

Creating Experiences for Study-Abroad Tourists

Gary D. Ellis

Texas A&M University, gellis1@tamu.edu

Patti Freeman

Brigham Young University, patti_freeman@byu.edu

Jingxian Jiang

Frostburg State University, jjiang@frostburg.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti>

 Part of the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ellis, Gary D.; Freeman, Patti; and Jiang, Jingxian () "Creating Experiences for Study-Abroad Tourists," *Journal of Tourism Insights*: Vol. 8: Iss. 1, Article 4.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.9707/2328-0824.1072>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/jti/vol8/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Tourism Insights by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

Quality experiences at attractions, heritage sites, and locations central to students' study abroad experiences are important to the substantial and growing number of study abroad programs worldwide, and to the success of organizations in the highly competitive tourism industry. The Institute for International Education reports that nearly two million students participate in such study-abroad programs each year (Institute for International Education, 2016). A broad range of interdisciplinary literature has potential to inform identification of strategies that can be used by experience providers to elevate the quality of experience of education tourists and thereby enhance value. Strategies discussed in the literature include structuring point-of-service encounters around a clear and pervasive theme, adding multi-sensory elements, providing unanticipated value-added elements, personalizing interactions (Pine & Gilmore, 1999/2011), optimizing "atmospherics" (Kotler, 1973), creating an immersive "servicescape" (Bitner, 1992), and assuring excellence in service quality (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). In this study, we tested the effect of two features of point-of-service encounters on immediate, subjective experiences of study abroad tourists. Specifically, the purpose was to examine the effect of activity type (engagement, absorption, immersion) and locus of structuring (provider-centric, activity-centric, and tourist-centric) on perceived value, delight, and prevalence of deep structured experience.

Background

Quality Experience Indicators

Quite a number of outcomes of structured experiences and service encounters have been measured through what Cutler and Carmichael (2010) refer to as the "evaluated experience" approach. Among these outcomes are positivity and negativity of affect, intention to engage in word-of-mouth advertising, satisfaction, potential of a structured experience to become a valued memory, perceived quality, entertainment quality, and perceived value (e.g., Oh, Fiore, & Jeoung, 2007; Oliver, 2010). Other approaches have been directed at capturing immediate subjective experiences of participation during structured experiences (e.g., Jackson & Marsh, 1996; Martin & Cutler, 2002). To avoid mono-method bias in the empirical process of our field study, we chose two measurement approaches from the evaluated experience framework (perceived value and delight) and one from the immediate subjective experience framework (deep structured experience).

Perceived value is regarded as among the most important concepts for "gaining a competitive edge" in both product and service industries (Petrick, 2002, p. 119). Gronroos (2011, p. 282) defines value creation as "the customer's creation of value-in-use." Likewise, Mathis *et al.* (2016) assert value is created and determined by the user. Value, however, can be a deceptively complex construct. Zeithaml (1988) defined value as "the consumer's judgement about the superiority or excellence of a product" (p. 5). She distinguished between objective and subjective quality and also examined the various meanings of the concept among consumers. She identified four consumer interpretations of value: value is low price, value is what the consumer wants in a product, value is the quality received relative to the price paid, and value is the quantity received in return for an investment (p. 14).

Other authors have explored perceived value as a multidimensional construct. Parasuraman and Grewal (2000), for example, considered the utility of different sets of value judgements. They pointed out that value judgements are made about (a) beliefs about acquisition of the product or service, (b) the actual transaction experience, (c) use and utility of the product

or service purchased, and (d) redemption of residual value at the time of termination of a service or end of life cycle of the product. Petrick (2002) also advanced a multidimensional construction of perceived value. Petrick identified five elements of perceived value: quality, emotional response, monetary price, behavioral price, and reputation. Confirmatory factor analysis supported this five-dimension structure. Dimension scores all correlated significantly with a unitary, global measure of perceived value.

Delight occurs when the intensity of response to an experience exceeds satisfaction and involves a heightened level of pleasure for a visitor (Alexander, 2010; Torres & Kline, 2013; Vanhamme, 2008). Previous researchers have explored the nature of the pleasurable experience associated with delight. Oliver, Rust, and Varki (1997), for example, provide empirical evidence that delight is the result of a sequence of arousal and emotion: arousal occurs first, followed by pleasure, and then delight. Other researchers conceptualized delight as a composite of several emotions, including joy, exuberance, thrill, and exhilaration (Kumar, Olshavsky, & King, 2001). Oliver (2010, p. 322) positions delight on a circumplex model. Positive states adjacent to delight in that model are “elated” and “excited.” The negative state opposite delight in the circumplex model is “disgust/contempt.” Some authors reserve application of the delight construct to circumstances that include an unanticipated value-added dimension. Chandler (1989), for example, defined delight as customers’ reactions “when they experience a product or service that not only satisfies but provides unexpected value or unanticipated satisfaction” (p. 536).

