

INTERNET TRAVEL BOOKING ACTIVITES
AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

By

JOSEPH MOREO

Bachelor of Science in Hotel and Restaurant

Administration

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

2004

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
December 2006

INTERNET TRAVEL BOOKING ACTIVITES
AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Radesh Palakurthi

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Bill Ryan

Dr. Hailin Qu

A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks are in order for my parents who even though they questioned the idea of me going to graduate college, they helped and supported me the entire way. To my friends who were always there for me, especially on the rough days. Thanks are especially in order for all friends, family, and coworkers who without their support I could never have come this far. For my professors who always encouraged me do better and never let me settle for anything. Without the support that these people gave me I never would have come this far and given me the drive to do the best that I can.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Purpose of Study.....	6
Research Questions.....	7
Chapter Summary.....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Online Traveler.....	8
National Computer and Internet Usage Demographics	9
“Generation Y”	13
Student Travel Behavior	14
Student Purchase Behavior	16
Chapter Summary	18
III. METHODOLOGY	19
Instrument Development.....	19
Sampling Plan	20
Data Collection	21
Data Analysis	22
IV. RESULTS	23
Demographics	23
Websites used and for what type of services	26
Reasons for website use and habits demonstrated	29
Sources of discovery of websites and the influence of sources	31
Number of persons traveling based on type and percentage of travel	33
Internet Purchasing behaviors.....	37
Chapter Summary	38

V. CONCLUSION.....	39
Summary of Study	39
Summary of Findings.....	39
Implications.....	40
Recommendations.....	42
Limitations and Future research.....	43
REFERENCES	45
APPENDIX A –Consent Form	47
APPENDIX B - Survey	48
APPENDIX C – Confirmation Page.....	56
APPENDIX D – IRB Approval	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Research Questions in Relation to Survey Questions	20
University Classification	24
Enrollment Status	24
Personal and Family Income	24
Age of Respondents.....	24
How Tuition is Paid	25
Gender of Respondents.....	25
Summary of Responses by College	25
Area of Origin	26
Metasearch Engines Used	27
Full Service Travel Sites Used	27
Company Travel Sites Used	28
Type of Service Used in Relation to Type of Website Used.....	28
Usage in Relation to Demographic	29
Reasons for Travel Website Usage	30
Buying Habits That May be Demonstrated by Respondent	31
Sources of Website Discovery	32
Influence of Sources	32
Distribution of Travel Percentages	33

Percentage of Travel that is for Business	34
Typical Number of Persons Traveling When on Business	34
Business Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel	34
Percentage of Travel that is for Leisure	35
Typical Number of Persons Traveling When for Leisure	35
Leisure Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel	35
Percentage of Travel Intended for Visiting Friends/Family	36
Typical Number of Persons Traveling When Visiting Friends/Family	36
Family Visit Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel	36
Items Purchased Online	37
Money and Time Spent Online	38

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The internet has become a vital part of society, business, and education. Individuals can go online and find information about the world, health issues, weather, stock market information, and products. Businesses use the internet to market and provide services to customers, purchase supplies, sell items to consumers, and to provide information. Educators and schools use the internet for gathering information, developing education aids, and to provide services for parents and students. More and more students in the United States use the internet for information, research, education, and communication. But what else do they use it for?

Due to computers, schools can have access to information that previously was unattainable. Computers have allowed students from around the world to learn of things that they may never have had an opportunity to learn without them. Most school students have had access to a computer or some form of interaction with a computer. If students are using computers and the internet on a regular basis in school it stands to good reason that it would enter their personal lives as well. Research shows that the online travel market is increasing as internet users are using the internet for booking travel (Gianforte, 2003), how are students interacting with online travel.

