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Abstract: The purposes of the study were to define the construct of novelty in the context of tourism, to conceptualize its role in the destination choice process, and to develop an instrument to measure novelty. The novelty construct was comprised of four interrelated but distinctive dimensions: thrill, change from routine, boredom alleviation, and surprise. A 21 item instrument was developed to measure the construct and its dimensions. The scale was judged to have content validity by an initial panel of experts. It was demonstrated to have convergent, theoretical, discriminant, and criterion validity in terms of its expected correlations with other measures. Items measuring the dimensions were internally consistent, and both test-retest and split-half reliability were satisfactory. Keywords: pleasure travel, tourism, novelty, scale development.

Résumé: Le mesurage de la quête de la nouveauté dans le tourisme. Le propos de la présente étude est de définir la construction mentale de la nouveauté dans le contexte du tourisme, afin de conceptualiser son rôle dans le processus de choix de destination et de développer un instrument pour mesurer la nouveauté. La construction mentale de la nouveauté comprend quatre éléments: émotion, changement du quotidien, soulagement de l'ennui et surprise. On présente, pour qualifier cette construction, un instrument de vingt et une questions. Des experts ont approuvé au préalable le contenu des questions, et les corrélations prévues avec des mesures externes ont prouvé la validité convergente, théorique, discriminante et critique. Les questions sur les quatre éléments ont une cohérence interne, et la fiabilité statistique est satisfaisante selon deux méthodes d'essai. Mots-clés: voyage d'agrément, tourisme, nouveauté, développement de mesure.

INTRODUCTION

The general issue of better understanding tourism motivation might be framed in terms of why the needs and desires of potential tourists cannot be satisfied in their home area, or why they expect they can
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experience elsewhere that which they cannot experience at home (Pearce 1987). One frequent explanation is an individual's desire for novelty, arousal, or stimulation. People may travel because they want to experience something new and different. The few empirical studies that sought insights into tourists' motives, consistently reported novelty seeking as a key motive (Dann 1977, 1981; Crompton 1979; Leiper 1984). These empirical findings have been endorsed and are reinforced by conceptualizations offered by several authors (Bello and Etzel 1985; Cohen 1972; McIntosh 1977; Wahlers and Etzel 1985).

Despite its apparent centrality in vacation choice decisions, novelty-seeking has received relatively little attention in the literature (Bello and Etzel 1985). The purposes of this study are to define the construct of novelty in the context of tourism, to conceptualize its role in the destination choice process, and to develop an instrument to measure novelty.

THE CONCEPT OF NOVELTY

A variety of definitions of novelty have been proposed, but the prevailing view is to define it as the degree of contrast between present perception and past experience (Jenkins 1969; Judd 1988; Pearson 1970). Thus, in assessing whether a stimulus is novel, individuals compare it with other stimuli present at that time and with stimuli they have encountered in the past (Greenberger, Woldman, and Yourshaw 1967).

Hutt (1970) proposed that perceptions of novelty differed according to their source. Therefore, in the present context, a tourist's perception of the extent to which novelty will be present at a vacation destination will be a function of the perceived novelty of objects (e.g., historical landmarks), the environment (the cultural atmosphere), and other people (residents or visitors). The degree of perceived novelty associated with objects, environment, or other people may be expressed along a continuum whose antithetical poles could be expressed in terms of time or experience. The antithesis of novelty is familiarity. Welker (1961) described novelty as a relative and experiential matter in which the strength or degree of familiarity of a stimulus depends upon the extent and recency of exposure. Hence, the more time with an object, environment or people, and the more recent the exposure to it, the less novel (or the more familiar) that stimulus becomes.

Belyne (1950, 1966) reported a direct relationship between novelty and exploratory behavior. Exploratory behavior is an overt expression of curiosity that is aroused by an environment perceived to be novel. His experiments demonstrated that more time was spent on exploring a novel stimulus than on stimuli that had been previously explored, and that less time was invested in exploring stimuli the second time an organism encountered them. That is, novel stimuli increased the extent of exploratory behavior. However, extremely novel stimuli may discourage exploration. The relationship between exploratory behavior and novelty was found to be an inverted U-shaped function, with the maximum level of exploratory behavior being exhibited in the presence of moderately novel stimuli. Curiosity was aroused and manifested as
exploratory behavior more often by partial familiarity with a stimulus than by total familiarity or by total novelty. Berlyne noted “we are indifferent to things that are either too remote from our experience or too familiar” (1960:21).