Deep structured experience (Ellis, Freeman, Jamal, & Jiang, 2017) is derived from literature on flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), optimal experience (Jackson & Marsh, 1996), peak experience (Maslow, 1961; Privette, 1983; Privette & Bundrick, 1987), deep play (Ackerman, 1999), and fast-thinking (Kahneman, 2011). The theory of structured experience (Ellis *et al.*, 2017) defines deep structured experience in a manner consistent with these phenomena:

A state of effortless concentration during which individuals lose (a) their sense of time, (b) their thoughts about themselves, and (c) awareness of their problems. Participants have a genuine interest in the activity in which they are involved and a strong desire to continue doing that activity.

Like previous conceptions of heightened states of experience (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Kahneman, 2011; Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Maslow, 1961), deep structured experience is binary (Ellis *et al.*, 2017); it varies as a dichotomy rather than a continuum. People are either “in” or “out of” a state of deep structured experience at a given point in time.

Techniques for Structuring Tourist Experiences

A vast body of literature informs the process of structuring experiences of tourists and consumers. Among the most frequently cited sources are Kotler’s (1973) paper on atmospherics; O’Dell and Billing’s (2005) and Mossberg’s (2007) construction of the “experiencescape” concept; Bitner’s (1992) description of the process of evaluating service encounters or “servicescapes”; Parasuraman *et al.*’s (1988/1994) SERVQUAL and SERVPERF approaches to understanding service quality, and Pine and Gilmore’s (1999/2011) identification of strategies used by businesses to succeed in the highly competitive “experience economy.” Other expansive bodies of literature suggest techniques that may elevate the quality of experiences without regard to tourism or consumer behavior. Tilden’s (1957) seminal “principles of interpretation” continue to serve as a foundation for the practice of heritage and environmental interpretation in the United States National Park Service and related organizations. Csikszentmihalyi’s (1975) conceptualization of the “flow” construct spawned extensive research on quality of immediate subjective experiences in activities that involve performance of action and reaction. Bryant and

Verhoff (2007) and Bryant, Chadwick, and Kluwe (2011) pioneered work on “savoring” of immediate sensory experiences.

Select techniques from these vast bodies of literature have been integrated into a theory of structured experience (Ellis *et al.*, 2017). That theory was constructed on the premise that any structured activity encounter, or experience, such as an interpretive talk at a heritage site, a dining experience at a restaurant, or involvement in a spectator event, includes both observable behavior and a subjective experience component (Duerden *et al.*, 2015). From the perspective of observable behavior, the theory of structured experience proposes that the majority of tourist activities can be classified as being one of three types (Ellis *et al.*, 2017): engagement, immersion, and absorption.

Engagement. The observable component of engagement experiences (Douglas, 2007; Reeve, 2013) involves attending to an unfolding story or narrative, either evident or implied. Examples of engagement experiences are attending theatrical performances, seeing movies, being a spectator at sporting events, reading books, participating in learning experiences, participating in heritage or environmental interpretation programs, visiting museums, and engaging in debates, conversations, and discussions.

Absorption. The observable facet of absorption experiences emphasizes focus on stimulation of one or more of the five senses (Pine & Gilmore, 1999/2011). Examples of activities that tend to give rise to absorption are wine tasting, viewing a sunset, enjoying a massage, savoring tastes of foods during dining, and viewing a landscape. Several subcategories of absorption activities and their associated subjective experiences can be defined. Examples are awe experiences (e.g., Bonner & Friedman, 2011; Shiota, Keltner, & Mossman, 2007), hedonic experiences (e.g., Hosany & Gilbert, 2010), and aesthetic experiences (e.g., Madsen, 1997; Madsen, Brittin, & Capperella-Sheldon, 1993).

Immersion. Immersion can be defined in terms of Csikszentmihalyi’s (1975) “flow” concept and with Pine and Gilmore’s (1999/2011) description of immersion. Immersion is thus a transitory state characterized by: (a) extraordinarily high focus of attention on a limited stimulus field, (b) environmental demand for immediate behavioral action, and (c) immediate feedback on the efficacy of those actions. Observable activities classified as immersion involve effortless concentration on action and reaction in performing a task. Examples of activities that may give rise to immersion are participating in competitive sports, creating art, dancing, piloting a boat, playing a musical instrument, competing in a game, birding, and rock climbing.

