

[Refereed Article]

Factors Causing Travelers to Dither and Their Influence on the Choice of Alternative Travel Destinations: Empirical Analyses for Domestic Travel in Japan

KIKUCHI Fumiaki

Abstract

Individuals often dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations for various factors. However, it is not clear whether these factors have the same influence on choice of alternative travel destination. This paper focuses on the difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and the perceived attractiveness of alternatives as factors causing travelers' dither. It also examines their influence on whether alternative travel destinations are located in a particular region or spread across many regions. The authors empirically analyzed domestic travel in Japan, showing that both aspects increased travelers' tendencies to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations, as expected. It was then revealed that while increasing difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations made individuals recognize prefectures within a certain region as alternative travel destinations, increasing the perceived attractiveness of alternatives made them prefer prefectures in different regions.

Introduction

In choosing travel destinations, we often cannot make immediate decisions and frequently dither about choosing between two or more alternative travel destinations, even if we are actually traveling to only one place. Although individuals commonly consider several alternative choices (Hauser and Wernerfelt 1990), it is still not clear which aspects drive individuals' dithering about choosing between two or more alternatives in the context of domestic travel. It is also unclear how these aspects influence whether these alternative travel destinations are in a specific region or in various regions. This study aims to elucidate these points drawing on frameworks from the field of consumer behavior.

Although various factors may influence individuals' decision-making, one representative factor can be their expertise or knowledge about objectives (Alba and Hutchinson 1987, 2000). This study focuses on this factor and considers two extreme cases. On the one hand, if individuals are not familiar with travel destinations, they are likely to struggle with understanding their features. This difficulty caused by a lack of knowledge is the first factor examined as an explanatory variable. Although it could increase individuals' indecisiveness, it has not been empirically examined in the context of deciding travel destinations in Japan. On the other hand, individuals' familiarity with travel

destinations will expectedly advance their understanding of these destinations. Considering that alternatives have equal value if there is a lack of objective criteria (Miura and Ito 2000), and because travel destinations typically lack such criteria, the expected consequence of advanced understanding of travel destinations is that many travel destinations will be perceived as attractive. In other words, the perceived attractiveness of alternatives defined as “customer perceptions regarding the extent to which viable competing alternatives are available in the marketplace” (Jones et al. 2000, 262) increases when individuals’ knowledge about travel destinations is abundant.

This study focuses on these two factors caused by a lack or abundance of knowledge and examines their influence on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations and the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations. Thus, we examine domestic travel in Japan and treat the eight Japanese regions (Hokkaido, Tohoku, Kanto, Chubu, Kinki, Chugoku, Shikoku, and Kyushu) as the units of analysis, although we measure the alternative travel destinations by prefecture as components of regions.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Based on the literature regarding our research questions, we first derive the hypotheses. Next, we present empirical results. Finally, we conclude by addressing our contributions and limitations.

Theoretical view and hypotheses

First, we focus on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations and consider the influences of difficulty in understanding their features and perceived attractiveness of alternatives.

With regard to the former, considering that more complete decision-making is likely to bring confidence to their choice (Bettman et al. 1998), individuals who can discern features of each alternative based on extensive knowledge and detailed evaluations are less likely to dither about choosing. In contrast, those who face difficulty in understanding the features of alternatives are less likely to be confident about their choice and tend to suffer from choice overload (Bettman et al. 1998; Thai and Yuksel 2017). In such cases, the tendency to dither about the choice seems to be higher.

It can be expected that difficulty in understanding the features of alternatives increases the tendency to dither about a choice. This study hypothesizes that this also applies to deciding upon travel destinations and derives the following hypothesis:

H1a

Difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations has a positive influence on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations.

Prior research suggests that the perceived attractiveness of alternatives decreases the loyalty toward a favorite alternative (Patterson and Smith 2003). This implies that other alternatives would simultaneously be more attractive. Hence, increasing their perceived attractiveness would make several alternatives equally attractive, causing individuals to dither about making a choice.

Such cases should be distinguished from those in which individuals face difficulty in understanding

Oct. 2020 Factors Causing Travelers to Dither and Their Influence on the Choice of Alternative Travel Destinations

the features of alternatives. While the former indicates that individuals dither about making a choice due to a lack of knowledge, the latter suggests that there is an ambivalence of choices resulting from an awareness of several alternatives and the perceptions of their attractiveness.