Instruments for measuring the constructs of arousal seeking and sensation seeking, which appear to be related to novelty, were developed by Mehrabian and Russell (1974) and Zuckerman (1971, 1979). A factor analysis of responses to Mehrabian and Russell’s 40 item “Arousal Seeking Scale,” identified five dimensions: arousal from change, unusual stimuli, risk, sensuality, and new environments. Zuckerman (1971, 1979) extracted four factors from his “Sensation Seeking Scale” which he labeled: thrill and adventure seeking, experience seeking, disinhibition, and boredom susceptibility.

Consumption has been conceptualized by Hirschman (1984) as a means by which individuals obtain cognitive and sensory experiences. From this perspective, a tourist can be viewed as a consumer who searches for new sources of stimulation. Hirschman (1984) offered propositions about the role of novelty in experience seeking, four of which can be adapted to the context of novelty seeking behavior in tourism. First, tourists may differ genetically in their overall capacity and desire to obtain and consume novel experiences (Jensen 1980; Zuckerman 1979). Thus, inherent differences (which may be manifested by tourists who are novelty seekers and those who are novelty avoiders) may instill in tourists a “ceiling” and a “floor” (Hirschman 1984) for engaging in certain experiential tourism activities. This suggests that some may desire to consume a high level of novel experiences on a vacation, while others may desire a lower level of novelty. Second, the way tourists view destinations may be influenced by their genetic predispositions toward a certain range of novel experiential consumption. Third, different tourist destinations may serve to satisfy similar desires for novelty experience. Fourth, by determining the relative level of novel experience desired by a given tourist, it may be possible to predict the positions and types of tourist destinations that an individual would visit.

Figure 1 offers a model of the role of novelty in the pleasure travel destination choice process. In a tourism setting, the extent to which an individual perceives a destination as being novel is likely to be a function of his or her preferred arousal level (Mehrabian and Russell 1973). Arousal is conceptualized as a basic trait ranging along a continuum from sleep to frantic excitement (Berlyne 1960). Arousal level connotes a psychophysiological dimension, indicative of how “wide-awake,” “alert,” or “excited” an organism is at a particular time (Berlyne 1966). Berlyne has postulated that every individual has a unique, normal, and adaptive optimal level of arousal he or she seeks to maintain, ranging from a high level that is characteristic of arousal seekers, to a low level that is characteristic of arousal avoiders.

Novel pleasure travel, which involves an altered routine and the experiencing of different things, people, and environment, may move an individual back toward the desired level of arousal. This is consistent both with Crompton’s (1979) notion of a vacation as an equilibrium-restoring break and with Berlyne’s (1960) concept of diversive ex-
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Figure 1. A Model of the Role of the Novelty Construct in the Pleasure Travel Destination Choice Process

exploration. A schemata proposed by Nunnally and Leonard (1973) suggests that boredom brought on by lack of arousal stimuli leads to diversive exploration (a search for new and different destinations) to increase arousal, which results in selection of a destination that will offer a novel experience.

The use of a variety of terms, such as curiosity drive (Fowler 1967), novelty seeking (Finger and Mook 1971), sensation-seeking (Zuckerman, Kolin, Price and Zoob 1964), and exploratory drive (Nissen 1951), to describe the quest for new experiences, attests to the complexity of the novelty construct (Bello and Etzel 1985). In this study, novelty was defined as a multi-dimensional construct that initially was conceptualized to be comprised of six overlapping dimensions that had been previously identified in the literature. They were change from routine, escape, thrill, adventure, boredom alleviation, and surprise (Figure 1).

Change from routine was defined as altered or different conditions of environment, psychological outcomes, and/or lifestyle (Mayo and Jarvis 1981). Humans apparently need change, and travel provides a
form of change by enabling people to do or see something different (Cofer and Appley 1967). Change of environment or routine has consistently emerged as a primary reason cited for taking a vacation (Crompton 1979; Garrett 1980; Pearce 1987).

Escape was defined as temporary distraction from reality, a dull routine, a normal mindset, an environment, and/or a lifestyle (Hornby 1974). In the tourism context, a tourist's desire for novelty may imply the "urge to escape to some new form of stimulation" (Berlyne 1950: 68). Tourism represents more of an escape-oriented than a seeking-oriented activity for most people under most conditions (Iso Ahola 1982). Dann (1977) suggests that the historical and anecdotal tourist motivation literature could be summed up by the concept of escape, but he stresses that the concept needs empirical verification.