Co-Creation

Research integrating literature on immediate subjective experiences of tourists (e.g., Cutler & Carmichael, 2010; Duerden, Ward, & Freeman, 2015; Ellis & Rossman, 2008; Jennings & Nickerson, 2006) stresses that tourists are not passive pawns (DeCharms, 1968) of experience providers. Rather, the quality of their experiences is a result of the manner in which tourists choose to attend to and participate in the activity. From this co-creation perspective, tourists are active agents in determining the quality of their immediate subjective experiences. Value is co-created through provider structure and tourist attention, motivation, and behavior (Binkhorst & Dekker, 2009; Duerden *et al.*, 2015; Kim, Ritchie, & McCormick, 2012; Morgan, Lugosi, & Ritchie, 2010; Mossberg, 2007; Prebensen, Chen, & Uysal, 2014).

This interaction between the participant and the provider has been described as both co-production and co-creation in the tourism, hospitality, and leisure literature (Binkhorst & Dekker, 2009; Campos, Menders, Valle, & Scott, 2016; Chathoth, Altinay, Harrington, Okumus, & Chan, 2013; Duerden *et al.*, 2015; Mathis *et al.*, 2016; Mossberg, 2007). Chathoth *et al.*

proposed that the differences between co-production and co-creation exist on a continuum, rather than as a dichotomy. Customization and service innovation lie between the two extremes. They defined co-production as “an exchange of products and services between customers and firms which is built on a platform of simultaneous production and consumption” (p. 11) and co-creation as “the joint production of value for both customers and firms alike through an interactive process” (p. 11). Although Chathoth *et al.* expounded upon differences between the two terms, they recognized the terms are seen in much of the literature as “interrelated phenomenon and less of distinctive processes” (p. 14).

For this study, co-creation refers to conceptualization of the “customer as a creator of value, interacting with the organization to ‘co-create’ value” (Mathis *et al.*, 2016, p. 62). The term aligns best with the tourism literature and tourist interactions with an experience provider. Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004) acknowledge, “Because there can be multiple points of interaction anywhere in the system . . . the [co-creation] framework implies that all the points of consumer-company interactions are critical for creating value” (p. 10). Pine and Gilmore (2013) contend that all experiences are co-created: “they happen inside the individual person in reaction to what is staged outside that person” (p. 34). Essentially, tourists construct different experiences from the same offering to suit their context (Pralhad & Ramaswamy, 2004).

Very little is known, however, about the effects of provider strategies for structuring point-of-service experiences, over and above the co-creation that occurs within the rich structure of group travel, such as study abroad. The unique social, cultural, and physical environments of study-abroad tourists provide a wealth of opportunities for co-creation in daily routines as well as at attractions and planned activities. Study-abroad students are colleagues who share intellectual and professional interests and motives. Their social group is comprised of similar-age peers of both sexes. As such, rich opportunity for co-creation is present regardless of whether study-abroad tourists are engaged in a central activity at an attraction, participating in an activity at a learning center, or are in situations that objectively seem common or familiar, such as traveling to or from that attraction, waiting for a train or coach, or socializing at a hostel. Co-creation occurs in all of these settings; being in the presence of students and professors with shared interests and backgrounds provides substantial opportunity for elevated experiences in even the most familiar set of circumstances. Providers at attractions are thus challenged to structure point-of-service encounters in ways that substantially elevate quality of experiences above levels resulting from the structure that is inherent to the study abroad program.

Hypotheses

Tourist Activity Type

A fundamental assumption is that engagement, absorption, and immersion activities elevate the quality of experiences above that of *familiar* experiences. Because a familiar experience lacks affordances of story (engagement), appealing sensory stimulation (absorption), and challenge (immersion), the subjective component of a familiar experience would largely be determined by co-creation initiated by the tourist. Given the rich social, cultural, and environmental contexts of study-abroad experiences, opportunities for co-creation are substantial. Colleagues and friends who have similar interests, similar needs, and diverse personalities and perspectives are constantly at hand in the form of teachers and classmates. The extent to which tourist activity type (engagement, absorption, immersion) can elevate experience quality over and above the naturally occurring co-creation in such settings is unknown. Thus, the following hypotheses were tested:

H₁: Tourist activity type (engagement, absorption, and immersion tourist activities)

increases prevalence of deep structured experience.

H₂: Tourist activity type (engagement, absorption, and immersion) increases perceived value of the activity.

H₃: Tourist activity type (engagement, absorption, and immersion) increases delight with the activity.