Thus, we propose that dithering about choosing results from different factors and derive the following hypothesis:

H1b

Perceived attractiveness of alternatives has a positive influence on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations.

Next, we focus on whether alternative travel destinations are in a specific region or in various regions and examine the influences of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and the perceived attractiveness of alternatives. That is, even if an individual dithers about choosing between two or more travel destinations (two or more prefectures in the context of this study), some may actually consider only prefectures in one particular region as travel destination options. In contrast, others may consider prefectures in various regions as possible options. Although we have only hypothesized that difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives have a positive influence on the tendency to dither about the choice between two or more travel destinations, the influence on the geographic range of alternative travel destinations may be different. This section elucidates such influences drawing on prior research.

Difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations may result in an unconfident choice or choice overload (Bettman et al. 1998; Thai and Yuksel 2017); thus, it can be assumed that individuals facing such difficulty are less likely to prefer larger assortments, which make comparison difficult (Chernev et al. 2015). In the context of this study, they would be less likely to choose travel destinations from various regions. They would prioritize the reduction of this uncertainty or choice overload by narrowing down the travel destination regions. In this case, a region with which individuals are relatively familiar or one that they find particularly attractive will be the preferred option for travel. This results in a situation in which they dither about choosing travel destinations within a particular region.

Thus, we propose that difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations will lead to a reduction in the number of regions comprising alternative travel destinations and derive the following hypothesis:

H2a

Difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations has a negative influence on the number of regions that comprise travel destination options.

We propose that the perceived attractiveness of alternatives makes prefectures with different characteristics attractive. It can be assumed that individuals with high perceived attractiveness of alternatives have sufficient knowledge about domestic travel and, in this sense, are more likely to be interested in travel. Considering that such individuals tend to evaluate each alternative in detail and

try to optimize their choice (Zhang and Markman 2001), they are expected to recognize alternatives across subcategories as their travel destination choices (Chakravarti and Janiszewski 2003). In the context of this study, this means that individuals perceiving high attractiveness of alternatives are more likely to recognize prefectures in various regions as potential travel destinations.

Thus, we propose that because individuals perceiving the high attractiveness of alternatives seem to recognize the attractiveness of prefectures in various regions, the number of potential travel destinations is likely to be spread across the nation. From this consideration, the following hypothesis is derived:

H2b

Perceived attractiveness of alternatives has a positive influence on the number of regions that comprise travel destination options.

In summary, we propose that although difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives increase the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations, its influence on the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations differs. Increasing difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations may cause individuals to target a geographically small range as alternative destinations (i.e., the prefectures considered will be located in particular regions). In contrast, increasing the perceived attractiveness of alternatives may cause individuals to target a geographically large range as alternative destinations (i.e., the prefectures considered will be spread across many regions).

Empirical study

Procedure

To test our hypotheses, questionnaire surveys were conducted in November 2019 at a university in Osaka, Japan. After collecting data, we excluded participants who did not complete the questionnaire from the analyses. In total, 83 participants were included in the study (mean age = 20.4 years, 70% male).

The measured data to test the hypotheses were difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations, perceived attractiveness of alternatives, tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations, and alternative domestic destinations in Japan.

The question items to determine difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations included "It takes a lot of information to determine the features of a travel destination," "Understanding features of travel destinations takes time," and "Understanding features of travel destinations takes effort." Participants responded to these items on a five-point scale ranging from "Agree" (5) to "Disagree" (1). The Cronbach's alpha was .83.

Using Jones et al. (2000) as a reference, the question items to determine perceived attractiveness of alternatives included "There are other good options when a travel destination needs to be changed," "I am convinced about travel destinations other than my favorite one," "I have travel destinations that are as satisfying as my favorite one," and "There are not very many travel

destinations with which I could be satisfied other than my favorite one.” Participants responded to these items on a five-point scale ranging from “Agree” (5) to “Disagree” (1), but the answers to the last item were coded in reverse. Although Cronbach’s alpha for these four items was .64, the value improved when the last item was excluded. Hence, we used the first three items for further analyses. The conclusive Cronbach’s alpha was .73.