According to the Stillwater Public Schools website students in grades K-12 attend school five days a week, for 7 hours a day or 35 hours a week, and 17 vacation days, 8 days in the Fall and 9 in the Spring, from school throughout the school year ("Stillwater Public Schools 2006-2007 School Calendar", 2006). College students usually have the option of choosing what days of the week they attend classes. As well as choosing from a variety of schedules, class schedules normally have about four classes or 12 hours a week, but can have anywhere from 1 hour to 19 hours of classes schedule. There are a variety of combinations of class schedules that can be arranged based on days of the week and time of day. College students can have classes at night or during the day, classes on Tuesdays and Thursdays, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, or any other combination. This leaves most free time to travel on weekends, holidays, or for short trips.

Most students who have a working career receive on average 13 days of vacation time a year (Infoplease, 2006). At Oklahoma State University during the Fall semester students receive five days of school holidays during the week; these include Thanksgiving, Labor Day, and Fall Break. During the Spring semester students receive six days of holidays, which includes Martin Luther King Day and one week of Spring Break. Therefore during the school year students receive a similar number of vacation days that an average business person would. College students are in school for eighteen week semesters, based on school scheduling which is typically two per year. Students receive three weeks away from school for Christmas, which some students use to travel on ski trips or to go home for the holidays. Students also receive a three month Summer Break. During the three months many students retain a job, have an internship, visit

family, or travel for pleasure. In July 2006 nearly 60% of people between the ages of 16 and 24 retained a job (Neuharth, 2006).

Society encourages vacations for relaxation, getaways, and for pleasure. Around the world many countries have more vacation days than in America. Some countries maintain laws that require a certain number of vacation days for citizens. Business people receive vacation days every year, and can choose when to use them. College students have plenty of leisure time and therefore have the ability to travel more. This raises the question of how much traveling a college student actually accomplishes and how they choose to make their travel arrangements. Do college students stay on the cutting edge of internet travel booking? What sites do college students actually use? What are the reasons that college students decide to use certain travel websites? What sources do college students use to discover travel websites and how influential are those sources for college students? What other products do college students buy online and how much do they spend online? What demographics do these college students demonstrate? All of these are questions that have not been answered well previously. This research project highlights such factors by conducting a detailed survey of students' internet travel behavior.

Background

The internet has the amazing ability to connect people and grow the network indefinitely. The internet has changed the way that businesses interact with their customers and companies have had to evolve to cope with those changes. With the advent of the internet hotels created new methods to it as a distribution tool, called the

Global Distribution System or GDS. “In simplest terms, the objective of a GDS (Global Distribution System) is to distribute a company’s products to as broad an audience as possible in the most effective and cost-efficient means available (Nyheim, McFadden, & Connolly, 2005).” GDS allows hotel employees and partners to access the inventory of the hotel chain around the world on a real-time basis. Consequently, hotels then allowed travel agents to have access to the system for instantaneous sales of rooms and confirmation of booking. Global Distribution networks have reshaped how travelers plan and arrange accommodations for personal vacations and business trips and how hotel companies interact with their customers (Nyheim, McFadden, & Connolly, 2005). The internet has taken the GDS to a new level and has changed how travelers plan and arrange accommodations. The internet has allowed third party vendors like expedia.com to have access to company GDS systems. This has, in turn allowed internet users to view hotel inventories at will using the internet. The cost advantages of such interactions are enormous. Considering the cost of a single hotel booking, traditional agency costs \$13.50, while an online intermediary costs \$10.50, and a hotel-company website costs \$1.50. (O'Connor, 2003)

Marketers have worked to make the internet easier for internet users to locate travel websites. To make travel searches online easier a new domain name for websites will have to be created. Most current travel information websites have domain name extensions of .com, .net, or .org. The proposed new domain is .travel that will categorize travel sources to allow customers to easily find travel information. The new domain name will allow marketers to be able to market directly toward those looking for

information without being redirected by other websites and having to pay for advertisements (Yesawich, 2006a).