Locus of Activity Structuring

Tourist activity type is only one of many factors that may affect the quality of tourists' subjective experiences. Locus of activity structure may be important as well. Locus of activity structure refers to the source of the primary determinants of the essential features of the activity and the activity environment. The natural setting or context of an activity may be so extraordinary that it elicits heightened subjective experiences apart from any additional structure by providers. In other instances, a skilled provider may elevate an otherwise mundane environment to create an enriched and memorable experience. In still other circumstances, activities are structured by the participants themselves. Thus, the following hypotheses were also tested:

H₄: Locus of structuring (provider centric, activity centric, participant centric) affects prevalence of deep structured experience.

H₅: Locus of structuring (provider centric, activity centric, participant centric) affects perceived value of the activity.

H₆: Locus of structuring (provider centric, activity centric, participant centric) affects delight of the activity.

Method

Sample

The sample included 208 experiences of 16 study-abroad tourists (15 females, 1 male). Data were collected during a five-week university-sponsored study abroad program to Fiji, New Zealand, and Australia. Data were collected immediately following participation in each of 13 activities over the 32 days. The 13 activities that were used to generate the sample of experiences are summarized in Table 1.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25 years ($M = 21$; $SD = 1.93$) and represented seven different majors. Twelve had traveled abroad for vacation at least once prior to participating in the study abroad. Five participants had made five or more vacation trips abroad. Half of the participants had visited three or more foreign countries ($M = 7.85$ countries; $SD = 5.71$) prior to participating in this study abroad program.

Measurement

Three measures of participants' experience quality were taken at each occasion. These included perceived value, delight, and deep structured experience. Perceived value was measured using a unidimensional approach to that concept. It was defined as the participant's "judgement about the superiority of" the structured experience (Zeithaml, 1988, p. 5) relative to other ways that their time could have been spent. Five items were used: (1) "I wish I had spent my time doing something else"; (2) "I am glad that I chose this activity"; (3) "I chose wisely when I chose to do this activity"; (4) "This activity was an excellent use of my time"; and (5) "This activity was worth what I invested in it." The response scale included five options, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The item, "I wish I had spent my time doing something else," required reverse coding. The standardized alpha reliability estimate of the perceived value measure was .95.

Delight was conceptualized as a continuum ranging from “delight” on one end to “disgust” on the other (Lee *et al.*, 2011; Oliver, 2010; Schneider & Bowen, 1999; Torres & Kline, 2013). Immediately after each structured experience, each research participant was asked to rate her or his “overall satisfaction” with that experience. Anchor points on the continuum were “delight” and “disgust.” Intermediate stages along the continuum were “satisfied,” “indifferent,” and “dissatisfied.”

Deep structured experience was measured with a single task (Ellis, Freeman, & Jiang, 2016). Participants were presented with a definition of deep structured experience and then asked to indicate the “times during the experience at which” they were “in” that state. The definition was as follows:

I was in a state of effortless concentration so deep that I lost (a) my sense of time, (b) my thoughts about myself, and (c) my thoughts about my problems. I wanted very much to keep doing this activity.

Participants indicated the times during the experience in which they were “in” that state by drawing one or more lines in a rectangle, whose opposite ends represented the entire duration of time of the structured experience. Participants who were in a deep structured experience for the entire time, for example, drew a line extending from the left side of the rectangle, representing the beginning of the experience, to the opposite side of the rectangle, representing the end of the structured experience. Participants who cycled in and out of a deep subjective experience drew lines corresponding to beginning and end points of occasions during which they experienced that state. Prevalence is the percentage of time within an interval that a behavior is present (Suen, 1990). As such, prevalence of a deep structured experience score was obtained by measuring the length of each line drawn, summing those lengths across all lines, and dividing by the length of the space within the rectangle. This approach is consistent with constructions of flow, peak experience, deep play, and fast-thinking as binary states (Auckerman, 1999; Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; Kahneman, 2011; Privette, 1983).

Criterion-related evidence of validity is reflected in the bivariate correlations among these three measures. The Pearson correlations between prevalence of deep structured experience and perceived value, and delight were .55 ($p < .001$) and .47 ($p < .001$), respectively. The Pearson correlation between perceived value and delight was .69 ($p < .001$). These validity coefficients support the position that it is appropriate to make inferences about perceived value, delight, and deep structured experiences based on the scores generated by the three measurement approaches. The coefficients are not so strong, though, to be considered redundant. The measures share a common element related to the quality of experience of participants, but also have unique roles in characterizing participant experiences.