Tourism provides an opportunity to escape from life's problems (McIntosh and Goeldner 1986). It can also be conceptualized as an escape from reality. Dumazedier (1967), for example, referred to travel as a kind of game that allows tourists to escape temporarily into a secondary reality. There they play for a time at being rich, primitive, or do daringly brave things that may be widely at variance with their everyday lives. Travel allows them to live out their fantasies in a novel world.

Thrill was defined as an experience in which excitement is the essential element (Hornby 1974), while adventure was defined as an exciting experience created through the medium of a strange, dangerous, and unusual happening, or as an undertaking involving unknown risks (Hornby 1974; Mayo and Jarvis 1981).

Many people like to try new and different things that involve some risk (Thomas 1964). Anderson (1970) termed the need for adventure the "Ulysses Factor" and saw it as a motivational force that prompted people to do something that for them may be extraordinary and contain some degree of risk. A novel environment may present a tourist with a considerable amount of complexity and unpredictability. Tourists may be unfamiliar with the languages, climates, cultures, and customs that they encounter during their travels. Unpredictability and insecurity emanating from discomfort and risk, may be perceived as sources of psychological tension by a novelty-avoiding tourist, but they may be seen as sources of thrill and adventure by a novelty-seeking tourist.

Surprise was defined as a feeling caused by unexpected features resulting from a discrepancy between what an individual believes and the reality of environmental stimuli (Smock and Holt 1962). Berlyne (1960) conceptualized surprise as being one of the dimensions of novel stimuli.

The sixth conceptualized dimension of the novelty construct, boredom alleviation, was defined at the beginning of the study as removal or reduction of the perception that available experience in the home environment is not sufficient to satisfy the needs for optimal arousal (Iso Ahola and Weissinger 1990). After a pretest of the measuring instrument developed in the study, a revised definition was used and boredom alleviation was redefined as "a search for additional or alternative stimulation of a more varied nature to achieve a high degree of
need satisfaction” (Hill and Perkins 1985:237). Boredom is often part of the human condition, especially in urbanized and industrialized societies where so much of life is reduced to organized routine. People become bored when they find themselves in an environment in which there is too much consistency or which is too predictable (Csikszentmihalyi 1975). The urge to be free from monotony and boredom by seeking some new form of stimulation is a very general and basic human impulse (Berlyne 1950).

The way tourists view destinations in terms of their potential for offering new sources of stimulation is likely to be influenced by their predispositions toward a certain range of novelty (Hirschman 1984). Thus, desire for novel experiences among tourists will range along a continuum from novelty seekers to novelty avoiders (Figure 1). Novelty seeking tourists are likely to be individuals who prefer vacation destinations perceived as being, “different, unusual, impressive, adventurous, refreshing, a change of pace, and exciting.” Novelty avoiding tourists, on the other hand, are likely to have “a greater preference for familiar, responsible, and planned experiences” (Wahlers and Etzel 1985:292).

Figure 1 suggests that the desire for a novel environment in pleasure travel interacts with other tourism motives. As Pearce (1987) pointed out, the novelty motive may be either positively or negatively associated with other sociopsychological motives. The desire to escape from routine, family, or neighbors and to meet new people, for example, may conflict with a desire to enhance kinship relationships. Alternatively, pleasure travel to a novel destination in Europe may be complementary to the need for status or recognition from others.

Evaluation of how well a destination’s attributes meet a tourist’s needs is influenced by the strength of other tourism motives and how well the destination meets those as well as the novelty motive. A destination may be selected primarily because of its foreign atmosphere or its different culture, which the individual has not previously experienced. On the other hand, other motives such as entertainment or relaxation may be dominant in choosing a destination. However, the final choice still may be partially influenced by a desire for a high or low degree of novelty, even though this was not the dominant motive.

Evaluation is the process of integrating internal motives and needs with the benefits perceived to be offered by alternative destinations, so that a final choice of destination emerges (Figure 1). However, between cognitive evaluation and making a final destination decision, potential travelers are likely to recognize that intention to visit a destination is moderated by the influence of situational variables such as time, money, and health. Selection of a final destination reflects a judgement about the relative efficiency of the destinations evaluated in satisfying dominant motives and the ability to accommodate situational constraints (Um 1987).

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND DISCUSSION

The initial operational definition of the novelty construct that was used to guide development of the scale was a desire to seek out new
and different experiences (Hirschman 1980) through pleasure travel. Novelty is conceptualized as a multi-dimensional construct that is comprised of several dimensions previously identified in the literature, including change from routine, escape, thrill, adventure, surprise, and boredom alleviation.