According to Bergen, 2004, many companies are converting from traditional travel agencies to online travel agencies because they are able to save more money by switching. Many of the online companies receive discounted rates since they buy their products in bulk. One reason that companies are changing their travel distribution strategies is because the connectivity of the internet allows them to keep track of travel arrangements that have been made and easily track accounting measures. Convenience has always been a strong motivator for booking online. Having the ability to look at different options at a click of a button is always attractive. Low price has been the other motivator for booking travel online. Online travel agencies Expedia, Travelocity, and Orbitz have also entered the corporate travel business. Among their selling points are booking fees as low as \$5 for transactions on customized corporate portals, compared with fees in \$30-\$45 at some traditional agencies (Bergen, 2004). Those at risk to lose market share are traditional travel agencies, whose numbers already have fallen dramatically due to industry consolidation, fallout from the September 11, 2001 attacks, and the incursion of the online agencies into leisure travel (Bergen, 2004). *Traditional* travel agency offices have been disappearing, their numbers down nearly 25 percent, to 24,337 in 2002 from a peak of 32,238 in 1999 (Bergen, 2004).

There are many characteristics that can be used to describe travelers, from the amount of money they spend to the types of trips they take. The typical internet user is an affluent, frequent traveler who spends more than average on leisure and entertainment and is therefore an attractive market for travel suppliers, (O'Connor, 2003). TIA (Travel

Industry Association of America) defines a frequent traveler as a person who takes five or more trips a year ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005). According to recent research, 86% of business travelers and 73% of leisure travelers have access to the internet at home (Yesawich, 2006b). This shows that frequent travelers have the potential for using the internet to book travel arrangements from the convenience of their home. The trends in online booking are also encouraging. Internet/online usage for planning some aspect of travel was 53% in 2002, was 57% in 2003, was 63% in 2004, was 59% in 2005, and was 64% in 2006 (Yesawich, 2006b). This information shows that the internet is becoming an increasingly useful tool for planning travel. Internet/online usage to make a reservation is also showing similar trends in 2002 was 32%, in 2003 was 38%, in 2004 was 45%, in 2005 was 47%, and in 2006 is 50% (Yesawich, 2006b). With the increase of planning and reservations activity being conducted online the increase of internet access from home and work the internet is becoming the most critical travel booking means. It can also be assumed that, the criticality of the internet will increase in online travel bookings business.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research is to study the online travel booking activities and habits of college students. There has been research in the area of business travelers and vacation travelers. There has been little research in the area of college student behaviors and habits. This study is to help fill the gap in the areas where research has not been conducted.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research is to determine what are some reasons college students use online sites for making travel arrangements? What factors influence the decision of college students when arranging travel bookings online? How do college students discover, associate with, and interact with online travel sources? What are college students' online purchase behavior and preferences and their general socio-economic and demographic characteristics?

Chapter Summary

This study will hopefully fill some gaps in the current research in this area of travelers. The age group in this study is on the cutting edge of technology and has been there as technology improves. Many future marketing techniques will be targeted towards this age group for this reason. This research will hopefully enlighten marketers to future prospects in the student travel market.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Online Traveler

According to a TIA Travel report there are approximately 216.1 millions adults in America, of whom 151.8 million are travelers, out of those traveled 101.3 million are online travelers ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005). About 52% of the travelers use the internet for planning trips and 43% use the internet to make travel reservations ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005). This reinforces the previous statement about the increase in the use of the internet for planning and reserving trips. Of the 151.8 million travelers 67% are frequent travelers that take more than five trips annually. This information also supports the traveler characteristics mentioned earlier of frequent travelers by O'Connor. Seventy-eight percent of online travelers said that they consulted the internet to get travel and destination information in 2005 ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005). Ninety-five percent of online travelers said that at least one trip in the last year was for pleasure, vacation, or personal purposes. This information supports the characteristics of internet user by O'Connor. Out of all the online travelers 67% used online travel agency websites, such as Expedia and Travelocity, 64% use search engine websites, and 54% used company-owned websites such as airlines and hotels. Out of online bookers 78% used the internet for at

least half of their travel bookings. The most popular online marketing techniques that triggers a response from consumers is unsponsored search engine results (36%), email recommendations from friends and colleagues (34%), links on websites (26%), and email and/or newsletters (21%) ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005). As a comparison between internet users and non-users the average age was 41 years old vs. 51 years old, some college or more 71% vs. 34%, and average household income \$70,000 vs. \$41,000. Internet sites used for travel planning are online travel agency 67%, search engine sites 64%, travel company sites 54%, and destination sites 46% ("Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition", 2005).