Procedures

Prior to departing for the study abroad, researchers reviewed all of the experience offerings in which participants would be participating during the study abroad program to determine which ones met the criteria of being an engagement (focus on an unfolding story), absorption (focus on sensory stimulation), immersion (focus on performance of a task), or familiar experience. Examples of the experiences are: alpine luge (an immersion experience), snorkeling (an absorption experience), interpreted walk (an engagement experience), and a van ride (a familiar experience).

After the 13 experiences were selected, the researchers determined the locus of structuring. That is, would the tourist activity be structured by the experience provider (provider centric) or would the nature of the activity itself naturally place demands on the participant for

performance, attention, or sensory involvement (activity centric). Some of the activities were not structured and the participants were left to create their own experience; there was no demand from the experience offering for their attention, it would be whatever the participants created within the context of the study abroad program (participant centric). See Table 1 for all experiences, their descriptions, the classification of tourist activity type, and locus of structuring.

Once the 13 experiences were selected and classified, a paper-and-pencil packet of study instruments was prepared for each participant, and a research assistant kept the packets while abroad. Upon completion of each of the selected tourist activities, the research assistant passed out packets to participants and directed them to the appropriate measures to complete for the specific activity.

Data Analysis

Hypothesis tests were conducted using mixed modeling techniques. “Participants” was a random effects variable, within which repeated observations at the 13 sites were generated. Six mixed models were constructed. Three of these were used to evaluate the effect of tourist activity type (engagement vs. absorption vs. immersion vs. familiar) and activity-within-locus structure (see Table 1) on prevalence of deep structured experience, perceived value, and delight. These models were used to test hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. The remaining three models were used to test the effects of locus of structuring (provider centric vs. activity centric vs. participant centric) and activity-within-locus of activity structure (Table 1) on those same outcomes: hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. Significant omnibus *F* ratios were followed up using Tukey’s LSD method.

Results

Results of analyses associated with the first three hypotheses are presented in Table 2. Means of engagement, absorption, and immersion experiences were higher than the means of the familiar experience for all three dependent variables: perceived value, delight, and prevalence of deep structured experience. The effect of tourist activity type was significant for all three outcome measures. The perceived value mean for “familiar experiences” was significantly less than the means of each of the three tourist activity types (engagement, absorption, immersion). Immersion experiences produced a significantly higher mean for delight than familiar experiences. Although the absorption and engagement means for delight were greater than the mean of the familiar experiences, the differences were not significant. For prevalence of deep structured experience, the immersion mean and the absorption mean were significantly greater than the mean of the familiar condition.

Table 3 shows effects of locus of structuring on the quality of the immediate experience. Significant effects were observed for prevalence of deep structured experience and perceived value, but not for delight. For both prevalence of deep subjective experience and perceived value, the provider centric and activity centric structuring yielded significantly higher means than the participant centric structuring.

Discussion

Results indicate significant effects of tourist activity type on perceived value, delight, and deep structured experience. Results also indicate an effect of locus of activity structure on both perceived value and deep structured experience. The effect of locus of activity structure on delight was not significant. Thus, provider actions and the nature of activities at attractions do tend to elevate the overall quality of experience above the naturally occurring co-creation of the participant.

The finding of significant effects probably surprises few readers. Enhanced, and often memorable, experiences are at the very heart of success of providers of attractions and quality of

experiences should be higher than familiar settings. Thus, the *effect size* (percent of variance explained) is perhaps much more informative than the significant *p* values. The R^2_{PRE} values ranged from .03 to .16, indicating weak to moderate relations between the structuring factors and the measures of subjective experience. R^2_{PRE} for perceived value was .16 in both the tourist activity type model and the locus of activity structure model. The range of R^2_{PRE} values for delight and deep subjective experiences was from .03 to .07. This result suggests that perceived value, which is a cognitive judgement, is more sensitive to experience structuring elements examined than the two measures of attentional and motivational state (delight and deep structured experience). Perceived value is a key to gaining a competitive advantage in the service sectors (Petrick, 2002). It is thus encouraging that perceived value is the most sensitive of the study variables to provider actions.

An important methodological limitation must be noted. Empirical redundancy exists in categorization of the levels of the independent variables across the two sets of analyses (hypothesis 1-3 vs. hypothesis 4-6). Cross-tabulation of the third and fourth columns of Table 1 reveals that all four engagement activities were also categorized as being provider centric. All three absorption activities were provider centric. Two of the three immersion activities were provider centric, and two of the three familiar activities were participant centric. As a result, redundancy exists across the two analyses. Thus, although the two analyses suggest that both tourist activity type (absorption, immersion, engagement) and locus of structuring (provider, activity, participant) impact perceived value and quality of experience, ambiguity exists concerning the precise nature of the cause.

