hope about the future in a post-depression America. These two fairs, and others that were to follow, were like a 'secular-Mecca' where the "new kingdom" (i.e. technology) was a vision which only visitors to the fairs could share (Moore 1980).

### 3.3.4. Brussels-The Atomic Age 1958; New York 1964-65

At the Brussels world's fair the emphasis broadened from nationalistic to global, although the theme was also scientific and technological in nature. The exposition was intended to provide a vision of how the world would look in the 'Atomic Age' (The Big Show Opens 1958). Visitors could share this vision by seeing exhibits and participating in events about this theme. Because the idea of an atomic age was relatively new, having first hand experience with it may have been fairly prestigious. This points out the prestige value of the fair for visitors because it was available only to those who attended. It may also have helped to maintain the image of world's fairs as a ritual experience where visitors could achieve a new or renewed sense of confidence in the future.

In regard to Brussels, some people felt that because of the increasing influence of television, the role of world's fairs as an educational and entertainment vehicle would disappear. Before modern mass media, world's fairs were an effective way for
countries or companies to communicate with their audience (New Orleans Fair 1984). This belief was reinforced by the limited success of the New York world's fair (1964-65). Although it attracted over 50 million visitors in two seasons, the fair was plagued by financial difficulties and a lack of community support, family fun and an air of excitement. Overall, visitors did not have the "vital experience that fairs had stimulated before television, sputnik and before the 21-day jet-excursion to Europe" (Schmendl 1965, p. 16). This comment implies that fairs competed with important or prestigious experiences that a fairs' target audience could have as tourists.

3.3.5. Montreal-Expo '67

The organizers of the Montreal world's fair learned of the importance (and difficulty) of getting and holding the attention of the public in the space age from the failure of the 1964 New York world's fair (Fulford, 1968). The planners of Expo '67 in Montreal realized that "multitudes...would come drawn...by the desire to be entertained..." (Roy 1968, p. 30). They set out to create an exhibition that would be educational and entertaining. By all accounts, Expo '67 was a phenomenal success; almost 50 million visits were recorded during a six month period. Fulford remarks that visitors were not offered education but "were immersed in it" (Fulford 1968). At Expo '67, science was not just a spectacle, it was a personal experience; some visitors, for example, were given the opportunity to use a recently developed picturephone to speak with other visitors at Disneyland in California. Experiences provided by these types of exhibits enabled Expo '67 to compete effectively against television. There were entertaining features at the fair in addition to exhibits. For instance, there was the World Festival, a very large gathering of artists and
performers. There were also countless street performers roaming the Expo '67 site, keeping up the spirits of those who spent hours waiting in line to gain admission to the exhibits, and there was La Ronde, the amusement park and nightclub centre established in its own section of the site. These features helped to attract visitors with all types of interests, from high-culture cognescentis to beer drinking partyers. This provides some credence to the idea that world's fairs have something for everyone, which implies that visitors with a wide range of levels of social status are likely to attend. This is an important assumption used in the analysis of data collected at Expo '86.

3.3.6. Vancouver-Expo ‘86

The importance of entertainment in World’s fairs seems to be an important ingredient to their ultimate success. The organizers of Expo '86, Vancouver's world’s fair, understood that "the interest of the public seems to have shifted from a sense of wonder over our technological future to a taste for colour, comedy and entertainment" (Personal Element 1986). As a result, the organizers designed a fair with "festive technology" (Canada 1986), "whimsy" and "celebration" (Woodall: Compass of Expo 1986). This atmosphere was built into the fair by the vibrant and upbeat colours of the site, the beautiful location, happy and helpful staff and many entertaining street performers who kept the visitors amused. As at Expo '67, there was an active nightlife centre that appealed to young adult visitors. The ability of the organisers to "match the product to the market and put it in front of the people" resulted in the most successful North American fair since Expo '67 (Pollock 1986). They were also able to maintain the prestigious and respectable image of world's fairs by promoting a World's Festival featuring internationally acclaimed
performers such as La Scala Opera Company, The Kirov Ballet and many others. In addition, there was a less publicised professional symposium that dealt with topics relevant to the transportation and communication theme of Expo '86. All these features may have helped to attract visitors at all levels of social status.

Although this world's fair was situated on a relatively small site and was located relatively far from other major population centres, it managed to record more than 22 million visits in six months. As at other world's fairs discussed here, the tourist element was very strong, in that half of the visitors came from the United States and other countries (confidential source). The internationalism of the fair was exemplified by the sheer number of international exhibitors: of the 90 national, provincial, territorial, state and corporate exhibitors, 54 were international participants.

3.4. CONCLUSION

Each fair discussed above was unique in its own way. Initially, people were satisfied with static displays of tools, implements and objets d'art. However, as audiences became more sophisticated, organisers changed the orientations of the fairs. For instance: at the American fairs of the great depression, science had to perform; at Expo '67, technology was an event visitors could experience. Nevertheless, the fairs share many of the same characteristics: Entertainment, technology, an international flavour, art and culture are elements of all the fairs discussed here. They are also necessary components of successful fairs because they enable visitors to be a part of something special and unique, to learn and/or to be entertained by people and things. In our constantly changing society, some people "need a reaffirmation of the future" (McMartin 1986). For those people world's fairs have the potential to serve
that purpose. As a tourist destination, world's fairs may be very significant for some people, analogous to the experiences of pilgrims and Grand Tourists. This experience may be connected with the educational aspects of the fair. Visitors with average levels of social status, hence levels of education, may be attracted by these aspects of the fair partly because of its prestige implications. People with higher levels of social status may be more attracted to the fair by high-culture events. The difference in importance of education and entertainment to low status versus high status visitors may manifest itself in some visitors' behaviours, rationales and expectations of world's fairs. Some of these concepts can be tested using the data collected at Expo '86. The next chapter outlines five areas that are relevant to the study of social status and tourism and develops related hypotheses specific to the Expo '86 dataset.
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES

The previous discussion posited a relationship between social status and tourism. The variables in this relationship can be modelled as illustrated in Figure 4.1.

FIGURE 4.1- CONCEPTUAL MODEL-FLOW DIAGRAM
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PHYSICAL BEHAVIOURS*1,2,3,5 AND RATIONALISATIONS*4 FOR BEHAVIOUR AT WORLD'S FAIRS
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*Only boxes with * are described by the data. The number next to the * refer to the construct(s) which are based on that box.
Specifically, certain tourist behaviours can be expected to vary depending on the social status of the tourist. Although many types of behaviours can be studied, only five broad areas of behaviour are chosen for this study. These are:

1. Attending cultural events;
2. Mode of travel to Expo '86;
3. Trip planning;
4. Expectations of Expo'86; and
5. Souvenir collecting.

These five constructs are suggested from questions asked in a survey of visitors to Expo '86. The data from that research are used to test hypotheses designed to measure each of the five constructs as they relate to social status. However, the applicability of the data to these research topics is limited because the Expo '86 study was designed to serve the purposes of other researchers; the wording of the questions and the sample of visitors taken, may not have measured the constructs as defined in this thesis. (A copy of the questionnaire is in Appendix I).

In the rest of this chapter the constructs are explained in detail. First, the term 'social status' and the manner in which it will be measured is described. An understanding of social status is important because each construct is of interest because of its relationship with the social status of visitors to Expo '86. The sections following each begin with an explanation of the broad area of behaviour implied by each of the other constructs (the dependent variables) and a brief description of the types of measures that are used to test each one. The anticipated results from each measure are specified as hypotheses. The rationale for each hypothesis is also discussed in detail. Research and other arguments are presented in support of each hypothesis. As well, descriptions of the sample of
respondents to whom the hypothesised behaviour is most likely to apply are specified. An overview of these hypotheses and the predicted direction of their relationships to social status are shown in Figure 4.2.
CONSTRUCTS, THEIR MEASURES AND RELATIONSHIP WITH SOCIAL STATUS

$H_1$: ATTENDING CULTURAL EVENTS

A: Respondents plan to visit cultural events on the Expo '86 site:
   Yes: Higher social status; No: Lower social status.

B: Respondents plan to visit museums in B.C. among respondents who have not visited Vancouver previously:
   Yes: Higher social status; No: Lower social status.

C: Respondents plan to visit the Ramses II pavilion:
   No: Higher social status; Yes: Lower social status.

$H_2$: MODES OF TRAVEL

A: Among respondents whose point of origin is 500-1500 miles from Vancouver: Respondents travelling without children only:
   Air: Higher social status; Car: Lower social status.

B: Among respondents not accompanied by children:
   Air: Higher social status; Car: Lower social status.
H₃: TRIP PLANNING

A: Respondents made plans to visit pavilion(s), excluding respondents who had visited Expo '67:
   Yes: Higher social status; No: Lower social status.

B: Number of pavilions respondent plans to visit excluding respondents who had visited Expo '67:
   0-9: Increases with social status.

C: Respondent discussed Expo '86 with others at home before arriving:
   Yes: Higher social status; No: Lower social status.

H₄: EXPECTATIONS OF EXPO 86

A: Respondent's first mentioned reason for adding pavilions to original list, excluding visitors to Expo '67 and visitors travelling with children:
   Entertainment: Higher social status; Education: Lower social status.

B: Respondents reasons for recommending Expo '86 to friends:
   Entertainment: Higher social status; Education: Lower social status.

C: Respondent's most important reason for visiting Expo '86, excluding Expo '67 visitors and visitors travelling with children:
   Entertainment: Higher social status; Education: Lower social status.

H₅: COLLECTING SOUVENIRS

A: Respondent plans to collect/buy souvenirs:
   Yes: Lower social status; No: Higher social status.

B: Number of souvenirs respondent plans to collect/buy:
   0-9: Decreases with social status.

C: Type of souvenir respondent plans to collect/buy:
Trinkets: Lower social status; Art: Higher social status.
4.1. MEASURES OF SOCIAL STATUS

4.1.1. Introduction

To test the following hypotheses, a summary measure of an individual's position in the social status hierarchy is needed since social status serves as the independent variable in each of the hypotheses. The discussion on social stratification (Chapter 3) concluded that an individual's social status is determined by society's subjective evaluation of that individual based on his/her role in society. Therefore the measure used in this research should incorporate a prestige component. However, it is worthwhile to review both objective (such as income and education) and subjective measures of status (such as reputational prestige assessments). This makes it possible to evaluate measures that incorporate both types.

The measures that are reviewed here all rely at least partly on occupational position, for two reasons. First, traditional measures of social status have used occupation to determine individuals' positions in the social status hierarchy. Second, earlier discussions in this paper have pointed out that an individual's occupation reflects important dimensions of status. Powers, points out that evaluations of occupational status take into account dimensions such as prestige, level of education, income and importance of the job to society (Powers 1982).

4.1.2. Objective Measures

One of the first people to use occupation as a determinant of social position in a systematic way was Alba Edwards of the U.S. Census Bureau (Dominquez and Page 1981). In 1938 he developed a classification of occupations based on socioeconomic characteristics. Although his classification scheme has been used extensively, some reviewers
comment that it is only a "crude" measure. Dominquez and Page (1981) point out that it lacks an objective dependent variable that could validate the measure.

A more recent version was developed by Nam and Powers (Dominquez and Page 1981). It is based on measures that are objective, but only the mean income and level of education of each occupation represented in the 1960 U.S. census are used to derive scores. Although it has been used extensively elsewhere as a measure of status it lacks a prestige component, which is an important criterion for this research.

While both measures are objective, Edwards classifies occupations into discrete categories, while Nam and Powers' index is a continuum. Previous discussions have implied that social status is a summary measure of many dimensions. It is unlikely that, based on all these dimensions, people fit into discrete groups without substantial overlap. Assigning respondents with different levels of status into groups on an arbitrary basis (e.g., High, Low) may 'simplify' an analysis, but by collapsing data into discrete categories, information is lost. Building a scale in this manner may have the same effect. A non-discrete scale is desirable for this research, for the reasons just mentioned and because no mention was found in the literature of any validated discrete categories.