National Computer and Internet Usage Demographics

According to a Pew Internet & American Life Project survey in 2006 73% of American adults use the Internet. Of those users 73% get travel information, 67% buy a product online, 43% bank online, and 44% get financial information ("Internet Activities", 2006). This information reinforces the fact that there is a strong correlation of internet use and using patterns. Another study by Pew found that 88% of people between the ages of 18-29 use the internet ("Demographics of Internet Users", 2006). This age bracket falls into the age group of "Generation Y". People who were born between the years of 1977 to 2003 are considered part of "Generation Y" their ages would be between 29 to 3 years of age. This information is significant in that many of this age group are just graduating from high school and are in college. Also, of the population that is receiving a high school education, 64% use the internet, whereas those with College education use the internet 91% ("Demographics of Internet Users", 2006). This

information is significant in that the more education that a person has there is an increase of internet usage and therefore a higher chance of spending time and money online.

The U.S. Census Bureau conducts research on household usage of the internet. 61.8% of households had access to a computer in 2003, compared to 56.3% in 2001 (*Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003, 2005*, p. 1). This is a significant increase in computer access and many computers can readily have access to the internet. “School influences a child’s access to computers. In 2003, 76% of all children aged 3 to 17 lived in a household with a computer and 83 % of the 57 million enrolled children used a computer at school. Ten years earlier, 32% of children had a computer at home and 61% used a computer at school (*Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003, 2005*, p. 4).” This information is important in that there has been an increase in computer access for children. Many of the children that had access to computers in 1993 are from “Generation Y”. This shows that there is an increase in computer usage and therefore a chance of this continuance of the trend. The proportion of children ages 15 to 17 in 2003 said they used a computer anywhere was 95%. “The proportion of adults using a computer anywhere grew from 18% in 1984, to 36% in 1993, to 64% in 2003 (*Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003, 2005*, p. 6).” As the statistics show there is a higher percentage of computer usage in a smaller age group. The age group is fairly high usage percentage when compared to the adults that are compared right next to them. “Computer use was less widespread among adults than children. 64% of adults used a computer at some location in 2003, compared with 85% of children (*Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003, 2005*, p. 9).” Understandably the percentage of children using the internet is higher since they have had more experience

through school. Many children have grown up using computers and have a better understanding since they have used them for a large part of their lives. “High-income households were more likely to have a computer or internet access. Among family households with incomes of \$100,000 or more during the 12 months prior to the survey, 95% had at least one computer and 92% had internet access (*Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003, 2005*, p. 10).” By having a higher income there is more disposable income that can be used for other things other than the bare necessities of life.

According to Pew Internet and American Life Project report on *Teenage Life Online* study the average age of the sample was 15, ranging from 12 to 17 years of age. Within this age group 27% had one year or less of internet experience, 52% had two to three years of experience, and 21% had more than three years (Lenhart, Rainie, & Lewis, 2001). This information shows that this age group has the extreme potential for internet purchasing. If previous percentages can be attributed to this age group then 73% of these users will purchase online travel in the future, this group is larger in that 95% of its population is online where as only 64% of the adult age group. According to a previous study in 2000 45% of all American children under the age of 18 go online. 73% of those between 12 and 17 go online, and 29% of children 11 years or younger use the internet. The average age of children started using the internet was 13 years old. Studies have found that teens have a hefty spending power by some accounts teens receive \$55 billion a year from their parents, this number is excluding any other money the teens may earn on their own (Lenhart, Rainie, & Lewis, 2001). This number is fairly substantial in that it shows how much money is given to teens and therefore the potential of spending.