An initial pool of items was constructed relating to aspects of desire for a new experience. These were derived from both popular literature and from the scientific literature (Iso-Ahola and Weissinger 1990; Maddi, Charlens, Maddi and Smith 1962; Mehrabian and Russell 1973, 1974; Pearson 1970; Wahlers and Etzel 1985; Wentworth and Witryol 1986; Zuckerman 1971, 1979; Zuckerman, Kolin, Price and Zoob 1964). From these sources a list of 84 items was generated. A five point scale comprised of strongly agree to strongly disagree (5 to 1 value) was used to indicate the degree of a respondent's agreement or disagreement with each item.

The initial items were refined and edited for content validity by a group of seven expert judges who were faculty members or doctoral candidates with expertise in consumer, leisure, or tourism behavior. These judges were given the study's operational definitions of the novelty construct and the six dimensions of the construct as initially conceptualized. The judges were requested to rate each item as being clearly representative of the novelty construct, somewhat representative of the novelty construct, or not representative of the novelty construct (Zaichkowsky 1985). They were also asked to assign each of the items into one of the six dimensions of novelty. A series of decision rules was established and items that did not meet them were discarded. These procedures resulted in a set of 41 items remaining out of the original list of 84 items.

The judges had three other observations which resulted in conceptual changes. One, they found it difficult to distinguish between the change from routine and the escape dimensions. Two, the premise underlying operationalization of the boredom alleviation dimension was that the home environment did not provide optimal arousal. It was pointed out that this was not necessarily true. Even if individuals did become bored in their home environment, they could seek optimal arousal through other activities while remaining in that environment. Three, the two dimensions, escape and boredom alleviation, were not necessarily related to novelty. It was pointed out that escape and boredom alleviation needs could be met simply by getting away from the day-to-day environment without going to a new novel environment.

Only 3 of the 41 items that remained after the decision rules had been implemented were assigned by a majority of the judges to the escape or boredom alleviation dimensions. Given these results and the judges' written comments, it was considered unreasonable for these three items to be expected to effectively measure two domains. The three items were retained but were reassigned to the change from routine dimension. Thus, the number of conceptual dimensions comprising the novelty construct was reduced from six to four. They were change from routine, thrill, adventure, and surprise.

Responses from a convenience sample of 219 undergraduate students were used to pretest the dimensionality and internal reliability of
the 41 scale items. A factor analysis was undertaken to validate the *a-priori* assignment of items into the four dimensions that had been done by the seven content validity judges. The appropriateness of the factor model was evaluated by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic, which provides a measure of the extent to which the variables belong together (Norusis 1988). The KMO statistic of .88 suggested the factor analysis results could be accepted with confidence. The four factor solution was rotated using oblique rotation, since it was expected that the dimensions of the novelty construct represented by the factors would be related.

The items assigned to the thrill and surprise dimensions loaded distinctively on two of the factors. Three items loading saliently on a third factor appeared to reflect the dimension of boredom alleviation, which was discarded after the initial content validity check by the judges. These were "I feel that life is boring. That is one of the reasons why I travel," "I have to go on vacation from time to time to avoid getting into a rut," and "I like to travel because the same old faces and routine kinds of work bore me." However, these items suggested that the operationalization of boredom, which guided the initial judges' decisions, should be replaced by that reported by Hill and Perkins (1985:237) who viewed boredom as "a search for additional or alternative stimulation of a more varied nature to achieve a high degree of need satisfaction." This revised operationalization suggested that in monotonous situations, individuals seek alternative stimulation of a more varied nature. A successful search for additional stimulation is dependent upon new stimuli being construed as being sufficient to alleviate boredom or to prevent its onset. Based on this revised operationalization of boredom, the boredom alleviation dimension was accepted as a dimension of the scale.

Items from the two domains of change from routine and adventure, both loaded saliently on the same factor. A review of the items purporting to measure the adventure dimension, suggested that they focused on a desire to discover and explore new phenomena. Adventure was an outcome that may or may not emerge from this process. Viewed from this perspective, adventure is a possible outcome of the novelty construct but should not be considered part of the construct *per se*. Therefore, adventure was eliminated from the conceptualization of the novelty construct. The emphasis on discovering and exploring new phenomena suggested that these items were consistent with the operational definition of change from routine.

During the pretest procedures, suggestions for amending the wording of some of the items were forthcoming from both respondents and reviewers of these procedures, and consequently the wording of five of the items was amended. A final reduction in the number of items was made by discarding all items whose factor loadings were less than .40, those who did not record an item-to-total correlation of at least .50, and those whose communality was less than .40. These decision rules and conceptual amendments resulted in a 21 item instrument that measured the four dimensions of the novelty construct: change from routine, thrill, boredom alleviation, and surprise.