4.1.3. Subjective Measures

The other major measure of social status is based on subjective evaluations. In one type, known as reputational, people evaluate others whom they know. In prestige measures, respondents evaluate the prestige of a person employed in a given occupation. The reputational evaluation was used in the well-known studies by Warner (Warner, Meeker and Eells 1949) and Hollingshead (Hollingshead and Redlich 1958). Using this method they
developed categories based on persons' rankings of subjects whom they knew. The findings were generalized by regressing the rankings on objective measures such as income and education. Warner also used house type and dwelling area as regressors. These classifications have been subject to a great deal of criticism (Dominquez and Page 1981). First, in replications, different numbers of categories have been determined. Not only does this reduce the generalisability of the findings, it also shows that categorising is problematical. Second, Warner's subjective regressors may be difficult to measure. Third, the method relies on the ability of a group of people to judge a group of others whom they all know. This is possible in small towns but may not be feasible in a large urban centre. The sample size would be restricted, and administration of the sample of raters would also be difficult. Martineau (1958) used Warner's weights in a Chicago study but left out the prestige evaluation. His results were similar to Warner's. Nevertheless, the weights are based on old data and may not be applicable to 1987 consumers.

The first major study based on the evaluation of occupations was conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in the U.S. in 1947. Ninety occupations were rated by a national sample of Americans according to their own personal opinions of the general standing "of a person engaged in that occupation" (Powers 1982 p.4). The aggregated ratings were then converted to rankings. Powers outlines some of the positive and negative factors associated with the NORC study. On the positive side, it included a large number of occupations and a large sample of respondents. This permitted the ratings to be tested along some respondent characteristics such as age and level of education. Differences were found but, according to Powers, there is, in general, a fairly high degree of consistency between raters. In addition, in a major Canadian study in 1967, Pineo and Porter (1970 p. 174) found rankings similar to the NORC results. There are other strong
indications that judgements of occupational prestige represent a measure of a common value system across groups and even nations (Hodge, Trieman and Rossi 1966).

4.1.4. Combination Measures

A third type of measure combines both the subjective and objective measures of social status. Duncan (1961) believed that prestige scores were an appropriate measure of social status, but that they were restrictive because they relied on a very small sample of occupations. To counter this problem he regressed the incomes and levels of education of a sample of occupations on the prestige scores of an identical sample of occupations from the 1947 NORC study. He used the regression weights for income and education to predict the prestige scores of occupations based on their income and level of education distributions. Duncan has been faulted mostly for his use of the NORC data which is disproportionately weighted to professional occupations (Powers 1982). Nevertheless, his scores correlate .97 with Nam and Powers' objective scale (Dominquez and Page 1981). In Canada, Blishen (1967) developed a similar index based on the prestige scores of Canadian occupations developed by Pineo and Porter (1967).

4.1.5. Conclusion

In this study prestige will be used as a measure of an individual's position in the social status hierarchy. It will be based on occupation because it combines the criteria specified earlier. First it relies on the evaluations of individuals by members of society. Second, the evaluations are based on individuals' functional roles in society. The combination measures overcome the restrictiveness of prestige indices by using objective measures to predict prestige scores for a wide range of occupations. A variety of scales have been developed, some of which are reviewed in Powers (1982). However, among some of the more recent
scales, the choice of which is best may not be an important question. As Featherman and Stevens (1982 p. 108) point out, although "the parameter estimates are not indifferent to the choice of the index of social standing...[the] indexes are so similar in their rankings of occupations that correlations among them approach unity." Therefore the most recently updated versions of Duncan's SEI and Blishen's Socio-economic Index for Occupations in Canada will be used here. These are Featherman and Stevens MSEI2 (1982), which contains scores of U.S. occupations and Blishen's 1967 revised scale (1976). Featherman and Stevens recommend the MSEI2 over other scales they have developed because it is the closest approximation to Duncan's SEI. Both scales are based on the characteristics of the male labour force but are generally applied to the total population. In this study each respondent is assigned a score based on his/her occupation. The list of occupations and respective scores are in Blishen (1976) and Featherman and Stevens (1982).

In the following sections, the relationship between social status, the independent variable and each of the five constructs is described in detail. Hypotheses, based on these discussions, and on measures available to test the arguments are specified.

4.2. ATTENDING CULTURAL EVENTS

Research on the social status implications of tourists' attendance at cultural events can be of benefit to event or regional planners. Based on the anticipated social status of potential visitors to cultural events held in conjunction with the event or at regional cultural institutions, different promotional strategies can be developed. This information can also help in the selection of cultural exhibitions and/or performances.

The hypotheses that follow are based on research that shows patrons of cultural events,
such as opera or classical music, modern or classical dance and museums have higher social status than the population in general (Belk and Andreason 1980 and Kelly 1987).

Two hypotheses are used in the present study to test this proposition regarding visiting museums and level of social status: attending cultural events on the Expo '86 site, $H_{1A}$ and visiting the Ramses II pavilion at Expo '86, $H_{1C}$. A third hypothesis, $H_{1B}$ regarding the relationship between visiting museums in British Columbia and level of social status, can be used to test the validity of the sample because, unlike the term 'cultural events', there is little room for interpreting the term 'museum'.

4.2.1. Culture On The Expo '86 Site

$H_{1A}$: The social status of those attending or planning to attend cultural events at Expo '86 will be higher than those who do not attend or plan to attend cultural events.

Cultural activities at Expo '86 included a wide variety of activities, such as folk and ethnic singing and dancing in addition to events of 'high culture' such as ballet and symphony performances. These are likely to have attracted many people, of low and high status, because they were offered free of charge at many times during the day and at many locations on the site. Although visitors' enjoyment of these cultural performances probably did not vary with social status, the perception that 'cultural events' are elitist may prevent people with lower social status from making advance plans to attend any of the cultural events, whether they be free or part of the World Festival. Therefore only visitors with higher levels of social status are expected to attend or to plan to attend cultural events.

$^2$A series of performances by internationally known performers such as La Scala Opera.
4.2.2. Visiting Museums

H_{1B} : The social status of Expo '86 visitors who plan on visiting or who have visited museums in Vancouver or elsewhere in B.C. is higher than those who have no plans to visit or who have not visited a museum.

Plans to attend museums may be mediated by previous visits to B.C. Visitors who have been to Vancouver before may not want to divide their time between the fair and other activities, especially if they have been to museums on previous visits. In other words, the effect of social status on a visitors tendency to visit museums may be affected by his/her previous visits to British Columbia. To account for this possibility those respondents who have visited B.C. previously are eliminated from the analysis.

4.2.3. Visiting The Ramses II Pavilion

H_{1C} : Visitors who plan to visit the Ramses II pavilion have lower social status than those who do not plan to visit.

The Ramses II pavilion was set up as a museum exhibit, with a broad range of artifacts from the museum in Cairo. Research cited above indicates that museum visitors have higher levels of social status than the population in general. This pattern may be extended to the Ramses II pavilion. However, although people perceive of both world's fairs and museums as places to learn, they are also very different environments. For instance museums are much more structured than world's fairs. This is especially the case for Expo '86 which was promoted as a big party (Ames 1986). As a result, because typical museum goers do not associate museums with world's fairs, they may not plan to visit Ramses II pavilion. On the other hand, people with lower social status may be attracted to visit the
pavilion for two reasons. First, they may not feel out of place there because they could blend in with the rest of the Expo '86 crowd. Second it meets their desire for an educational experience. Therefore people with lower levels of social status are more likely to visit the Ramses II pavilion than people with higher levels of social status.

Another argument can be made supporting the opposite conclusion. That is, people with higher levels of social status will be attracted to a museum-type exhibit and will plan to visit it because of the intellectual image or experience it may offer them. But because they may not associate Expo '86 with museums, the former argument is hypothesized to hold.

4.3. MODES OF TRAVEL

Differences in modes of travel along the social status dimension have implications for marketing mix strategies for companies involved in transporting tourists. They may want to tailor their promotional or pricing policies if methods of travel are dependent on level of social status. This discussion proposes the following hypothesis:

\[ H_2 : \text{Social status increases with faster and more expensive modes of travel to Expo '86. Therefore, people with higher levels of social status are more likely to travel by air and visitors with lower levels are more likely to travel by car.} \]

This relationship may be mediated by the presence of children in the travel party, and the distance from the visitors point of origin to Expo '86.

The factors that vary with social status that are expected to affect choice of travel mode are income, time orientation, and family or social orientation. First, people with higher levels of social status typically earn more and are therefore less constrained in their choice
of travel method. Second, those with higher social status are more goal oriented in their careers and other activities. One result is a desire to decrease the time spent getting to a destination to begin an activity or holiday. Therefore, they will use the quickest mode of travel. The third characteristic is social orientation. People with lower social status value family interactions more. Being with family members or friends may be more important than the place or the activity. Choice of travel mode can hinder or facilitate social interactions. For instance, the social atmosphere in a car is more relaxed than in an airplane. A group travelling by car can sing, tell stories or play games more easily than the same group travelling in an airplane. This desire to travel by car may be greater among visitors accompanied by children, which may obscure the effects of social status. Therefore respondents travelling with children are excluded from this analysis.

These arguments support the hypothesis that higher status people are more likely to travel by air to Expo '86 than lower status people. However, distance may mediate this relationship. Regardless of social status, people who live at a considerable distance from Vancouver are unlikely to drive because it would be very time consuming. People living very close by are unlikely to fly because it is impractical. Therefore, to test this hypothesis people living very near and people living very far from Vancouver are excluded. A range where an equal number of respondents choose air travel and car travel is determined. Respondents living outside this range are excluded. More details on the method used to determine the range discussed in Appendix II.
4.4. TRIP PLANNING

Event marketers should be very concerned with prospective visitors' information search. Specifically, they need to know the amount of information prospective visitors look for, how much time they spend and where they look for information regarding events. The marketers may want to adjust their choice of promotional vehicles and advertising copy for event promotion if tourists' search process is dependent on level of social status.

The research literature indicates that people with more education are more likely to know where to look, and more likely to know how to interpret information than people with lower levels of education (Thorelli 1971; Newman and Staelin 1972; Moschis and Churchill 1978; and Kiel and Layton 1981). Although these studies do not concern tourism behaviour directly, the relationships should be similar because tourism may be viewed as a consumer product; many of the elements involved in the selection, use and evaluation of tourism destinations, activities and events are similar to those regarding any other product or service. Information search may increase with social status because of socialisation (e.g., people have been taught by parents and teachers that it is appropriate to ask questions and to seek information). There are three ways to test the proposition that trip planning varies with social status. Two are based on the outcome of the search, that is, whether they planned to visit any pavilions ($H_{3A}$), and the number of pavilions respondents planned to visit ($H_{3B}$). The second is based on whether they spoke with anybody at home who had already been, or who had plans to go, about their plans to visit Expo '86 ($H_{3C}$).
4.4.1. Pavilions

\( H_{3A,B} \): Planning to visit pavilions and the number of pavilions people planned to see increases with social status, but may be mediated by their experiences at other world’s fairs.

Expo ’86 marketers distributed masses of information about the fair to people throughout North America (Ames 1986). This information was undoubtedly very positive and, given that someone planned to visit, would probably have increased their desire to see more pavilions and other events at the fair. Media reports of the fair and of particular pavilions, and independent guidebooks published after the fair began, may have dissuaded some visitors from planning to visit certain pavilions. Nevertheless, an overwhelming amount of information in the media was directly or indirectly controlled by Expo ’86 organizers and was therefore positive. This suggests that as the amount of information a visitor obtains about Expo ’86 increases, his/her likelihood of having a list of pavilions at all will be greater \( (H_{3A}) \), and the number of pavilions s/he planned on seeing will increase \( (H_{3B}) \). However, this tendency may be mediated by experiences at other world’s fairs. Having visited and enjoyed other world’s fairs, a visitor to Expo ’86 may desire to see pavilions representing the same country, corporation or theme again. Expo ’67 could create such a reaction. Overall, visitors’ impressions of that fair were very favourable (General Report 1969). We may expect that these impressions might influence their memories of the entire experience. If visiting pavilions was a part of the experience, then their attitudes to visiting pavilions at Expo ’86 may be very positive. Although many American visitors will have been to one of the recent fairs held in the U.S., it is less likely that any of those fairs created such a reaction, because, in general, none of these fairs elicited as positive a reaction as Expo ’67. Visitors to Expo ’67 may be more likely to have a list of pavilions.
that they want to see regardless of their social status. In order to remove the effects of other variables, other than level of social status, on pavilion planning, respondents who have visited Expo '67 are excluded from the analysis.