In 2005 86% of U.S. teens aged 12-17 use the internet, compared to 73% in 2000, and 66% of adults use the internet, compared to 56% in 2000 (Lenhart, Madden, & Hitlin, 2005). There is a higher rate of internet use growth among the teens than with the adults, even with the additions of the teenagers who have grown into the adulthood. 51% of teenagers say that they use the internet on a daily basis. 43% of teenagers said that they have made a purchase online, which is up 71% in online teen shopping since 2000 (Lenhart, Madden, & Hitlin, 2005). If this information is used in reference with the information from 2000 that emphasized that teens are given \$55 billion by their parents then it could be said that they could spend close to \$23.7 billion online every year.

75.9% of Americans use the internet in 2003 whereas in 2000 only 66.9% use the internet (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004). This increase shows that there is substantial growth among the populace about the role that the internet can be. The average number of hours that an American spends online in 2003 was 12.5 hours a week in 2000 the American spent 9.4 hours a week (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004). In three years the average number of hours has increased by 3.1 hours, an increase of nearly 27 minutes every day. Of the people surveyed 3.3% had less than one year of experience, 13.8% had one to three years of experience, 25.2% had three to five years of experience, 25% had five to seven years of experience, and 32.7% had seven years of experience (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004). As it can be seen the population has extensive experience with the internet, with the majority of users having more than 3 years of experience using the internet. In 2003 43% of Americans have bought something online and spend an average of \$95.14 a month purchasing items online (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004). Of the common activities that online users do every week 90.4% say that they email, 77.2% say

that they web surf or browse, 44.2% say that they shop and buy online, and 34.6% say that they look at travel information every week (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004). In 2003 the internet use among age groups were 12-15 is 98%, 16-18 is 97%, 19-24 is 92%, 25-35 is 85%, 36-45 is 87%, 46-55 is 78%, 56-65 is 67%, and over 65 is 38% (*Surveying the Digital Future*, 2004).

“Generation Y”

Students’ online habits could have a profound impact on future online usage and may help kick the internet economy out of its doldrums, the researchers believe (Suzukamo, 2002). The online habits of college students have the potential to be a great asset. As mentioned in a previous study, teens receive up to \$55 billion in money from their parents. College student depending on their tuition payment status can have a difference in disposable income. If a college student’s tuition is paid for by scholarships, family, loans, and works another job on a full or part time basis. There is a potential for a higher disposable income even though they may not be earning a high income they spend a higher percentage of that income.

College students have long been in the vanguard of U.S. Internet users, and they’ve become its most pampered users. Colleges and universities nationwide have spent millions rewiring ivy-covered halls into 21st century information-technology nerve centers(Suzukamo, 2002). By being pampered in college users have learned of how to use the internet for their uses. As mentioned in previous studies the average number of hours spent online has increased and the amount of experience with internet and computers has increased as well.

According to en.wikipedia.org “Generation Y” is a segment of people born between 1977 and 2003. Yet they also define people born between 1986 and 1999 as the “Internet generation” as a subsection of “Generation Y”. This generation is one that has a prolific use of technology. They are the first generation that has had access to PCs and the internet both at home and at school (Wikipedia, 2006). It has been said that this generation is the most “wired generation yet”. As the previous information states there is a gap in between the experience of adults and those in their teens and of those in college.

Soon a lot of other companies are going to have to learn the nuances of Gen Y marketing. In just a few years, today’s teens will be out of college and shopping for their first cars, their first homes, and their first mutual funds. The distinctive buying habits they display today will likely follow them as they enter the high-spending years of young adulthood. Companies unable to click with Gen Y will lose out on a vast new market—and could find the doors thrown open to new competitors (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999). Neuborne makes an excellent point in that this is a group of shoppers and internet users that will become the next generation of consumers. This generation has more information at their disposal than any other generation has had and there will have to be more research as to what appeals to them. The Internet is Gen Y medium of choice, the internet drives diversity (Neuborne & Kerwin, 1999). Diversity is what drives business and enables change and information is what allows for diversity to thrive.