Based on the sampling precedent adopted by others who have re-
ported similar studies (Churchill 1987; Parasuraman, Zeithmal, and Berry 1988; Zaichkowski 1985) and the pragmatic constraints of limited time and financial resources, a decision was made to use purposive samples to test the instrument. Three different university undergraduate student samples and one Texas visitor sample were selected for the instrument tests.

It has been observed that evaluation of a scale through the use of relatively homogeneous samples provides a rigorous evaluation of theoretically expected relationships, since variance that may be contributed by intervening variables typically will be lower than when heterogeneous samples are used (Calder, Philips and Tybout 1982). To determine the type of subjects who should be used for the validity tests and the size of sample required, historic evidence was reviewed to identify what others used in similar studies in the past (Churchill 1987). All of the studies reviewed used undergraduate students for their samples, which ranged in size from 92 to 255 (Iso-Ahola and Weissinger 1990; Kohn, Hunt, Davis and Cowles 1982; McCarroll, Mitchell, Carpenter and Anderson 1967; Mehrabian and Russell 1974; Oppenheim 1984; Weissinger 1985; Zuckerman 1971).

The three independent undergraduate student samples consisted of 204, 169, and 255 respondents. The nonstudent sample was derived from 413 respondents who had stopped at a state welcome center in the past 18 months, were visiting Texas for a pleasure vacation, and who stayed in the state for at least two nights. The sample was selected so that approximately half were winter Texans, defined as “visitors of age 55 or older to the Lone Star State who stay at least one month during the winter season” (Vincent and de los Santos 1990:9). The other half of these respondents were designated non-winter Texans. Data were collected from the nonstudent sample through a mail questionnaire and, after a follow-up, 303 were returned completed, giving a response rate of 73 percent.

Tests of the Scale's Dimensionality

Dimensionality and stability of the scale were evaluated by undertaking a factor analysis with oblique rotation on each of the four samples. A summary of the results is shown in Table 1. In all four analyses, the scree plots indicated that a four factor solution was appropriate. The analyses confirmed the dimensional distinctiveness of the scale and its dimensional stability. The overall patterns of factor loadings were remarkably similar across the four independent samples. Items assigned to each dimension consistently exhibited high loadings on only one of the four factors extracted. As expected, moderate correlations were identified between the dimensions in each analysis. The average pairwise correlations between dimensions were .24, .28, .29, and .28 for the three student and the nonstudent samples, respectively. These are sufficiently low to confirm the distinctiveness of the scale's four dimensions (Parasuraman, Zeithmal and Berry 1988).

These results suggest that although the dimensions are interrelated components of the construct, they are individually distinctive and they are measurable by this scale. The dimensionality appears not to be
Table 1. A Summary of the Factor Loadings Following Oblique Rotation of Four-Factor Solutions across Four Independent Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrill</td>
<td>I sometimes like to do things on vacation that are a little frightening.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy doing &quot;daring&quot; activities while on vacation.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes it is fun to be a little scared on vacation.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy experiencing a sense of danger on a vacation trip.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to be on a raft in the middle of a wild river at the time of the spring flood waters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy activities that offer thrills.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I seek adventure on my vacation.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My ideal vacation involves looking at things I have not seen before.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want there to be a sense of discovery involved as part of my vacation.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to travel to adventurous places</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Routine</td>
<td>I like to find myself at destinations where I can explore new things.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to experience new and different things on my vacation.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to experience customs, and cultures different from those in my own environment on vacation.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy the change of environment which allows me to experience something new on vacation.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My ideal vacation involves looking at things I have not seen before.</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want there to be a sense of discovery involved as part of my vacation.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to travel to adventurous places</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Student Sample 1 (n = 204)</th>
<th>Student Sample 2 (n = 169)</th>
<th>Student Sample 3 (n = 255)</th>
<th>Nonstudent Sample (n = 290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>I feel a powerful urge to explore the unknown on vacation.</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to travel to relieve boredom.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have to go on vacation from time to time to avoid getting into a rut.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like to travel because the same routine work bores me.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>I don't like to plan a vacation trip in detail because it takes away some of the unexpectedness.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I like vacations that are unpredictable.</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to take off on a trip with no preplanned routes in my mind.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of variance extracted by the four factors in each sample were 50.7, 53.6, 52.2, and 52.3, respectively.

dependent on the nature of the respondents, since it was similarly replicated across student and nonstudent samples, involving people in very different age cohorts.