4.4.2. Discussing Expo '86 With Others At Home

\[ H_{3c} \]: The social status of people who have discussed Expo '86 with others before coming to Vancouver is higher than those who have not.

A discussion about plans can be considered part of the information search process. Research cited earlier in this chapter shows that information search increases with social status. No detail is provided regarding the depth or type of information visitors obtained, from whom, or from how many people. Nevertheless having some discussion at all may be related to level of social status. However, this effect may not be very strong.

4.5. EXPECTATIONS OF EXPO '86

The designers of events may want to pay particular attention to the features that create desire among tourists to visit. Expectations of world's fairs relate to its prestige dimension. This set of hypotheses proposes that certain characteristics of Expo '86 are associated with prestige based on the notion that visitors with lower levels of social status attach more prestige to world's fairs than visitors with higher levels of social status. The particular characteristics are detailed in the following discussion.

Previously it was proposed that both education (defined by learning about new things, ideas or places) and entertainment (defined by participating in, or watching, fun and leisure activities, events or exhibits) are important characteristics that people perceive in connection
with world's fairs. These are also important features of holidays and vacation goals. Therefore, respondents' reasons for visiting Expo '86 may include education and/or entertainment. However, depending on their social status, some visitors may be more likely to emphasise one more than the other.

Visitors' reasons may be partly a reflection of their perceptions of world's fairs. The earlier discussion on fairs showed that fairs have an image as being special experiential opportunities, but that the presentations were designed to cater to a general audience. This may mean that people who have high status may not expect the educational content to be very sophisticated and will visit for the entertainment aspects. Therefore, the words they use to describe the favourable aspects of the fair will reflect this. Even if they find that some elements of the fair are educational, the words they use to describe them will be consistent with this image.

On the other hand, people with lower levels of education may have lower standards regarding what constitutes education or a learning environment. Given that they may know less about any given topic, they may be more receptive to and/or less critical of new information. This suggests that visitors with lower social status are more inclined to expect and to be receptive to the educational aspects of world's fairs. Exhibits that meet their expectations are likely to be evaluated positively, using words that are synonymous with education.
4.5.1. Reasons For Adding Pavilions To List

H$_{4A}^A$: The social status of respondents who mention entertainment as a reason for adding a pavilion to their 'must see' list is higher than for those who mention education.

This hypothesis refers to Question 11.b in the Expo '86 survey questionnaire, (Appendix I), which asks visitors why they added pavilions to their 'must see' list. The reasons they give should reflect those aspects of the pavilions that they enjoyed the most. As discussed above, the reasons they give will vary with their expectations of the fair.

This hypothesis assumes that the type of pavilions that the respondents visited does not vary with social status. If the type of pavilions visited does vary with social status, the type of comments made will depend on the type of exhibits in those pavilions. This may be a mediating factor between their responses and their levels of social status.

Another factor that may affect the type of comments made is whether respondents had visited Expo '67 in Montreal, Canada. That world's fair is acknowledged as an environment where progressive ideas were expressed. Visitors to Expo '67 may therefore have different expectations of world's fairs. To account for this, the hypothesis is tested after excluding visitors who have been to Expo '67 in Montreal (H$_{4A}^A$).

The presence of children in the travel group may also influence visitors' points of view regarding the salient aspects of the pavilions they visited. Crompton (1979) found that children substantially influence vacation destination decisions. Taken one step further, parents' expectations may also be influenced by the presence of their children. It is
possible that people are generally more interested in the educational aspects of any experience when they are accompanied by their children. To account for this the hypotheses is tested on the sample after excluding visitors with children as well.

4.5.2. Recommendations To Friends

H_{4B} : Respondents who say they will recommend the entertainment aspects of Expo '86 to their friends and family at home have higher levels of social status than those who recommend Expo '86 for educational aspects.

The question upon which this hypotheses is based (Q.20, Appendix I) asks respondents why they would recommend Expo '86 to their friends and family at home. Unless they were thinking of a particular individual, the replies were likely directed at their friends and family in general. Research described in the section on socialisation explained that people have friends who are similar to themselves. Basically, what our friends like, we probably like too. This suggests that people may recommend the aspects of Expo '86 they themselves like best. Therefore, the pattern of responses is similar to those of the previous hypothesis concerning reasons for visiting certain pavilions. Responses are not mediated by their experiences at Expo '67 or the presence of children because they can probably relate to the circumstances of their friends sufficiently to make recommendations.

4.5.3. Importance Of Education And Entertainment For Visit

H_{4C} : Those visitors who say that entertainment is the most important aspect of Expo '86 for their visit have higher levels of social status than those who say that education is the most important aspect of the fair.
These evaluations may be similar to their remarks about pavilions because they may also be related to their expectations of the fair. Hypotheses are tested in the same manner. (i.e. Visitors with children and respondents who have visited Expo ’67 are both excluded from the analysis).

4.6. COLLECTING SOUVENIRS

Measures of souvenir collecting are important from two points of view. First, academics such as McCannell (1976) have stressed the importance of souvenirs as markers of an experience with status connotations. An empirical investigation of differences in souvenir collecting along the social status dimension may provide some validity to that argument. Secondly, souvenir distributors need to know what types of souvenirs people are likely to purchase. The hypotheses specified here refer to types of souvenirs, the number of souvenirs purchased and whether the respondent purchased any. Empirical support would indicate that there are social status differences in souvenir collection. That would provide support for additional research in this area. The hypotheses are:
$H_{5A}$: People who plan to purchase souvenirs have lower social status than those who do not plan to buy souvenirs.

$H_{5B}$: The number of souvenirs that respondents plan to purchase is inversely proportional to their social status.

$H_{5C}$: Visitors with higher social status are more likely to collect art related souvenirs. Visitors with lower levels of social status are more likely to collect trinkets such as T-shirts, souvenir spoons and postcards.

Souvenirs offer tourists the opportunity to capture part of the essence of an event or destination. The souvenirs can serve as mementos (e.g., memory triggers) of a tourist's holiday or as a method of displaying the purchaser’s connection with some event, attraction or destination. By displaying a connection with something of social significance, the holder of that marker is communicating his/her social status. McIntosh (1977) explains that status and prestige constitute one of four categories of travel motivators. Kotler (1972) identifies status and prestige as a social reward for incidental use of a product. Mayo and Jarvis (1981), in a discussion of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, explain that many products serve as symbolic reflections of the fulfillment of esteem and prestige needs. Therefore, even though some people buy souvenirs as momentos, others may buy them for social status reasons. People with higher levels of social status attach social significance to events or things that are, in some fashion, exclusive, or "taste-revealing" (Kelly 1987). Expo '86 and other world's fairs are mass-oriented attractions. Ames (1986) cites sources that explain that Expo '86 was marketed on a massive scale to reach virtually the entire Canadian population. In other words, it was not designed or marketed as an exclusive event. Therefore, higher statused visitors are less likely to perceive Expo '86 as a potential
indicator of social status, but the souvenirs they collect will be "taste-revealing" (such as sculpture, art or traditional or native crafts).

On the other hand, people with lower levels of social status may feel that Expo '86 is a socially significant event. Their visit may be more special, because they travel less often than higher status people (Canada 1980). In addition, and as a result of their visit, they may feel that they have gained valuable knowledge about the world, its nations and cultures and that this is worthwhile communicating to their peers. Therefore, they are more likely to buy souvenirs (H_{5A}), and to buy more of them (H_{5B}).

This completes a description and details of the research model and hypotheses. The next chapter describes the methods that were used to collect the data.
CHAPTER 5. DATA METHODS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the steps involved in the collection, coding and planned analysis of the data. In the first section the design of the research instrument is discussed. This is followed by a description of the sampling procedure. The third section reviews the respondent selection and interviewing procedures. In the fourth section the methods used to code the data are explained. The final section describes the techniques that are used to analyse the data. Each section also contains a discussion of why the particular method is chosen, its inherent problems and/or limitations and how those issues are resolved.

5.1. THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The research instrument is a personal interview questionnaire. It was designed by R.F. Kelly at the University of British Columbia, for use at Expo '86, the world's fair held in Vancouver, Canada, between May 2 and October 13 1986. The survey of 30 questions is contained in Appendix I. Topics covered by the survey include:

1. the respondent's trip to Vancouver, his/her travelling party, his/her trip planning process (whether s/he spoke with anybody prior to departure from home);
2. places the respondent planned to visit or had visited in Vancouver and elsewhere in British Columbia;
3. respondent's activities at Expo '86, including, pavilions and events they planned to see before arriving, additional plans made since their arrival, and reasons for those changes and for purchase of souvenirs;
4. respondent's opinions about various aspects of Expo '86 relative to other world's fairs and on its own merits.
5. respondent's perceptions of him/herself vis-a-vis other Expo visitors, his/her expectations of the cost and enjoyment of his/her visit to Expo;

6. respondent's demographic characteristics.

This researcher made certain minor changes to some questions in order to improve clarity. They are as follows:

1. In Questions 15 and 16 respondents were asked to rank the importance of four themes for their visit to Expo and the presentation of each theme. This was changed from having the respondent name only one theme that they most valued and judged to be best presented. Although the time necessary to complete a survey was critical, the additional information that might be gained by requesting a ranking of the four items in both questions was considered worthwhile.

2. In Question 22, information was being sought in order to differentiate between frequent and infrequent tourists among the respondents, under the assumption that there may be behavioural differences between the two. Originally, the question asked respondents if they had taken any other holidays in the past year. A stricter definition of the term 'holiday' was needed because it may mean different things to different people. An appropriate manner of posing the question emerges from a definition of tourism. Four definitions were examined:
   a. One of the best recognized definitions was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Travel and Tourism in 1963. A visitor, the broadest category, is defined as "any person visiting a country other than that in which he has his usual place of residence for any reason other than following an occupation remunerated from within the country visited" (Murphy 1983). Tourists are one subdivision and are defined as people "who are visitors making at least one
overnight stop in a country or region and [who] stay for at least 24 hours."

b. The World Tourism Organization (Chadwick, 1987) divides visitors into residents and non-residents. Among the latter, visitors may be international or domestic and tourists or excursionists. Tourists are defined as people travelling for pleasure, recreation, holiday or sport, or business, visiting friends and relatives, conferences, health, etc. Excursionists are the same as tourists except that they do not stay longer than 24 hours.

c. The Canadian Government Office of Tourism defines a domestic visitor as one who travels at least 80 kilometers from home and who stays in a commercial establishment or in the home of a friend or relative (Canada 1983).

d. The OECD defines a holiday as "a stay outside the place of residence for health and recreational purposes and including 4 consecutive nights" (OECD 1980).

These definitions suggest that a tourist holiday can be viewed as a journey relatively far from home for at least 24 hours for reasons of pleasure and recreation. To reduce ambiguity the question was modified by explicitly defining the term 'holiday' as at least two nights spent away from home. Two nights away from home is at least equal to 24 hours in duration and may be an easier time category for respondents to remember. The matter of a distance criterion as specified by Statistics Canada was achieved by limiting respondents to non-B.C. residents. The time frame was set at 12 months under the assumption that frequent tourists take a holiday at least once a year. Twelve months is preferable to "in the last year" because it is less likely to be

\[\text{see section 5.2 below}\]
confused with "since the beginning of the year." We assumed that the criterion of pleasure would be understood by the respondents who would interpret 'holiday' as including pleasure-oriented events and activities.

3. A demographic question, concerning the marital status of the respondent, was added. It was included on the basis that there may be behavioural differences between people depending on their marital status.