Given the increasing interest in creating memorable and meaningful tourist experiences, the future will bring more research examining the structuring of visitor experiences. If co-creation of value is indeed what will give providers a competitive advantage, it is essential that research be designed to more fully understand the co-creation process. From Mathis *et al.* (2016) we learned that co-creation yields loyalty, and loyalty yields return on investment. Thus, research is needed to systematically vary co-creation and understand its effects on loyalty. It is important to understand where in the value chain tourists most value co-creation and structuring strategies.

Further study of the techniques for fostering deep structured experiences is warranted. As an example, Pine and Gilmore (2011) have likened an experience offering to that of the dramatic flow of a theatrical production. They assert that differing structures or patterns (e.g., constantly low, reaches a pinnacle too early or too late) result in differing levels of engagement. This phenomenon warrants investigation. Research may reveal that providers might strategically and systematically introduce and withhold precise techniques over the entire course of tourist encounters at attractions and services.

Finally, it is notable that participants were education tourists participating in a study abroad program. With increasing interest in university participants becoming global citizens and having international experiences, it would be beneficial for directors of study abroad experiences as well as the tourist providers to better understand the learning value of these tourist experiences as part of study abroad programs. Pine and Gilmore's (2011) *Experience Economy* has shaped the way many organizations think of conducting business and the tourism industry has embraced many of the tenets of their work. Due to increased market demand by tourists for memorable experiences, it is essential for experience providers to better understand factors influencing and shaping aspects of the tourist experience. Doing so will not only provide memorable experiences for tourists but also enhance the co-creation of value. The findings of this study demonstrate that tourist activity type and locus of structuring positively affect perceptions of value, delight, and

deep structured experiences, which are outcomes that can be systematically measured and studied in relation to various antecedents.

References

- Ackerman, D. (1999). *Deep play*. Vintage Books: New York.
- Alexander, M. W. (2010). Customer delight: A review. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 14(1), 39–54.
- Binkhorst, E., & Dekker, T. D. (2009). Agenda for co-creation tourism and experience research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 18(2/3), 311-327.
doi:10.1080/19368620802594193
- Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on consumers and employees. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(April), 57-71.
- Bonner, E., & Friedman, H. (2011). A conceptual clarification of the experience of awe: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 39(3), 222-235.
doi:10.1080/08873267.2011.593372
- Bryant, F., & Veroff, J. (2007). *Savoring: A new model of positive experience*. Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.
- Bryant, F., Chadwick, E. D., & Kluwe, K. (2011). Understanding the processes that regulate positive emotional experience: Unsolved problems and future directions for theory and research on savoring. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1(1), 107–126.
doi:10.5502/ijw.v1i1.18
- Campos, A. C., Mendes, J., Valle, P. O., & Scott, N. (2016). Co-creation experiences: Attention and memorability. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 33(9), 1309-1336.
doi:10.1080/10548408.2015.1118424
- Chandler, C. (1989). Beyond customer satisfaction. *Quality Progress*, 22(2), 30-32.
- Chathoth, P., Altinay, L., Harrington, R. J., Okumus, F., & Chan, E. S. W. (2013). Co-production versus co-creation: A process based continuum in the hotel service context. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 32, 11–20.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). *Beyond boredom and anxiety*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Cutler, S. Q., & Carmichael, B. A. (2010). The dimension of the tourist experience. In M. Morgan, P. Lugosi, & J. R. B. Ritchie (Eds.), *The tourism and leisure experience: Consumer and managerial perspectives* (pp. 3-26). Channel View: Bristol, UK.
- DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. Academic Press: New York.
- Douglas, D. (2007). *Effects of provocation type and theme type on engagement of visitors to heritage sites* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
- Duerden, M., Ward, P., & Freeman, P. (2015). Conceptualizing structured experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 47(5), 601-620.
- Ellis, G., Freeman, P., Jamal, T., & Jiang, J. (2017). A theory of structured experience. *Annals of Leisure Research*, DOI: 10.1080/11745398.2017.1312468.
- Ellis, G., Freeman, P., & Jiang, J. (2016). *Measurement of situated tourist experience theory concepts*. Paper presented at the 12th Annual ATINER International Conference on Tourism, 30-31 May & 1-2 June 2016, Athens, Greece.
- Ellis, G. D., & Rossman, J. R. (2008). Creating value for participants through experience staging: Parks, recreation, and tourism in the experience industry. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 26(4), 1-20.
- Gronroos, C. (2011). Value co-creation in service logic: A critical analysis. *Marketing Theory*, 11(3), 279-301.