Tests of the Scale's Reliability

The Cronbach alpha values for each dimension and for the total scales on the four independent samples are summarized in Table 2. The values were fairly consistent across the samples, and all the items in each dimension had item-to-total correlations higher than .40 in all four samples. The data confirmed that the items specified did belong to the dimensions to which they were assigned, and that the scale as a whole was internally consistent.

Test-retest reliability measures stability of the scale over time and involves administering the scale to the same group of respondents at two different times. This was examined using 53 undergraduate students in a classroom setting with a three-week interval between the two administrations (Churchill 1987; Parasuraman 1986). The observed
Table 2. A Summary of Cronbach Alpha Results Measuring the Internal Consistency of Each of the Four Dimensions, on Four Different Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Student Sample 1 (n = 204)</th>
<th>Student Sample 2 (n = 169)</th>
<th>Student Sample 3 (n = 255)</th>
<th>Nonstudent Sample (n = 290)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrill</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items: 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from Routine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items: 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom-Alleviation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items: 2, 6, 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Items: 10, 18, 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Linear Combination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total-Scale Reliability)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test-retest Pearson correlation was .85 ($p < .001$). Individual item-to-item correlations ranged from .63 to .89 ($p < .001$). Test-retest reliabilities for each dimension were .89, .83, .79, and .81 ($p < .001$) for thrill, change from routine, boredom alleviation, and surprise, respectively. The magnitude of these correlations compares favorably with correlations reported in other similar studies (Bearden, Netemeyer and Teel 1989; Madsen, Das, Bogen and Grossman 1987; Mehrabian and Russell 1974; Zaichkowsky 1985), indicating that the scale's test-retest reliability was acceptable.

Split-half reliability measures the degree of consistency across items within a scale. It involves dividing the scale items randomly into two sets, with an equal number of items in each set, and examining the correlation between respondents' total scores derived from the two sets of items.

To test split-half reliability, the total set of items was divided into two halves using an odd-even decision rule for assignment. The even items were assigned to form one half and the odd items the other half of the instrument. Total score on the even items was then correlated with the total score obtained from the odd items. The combined set of three student samples ($n = 628$) and the nonstudent sample ($n = 290$) were tested independently. Since the scale consisted of 21 items, one-half contained 10 and the other 11 items. Thus, it was necessary to transform the score on each half to a ratio index (0 to 1.0) by dividing each respondent's summed score by 50 and 55, the maximum possible scores, respectively. Using Pearson correlations the split-half reliabilities were .86 ($p < .001$) for the first sample ($N = 628$) and .87 ($p < .001$) for the second sample ($N = 290$). The correlation coefficients provided further evidence that the scale was reliable and internally consistent.
Tests of the Scale's Validity

The validity of the scale was tested by assessing the strength and significance of its relationships with known measures of other constructs. Convergent validity was assessed by comparing the scale scores with responses to other measures that were considered measures of the same construct. Five scale items from Driver's (1977) Recreation Experience Preference (REP) Scales were chosen for the comparison. They were the desire to experience new and different things, to explore things, to experience the unknown, to see new and different things, and to experience thrills. An alpha coefficient of .80 for the five REP scale items was revealed which verified the internal consistency of the five items. The correlation between the scale score and Driver's five REP scale item scores was examined using Student Sample 1 (n = 204). A significant (p < .001) positive correlation (.65) was found between the scale scores and Driver's five REP scale items, suggesting there was convergent validity.

If a relationship between two constructs is established in theory and the measures of those constructs behave as expected with respect to each other, then theoretical validity of the measure is supported (Dooley 1984). Theoretical validity was tested by comparing scores on this study's scale to those given by the same respondents to three previously established scales that are theoretically or conceptually related to the tourist novelty construct. The scales chosen were the Arousal Seeking Tendency Scale (Mehrabian and Russell 1974) and two Exploration and Stimulation Seeking scales from Driver's (1977) REP Scales.

It was anticipated that there would be a reasonably high positive correlation between responses to the scale developed in this study and responses to Mehrabian and Russell's (1974) Arousal Seeking Scale, since the conceptualization guiding this study suggests that level of arousal is likely to strongly influence the extent to which an individual seeks novelty in selecting a destination. Scores from the two scales were correlated using respondents in Student Sample 2 (n = 169). A significant (p < .001) positive relationship of .66 was revealed.