5.2. THE SAMPLING PROCEDURE

This section describes the sampling element, the rationale for that sample, which units within that element are chosen, the timing of the survey, the sample size and the potential biases inherent in this sampling method. The sampling element consists of tourists visiting Expo '86. Individuals or units within this element were selected if they are also from out-of-town and were staying away from home for at least 24 hours. To meet these criteria, residents of British Columbia are excluded from the sample. Although some B.C. residents can be considered tourists, three factors contributed to the decision to exclude them. First, there was a very intensive publicity campaign targeted at B.C. residents concerning many aspects of Expo. This campaign was much broader and more intense than promotion in other geographic areas. Second, B.C. residents were heavily involved in the economic and political aspects of the fair which were covered by the local and regional news media. Third, B.C. residents were likely more aware than non-BC residents of the design, layout, pavilions and attractions at Expo before it opened. These factors suggest that B.C. residents' reasons for attending the fair and their responses might not be representative of tourists on holiday.
On the other hand, all non-B.C. residents can be considered tourists since they are all relatively far from home, most will be spending overnight away from home, and all are at Expo for reasons of pleasure. Information obtained from respondents helped eliminate those who did not meet these criteria (i.e., not staying overnight).

Certain considerations necessitated exclusion of non-U.S. and non-Canadian visitors from the sample. Non-North Americans, as a group, may behave or may provide different reasons for their behaviour than North Americans as a result of cultural differences. Thus, their responses might require a separate analysis under a different set of hypotheses that relate to their particular cultural experience. In addition these visitors' difficulties with the English language could affect their interpretations of the questions.

Another restriction imposed on the selection of respondents was based on age. In this research it is important that respondents had made a significant contribution to the decision to visit to Expo '86. People who were taken to the fair (i.e. children) may have a different point of view about elements of the fair than people who made conscious decisions to attend. Under the assumption that few non-B.C. resident teenagers would choose, independently, to visit Expo '86, the sample was restricted to people 20 years of age and older.

Surveys were conducted from late July to early October. This may represent a constraint in generalizing to all non-B.C. resident Expo visitors because the type of visitors that visit early in the season may be different from those who visit during the summer or fall. This is discussed in the chapter on results.
A sample size of approximately 200 was agreed upon. Given this sample size, desired groupings of respondents (e.g., American/Canadian) would each contain enough units to allow statistical analyses at the 90% level of statistical confidence.

5.3. RESPONDENT SELECTION

This section describes how individual respondents were selected. All respondents selected were among visitors standing in the 'stand-by' line in the entranceway to "Challenge" in the B.C. Pavilion complex. The B.C. Pavilion was used as the interview location because it was easier to obtain permission from the B.C. Pavilion administrators than from the Expo '86 administration. Furthermore, it was reputed to be one of the most popular pavilions, an indication that many people visited or tried to visit the pavilion. Thus, from among this group, one could be fairly certain of a representative selection of all Expo visitors. The stand-by line was the line for those visitors who had not obtained tickets to the pavilion, given out free each morning, for each scheduled show. People in the stand-by line were allowed into the pavilion at regular, frequent intervals when people with tickets failed to show up at their appointed time. Because of the availability of reserved tickets in the morning, a stand-by line rarely formed before 1 or 2 P.M. People in the reserved ticket line were not interviewed because the amount of time they waited in line was not long enough to complete an interview. Therefore, interviews were conducted only among people in the stand-by line and only from about 2 P.M. until closing at 9 P.M. Efforts were made to interview visitors on all days of the week.

In order to reduce bias in respondent selection, two landmarks were preselected alongside the stand-by line. The landmarks were far enough apart to ensure that no two adjacent respondents were in the same party. From among those standing along the outside of the
stand-by line, the person closest to one of the landmarks was asked to respond to the questionnaire. When the interview was completed, or a person selected refused to participate, or a person was a B.C. resident, the interviewer moved to the next landmark and repeated the procedure there.

The interviewers were wearing identity cards which contained the BC pavilion logo and their name. Interviewers were instructed to identify themselves as representatives of the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia. Respondents were asked if they would take the time to respond to the questionnaire. If they agreed they were screened on the basis of their residence. B.C. residents were thanked and excused from the remainder of the questionnaire.
CHAPTER 6. RESULTS

6.1. INTRODUCTION

A dataset collected at Expo '86 was used to test the hypotheses. In all, 196 out of 198 non-BC residents who were asked replied to the questionnaire. There were two interviewers. The first worked in July and August and collected 96 completed questionnaires. The second interviewer worked in September and October and completed 100 questionnaires. Of the total, one was eliminated because the respondent asked to be interviewed. This may have created some bias. Of the remainder, those that did not meet the definition of 'tourist' as outlined in chapter 5.3 were eliminated. Other respondents for whom social status scores could not be computed were also eliminated (i.e. homemakers and students). 88 usable interviews remained.

Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 show the relevant statistics for each hypothesis. These statistics show that at the .10 level of significance none of the sub-hypotheses regarding attendance at cultural events or souvenirs are supported. Furthermore, only one sub-hypothesis in each of the other areas, mode of travel, trip planning and expectations of the fair is significant. These results are discussed in two sections. In section 6.2 the results of the individual tests and issues related to how the constructs were measured are discussed. The second section deals with the factors that may affect all the results in general. These include: homogeneity of the sample, respondent errors, sampling-based errors and interviewer errors. The respondent errors mentioned here are likely to have had an effect on all of the hypotheses, if any, because all of a respondent's answers would have been biased equally. Sampling frame errors concern whether the sampling method produced a sample of respondents which is representative of out-of-town, American and Canadian
(non-B.C. resident) visitors to Expo '86. There is the possibility that unforeseeable conditions at the fair may have resulted in a sample that is not representative. Interviewer errors concern the methods that the interviewers used which could have affected the responses. These three types of errors are not specific to the measure of any hypothesis.

Section 6.3 discusses the actual results and issues related to the specification and testing of the model.

6.2. HYPOTHESIS TESTING

In this section, the results of the statistical analysis for each hypothesis and sub-hypothesis are reviewed. The biases that may be affecting the results are also discussed. An assessment of the reliability of the results is made at the conclusion of the discussion of each hypothesis.

The methods of analysis are simple regression analysis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov two sample test of homogeneity. The procedures are discussed in detail in Appendix III.

6.2.1. ATTENDING CULTURAL EVENTS

Three sub-hypotheses are used to test the relationship between level of social status and attendance at cultural events:

1. \( H_{1A} \): The likelihood of planning to attend or having attended cultural events on the Expo '86 site increases with social status;

2. \( H_{1B} \): The likelihood of visiting museums in B.C. increases with social status among first-time visitors to Vancouver.

3. \( H_{1C} \): The likelihood of visiting the Ramses II pavilion at Expo '86 decreases with
### KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TWO SAMPLE TEST OF HOMOGENEITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>MAX D</th>
<th>C*</th>
<th>P VALUE OBS. PRED.</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending Cultural Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A Plans to See On-Site Events</td>
<td>-.11161</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B B.C. Museums-1st Visit to Van</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C Plans to See Ramses II Pavilion</td>
<td>.31015</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>PLANE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Origin=500-1500 Miles from Van</td>
<td>-.3275</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B 500-1500 miles, -Children</td>
<td>-.49231</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>&lt;.10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A Plans to See Pavs, -Expo '67</td>
<td>-.14386**</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B No. Pavilions Planned, -Expo 67</td>
<td>SEE TABLE 8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Discussed EXPO 86 with Friends</td>
<td>-.38961</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>= .10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations Of EXPO 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A Reasons for Adding Pavilions,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>ENTRN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Expo '67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B Recommendations to Friends</td>
<td>+.28283***</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C Reason For Visit:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C1 Intrvr 1, -Expo '67, -Child</td>
<td>-.72727</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C2 Intrvr 2, -Expo '67, -Child</td>
<td>+.467</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting Souvenirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A Plans to Collect Any Souvenirs</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B Number of Souvenirs Planned</td>
<td>SEE TABLE 8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* C=ABS (K-S D)*(m*n)

** +.14035 160 n.s. +

*** -.2171 43 n.s. +

-These are large D values opposite in sign of Max K-S D.

Precise P values for each hypothesis test are not always available. Kim and Jenrich (1973) provide critical values only at high levels of statistical confidence. Therefore, in these tables 'n.s.' implies that the results are not significant at levels approaching alpha=.10.

D values reflect the difference in the cumulative distribution of each subset sample (i.e. 'Yes' vs 'No').

C* is the rescaled D value, taking into account individual sample sizes (e.g. Yes=32, No=56).
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social status.

None of results are significant at the .10 level. K-S test was used to test each hypothesis. Regression analysis is used to test 1A. Although the dependent variable is not ratio scaled, the sample size in each category (did plan, did not plan) is greater than 30 which produce unbiased regression weights (Neter, Wasserman and Kutner 1985). The following discussions concern issues with respect to the measure of each sub-hypothesis.

6.2.1.1. $H_{1A}$ : Culture On The Expo 86 Site

There are two issues with regard to measuring the construct that may affect the results. The first concerns the measure of cultural events and the second concerns respondents' plans. Respondent bias is probably not a factor because this question requires respondents to know the names of museums they plan to attend; it would be difficult for them to respond dishonestly.

As discussed earlier, cultural events can include a wide range of activities from ballet and symphony concerts to children's choirs and folk dancing. For this hypothesis, bars or clubs or events that are purely entertainment oriented are not included (e.g., the pop singing group The Temptations or comedian Joan Rivers). Responses concerning activities of this nature were eliminated from the analysis. However, the problem still remains that culture has different meanings for different people. The hypothesis that states that fair visitors' plans will differ depending on social status is based on the assumption that visitors' perceptions of culture consist only of 'elitist' events such as opera and classical music. It has been well established earlier in this paper that attendance at these types of events is related to social status. If respondents did conceive of cultural events as "high culture", then the hypothesis is not supported. If they did not, then no conclusions regarding the
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REGRESSION ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P-VALUE</th>
<th>OBS.</th>
<th>PRED.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending Cultural Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to See On-Site Events</td>
<td>-0.0063</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to See Pavs, -Expo '67</td>
<td>+0.006</td>
<td>+0.174</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Pavilions Planned, -Expo '67</td>
<td>+0.02171</td>
<td>+1.454</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collecting Souvenirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Souvenirs Planned</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These T scores are not significant at levels approaching alpha=.10.
hypothesis can be made.

Another assumption made is that the visitors sampled are representative of the population at large. However it is possible that the visitors actually sampled were only oriented to seeing pavilions. This would represent a sampling error and no conclusions regarding social status and plans to attend cultural events among Expo '86 visitors could be drawn. On the other hand given the extensive promotion for Expo '86 and all its attractions there is no justification for believing that a significant proportion of visitors only wanted to visit pavilions or that other visitors did not want to see any pavilions.

The tourism literature provides a strong basis for this hypothesis. However it is possible that some respondents did not interpret the term 'culture' as it is described here; that is referring to classical or 'high' cultural activities. As a result the influence of social status may be obscured.