- Hosany, S., & Gilbert, D. (2010). Measuring tourists' emotional experiences toward hedonic holiday destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(4), 513-526.
- Institute for International Education. (2016). *International students: Enrollment trend*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/International-Students/Enrollment-Trends/1948-2016>.
- Jackson, S., & Marsh, H. (1996). Development of a scale to measure optimal experience: The flow state scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 18, 17-35.
- Jennings, G., & Nickerson, N. (2006). *Quality tourism experiences*. Elsevier: New York.
- Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York.
- Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. R. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12-25.
- Kotler, P. (1973). Atmospheric as a marketing tool. *Journal of Retailing*, 49(4), 48-64.
- Kumar, A., Olshavsky, R., & King, M. (2001). Exploring the antecedents of customer delight. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Complaining Behavior*, 14, 14-27.
- Langer, E. J. (1990). *Mindfulness*. Da Capo Books: Reading, MA.
- Lee, J. W., Ralston, L., Ellis, G., & Park, J. (2011). *The influence of nationality and service quality on positive affect, negative affect and delightedness*. Paper presented at the 2011 International CHRIE Conference, July 26-30, Denver, Colorado. Abstract retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/refereed/ICHRIE_2011/Saturday/9/
- Madsen, C. (1997). Focus of attention and aesthetic response. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(1), 80-89.
- Madsen, C., Brittin, R., & Capperella-Sheldon, D. (1993). An empirical method for measuring the aesthetic experience to music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41(1), 57-69.
- Mannell, R., & Iso-Ahola, S. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 314-331.
- Martin, J., & Cultler, K. (2002). An exploratory study of flow and motivation in theatre actors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14(4), 344-352.
- Maslow, A. (1961). Peak experiences as acute identity experiences. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 21(2), 254-262.
- Mathis, E. F., Kim, H., Uysal, M., Sirgy, J. M., & Prebensen, N. K. (2016). The effect of co-creation experience on outcome variable. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 57, 62-75.
- Morgan, M., Lugosi, P., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2010). *The tourism and leisure experience*. Channel View: Bristol, UK.
- Mossberg, L. (2007). A marketing approach to the tourist experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 59-74.
- O'Dell, T., & Billing, P. (2005). *Experiencescapes: Tourism, Culture and Economy*. Copenhagen Business School Press: Copenhagen.
- Oh, H., Fiore, A., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: Tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 119-132.
- Oliver, R. L. (2010). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer* (2nd ed.). M.E. Sharpe: Armonk, NY.
- Oliver, R., Rust, R., & Varki, S. (1997). Customer delight: Foundations, findings, and managerial insight. *Journal of Retailing*, 73(3), 311-336.
- Parasuraman, A., & Grewal, D. (2000). The impact of technology on the quality-value-loyalty chain: A research agenda. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1), 168-174.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring customer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-20.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1994). Reassessment of expectations as a comparison standard in measuring service quality: Implications for further research. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(January), 111-124.
- Petrick, J. (2002). Development of a multi-dimensional scale for measuring the perceived value of a service. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14(2), 119-134.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. (1999). *The experience economy*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. (2011). *The experience economy, updated edition*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. (2013). The experience economy: Past, present, and future. In J. Sundbo, & F. Sorensen (Eds.), *Handbook on the experience economy* (pp. 21-44). Edward Elgar: Northampton, MA.
- Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(3), 5-14.
- Prebensen, J., Chen, S., & Uysal, M. (2014). *Creating experience value in tourism*. CABI: London, England.
- Privette, G. (1983). Peak experience, peak performance, and flow: A comparative analysis of positive human experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1361-1368.
- Privette, G., & Bundrick, C. M. (1987). Measurement of experience: Construct and content validity of the experience questionnaire. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 65(1), 315-332.
- Reeve, J. (2013). A self-determination theory on student engagement. In S. Christenson, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172). Springer: New York.
- Rossmann, J. R., & Schlatter, B. E. (2011). *Recreation programming: Designing leisure experiences* (6th ed.). Sagamore: Champaign, IL.
- Schneider, B., & Bowen, D. E. (1999). Understanding customer delight and outrage. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 41(1), 35-45.
- Shiota, M., Keltner, D., & Mossman, A. (2007). The nature of awe: Elicitors, appraisals, and effects on self-concept. *Cognition and Emotion*, 21(5), 944-963.
- Suen, H. K. (1990). *Principles of test theories*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, NJ.
- Tilden, F. (1957). *Interpreting our heritage* (3rd ed.). University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill.
- Torres, E., & Kline, S. (2013). From customer satisfaction to customer delight: Creating a new standard of service for the hotel industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 25(5), 642-659.
- Vanhamme, J. (2008). The surprise-delight relationship revisited in the management of experience. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (English Edition)*, 23, 113-138.
- Zeithaml, V. A. (1988). Consumer perceptions of price, quality and value: A means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing*, 52(3), 2-22.