We conducted a factor analysis based on the principal factor method with varimax rotation on the answers to these six items. The results reveal that two factors were extracted, as expected (see Table 1). We calculated the factor scores for each participant and used them as independent variables.

The item “I dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations” was used to measure each participant’s tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations. They responded to the item on a five-point scale from “Agree” (5) to “Disagree” (1).

To identify alternative travel destinations for domestic travel, we used the item “Assuming you are going to travel to one place in the country, please mark the prefectures you would like to go to.” For this item, the recognition method was used. The units of measurement were Japan’s prefectures; 47 prefectures were listed in the questionnaire. This item allowed participants to choose multiple answers. We then transformed raw data measured by prefectures into aggregated data on the basis of units of regions in Japan. That is, if a participant marked at least one prefecture in a region at a given item, we considered this region to include alternative travel destinations for this participant, regardless of the number of marked prefectures in this region (in this case, we coded it as 1, otherwise 0). Considering that the 47 prefectures in Japan are consolidated into eight regions (Hokkaido region is the same as Hokkaido prefecture; Tohoku region consists of Aomori, Iwate, Miyagi, Akita, Yamagata, and Fukushima; Kanto region consists of Ibaraki, Tochigi, Gunma, Saitama,

Table 1
Factor loadings and communalities based on factor analysis

	Difficulty in understanding features	Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	Communality
Item 1	.75	-.03	.56
Item 2	.86	-.23	.79
Item 3	.78	.12	.62
Item 4	-.17	.53	.31
Item 5	.04	.79	.62
Item 6	.06	.76	.59
Eigenvalues	1.93	1.56	
Percentage of variance	32.16	25.94	
Percentage of total variance	32.16	58.10	

Item 1: It takes a lot of information to determine the features of a travel destination.

Item 2: Understanding features of travel destinations takes time.

Item 3: Understanding features of travel destinations takes effort.

Item 4: There are other good options when a travel destination needs to be changed.

Item 5: I am convinced about travel destinations other than my favorite one.

Item 6: I have travel destinations that are as satisfying as my favorite one.

Chiba, Tokyo, and Kanagawa; Chubu region consists of Niigata, Toyama, Ishikawa, Fukui, Yamanashi, Nagano, Gifu, Shizuoka, and Aichi; Kinki region consists of Mie, Shiga, Kyoto, Osaka, Hyogo, Nara, and Wakayama; Chugoku region consists of Tottori, Shimane, Okayama, Hiroshima, and Yamaguchi; Shikoku region consists of Tokushima, Kagawa, Ehime, and Kochi; Kyushu region consists of Fukuoka, Saga, Nagasaki, Kumamoto, Oita, Miyazaki, Kagoshima, and Okinawa), the maximum score of this item for each participant was eight, and the corresponding minimum score was one. The data of participants who marked no prefectures on this item were eliminated from the analyses.

To test H1a and H1b, using the factor scores of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives as independent variables, the sex (coded 1 if male, 0 if female) and age of each participant were considered control variables, and the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations was the dependent variable. We estimated the influences of independent variables on the dependent variable based on an ordered probit regression model. Our hypotheses predicted positive influences of both independent variables.

To test H2a and H2b, because the dependent variable (i.e., the number of regions that comprise travel destination options) reflects count data and does not contain zero, we use a zero-truncated Poisson regression model. The independent and control variables were the same as in testing H1a and H1b. We assumed that while difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations has a negative influence on the number of regions that comprise travel destination options, the perceived attractiveness of alternatives exerts a positive influence.

Results and discussion

For H1a and H1b, the results reveal that difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives have a positive influence on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations (see Table 2). Hence, these hypotheses were supported. These results indicate that travelers, on the one hand, are likely to dither about decision-making due to increasing difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations presumably caused by their lack of knowledge. On the other hand, they also have trouble with decisions due to the high perceived attractiveness of alternatives presumably caused by abundant knowledge.