6.2.1.2. $H_{1B} : Visiting Museums in B.C.$

This analysis of the result of this hypothesis test that might influence the results focuses on two areas:

1. Reasons people gave for visiting or planning to visit museums in B.C.; and

2. The differences between the types of museums that respondents mentioned when asked about their plans outside Expo '86 compared to the definition of museum implied in the hypothesis. The hypothesis test was conducted only among respondents who had never visited Vancouver previously. The results are not significant at 90% confidence level.
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KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TWO SAMPLE TEST OF HOMOGENEITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST-HOC HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>MAX K-S D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P VALUE OBS. PRED.</th>
<th>OBS. PRED.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans to Visit Museums in Vancouver</td>
<td>-.38819</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>79 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first issue concerns the characteristics of respondents who did mention that they planned to visit museums in B.C. Many people visit museums, incidentally, as part of organized tours. Many people who visit Vancouver Island for example go as part of organized tours which originate in Vancouver. Some tourists make a stop at the B.C. Provincial Museum. While tourists are not forced to enter the museum, the selection of sites is made by the tour company (e.g. Grey Lines). These visitors will have responded in the affirmative regarding their plans to visit museums. The problem is that many of the affirmative responses are from visitors who only sought sightseeing tours in Vancouver or Victoria. In fact only the responses of those who made special efforts to visit museums should be included in the analysis. They are expected to have higher status than museum non-visitors. To verify these effects, a post hoc hypothesis is tested on a sample which includes only respondents who mentioned plans to visit museums in Vancouver. The result is not significant at 0.10, but there is an improvement in the p value. This result is reported in Table 6.3

A second factor that may help explain these findings is based on the type of museum implied in the hypothesis and the types of museums respondents mentioned. The construct ‘museum’ as used in this study refers to traditional types of museums or art galleries such as the Vancouver Art Gallery or the Museum of Anthropology. However, respondents mentioned quite different types of museums including, for example, the Wax Museum in Victoria. Characteristics of museum patrons visiting wax museums are likely different from those patronising the more traditional types of museum. However, in the Expo ’86 survey, all were counted as museumgoers. This practice may have served to obscure social status differences.
6.2.1.3. $H_{1c}$: Visiting The Ramses II Pavilion

The assumption underlying all hypotheses is that respondents are equally familiar with the choice of pavilions, and their plans depend on other characteristics such as their social status. However, another sub-hypothesis, $H_{3a'}$, predicts that people with higher social status do more planning. This suggests that people with higher social status are more likely to have heard of the pavilion, and therefore the probability of their mentioning it is higher than might be expected. This may cancel out the expected effect.

Respondent bias would be a possible factor if there was evidence that many people who did not intend to visit Ramses II mentioned it anyway. That is unlikely to be the case since only 7 respondents did mention that they planned to visit the pavilion.

In general, if perceptions about the Ramses II pavilion do vary with social status, this hypothesis may still be valid, but the problems of differences in familiarity with the pavilions may be obscuring the relationship.

6.2.1.4. Conclusion

In general, although the data do not support these hypotheses, issues with regard to the measures used suggest that the construct is still tenable. That is, people with higher levels of social status are more likely to attend cultural events or participate in cultural activities. Another way of testing the hypotheses is discussed in the conclusion.
6.2.2. MODES OF TRAVEL

This hypothesis ($H_2$) tested the relationship between social status of visitors to Expo '86 and the methods they used to travel to the fair. The hypothesis states that: Social status increases with faster and more expensive modes of travel to Expo '86. Therefore, people with higher levels of social status are more likely to travel by air and visitors with lower levels are more likely to travel by car. This relationship is mediated by the presence of children in the travel party, and the distance from the visitors point of origin to Expo '86.

The data were analysed first among all respondents who live between 500 and 1500 miles from Vancouver. This distance range was selected on the basis of a graphical analysis of respondents' travel distance to Vancouver by mode of travel (car or plane). At this distance range, there appeared to be a large difference in the choice of travel mode and a near equal representation of respondents in each category. The results of the analysis on all respondents living within this distance range are not significant. This suggests that regardless of their level of social status, people do not make a distinction on the status significance of air versus automobile travel to a destination. However, further analysis reveals that among people who live between 500 and 1500 miles from Vancouver and who were travelling without children, those with higher social status are more likely to travel by plane. Children, it seems, have a greater effect on the choice of travel mode among people with high social status scores. There is no evidence for this relationship among the group of visitors accompanied by children. Children's influence on choice of travel mode may be due to two factors. First, families with children may want to travel together, regardless of their social status. Second, all families travelling with children may be equally constrained by the extra cost of air travel. Among people travelling without children, higher status people may not be constrained by the cost of an airplane ticket, but people with lower status may be.
The question regarding travel method seems to have measured the construct appropriately. The question asks for information regarding method of travel, and the hypothesis deals with the same. Respondents indicated, without prompting, the vehicle or vehicles they travelled in, to get to Vancouver. Travel mode categories are not suggested, so there is no effect on the respondent's evoked set. Indeed a variety of responses are given, such as car and trailer, recreational vehicle and combinations of airplane and car. This suggests that the results are meaningful.

6.2.3. TRIP PLANNING

Three sub-hypotheses are tested:

3. $H_{3A}$: The social status of respondents who planned to visit pavilions is higher than those who did not among respondents who did not visit Expo '67.

4. $H_{3B}$: The number of pavilions that respondents planned to see increases with social status, among respondents who did not visit Expo '67.

5. $H_{3C}$: The social status of respondents who discussed Expo '86 with others at home is higher than those who did not discuss Expo '86 with others at home.

The K-S test was applied to the test of hypotheses 3A and 3C. Regression analysis was also applied to 3A because the sample size in each category (did plan, did not plan) was greater or equal to 30. Regression analysis was used to test 3B because the data are ratio scaled. Only the hypothesis dealing with respondents' discussions is significant at .10, in the direction hypothesized. None of the other results is significant.
6.2.3.1. $H_{3A,B}:$ Pavilions

The analysis of these two hypotheses is discussed jointly because the measurement is based on the same question (10) in the Expo '86 survey questionnaire. These two hypotheses were tested only among respondents who did not visit Expo '67 in Montreal. These findings may be affected by the way the construct was measured. These hypotheses focus on respondents' plans, but this is not emphasized in the question. As a result the respondent may have focused on the phrase 'any pavilions you wanted to see' in the question and proceeded to provide a list of all the familiar pavilions as opposed to the pavilions that he or she planned to see.

This suggestion that the construct 'planning' was not measured and that therefore the results are not relevant to the hypothesis may not be correct. One of the steps in making plans is the selective attention to relevant information. The information can be stored by the tourist for future use. Although this is not 'planning' as it is considered in this research, paying attention to a special type of information as it is encountered may be a part of the planning process. Therefore respondents may be expected to mention pavilions with which they are familiar because of this step in their planning process. So even if the question did not measure the construct 'planning' as it was discussed earlier, it is still relevant to the general concept of planning. This explanation suggests that the question is properly measuring the construct.

6.2.3.2. $H_{3C}:$ Discussing Expo '86 With Others At Home

The results of this analysis suggest that discussion with others at home about Expo '86 varies with social status in the hypothesized direction.
6.2.3.3. Conclusion

The analysis of the findings of the tests of these three sub-hypotheses suggests that there is some evidence for the hypothesized relationship between social status and trip planning behaviour. Some results may not have been as expected because measures of the hypotheses as specified were not available in the data.

6.2.4. EXPECTATIONS OF EXPO '86

Three hypotheses were tested:

1. \( H_{4A} \): The social status of respondents who mention entertainment as a reason for adding a pavilion to their 'must see' list of pavilions is higher than for those who mention education among respondents who did not visit Expo '67.

2. \( H_{4B} \): Respondents who say they will recommend the entertainment aspects of Expo '86 to their friends and family at home are likely to rank higher on the social status dimension than those who recommend Expo '86 for educational aspects among respondents who did not visit Expo '67.

3. \( H_{4C} \): Visitors who say that entertainment is the most important aspect of Expo '86 have higher social status than those who say that education is the most important feature of the fair among respondents who did not visit Expo '67.

In all three cases, the intention was also to exclude visitors accompanied by children. However, with children excluded, in tandem with non-Expo '67 visitors, or independently, there were too few cases left for a meaningful analysis. As a result, only Expo '67 visitors were excluded. Furthermore only the K-S test was used to test each of these hypotheses because sample sizes were too small to produce unbiased regression weights. The results (Table 6.1) show that only \( H_{4A} \) is supported at the .10 level, but not in the hypothesized direction.
6.2.4.1. $H_{4A}$: Reasons for Adding Pavilions To List

The finding of this hypothesis test shows that education is found to vary positively and entertainment, negatively, with social status at $p< .12$ among respondents who did not visit Expo '67 in Montreal. A possible problem with the measure of this hypothesis concerns the method used to measure the construct. The question in the Expo '86 survey, (11.a) measures respondents most enjoyable aspects of the pavilions. In this study it is interpreted as a proxy for their expectations of the fair. This is reasonable if we assume that people enjoy those aspects and features of pavilions that are in some way, important to them. That is, their responses reflect what they had hoped to enjoy. This suggests that the question is measuring the construct appropriately. On the other hand, in the process of coding responses, certain words that respondents used were accepted as synonyms of either education or entertainment. However 'education' or 'entertainment' may not reflect what the respondents actually had in mind.

6.2.4.2. $H_{4B}$: Recommendations To Friends

All respondents were included in the test of this hypothesis. Based on the K-S test the results do not support this hypothesis at the .10 level. As before, there is the possibility that the research construct is not being measured, or that the hypothesis is not correct.

The words that are accepted as being synonymous with either education or entertainment are the same in this hypothesis as in the previous one. The problems underlying the measure are very important and are the same as in $H_{4A}$. Therefore they do not need to be repeated. The difficulty in establishing that the construct is being measured appropriately suggests that the results cannot be relied upon.
6.2.4.3. \( H_{4C} \) : REASONS FOR VISIT TO EXPO '86

This hypothesis is based on question 15 of the Expo '86 survey. All the analyses of this hypothesis are tested for each interviewer because the two interviewers asked the question differently. One asked for respondents to rank the importance of education, art, technology and entertainment for their visit to Expo '86; the other interviewer asked respondents only for the most important reason for their visit among the four items. As discussed in Chapter 4.4, respondents are selected only if they had not visited Expo '67 and were not accompanied by children. The results of the K-S test are not significant at .10.

A problem with this finding concerns the items that respondents were asked to rank in the questionnaire: education, entertainment, art, and technology. Among some respondents, none of these items may be important for their visit to the fair. In this case, some respondents may have ranked or chosen the most important item randomly. There are three arguments against this possibility. First, these areas were mentioned among a list of important items for their visit by visitors to Expo '67 (General Report 1969). Second, many respondents used words and phrases synonymous with education and entertainment without prompting in open-ended questions preceding the question on which this hypothesis is based. This suggests that education and entertainment were important to Expo '86 visitors. Third, research discussed earlier shows that education and entertainment are important components for vacation takers. The lack of support for this hypothesis suggests that reasons for visiting the fair do not depend on respondents' positions in the social status hierarchy.
6.2.4.4. Conclusion

The only measure of support for the hypothesis that visitors’ expectations of the fair depends on their levels of social status is $H_{4A}$ (their reasons for adding pavilions to their must see list). It is likely that expectations of the fair are not influenced by visitors level of social status. However, problems with coding responses may be contributing to the null results.

6.2.5. $H_{5A,B}$: PURCHASING SOUVENIRS

Two hypotheses were tested:

1. $H_{5A}$: Visitors who plan to collect souvenirs from Expo '86 have lower status than those who do not.

2. $H_{5B}$: The number of souvenirs that visitors plan to purchase decreases with level of social status.

$H_{5C}$, relating the types of souvenirs collected to visitor level of social status, was not tested because there was not a sufficient number of visitors who purchased art related souvenirs to make any meaningful statistical inferences.

K-S test is used to test 5A and regression analysis is used to test 5B. Neither result supports the hypothesis that souvenir collecting varies with social status. The analysis of these results deals with the lack of congruence between the construct and the measure.

Although the question in the Expo '86 survey (12.b) did not specifically use the term souvenir, most respondents indicated that they understood that a souvenir is a tangible item purchased or taken from Expo '86, which is in some way connected with the visit
and/or the event. However, the hypothesis makes reference to the relationship between social status and souvenirs as personal possessions of the tourist, but the collection of souvenirs may not vary with social status if they are simply collected as gifts for others. The type of use intended is not specified in the questionnaire. As a result, respondents who indicated they had plans to purchase souvenirs may have been lumped in with others who planned to buy souvenirs as gifts for relatives and friends at home or for people (i.e., their children) accompanying them. If the souvenir is not purchased as a personal possession, the hypothesised effect may not occur.

Even so, an argument can be made that a souvenir purchased as a gift may serve as an indicator of status for some people. A gift may be able to communicate the prestige of the purchaser because he/she had the means or the ability to take a trip to a destination with some social significance. Given this argument the measure is valid, except in the case of souvenirs purchased explicitly for children. Prestige signalling behaviour between an adult and child is difficult to support. Since there is no way to determine the number of responses that fall into this category, the hypotheses cannot be tested using these data.