Student Travel Behavior

According to Carr, 2005 university students demonstrate a high travel propensity and a strong desire in tourism experiences. They also tended to have relatively low

income levels. As a result, the students tended to spend a high proportion of their available finances on tourism (Carr, 2005). The use of loans, overdrafts, and credit cards by students to fund their holiday experiences seems to be associated with younger rather than mature students (Carr, 2005). However, the apparent financial and temporal constraints imposed on the students by a combination of a lack of funds and the consequent requirement to work does not appear to prevent majority of students from taking a vacation. Rather, it appears that the strength of students' desire to take holidays means that they are willing to overcome these constraints by whatever means possible, including often going into debt (Carr, 2005). Carr identified two types of students the first of these types, whilst relatively poor, tend to avoid going into debt to pay for holidays that they view as luxury items. In contrast, the other type of student, who may also be relatively poor, views holidays and travel as a necessary part of their life and are very willing to go into debt to enable them to take vacation (Carr, 2005). Within the context of the tourism industry, the results shown in this paper indicate that the student population is still a significant market, both in terms of its scale and spending habits, and as such is worthy of specific product development and market strategies (Carr, 2005). This conclusion is based on the evidence that the majority of students are comfortable with the idea of living in debt to help fund their tourism experiences (Carr, 2005). The debt burden after graduation may lead to a decline in the tourism experiences as they have to adjust to coping with debts amassed during their time at university (Carr, 2005).

Student Purchase Behavior

According to Lueg et al. 2006 the association with a shopping channel has an influence with involvement. When a teen is involved with a channel, he or she is motivated to expend more time and effort fully about, exploring, and experiencing the channel. Without this involvement, the teen displays less favorable behaviors and intentions towards the channel (Lueg, Ponder, Beatty, & Capella, 2006). The Internet allows a consumer to shop at numerous stores that might not have a presence anywhere near the shopper. It is very difficult for an online consumer to reach information saturation. Hence, the consumer with Internet access has the incentive to spend more time shopping via this channel. Therefore, access to the Internet is related positively to Internet shopping time and future intentions (Lueg, Ponder, Beatty, & Capella, 2006). The Internet is at an earlier adoption stage than the mall. Therefore, teens of all ages intend to shop and purchase via the internet in the future (Lueg, Ponder, Beatty, & Capella, 2006).

Chang's 2005 analysis of literature found that there were significant positive impacts to online shopping experiences based on accessibility and website satisfaction. On consumer characteristics there were significant positive impacts detailed to convenience oriented shopping and impulsive buying habits. Demographic variable on the other hand some differences were found out of four studies that evaluated education level three found a significant positive impact whereas one study did not find any impact. Computer/Internet knowledge and usage there were seven studies that were evaluated six of the studies found that there was a significant positive impact whereas one other did not

have an impact. A significant positive impact was found for people who have a “wired” lifestyle (Chang, Cheung, & Lai, 2005).

In a study by Ahuja et al. 2003 that studied online purchasing behavior they found that 52.9% of students had bought internet travel and 89.2% said that they planned to purchase in the future. At the same time 60.8% of non-students in the study said that they had bought internet travel and 75.3% planned to purchase travel in the future (Ahuja, Gupta, & Raman, 2003).

In a study from Pew Internet and American Life Project found that 86% of college students have gone online compared with 59% of the general population. 49% of college students say that they first began using the internet when they got to college and 47% said that they had begun before they came to college (Jones, 2002).

Cole 2004 suggested that the internet is the new media of the future he compares the current status of the internet to the automobile at the turn of the century. He mentions that the automobile wasn't studied in its infancy and should have been to evaluate the impact that it made on society. Television was been studied on impact on the lives of those that watch. Cole suggests that the internet should be studied now to evaluate the impact that it makes on the lives of those that use it. Cole also notes that education will benefit substantially from the internet especially when the current student who have been using the internet in school become educators and encourage their students to use the internet for class (Cole, 2004).