Table 2

Influence of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives on tendency to dither about choosing between two or more destinations

	Coefficient	Standard error	<i>z</i> -value
Difficulty in understanding features	0.26	0.14	1.91 (<i>p</i> < .10)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.32	0.14	2.29 (<i>p</i> < .05)
Sex (control variable)	0.02	0.27	0.08 (NS)
Age (control variable)	0.07	0.10	0.68 (NS)
Log likelihood = -105.72			
McFadden's pseudo R ² = .04			

Table 3
Influence of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives on the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations

	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.17	0.09	-1.92 ($p < .10$)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.21	0.11	1.87 ($p < .10$)
Sex (control variable)	-0.33	0.20	-1.68 ($p < .10$)
Age (control variable)	0.02	0.08	0.19 (NS)
Log likelihood = -131.04			
McFadden's pseudo $R^2 = .04$			

Next, for H2a and H2b, the results show that difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations has a negative influence on the number of regions that comprise travel destination options, which is consistent with H2a. In contrast, the perceived attractiveness of alternatives has a positive influence on the dependent variable, as expected. Hence, H2b was also supported. A summary of the results is provided in Table 3. Taken together, it can be implied that, while difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives promote travelers' dither about making a choice, they bring different consequences regarding the selection of travel destination options.

Furthermore, from these results, a new analytical perspective can be obtained: It may be worthwhile to examine whether regions that comprise alternative travel destinations converge into a particular region or diverge into various others among travelers when difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives increase. For instance, even if difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations leads to a limited number of regions that comprise travel destination options, it may be possible that different regions were preferred among participants, which has been implied in previous research on consumer behavior (Andrews and Srinivasan 1995; Kikuchi 2015). To interpret the results regarding H2a and H2b in more detail, an additional analysis was conducted.

To test this research question, applying the index originally indicating the probability that a certain choice set C will occur proposed by Andrews and Srinivasan (1995) in this study, we quantified the degree of convergence of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations for each participant as follows:

$$P(C) = \frac{\prod_{i \in C} D_i \prod_{i \notin C} (1 - D_i)}{1 - \prod_i (1 - D_i)},$$

where D_i indicates the frequency that region i comprises alternative travel destinations calculated by dividing the number of participants who regarded at least one prefecture in region i as an alternative by the total number of participants. Hence, each D_i ranges from zero to one. Then, we calculated $P(C)$ for each participant, which also ranges from zero to one. If a participant regards only regions with

large D_i as alternative travel destinations and excludes others (i.e., regions comprising alternative travel destinations chosen by this participant overlap those chosen by other participants), the index of this participant will be large (close to one). In contrast, if another participant regards only regions with small D_i as alternative travel destinations (i.e., regions comprising alternative travel destinations of this participant are different from those of other participants), the index of this participant will be small (close to zero). In summary, the larger $P(C)$ indicates the high degree of convergence of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations among participants. Therefore, we explore whether the index calculated for each participant will be larger or smaller with the increase of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives.

We estimated coefficients of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives using OLS. Furthermore, the sex and age of each participant were used in the analysis as control variables. As for the dependent variable, $P(C)$ obtained in the equation above for each participant was transformed as follows:

$$P^*(C) = \log\left(\frac{P(C)}{1-P(C)}\right).$$

We will use $P^*(C)$ as a conclusive dependent variable. The interpretation of $P^*(C)$ is same as that of $P(C)$: the larger value means the high degree of convergence of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations among participants.

The results are shown in Table 4. The coefficient of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations is significantly positive, which means that particular regions that comprise alternative travel destinations converge among travelers when difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases. For perceived attractiveness of alternatives, there was no significant result.

Focusing on the significant result in Table 4, we can interpret that the preferences for domestic travel become similar among travelers as difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases. Further studies should seek to verify this claim.

Table 4

Influence of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives on the degree of convergence of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations

	Coefficient	Standard error	t-value
Difficulty in understanding features	0.42	0.22	1.92 ($p < .10$)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	-0.20	0.22	-0.91 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	0.43	0.43	1.00 (NS)
Age (control variable)	0.02	0.17	0.14 (NS)
Adjusted $R^2 = .01$			

Conclusions

This study examined how difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives influence individuals' tendency to dither about choosing between two or more destinations and the number of regions that comprise alternative destinations. The empirical results indicate that both aspects have positive influences on the tendency to dither about choosing between two or more destinations. Furthermore, it was revealed that while difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations has a negative influence on the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations, the perceived attractiveness of alternatives has a positive influence on it. The major value of this study is the empirical presentation of these results.