This analysis shows that there is a potential problem with the lack of specification of whether the respondent is buying gifts for him/herself, family or friends or for a child. Because the hypothesis does not hold for souvenir purchases for children, the data cannot be accepted as a valid measure of these hypotheses. Furthermore, the without specifying the nature of the gift it may not be possible to make some meaningful conclusions.
6.2.6. CONCLUSION

This analysis has pointed out many of the problems inherent in the data. Many of the problems associated with the data could have been solved by specifying the hypotheses to be tested before collecting the data. Because this was not possible in this situation, another solution may have been to specify the hypotheses with greater consideration of the data. Although it is possible that the model presented earlier is without merit, there is not sufficient information to reject it. In the conclusion of this thesis some changes or additions that could be made in the future to retest the model are recommended.

6.3. RESEARCH WIDE ERRORS

6.3.1. RESPONDENT-BASED ERRORS

There are several types of respondent-based error that affect all research in the behavioural sciences. These are: personal characteristics of the respondent such as ego and humility; respondent’s mood, degree of fatigue and commitment; demand characteristics (Hulbert and Lehmann 1975). Ego and humility errors are caused by respondents who reply dishonestly in order to maintain a consistent or inconsistent image, or in order to impress the interviewer. Demand characteristics are cause for concern if the respondent, in trying to guess the hypothesis, responds in a manner to help or hinder the research. These effects were not measured, so it is not possible to determine whether they affected the results.

The respondent errors of mood, fatigue and commitment may be a source of bias in this research if many respondents were affected by the environment and did not provide honest replies. The following discussion provides some evidence that these factors did not play a role.
Although mood factors were not measured, the response rate (99%) is one indication of respondent mood. The interviewers also reported that the respondents seemed happy and were extremely helpful and courteous. The environment probably had a positive effect on respondents’ moods because it was a festive setting. The interview was also conducted under excellent conditions; because the respondents were standing in line, they were in no hurry. The line-up area was shaded from the sun and was relatively free of distraction from street performers, or other noise. Thus, in general, there are no indications that the environment had anything but a positive effect on respondents’ mood and that this is an unlikely source of error.

Fatigue is also not a likely factor because the survey was very short and few people would have become tired of answering questions for 10 or 12 minutes. Some respondents did show signs of uneasiness towards the end, especially when they were asked to make difficult comparisons with other world’s fairs (Q. 17). The likelihood that many respondents had been standing in this line-up or perhaps some other line-up for significant periods of time, and that they may have been on the site for many hours may have contributed to their overall feeling of fatigue. However, it is worth repeating that most respondents seemed cheerful and very helpful. Neither are there signs of lack of commitment: not one respondent felt compelled to stop the interview; all the respondents answered all of the personal demographic questions at the end of the interview. Under these circumstances, these respondent errors and biases do not seem to have had a negative effect on the results.
6.3.2. SAMPLING FRAME ERROR

Sampling frame error relates to the issue of whether the sample is representative of visitors to Expo from Canada (excluding B.C. residents) and the United States. An assumption is made that the visitors to the B.C. Pavilion are representative of all Expo '86 out-of-town visitors. This is important for any generalisations regarding tourist behaviour to be made. However, this assumption may be flawed in two ways. First, people who choose to see pavilions may be different from those who prefer to engage in other activities, such as watching people. Secondly, those who obtained reserved tickets and thereby avoided the stand-by line may be different from those who for some reason did not obtain them. In that case, the hypotheses that hold true for Expo '86 visitors in general may not be applicable to this sample. Furthermore the sampling method cannot claim to have been random even within the stand-by line. Visitors were not surveyed at all times of the day for reasons detailed earlier. During the periods when research was being carried out, visitors were not approached at randomly assigned time intervals but rather at convenient ones. Finally, the research was not carried out throughout the event, but mainly in the last two thirds of its duration. Unfortunately, data received from the Expo Corporation does not contain enough information to compare the demographic characteristics of this sample to their random sample of Expo '86 visitors. It is not possible to conclude that the sampling frame provides a representative sample of all the visitors to whom the hypotheses apply, but neither is there evidence to suggest that respondents are not typical of all Expo '86 visitors from outside B.C. Therefore for the purposes of this study, respondents are accepted as being characteristic of all out-of-town visitors to Expo '86.
6.3.3. INTERVIEWER BASED ERRORS

Interviewer-based errors may also be present in the form of bias, interpretation and carelessness. To avoid interviewer bias, the wording of the questions was followed as closely as possible. In addition, the interviewers were instructed not to exert any pressure to speed up the interview, even if that meant not completing a questionnaire because the stand-by line began to move into the pavilion. Prompting or lack of prompting may have caused some bias, especially if the respondents initially did not provide any response or if there was the possibility that the respondent had more to add. An initial cursory examination of the data showed some evidence for differences between interviewers, especially with regard to the level of prompting. Except for one question these fears are not borne out in a statistical analysis. Question 15 was interpreted differently by the two interviewers: the second interviewer asked respondents for their most important theme among four possibilities provided; the first interviewer asked respondents to rank the themes in order of importance.
CONCLUSIONS

This research has been concerned with the relationship between social status and tourist behaviour. The idea that behaviour depends on level of social status or position in society is not new (Veblen 1899, MacCannel 1976, Boorstin). However, no empirical evidence was found in the literature concerning a link between types of tourist behaviours and level of social status. There is some discussion, in the literature, reviewed in earlier chapters, regarding the perception that tourism or travel is prestigious, and that this prestige is associated with people with higher levels of social status. This thesis has attempted to show that tourists' behaviour regarding some prestige aspects of tourism will differ depending on their level of social status. A model of social status and behaviour was applied (Chapter 4) to a specific tourist application, namely world fairs, mass-oriented special events.

Tourism was chosen because of its potential contribution to society economically, culturally and politically. As these roles of tourism expand, tourism becomes a more valuable area of study. A better understanding of the behavioural component can help planners develop and market their tourist resources more efficiently.

A difficulty in this thesis has not been in developing or justifying the model of behaviour and social status. Rather the issue was developing testable hypotheses from a given dataset collected at Expo 86 in Vancouver. The dataset suggested five areas of tourist behaviour that have links to social status. From these areas or constructs a set of hypotheses were proposed and were tested on a sample of out-of-town, Canadian and American visitors to Expo '86. A world's fair is an appropriate environment on which to test the model because it is an event that is likely to attract people with many levels of social status.
This suggests that if there are differences in behaviour that are status linked, they may be manifest at this type of event. Although the results were, in general, inconclusive, and only two hypotheses were supported at the .10 level, the viability of the hypotheses could not be summarily dismissed because of limitations in the data. In addition, there is strong evidence in the literature discussed earlier to support the idea that one's position in the social status hierarchy has an influence on behaviour including tourist activities. Therefore the variability in behaviour along social status lines within each of the constructs is still likely. These constructs are: attendance at cultural events; trip planning; expectations of the fair; travel mode; and souvenir collecting. However, some hypotheses may have been misspecified.

These and other limitations are partly because the data were collected for purposes other than this research. Thus, the questions posed were not necessarily intended to measure the constructs that are specified in this thesis. First of all, the measure of social status is based on each respondent's occupation as recorded. Partly because the use of a list of social status scores was not conceived at the time the interviews were conducted precisely defined occupational titles for each respondent were not always obtained; even when precise titles were recorded, they did not always match the occupations on the social status scores list. As a result, some social status scores for some respondents may be higher or lower than they should be. Second, a measure of the trip planning construct, discussions about Expo '86 with others at home, may not actually reflect this construct. Third, entertainment and education may not be the most important aspects of the fair for any visitors. In addition, these two notions may not be independent of one another for any given respondent. Fourth, although the importance of the type of souvenir visitors purchase was acknowledged earlier, the measure of souvenir collecting did not provide
sufficient information to test the hypothesis. Fifth, the sampling procedure may have resulted in a skewed sample of visitors, partly because only visitors who were waiting in a stand-by line were interviewed, and partly because only pavilion visitors were selected. Visitors who did not want to wait in line-ups or who did not want to visit pavilions may have different views than those in this sample. These limitations are addressed in the suggestions for future research.

This first part of this discussion focuses on the marketing implications of the two hypotheses that are supported. The second part deals with methods that might be used to retest these and the other hypotheses. The discussion of a replication is in the context of another world's fairs or any other well known and highly visible event that has a variety of activities and which is likely to attract people from relatively far away (e.g., Olympic Games). This type of event should be a tourist event with a prestige potential for at least some of the visitors. In the discussion of the retest a scale is developed to determine whether attendance at the event is considered to be prestigious and whether that perception varies with levels of social status. In the third section areas for future investigation are discussed.

1. **MARKETING IMPLICATIONS**

$H_{2B}$ suggests that as social status of people living 500 to 1500 miles away from Vancouver and travelling without children increases the chance that air travel 'versus car travel will be used increases. People with children are as likely to travel by airplane as by car, regardless of their level of social status.

This finding has implications for marketing to childless singles and couples, to
empty-nesters, and to widow(er)s. Airlines and travel bureaus should pay attention to the images portrayed in their advertising and other promotional material. Specifically in promotional photographs, videos or other vehicles, tourists travelling without children should appear to be of higher social status if there is air travel involved in the communication. Social status can be communicated via style of dress, luggage, accessories and even camera equipment. Characters in the promotions need not be attired in the best clothing, or carrying the best luggage, but the items should be fashionable and appear to be above average in quality. Another aspect of behaviour that can be portrayed is the confidence or comfortableness of the characters in their roles as tourists. Because people with higher levels of social status travel more often than their lower status counterparts, they may be more confident in travel situations and should be portrayed in that manner.

Promoters of an event might also wish to portray individuals enroute to that destination. Characterisations of visitors should follow the same guidelines as suggested for airline companies or travel agencies.

The second hypothesis that is supported by the data at the 90% confidence level is $H_3^C$. This hypothesis posits that people with higher levels of social status were more likely to discuss Expo '86 with others before they arrived in Vancouver. If discussions with others is part of the information search process, then this suggests that at least this aspect of a tourist's search for information increases with his/her level of social status and vice versa. If it is extended to other aspects of the planning process, then implications exist for the amount of information disseminated to target groups depending on their general level of social status. Information contained in promotional brochures, newspaper or magazine...

---

4 These are people who have adult children who are no longer living at home
articles, or print, radio or television advertisements targeted to individuals with higher levels of social status can be more detailed and precise. The result also suggests that this information need not be repeated as often as it may need to be for prospective visitors with lower levels of social status. This may be because people with higher levels of social status are more likely to seek out information and will pay greater attention to information that they encounter. Awareness advertising should follow a ‘more-is-better’ rule for all target markets regardless of level of social status.

Although the hypothesis did not examine the types of discussions visitors had with others, the result suggests that promotional effects from word-of-mouth advertising is less used by people with lower levels of social status. It is possible that more would attend if they were encouraged or supported by their friends to do so. Therefore promotional efforts targeted at people with lower levels of social status should encourage them to tell or talk with their friends about the upcoming event. Other forms of promotion targeted at people with lower levels of social status should be repeated often and should contain less detailed information or, detailed information should be presented less often.

2. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This following two sections discuss other methods that can be used to test the hypotheses specified in this research. With regard to a specific touristic event, some of the hypotheses can best be tested with data collected from people before they visit (pre-event survey), while others can best be tested from a survey of visitors at the event (on-site survey).
2.1. PRE-EVENT SURVEY

In the pre-event survey several areas can be examined: Social status differences between people who plan to visit and those who do not plan to visit; respondent’s likelihood of visiting the event; details about their trip planning methods; and expectations of the event from among those who do plan on attending.

2.1.1. MEASURES OF THE CONSTRUCTS

The measure of an individual’s social status score may be determined by ensuring, at the time of interview, that the occupation indicated is listed in an index of occupations that is being used to assign social status scores. Each respondent should be assigned a score on the basis of the head of household’s occupation. The head of the household might be defined as the person whose salary or income is used to pay food, shelter and clothing expenses. Some models of social status use the male head of household’s occupation and education to determine the social status position of the rest of the family (Powers 1982). Scores of students who are independent can be determined from their most recently held full-time occupation, or, if they are dependent on outside support, on the basis of the present occupation of the head of the household where they lived most of their life.