Chapter Summary

As is can be seen there is little research in this age group. Much of the research is in the form of reports from independent researchers and the US Census Bureau. There has been plenty of research in the area of internet usage and experience among the different age groups, adults and teenagers. There is little research in what the adult category looks for online when shopping but there is no research in the area of teenagers and what they shop for online. Suzukamo, 2002, believes that students could possibly be an asset for the internet economy. Since many of them have access to the internet through the colleges that they attend, who have improved their technology for the purposes of education. Many of today's students are part of "Generation Y", which is the most "wired" generation to date. Nueborne, 1999, points out that this generation will become the next group of shoppers and internet users, a group that knows how to use the internet for information. Carr's, 2005, research found that university students demonstrated a high propensity for travel and a strong desire for tourism experiences. These students were comfortable in going into debt so that they could have these experiences. Lueg's, 2006, research found that the association with a shopping channel increased its influence. Since many students are on the internet it could stand to reason that their interaction with it will increase the influence of shopping online.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This is a cross-sectioned survey research project that was conducted online during the months of September to October in 2006. The goal of this research was to identify college student travel habits and behaviors. The information obtained could influence marketing techniques of online travel agencies toward college students. The survey was designed using Microsoft FrontPage, web design software, with the assistance of the Oklahoma State University's Institute for Teaching & Learning Excellence. The survey was designed by evaluating product categories on multiple online sites, top rated travel websites according to *Consumer Reports*. The survey was tested for two months on the university's FrontPage server to identify problems that may occur during data input. A pilot test was conducted to identify semantic errors and fix formatting and flow of questions. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was necessary for this research since it involves research with human subjects. The survey was distributed through the university's listserv server to the student body. The data was stored on the university's FrontPage database.

Instrument Development

The survey is divided into several sections. In the first section asked the participant what travel sources (metasearch engines, full service travel website, and

company website) have they used, how often they used them, and for what purposes. The second section evaluates the reasons why they use the various sources and habits that they demonstrate based on a Likert scale. The third section identifies where the participant learned their buying skills and how influential they were; and reasons for travel and percentage of that travel. The fourth section identifies what other products that participant may purchase from the internet, how much they have spent online for travel and other products, and how much time they spend online. The fifth and final section of the survey identifies the demographics of the participant gender, age, personal and family income, college classification, major/college, and what region that they originate from. The survey consists of multiple answer choice questions that use checkbox and radio button options set into a Likert scale, from 1 being the lowest to 5 being the highest, to answer questions. The survey was stored on the Oklahoma State University FrontPage server and was distributed through the University's listerv server.

Table 1. Research Questions in Relation to Survey Questions

Research Questions	Survey Question
R1 -What are some reasons college students use online sites for making travel arrangements?	4, 5,
R2 - What factors influence the decision of college students when arranging travel bookings online?	6, 7,
R3 - How do college students discover, associate with, and interact with online travel sources?	1, 2, 3, 8, 12,
R4 - What are college students' online purchase behavior and preferences and their general socio-economic and demographic characteristics?	1, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21

Sampling Plan

The survey is a census survey which was distributed to enrolled students at Oklahoma State University, for the Fall of 2006, through their student email addresses. Email addresses were obtained through the Administrative Information Reporting System which is provided by the University's Vice President of Administration and Finance

office website. A listserv was used to distribute emails to students of the entire OSU system in every collegiate classification (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate student, approximately 23,307 students). Email addresses were excluded for several reasons, first if the person has requested that their email addresses not be used for research, the Buckley option, a privacy option that the university offers, and second if they were not 18 years of age. The Buckley option originates from The Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (Buckley Amendment) which was designed to protect the privacy of educational records. The Buckley option, in regards to the university, is aimed at protecting the student's right to prevent the disclosure of personally identifiable information, in this case email addresses. After the removal of the students there were 22,821 email addresses available for the distribution of the survey. To maintain a 95% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error, 378 responses were needed for the research. There are currently a total of 18,737 undergraduate students and 4,570 graduate students enrolled in the Oklahoma State University system for a total of 23,307 ("Oklahoma State University Student Profile: Fall Semester 2006", 2006). Of those 22,821 students are over the age of 18 and do not have the Buckley option activated. This was the sampling population for this study.