Driver's (1977) Exploration and Stimulating Seeking Scales consisted of four (alpha = .82) and six (alpha = .80) items, respectively. Exploration reflects an urge to experience the unknown which may incorporate the novelty construct's dimensions of thrill and surprise. Stimulation seeking, as Wahlers and Etzel (1985) pointed out, is likely to be closely related to a tourist's desire for novelty on a vacation. Thus, the responses on the two scales were hypothesized as being likely to correlate strongly and positively with the tourist novelty construct scale responses. Respondents in Student Sample 1 (n = 204) were used for this test. The correlations were .54 (p < .001) for the Exploration Scale and .59 (p < .001) for the Stimulation Seeking Scale. These reasonably high correlations suggested theoretical validity.

Discriminant validity is established if the scale shows predictably low or negative correlations between it and other measures that are supposedly not measuring the same variable or construct (Churchill 1979). It also reflects the extent to which a measure is indeed novel and not simply a reflection of some other measure (Churchill 1979).
Discriminant validity was assessed by correlating responses to the scale, with responses to the Desire for Novelty Scale (Pearson 1970), the Novelty-Seeking Scale (Hirschman 1984), the Leisure Boredom Scale (Iso-Ahola and Weissinger 1990), and selected Recreation Experience Preference Scales (Driver 1977).

Pearson's (1970) Desire-for-Novelty Scale is intended to measure the desire for new experiences in life in general. The scale scores developed in this study and responses on the Desire-for-Novelty Scale were hypothesized to correlate positively and reasonably strongly. Respondents in Student Sample 2 \( (n = 169) \) responded to the two scales. A significant \( (p < .05) \), positive, but not strong, coefficient of .16, was recorded with the Desire-for-Novelty Scale. This was a lower correlation than had been anticipated but it emphatically demonstrated the scale's discriminant validity.

The Novelty-Seeking Scale is a 15-item scale developed by Hirschman (1984). It was designed to assess the willingness to try something new, such as new dances, places to shop, apparel, furnishings, movies, books, restaurants, and hairstyles. It was anticipated that the scores on the Novelty Seeking Scale and the responses on the scale developed in this study would relate positively and reasonably strongly. Respondents from Student Sample 1 \( (n = 204) \) responded to the two scales. The result was a positive correlation of .08, which was not significant at the .05 level. Because this was much lower than anticipated, the scores on the scale developed in this study were correlated with the score on each product class included in the Hirschman Scale. The results are shown in Table 3. Only 3 of the 15 product classes had a significant correlation coefficient. They were new foods \( (.15, p < .05) \), new transportation \( (.15, p < .05) \), and new vacation spots \( (.78, p < .001) \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Correlated</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New dances</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New places</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New apparel</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New home furnishings</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New movies</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New books</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New magazines</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New vacation spots</td>
<td>.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New foods</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New restaurants</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New political ideas</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New types of transportation</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New religious ideas</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New hair styles</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sport activities</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \).  
** \( p < .001 \).

Table 3. Results of Correlations with Individual Items of Hirschman's Novelty Seeking Scale \( (n = 204) \)
NOVELTY SEEKING IN TOURISM

The other product classes all recorded correlation coefficients lower than .10 and were not significant at the .05 level. This indicated that there was no meaningful relationship between respondents' novelty constructs in the context of tourism and their willingness to try other new product classes that were incorporated into Hirschman's (1984) scale. The degree of independence of the two scales was substantially greater than had been anticipated.

The scale scores were correlated, using responses from Student Sample 3 (n = 255), with the 16-item Leisure Boredom Scale developed by Iso-Ahola and Weissinger (1990), which measured tendency toward leisure boredom. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the scale was .86. A negative correlation was expected with this scale, since boredom is seen as the antithesis of novelty and alleviating boredom was identified as one of the dimensions of the novelty construct. A significant (p < .001) negative correlation of −.23 was revealed.

The scale scores were correlated using responses from Student Sample 2 (n = 255), with five other scales—Meeting New People, Creativity, Scenery, Tranquility, and Social Recognition—which were designed to measure constructs other than novelty. These scales were chosen from Driver's (1977) set of scales. The scales were comprised of five (alpha = .86), five (alpha = .78), four (alpha = .86), six (alpha = .85), and five (alpha = .89) items, respectively. Scales ranged from 6, meaning extremely important, to 1, meaning extremely unimportant. Since they have no obvious relationship to the novelty construct, a low correlation with them was anticipated. The scale correlated positively, but relatively weakly, with these five REP scales: Meeting New people (.23), Creativity (.39), Scenery (.24), Tranquility (.21), and Social Recognition (.03). The results were consistent with the expectation that the scale would have a low correlation with these measures.