For each other construct, two interval measures are obtained for each respondent. These two measures are analysed in association with social status in a canonical correlation. This is a multivariate technique which indicates the strength between variables and groupings among variables. It is a multidimensional version of multiple regression. Like regression it does not imply any causality in the relationships.

The relationship between social status and attendance at cultural events can be determined,
first, by collecting information on the number of cultural events the respondent has attended in the last 12 months. Second, the respondents can rank the relative importance, for their visit, of the various cultural activities taking place at the event and in proximity to the event. These two variables can be analysed with the social status scores. Of course, respondent bias can be introduced to the measure of cultural events patronage if the respondents omit events, include some from the previous twelve months (telescoping) or alter the truth.

Information on trip planning and its relationship to social status can be determined by the number of pavilions respondents plan to attend and by details about their information search. Details about their information search can be determined by the number of sources they have used to gather information about the event and their ranking of the importance of each information source in their decision and plans to come to the event. These sources include, people, professional sources (e.g. travel agents), magazine and newspaper articles and advertisements, television and radio shows and commercials, and other promotional material.

The type and importance of visitors’ expectations of the features of an event might be determined by asking respondents to indicate in which activities they plan to participate and then to rank the importance of the characteristics of those activities from a list that is provided (e.g. educational, entertaining, exciting). The list eliminates the problem of ambiguous descriptors and provides a measure of the importance of each descriptor. To reduce the chance that the respondent will rank the descriptors in the order recited by the interviewer, the order of presentation of a list of adjectives should be rotated on a random basis. Social status scores can be regressed on respondents’ rankings of the
descriptors. Respondents can then be provided with a second list identical to the first and asked to indicate what features they believe the event will have. As before, they could rank the list of features they choose in importance. Their rankings of both lists might be analysed with social status scores to determine whether relationships exist and if so, their direction and strength.

2.1.2. SAMPLING METHOD
The sample of respondents should be relatively heterogenous with respect to social status. That is they should represent a wide variety of occupations. This will help detect any differences in behaviour along the status dimension.

A representative sample of urban, suburban and rural areas should be selected. From within each region, city or town selected, a random selection of respondents can best be made either on a door-to-door or telephone basis. Compared to door-to-door interviews, telephone surveys are much less expensive and more respondents can be sampled in a given time frame. A more representative sample can be obtained more easily using either telephone or door-to-door interviews in comparison to self-administered mail questionnaires because lists of addresses of respondents from all levels of social status may be difficult to obtain. Since a very large sample of initial contacts may be needed if a large sample of people who plan to visit the event is to be obtained, a telephone survey will be most efficient. In addition, it is the easiest method of obtaining respondents from all levels of social status. Sudman (1985) details telephone sampling methods.
2.2. ON-SITE SURVEY

The on-site survey is similar to the survey on which this research is based. Visitors to an event are sampled during their visit. The survey includes measures of trip plans, expectations of the event, souvenir collecting, the prestige of the event and mode of travel.

2.2.1. MEASURES OF THE CONSTRUCTS

Respondents might be asked to list the souvenirs they plan to collect and for whom. The relationship between number of souvenirs respondents planned to obtain for themselves and their social status scores could be determined using regression analysis.

A measure of the prestige of the event could be achieved by asking respondents to rate a series of statements about the event and their visit. Respondents could be asked to rate them from the point of view of their family members and friends, in general. The topics of the statements would be the perceived uniqueness and specialness of the event, the relative distance to the event (close/far), the cost of the trip and its overall prestige to visitors. A list of such statements is in Appendix IV.

A measure of the importance of various aspects of the fair could be obtained by having respondents indicate the activity they most enjoyed and then asking them to rank the characteristics of that activity from most liked to least liked from a list of features provided. Finally, level of social status can be determined in the same manner as suggested in the pre-visit survey.
2.2.2. **SAMPLING METHOD**

One sampling method involves interviewing visitors standing in line at a pavilion or exhibit. However, only people who visit pavilions and who are willing to stand in line will be represented in such a sample. Other visitors may not be represented at all, depending on their tolerance for waiting in lines of various lengths and by their likelihood of visiting pavilions. A solution may be to sample other visitors in various locations on the site. A choice of interviewing locations might be randomly selected from a sample of locations, including the most popular pavilion on the site, and applied to a random selection of days during the fair. For instance, at Expo '88 in Australia, the locations might include areas near each of the entrances and the Australian pavilion (it is likely to be at least as popular as any other pavilion). One of these locations can be randomly selected for each of the randomly assigned interviewing days. Respondents who walk through a predetermined area, or who are standing in a predetermined spot in line, are selected.

### 3. REMARKS FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATIONS

In this section four topics are suggested for future research. These suggestions are based on areas discussed in this thesis. A more thorough understanding of these areas can improve the model specified earlier.

In this thesis, the transformation ritual is referred to frequently. In this context it is the transforming effect travel experiences can have on individuals, especially in reference to their positions in the social status hierarchy. Rituals are simply behaviours or experiences that are requirements for passage into a group in society. Having been at a destination or having had an experience at that destination can influence subsequent behaviour, or the experience can be communicated in some manner to significant others. The result is a
transformation of the individual’s position in society. Future research could help determine if modern tourists expectations of a tourist event or destination to provide transforming experiences could influence their behaviours (e.g. watching a variety of ethnic and folk dances at a world’s fair or just wandering through pavilions) and whether their expectations are linked to their level of social status. Indeces of items for tourists of given levels of social status could be developed to measure both the status transformation power of an event or destination and its influence on tourists’ behaviour for each level of social status. Not only will this add insight to the topic of rituals but could also provide tourism marketers with valuable information about the importance of some features of a destination to some groups of tourists.

This research raises the question of how the prestige of a destination makes it attractive to people with relatively low levels of social status. In the discussion of tourists of the 19th century, the association with Grand Tourists was noted as a possible tourism motivator. Among modern tourists, it is often assumed that some tourists with lower levels of social status are attracted to destinations where they could potentially associate with tourists with higher levels of social status. However, the discussion on socialisation pointed out that people relate best to others with similar levels of social status because they share similar values and norms that they learned during their socialisation process. It is not quite clear at what point a destination becomes available to people with a given level of social status. Nor is the process of how people ‘associate’ themselves with others well understood. Future research would do well to make this process and the concept of ‘prestige association’ better understood.

Another issue concerns the direct influence of socialisation on tourist behaviour. In this
thesis it played an indirect role through social status. Perhaps the underlying foundation of social status, that is, values, beliefs, norms and attitudes, which link social status and socialisation, can be used in a more direct way to predict or explain behavioural differences between groups with different levels of social status. To determine if there are links between social status and values, one of the inventory scales can be used, such as VALS (Mitchell 1983) or LOV (Beatty et al 1986) or RVS (Rokeach 1973). VALS is the best known system and is widely in business. However, it is expensive and time consuming to administer. Furthermore in a comparison between LOV and VALS, LOV, the far simpler method, produced higher correlations between value orientations and behaviours. RVS is by far the oldest of the three and is valuable as a theoretical base only. For research of this type, LOV seems to be the most useful value inventory method. Using LOV perhaps tourist behaviours or expectations can be tied to either or both, values, beliefs, norms and attitudes, and level of social status.

Finally, this research raises and tries to answer whether behaviour varies with social status. The literature suggests that it does. Another fruitful question is how changes in social status affect behaviour. For example, do gradual increases in social status cause gradual shifts in behaviour? Or do the changes in behaviour occur at certain levels of social status? No evidence was found in the literature regarding subgroups within this or any similar social status hierarchy. (Warner (1949) and Coleman identified classes, but their stratification methods are different than the type used here). More research needs to be done to determine the nature of the specific relationship between changes in level of social status and behaviour.


"Personal Element Became Expo's Biggest Success". Globe and Mail (October 8, 1986).


Hello, my name is _______________. I am conducting a study on world's fairs for the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia. Are you, by any chance, from outside the province? (If from B.C., then respondent and terminate the interview. If from outside B.C., ask:) Would you please answer some questions about your experiences here at EXPO '86? It will only take a few minutes and will help us greatly in understanding how to plan effective expositions.

1. Would you please tell me your permanent place of residence?
   - City
   - Canada
   - U.S.
   - Other (Specify)

2. By what means did you travel to Vancouver?
   - car
   - bus
   - plane
   - boat
   - train
   - boat
   - other (Specify)

3. Did you travel here with anyone else?
   - No
   - spouse only
   - friends and spouse
   - spouse and children
   - parents
   - family
   - friends

4. (If with family) Are there any children under the age of 18 travelling with you?
   - Yes
   - Number

5. How many days -- altogether -- do you plan to spend at EXPO '86?
   - Just today
   - 2 - 3
   - 4 - 5
   - over 5
   - do not know
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(6) How many days, including today, have you been here so far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just today</th>
<th>over 5</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>do not know</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(7) Are you spending any days in Vancouver when you are not going to EXPO?

No

Yes (a) What other places in Vancouver do you hope to visit?

(b) What about elsewhere in B.C.? Do you plan to spend anytime in the province outside the Vancouver area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
<th>Number of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Whistler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver Island</td>
<td>Sunshine Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okanagan</td>
<td>Gulf Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kootenay</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) Is EXPO the main purpose of your trip to Vancouver?

Yes

No What else brings you here? Business

Visit relatives/ friends

Outdoor activities

Resort holiday

Cruise

(9) Have you been to Vancouver before this trip?

No

Yes When were you here last? (Year)
(10) Before arriving at EXPO ’86, were there any things you especially wanted to see at EXPO?

No, not especially __________

Yes __________ What were they?

_________ Canada Pavilion
_________ B.C. Pavilion
_________ Ramses
_________ China
_________ USSR
_________ USA
_________ Folklife
_________ Homestate, country, province pavilion
_________ Highway ’86
_________ Rides
_________ Corporate pavilions
_________ On-Site entertainment
_________ Bars, pubs
_________ Special entertainment - (EXPO Theatre)
_________ Other

(11a) Now that you are here, are there any things you would add to or take away from that "must-see at EXPO" list?

(a) No ______
    Yes ______

(If add): What? __________________________

(If subtract): What? __________________________

(b) Why? (Add)

(Subtitle) __________________________

(Subtitle) __________________________
(12a) Is there any one place, or activity, or symbol that -- more than all others -- represents EXPO '86 for you?

(a) No _______  
Yes _______  What is that? ____________________________________________

(b) Is there anything(s) you would like to take home to remind you of this experience?

No _______  
Yes _______  Would you mind telling me what? _______________________

(13a) Do you plan to attend any of the cultural events associated with EXPO while you are here?

(a) No _______  
Yes _______  What, is particular, appeals to you? _______________________

(b) Do you plan to visit any museums or art galleries?

No _______  
Yes _______  Which?

Museum of Anthropology
Vancouver Art Gallery
Vancouver Museum & Planetarium
Maritime Museum
Art, Science and Technology Center
Other - Specify: _______________________

(14) Have you been to expos or world's fairs before EXPO '86?

No _______  
Yes _______  Where was that? Montreal
Knoxville
New Orleans
Others - Specify: _______________________

(15) For your visit to Expo which of these items is most important to you? (Hand card).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education/information</th>
<th>Art, Creativity</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(16) What do you think EXPO does best among these four items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education/information</th>
<th>Art, Creativity</th>
<th>Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(17) How do you feel EXPO '86 compares with other world's fairs you have seen or hear about? Would you say EXPO '86 was much better (MB), a little better (LB), about the same (S), a little worse (LW), or much worse (MW) than others on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) education</th>
<th>(f) just plain fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>LW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b) entertainment</th>
<th>(g) difficulty in getting around</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>LW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(c) artistic quality</th>
<th>(h) difficulty to handle crowds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>LW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(d) technology</th>
<th>(i) political (propaganda)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
<td>LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>LW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e) imaginative (creative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(18) How did you first hear about EXPO '86?