How can we integrate these results? On the one hand, it can be summarized that individuals who face great difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations are more likely to dither about choosing between two or more destinations in a few specific regions. On the other hand, the results imply that, while individuals perceiving strong attractiveness of alternatives are also likely to dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations, the geographic range considered is extensive. Thus, it can be concluded that the influence of dither about choosing travel destinations on the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations is not robust but dependent on whether the possible antecedent factors are difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations (possessing negative influence) or perceived attractiveness of alternatives (possessing positive influence).

A few research paths can be expected from this study in the future: First, although the relationship between dither about choosing between two or more travel destinations and the number of regions that comprise alternative destinations was mentioned in this study, it remains to be empirically tested. If the relationships among the four factors examined in this study are analyzed simultaneously, meaningful revelations can be expected. Second, this study did not account for the distance between regions when considering the number of regions that comprise alternative travel destinations. That is, it did not differentiate between combinations of travel destinations among geographically close and distant regions. Considering that the psychological meaning might be different between the two cases, an investigation from this perspective would be worthwhile. Third, as briefly mentioned in the Appendix, the preference for travel destinations may be dependent on where individuals are currently living. In other words, the perceived attractiveness of alternatives is not the same among each alternative. With this point in mind, it may be possible that individuals living in urban areas prefer rural areas across Japan (i.e., the perceived attractiveness of alternatives will be high, especially for rural areas) and the number of regions that comprise alternative destinations would be large; however, individuals living in rural areas may prefer a few large cities as travel destinations (i.e., the perceived attractiveness of alternatives will be high, especially for urban areas) and the number of regions that comprise alternative destinations would be small. Thus, analyses considering the current residences or native areas of travelers could be expected.

Finally, we should mention the limitations of this study. First, while this study integrated all prefectures in Japan into eight regions in testing the hypotheses, other definitions of regions in Japan may exist. In other words, the results of this study may be dependent on how each boundary among

the regions is defined. Second, this study did not consider the situation at the time of decision-making. For example, certain social issues such as epidemics of infectious diseases may influence travelers' dither. Further analysis considering this perspective could be a future topic of research. Third, the sample size of this study was limited and the participants were all students, which indicates some sampling bias. Furthermore, although the results supported all hypotheses of this study, the overall low coefficients of determination should also be noted. Thus, the findings of this study should be accepted with certain reservations.

Appendix

This section considers why the regions that comprise alternative travel destinations converge with particular regions among travelers as the difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases. This result could be attributed to two different factors. The first is that increasing difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations leads to a strong preference for particular regions. Second, as difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases, travelers avoid particular regions as travel destinations. Thus, we examine whether the two possibilities exert any influence in each region.

To test this issue, we use factor scores of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives as independent variables, as with the testing of this study's hypotheses. Similarly, the sex and age of each participant were included in the analyses as control variables. Because we conducted analyses for each region, the dependent variable was whether participants regarded at least one prefecture in that region as an alternative travel destination (coded 1 if at least one prefecture was regarded as an alternative, 0 if otherwise). Hence, because the dependent variable is binomial, the analyses were conducted based on the probit regression model.

As Table A reveals, the only significant result regarding difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations was obtained from the analysis of the Kinki region, and the coefficient was negative. This means that increasing difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations decreases the probability that travelers regard prefectures in the Kinki region as alternative destinations.

It is worth considering why prefectures in a particular region are less likely to be considered as travel destinations when difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases. Given that almost all participants of this study live in the Kinki region, it is natural to interpret that neighborhoods may be less likely to be recognized as travel destinations as difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations increases. Further theoretical considerations and related empirical examinations will be conducted in the future.

Table A
Influence of difficulty in understanding the features of travel destinations and perceived attractiveness of alternatives on the probability that travelers regard at least one prefecture in each region as an alternative travel destination

Hokkaido			
	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.04	0.16	-0.26 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.18	0.16	1.14 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.30	0.31	-0.96 (NS)
Age (control variable)	-0.03	0.12	-0.25 (NS)
Log likelihood = -56.30			
McFadden's pseudo R ² = .02			
Tohoku			
	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.17	0.20	-0.86 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	-0.04	0.21	-0.19 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.49	0.40	-1.22 (NS)
Age (control variable)	0.14	0.16	0.91 (NS)
Log likelihood = -27.10			
McFadden's pseudo R ² = .05			
Kanto			
	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.09	0.16	-0.59 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.27	0.17	1.58 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	0.43	0.33	1.30 (NS)
Age (control variable)	0.13	0.13	1.06 (NS)
Log likelihood = -50.27			
McFadden's pseudo R ² = .06			
Chubu			
	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.10	0.16	-0.61 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.16	0.18	0.90 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.23	0.34	-0.70 (NS)
Age (control variable)	0.18	0.13	1.39 (NS)
Log likelihood = -43.78			
McFadden's pseudo R ² = .04			