Criterion validity is demonstrated by comparing the scores from the developed instrument with one or more external variables that provide a direct measure of the characteristic in question (French and Michael 1969). The first external variable selected as a criterion was "willingness to try new vacation spots," an item from Hirschman's (1984) Novelty-Seeking Scale. Correlation of the scale with the criterion measure using responses from Student Sample 1 yielded a criterion validity coefficient of .78 (p < .001, n = 204). This relatively high correlation demonstrated the scale's criterion validity.

The second criterion test assessed whether the scale could differentiate the positions of "known groups" (Churchill 1979; Kerlinger 1986) by yielding a difference in the scale scores of winter Texans and non-winter Texans in the Nonstudent Sample (n = 290). Winter Texans were considered likely to record lower novelty scale scores, since novelty-seeking tourists indicate "a lower likelihood of returning to the same destination" (Bello and Etzel 1985:22). Vincent and de los Santos (1990) reported that over 82% of the large sample of winter Texans they surveyed indicated that they would definitely return in the following year, and, on average, this was their eighth trip to Texas. These characteristics, together with their older age cohort, suggested that winter Texans were likely to exhibit a lower desire for novel vacation experiences than non-winter Texans.
Validation was considered demonstrated if the non-winter Texan tourists had a significantly higher novelty scale score than winter Texans. Non-winter Texans recorded a mean total scale of 73.72, which was higher than that of winter Texans, who recorded 57.81. The non-winter Texans' mean values were higher on each of the four dimensions of the scale than those of winter Texans. A series of t-tests confirmed that all these differences were statistically significant ($p < .001$). These results offered further support for the scale's criterion validity.

CONCLUSIONS

A valid and reliable 21-item scale was developed. The scale was judged to have content validity by an initial panel of experts. The scale consisted of four interrelated but distinctive and stable dimensions: thrill, change from routine, boredom alleviation, and surprise. The items measuring the dimensions were internally consistent. The test-retest reliability and the split-half reliability coefficients were satisfactory. The scale was demonstrated to have convergent, theoretical, discriminant, and criterion validity in terms of its expected correlations with other measures. The only partial exceptions to this were the discriminant validity tests with the Pearson's (1970) and the Hirshman's (1984) Scales. In these instances, the discrimination was much higher than expected. Both of these scales measured novelty and, even though their measures were developed for use in contexts other than tourism, a stronger relationship was expected with them.

These two unexpectedly low correlations are readily interpretable and reinforce the specificity of this scale to tourism experiences. Pearson's (1970) Desire-for-Novelty Scale measures respondents' perceptions of life in the context of new experiences and boredom. Examples of items are "I wish for some major change in my life," "I am in a rut," "I often wish life were more stimulating," "I would like to change places with someone who lives an exciting life," and "I wish life were different than it is." This is a global scale, whereas the Tourist Novelty Scale developed here specifically focuses on novelty in the context of pleasure travel.

The responses on Hirshman's (1986) Novelty-Seeking Scale are a measure of interest in novelty in the particular product classes that constitute the scale, but these product classes do not appear to be closely related to novelty in a tourism context. This was reinforced by the scale's high correlation with the criterion validity variable relating to new vacation spots, which was part of Hirschman's scale. This contrasted vividly with the correlations with the other 14 items on that scale (Table 3). Further, this Tourist Novelty Scale assesses the psychological construct of novelty, while Hirschman's (1984) scale related to intent to purchase selected products. The intervening influence of environmental and social forces between intrinsic interest in novelty seeking and actual trial of new products, which was shown in the model in Figure 1, may also account for some of the distinctiveness between the two scales.

Bello and Etzel (1985) suggest destination marketers should clearly define their offerings in terms of the degree of novelty provided, and
develop messages that communicate the novel or familiar nature of a destination, since markets exist for both types of offerings. The proposition that tourists differ in their desire to obtain novel experiences was demonstrated by the scale developed in this study, which differentiated between the two different Texas visitor groups: one with a relatively high novelty desire and the other with a relatively low novelty desire.

To identify and segment markets existing for both types of destinations, marketers need an instrument to perform the task. Crompton has stated that an urgent priority in the study of tourism is “investment in research focusing on instrument development” (1990:13). Dann, Nash, and Pearce noted that it is too early to argue that tourism research has reached high levels of theory and method. They argued that “with respect to measurement, tourism as a legitimate field of inquiry appears to have fallen a good way behind other areas of social scientific investigation” (1988:13). This study developed a reliable, stable, and valid standardized instrument that can be viewed as a partial response to the calls of Crompton (1990) and Dann, Nash and Pearce (1988) for instrumentation that can be applied generically in tourism research.
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