- Advertising  
- Word-of-mouth  
- Newspaper  
- Radio  
- Television  
- Travel Agents  
- Other (specify)  

(19) Do you personally know others coming to EXPO '86 from your home city?

No  
Yes  Did you discuss EXPO '86 with them before travelling to Vancouver?

Yes  
No  

(20) When you return home, would you recommend EXPO '86 to people who might ask you about it?

No  Any particular reasons?

Yes  

(21) Please tell me whether you strongly agree (SA), somewhat agree (SA), neither agree nor disagree (NN), somewhat disagree (SD), or strongly disagree (SD) with the following statements:

(a) Most visitors to EXPO '86 are people like me.

SA  
SA  
NN  
SD  
SD  

(b) The experience of being at EXPO is just as I imagined it to be.

SA  
SA  
NN  
SD  

If either "strongly" or "somewhat disagree" on (b) above, ask:)

(1) How does it differ from what you expected?

("Again, how well do you agree with the following statements?"
(c) My visit to EXPO '86 cost just about what I expected.

SA ______
SA ______
NN ______
SD ______
SD ______

(d) My visit to EXPO cost no more than my usual annual holidays.

SA ______
SA ______
NN ______
SD ______
SD ______

(e) Overall, EXPO was more enjoyable than I had expected it to be.

SA ______
SA ______
NN ______
SD ______
SD ______

"Just a few questions now to help us classify our information and we will be finished.

(22) Have you taken any other holidays in the last 12 months, more than 2 nights away from home?

No ______
Yes ______

(23) What is your occupation please?

Professional ______
Managerial ______
Clerical or Sales ______
Hourly worker ______
Retired ______
Student ______
Housewife ______
Other ______
(specify) ______
(24a) And your highest completed year of education?

(a) Secondary or less  _____  Completed university  _____
    Some college or university  _____  Post-graduate work  _____
    Trade/technical school  _____

(b) What did you specialize in at university?  

(25) Age?  
    under 20  _____  41 - 50  _____
    21 - 30  _____  51 - 60  _____
    31 - 40  _____  over 60  _____

(26) Marital Status:  M _____  S _____  D _____  Other _____

(27) (Interviewer record) Sex:  Male  _____
    Female  _____

(28) Time (hour and day) of interview  

(29) Interviewer name  

(30) Interview location  
APPENDIX II

1. DATA CODING

All the data except city and state or province of residence were coded in numeric format. Cities were given 4 letter codes and states or provinces were given 2 letter codes. A list of the codes and their respective full names is at the end of this appendix. Answers to closed-ended questions, such as level of education or mode of travel to Vancouver, were assigned numbers from 1 to 8; 9 was usually reserved for the category 'other'. Answers to statements that required a rating from much better to much worse, very important to not at all important, best liked to least liked and strongly agree to strongly disagree were coded on the basis of the number of categories available, starting from 1 at the positive end of the scale (e.g., much better); 0 was reserved for 'don't know'. Open ended questions were content analyzed. For some questions each common response was assigned its own category; 1 was coded if the response was given, 0 otherwise. For other open ended questions each common response was given its own code. For instance each type of response to the question regarding the purchase of souvenirs at Expo '86 was given its own numerical code: 1 = postcards; 2 = spoons, pins; etc. Two other open ended questions, 11.b and 20, were coded somewhat differently. This is described below.

Question 10, which concerns the respondent's plans to visit sites at Expo before arriving, was coded for each site and for the number of sites that the respondent planned to visit. Question 11.a was coded in the same manner.

Question 11.b, concerning the rationale for adding pavilions to visit to an "original" list is coded on the basis of whether the response indicated reasons of an educational or
entertainment nature or both. Other information contained in the responses was not coded. Statements were coded into the appropriate category if the words or phrases recorded were synonymous with either education or entertainment. Acceptable synonyms were based on entries listed in Roget's Thesaurus (Dutch 1966). In the keyword index, entertainment is contained under the theme of amusement. Some of the synonyms listed under the theme 'amusement' along with entertainment are: nice, interesting, exciting, and delightful. The keyword 'education' is contained under the theme of knowledge. Some of the synonyms of knowledge, in addition to education, are: learning, things to hear and enlightening. The responses were coded into the appropriate category depending on the phrases recorded. Adjectives explicitly modifying another reason (e.g., exciting technology) were not coded into either category. The phrase 'special effects' was assigned to the entertainment category.

Question 20, regarding the respondent's reasons for recommending Expo '86 to people at home, was coded in an identical manner to question 11.b.

Question 12.b concerning the respondent's purchase of souvenirs was coded on the basis of type of souvenir and on the number of souvenirs mentioned. Memories and other comments like 'sore feet' were not included, but photographs, passport books and brochures were included.

To account for experimental bias that may have resulted from differences in interviewing style, surveys were coded for each interviewer.

Occupation was coded in two ways on the basis of the occupational title that the
respondent supplied. First, categories were established as follows:

1. Professional: Any occupation for which special training is required, or which has a governing body that determines who may practice. In most cases professionals must have completed university or a trade or technical school. All professionals are 'white collar'; that is the tasks involve more mental than physical activity. Some examples are lawyer, medical doctor, engineer, chartered accountant, registered nurse and teacher.

2. Managerial: The respondent must manage or supervise people or have a multitude of tasks. Level of education is not a criterion. Managers can be blue or white collar. Some examples are supervisor, farmer, store owner and self employed carpenter.

3. Clerical/sales: These people are all 'white collar'. They are not involved in supervisory tasks. Their occupations are service oriented. Some examples are secretary and salesman.

4. Skilled hourly: These jobs require specialized training and usually special certification; respondents usually have completed trade or technical schools. They are primarily jobs involving physical labour and are not salaried but are paid hourly. Some examples are electrician, heavy construction worker and nurse assistant.

5. Unskilled hourly: These are typically jobs that require no formal training or certification and can be learned on-the-job easily. They are also not salaried but are paid by the hour. Typically the jobs require physical activity. Some examples are waiter/waitress, lineman and transit operator.

6. Retired: Previous occupations are coded under 'Prevocc'.


8. Student.

9. Unclassifiable: These are categorized as 'Other'.
If the occupation was not supplied, the respondent was categorized according to how the interviewer coded the response at the time of the interview or according to how the respondent self-categorized him/herself (e.g., professional).

Second, each respondent was assigned a score on the basis of the social status associated with his/her occupation. These scores are taken from Blishen (1976) for Canadian respondents and from Featherman and Stevens (1982) for American respondents. Scores are not assigned to residents of any other countries. Behaviours of tourists from other countries may not fall into the patterns as hypothesized in Chapter 5. In addition, behaviour may differ from respondent to respondent depending on their residence. There were not enough respondents from each country other than the United States and Canada for a meaningful analysis.

There were three problems in assigning scores to respondents on the basis of occupational title. First, occupational titles were not always specified on the response sheet. The interviewer often classified the respondent's occupation into one of the nine categories detailed above without providing the respondent's occupation. Third, the occupational titles specified were not always specific enough. For instance, 'Engineer' may have been recorded, but the lists provide different scores for different types of engineers (e.g. civil, mechanical engineer). Second, the occupational titles supplied did not always match the titles in the classification scores developed by Blishen or Featherman and Stevens. For instance, 'cashier' is not listed in Blishen. These problems were resolved by using the occupation that came closest to the occupation recorded. If only the type of occupation was recorded (e.g. managerial), the lowest score for occupations in that classification was assigned. If the occupational title recorded was not specific enough, the score for 'other'
within that occupation is assigned. An exception to this rule was that the score applicable
to secondary school teachers was assigned to all teachers. If there was no match for the respondent’s occupation, a rule was applied to each occupation that was specified but unmatched, as necessary; for instance, self-employed people, store owners and business executives are considered managers and are assigned the appropriate score.

Visitor residences were coded on the basis of distance to Vancouver in miles. The respective distances were computed from Gousha’s Road Atlas mileage chart (1983). Places of residence not on the mileage chart were assigned distances based on the distance to Vancouver from the location of the nearest city that was on the mileage chart.

For the purposes of this research, point of origins that were defined as ‘near’, were places within one day’s driving distance to Vancouver, approximately 500 miles. Points of origin defined as ‘far’, were those so far away, that few would consider driving. A distance of 1500 miles was selected.
APPENDIX III-DATA ANALYSIS

This section describes the methods used to analyse the data. Variables that are measured with ratio-type data are tested in a simple linear regression model. Social status scores are the independent variable and data measuring each variable of interest is input, one-at-a-time, as the dependent variable. Variables that are measured with categorical data are tested by comparing the homogeneity of the sample distributions of each category along the dimension of social status scores. The test used is the Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample test (K-S). The regression model is chosen because it is simple to use and the results are easy to interpret. The assumptions are also clear and easily met. The major assumption in the linear regression model,

\[ Y = a + \beta X + \epsilon \]

is that the Y's are independently and normally distributed. However, some of the dependent variables are dichotomous (e.g., discussing or not discussing the visit to Expo '86 with others at home). Dichotomous response variables are clearly non-normal. Nevertheless, the method of least squares used to fit the regression equation provides unbiased estimates of \( \beta \) for large sample sizes (Neter, Wasserman and Kutner 1985 p.357). This method is used in this analysis. Continuous dependent variables are tested for normality and attempts are made to transform those that are not. The assumption of linearity can be tested by examining the plot of the residuals.

The \( \beta \) for social status scores in each regression equation with each dependent variable is tested against the null hypotheses (Ho: \( \beta = 0 \)) at alpha=0.10. The significance level is not very stringent because the data were not collected with the intention of testing these hypotheses. Therefore, much more 'noise' may need to be overcome before relationships manifest themselves statistically.
The K-S test is "a test of whether two independent samples have been drawn from the same population...[it] is sensitive to any kind of differences in the distributions from the two samples drawn. If the two samples have in fact been drawn from the same population distribution, then the cumulative distributions of both samples may be expected to be fairly close to each other...a large enough deviation between [them] is evidence for rejecting H₀" (Siegel 1956 p.127-28). The advantage to using the K-S test is that it requires no assumptions of normality. The independent sample requirement is assumed because the likelihoods of a respondent being measured twice or respondents in the same visitor group being interviewed are remote.

The procedure is implemented by invoking a procedure in SPSS-X which calculates the largest positive and negative differences between the two cumulative distributions. A positive difference indicates that the social status scores for the first category specified are smaller than for the second category specified, since the formula specifies that

\[ D = S_n_1(X) - S_n_2(X) \]

where \( S_n_i \) = the observed cumulative distribution of the \( i \)th sample with sample size=\( n \).

To determine if there is a significant difference between the two samples as specified in the hypothesis, the value with the appropriate sign is multiplied by the product of the sample sizes of each sample and compared to the tabular value (Kim and Jennrich 1973) at the .10 level. It is possible that the distributions have crossover points at different levels of social status. To verify that the opposite hypothesis is not true, the value with the opposite sign is tested as well.

Each of the dependent variables tested was either ratio scaled or nominally scaled in two

---

5 SPSS-X is a statistical computer package
categories. The multi-category nominal variables are recoded as dichotomous variables with
the two categories indicating the presence or absence of the behaviour of interest.
APPENDIX IV-MEASURE OF PRESTIGE

Thinking of your friends and family in general how do you think they would rate each of the following statements about your trip? Please rate each statement from 1 to 5

1 = strongly agree
2 = somewhat agree
3 = neutral
4 = somewhat disagree
5 = strongly disagree

1. Its a very expensive trip.
2. I could easily afford to go.
3. The event is unique.
4. This type of event happens rarely.
5. This event is very special.
6. Visitors to this event will see and experience things they couldn’t elsewhere.
7. The event is far from home.
8. The event is not further away from home than the other places to which I travel.
9. People who attend this event are very lucky to have the opportunity.
Please rank the following items in terms of their importance in your decision to come to the event.

1. Uniqueness of the event
2. Location of the event
3. Cost of the trip
4. Prestige of the event
5. 'Specialness' of the event.