Kinki

	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.40	0.18	-2.22 ($p < .05$)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.11	0.19	0.57 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.11	0.37	-0.29 (NS)
Age (control variable)	-0.34	0.16	-2.10 ($p < .05$)
Log likelihood = -37.89			
McFadden's pseudo $R^2 = .10$			

Chugoku

	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.15	0.18	-0.87 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	-0.01	0.19	-0.04 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.17	0.36	-0.48 (NS)
Age (control variable)	-0.15	0.15	-1.02 (NS)
Log likelihood = -38.43			
McFadden's pseudo $R^2 = .02$			

Shikoku

	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	-0.16	0.20	-0.83 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.14	0.22	0.61 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.41	0.40	-1.03 (NS)
Age (control variable)	-0.03	0.17	-0.21 (NS)
Log likelihood = -27.44			
McFadden's pseudo $R^2 = .04$			

Kyushu

	Coefficient	Standard error	z-value
Difficulty in understanding features	0.04	0.16	0.26 (NS)
Perceived attractiveness of alternatives	0.04	0.16	0.25 (NS)
Sex (control variable)	-0.52	0.31	-1.67 ($p < .10$)
Age (control variable)	0.03	0.12	0.29 (NS)
Log likelihood = -55.88			
McFadden's pseudo $R^2 = .03$			

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP17K13808.

References

- Alba, Joseph W. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (1987), "Dimensions of Consumer Expertise," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13 (4), 411-454.
- Alba, Joseph W. and J. Wesley Hutchinson (2000), "Knowledge Calibration: What Consumers Know and What They Think They Know," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27 (2), 123-156.
- Andrews, Rick L. and T. C. Srinivasan (1995), "Studying Consideration Effects in Empirical Choice Models Using Scanner Panel Data," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 32 (1), 30-41.
- Bettman, James R., Mary Frances Luce, and John W. Payne (1998), "Constructive Consumer Choice Process," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25 (3), 187-217.
- Chakravarti, Amitav and Chris Janiszewski (2003), "The Influence of Macro-Level Motives on Consideration Set Composition in Novel Purchase Situations," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30 (2), 244-258.
- Chernev, Alexander, Ulf Böckenholt, and Joseph Goodman (2015), "Choice Overload: A Conceptual Review and Meta-Analysis," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 25 (2), 333-358.
- Hauser, John R. and Birger Wernerfelt (1990), "An Evaluation Cost Model of Consideration Sets," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16 (4), 393-408.
- Jones, Michael A., David L. Mothersbaugh, and Sharon E. Beatty (2000), "Switching Barriers and Repurchase Intentions in Services," *Journal of Retailing*, 76 (2), 259-274.
- Kikuchi, Fumiaki (2015), "The Influence of Consumer Involvement on Consideration Set Composition in Japanese and German Consumers," *Takahiko Ronso*, 50 (1), 297-309.
- Miura, Toshihiko and Naofumi Ito (2000), "Think and Feel Attributes/Products and Global Marketing Strategy," in *2000 AMA Educators' Proceedings: Enhancing Knowledge Development in Marketing*, Vol. 11, ed. Gregory T. Gundlach and Patrick E. Murphy, Chicago: American Marketing Association, 220-227.
- Patterson, Paul G. and Tasman Smith (2003), "A Cross-Cultural Study of Switching Barriers and Propensity to Stay with Service Providers," *Journal of Retailing*, 79 (2), 107-120.
- Thai, Nguyen T. and Ulku Yuksel (2017), "Too Many Destinations to Visit: Tourists' Dilemma?" *Annals of Tourism Research*, 62, 38-53.
- Zhang, Shi and Arthur B. Markman (2001), "Processing Product Unique Features: Alignability and Involvement in Preference Construction," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 11 (1), 13-27.

(2020年7月24日掲載決定)