Table 1

Classification of Structured Experiences

Experience Name	Description	Tourist Activity Type	Locus of Activity Structure
Whitewater Rafting	A full day trip on a class III river.	Immersion	Provider Centric
Alpine Luge	1 hour on 3 tracks of differing levels the rider negotiated down the mountain on a “luge.”	Immersion	Provider Centric
Sea Kayaking	2-hour sea kayaking experience.	Immersion	Participant Centric
Snorkeling	Full day of reef snorkeling.	Absorption	Provider Centric
Australian Wildlife Park	1-hour visit to interact with and observe iconic Australian wildlife.	Absorption	Provider Centric
Australian Dairy	A tour of a working dairy as well as chocolate- and cheese-making factory.	Absorption	Provider Centric
Maori Village	A 3-hour interactive journey into the heart of Maori culture and food.	Engagement	Provider Centric
Aboriginal Experience & Dreamtime Walk	1-hour “journey” to learn about customs and traditions of indigenous Australians; observed and participated in various activities.	Engagement	Provider Centric
Agrodome	1-hour farm show telling the story of sheep and dogs in an educational and entertaining way.	Engagement	Provider Centric
Daintree River Cruise	1.5-hour river cruise guided by a naturalist to see birds and crocodiles.	Engagement	Provider Centric
Train Ride	2-hour train ride from one city to another; much through scenic areas and mountains.	Familiar	Activity Centric
Scenic Tram Ride	A tram ride over an open gorge.	Familiar	Participant Centric
Van Ride	1-hour van ride from an attraction back to the night’s lodging.	Familiar	Participant Centric

Table 2

Quality of Immediate Experience Measures by Tourist Activity Type and Activity (nested)

	N	Mean	SD	SE	Tourist Activity Type F(df1,df2)	Activity Within Tourist Activity Type F(df1,df3)	R²PRE
<i>Perceived Value</i>	205	35.75	9.25	.65	8.29 _(3,192) ***	2.86 _(9,192)	.16
Immersion	47	38.06 ^a	8.84	1.29			
Absorption	48	38.25 ^a	8.32	1.20			
Engagement	63	36.02 ^a	7.54	.95			
Familiar	47	30.51	10.65	1.55			
<i>Delight</i>	175	7.18	1.63	.12	3.39 _(3,162) *	.91 _(9,162)	.03
Immersion	41	7.78 ^a	1.49	.23			
Absorption	41	7.22	2.19	.34			
Engagement	53	7.08	1.14	.16			
Familiar	40	6.68	1.51	.24			
<i>Deep Structured Exp.</i>	208	14.25	4.72	.33	2.66 _(3,195) *	2.25 _(9,195)	.07
Immersion	48	15.13 ^a	4.02	.58			
Absorption	48	15.13 ^a	4.86	.70			
Engagement	64	13.91	3.98	.50			
Familiar	48	12.93	5.81	.84			

* $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$ ^a Indicates the mean of this tourist activity type is significantly greater than the mean of the familiar structure

Table 3

Quality of Immediate Experience by Locus of Activity Structure and Activity (nested)

	N	Mean	SD	SE	Locus of Activity Structure F_(df1,df2)	Activity Within Locus F_(df1,df2)	R²_{PRE}
<i>Perceived Value</i>	205	35.75	9.25	.65	13.79 _(2,192) ***	2.30 _(10,192)	.16
Provider Centric	127	37.25 ^a	8.08	.72			
Activity Centric	31	38.29 ^a	8.47	1.52			
Participant Centric	47	30.00	10.44	1.53			
<i>Delight</i>	175	7.18	1.63	.12	2.47 _(2,162)	1.33 _(10,162)	.03
Provider Centric	108	7.22	1.74	.17			
Activity Centric	26	7.65	1.62	.32			
Participant Centric	41	6.78	1.24	.19			
<i>Deep Structured Experience</i>	208	14.25	4.72	.33	6.79 _(2,195) ***	1.47 _(10,195)	.07
Provider Centric	128	14.63 ^a	4.27	.38			
Activity Centric	32	15.73 ^a	4.84	.86			
Participant Centric	48	12.25	5.25	.76			

*** $p < .001$ ^a Indicates the mean of this treatment condition is significantly greater than the mean of the “participant centric” condition