Data Collection

Surveys were distributed via the university's listserv server on October 11, 2006. Data was collected from October 11, 2006 to October 20, 2006. The 11th was the first day in which students returned from Fall Break. The 20th was the University's Homecoming celebration which is a campus wide event. During this time there were 605

responses that were sent to the database on the university's server. Responses received no coding and therefore could not be linked with a specific respondent. Since there was no way to identify who had responded to the survey it was decided not to send a reminder message to ensure that there would not be any resubmissions by respondents. There were also approximately 700 returned messages because of errors such as incorrect email address and rejection from server.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to identify the behaviors and habits that are demonstrated by college students while engaging in online purchases of travel. To accomplish this, SPSS (version 12.0.1) data analysis software was used to analyze descriptive statistics, frequency statistics, and correlation data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of this study. First the demographics of the respondent will be described in relation to the demographics of the University's Fall 2006 profile. The second section of this chapter will review what websites were used and for what type of services. The third section evaluates the reasons for website use and habits demonstrated by the respondents. The fourth section identifies the sources of discovery of websites and the influence the source has on purchasing. The fifth section analyzes the travel percentage by type, business travel, leisure travel, and visitation of friends and family. The sixth and final section evaluates internet purchasing behaviors that may be demonstrated. Out of 22,821 surveys that were distributed for this study 605 responses were returned to the database. This resulted in a response rate of 2.65%. The University profile that is mentioned throughout the results is developed from Oklahoma State University Student Profile: Fall Semester 2006. This profile is a description of the entire student body that is enrolled at Oklahoma State University as of the end of the third week of Fall 2006 semester.

Demographics

The following tables summarize the demographics of the respondents. It was found that the majority of the respondents were full-time students at Oklahoma State

University. Many of the students were either supporting themselves (51.90%) or had scholarships (51.57%) to attend school. The average age of respondents was 25.94 years whereas the university profile states that the average age is 23.9. When asked about income of the students and their parents, the respondents stated that: the average personal income was \$23,718.31 with a median of \$15,000; and that the average income for their parents' household was \$101,139 with the median at \$60,000.

Table 2. University Classification

University Classification	Frequency (N=592)	Percentage	University Profile
Freshman	68	11.5%	17.88%
Sophomore	48	8.1%	18.0%
Junior	69	11.7%	21.04%
Senior	141	23.8%	22.88%
Master Student	142	14%	16.22%
Doctoral Student	111	18.8%	
Post-Doctoral Student	4	.7%	

The majority of the respondents were in the upper levels of university classification and were enrolled as full-time students.

Table 3. Enrollment Status

	Frequency (N=579)	Percentage	University Profile
Full-time Student	479	81.6%	78.43%
Part-time Student	100	17.0%	21.57%

Table 4. Personal and Family Income

	N	Mean	Median
Personal Income	342	\$23,914.72	\$15,000
Family Income	149	\$101,139	\$60,000

The mean income for the respondents was \$23,914.72 this may be higher than that of the typical undergraduate student in that a large portion of the respondent were graduate students, who may be on salary as teachers.

Table 5. Age of Respondents

Mean (N=556)	Standard Deviation	University Profile
25.94	8.47	23.9

There was a high percentage of graduate students that responded to the survey may explain the high average age of the respondents

Table 6. How Tuition is Paid

	Frequency (N=605)	Percentage	University Profile
Family Support	229	37.85%	N/A
Loans	250	41.32%	47.60%
Scholarships	312	51.57%	28.60%
Self Support	314	51.90%	N/A

There were a high percentage of respondents who receive scholarships to pay for college; the extra income may skew the information in Table 4.

Table 7. Gender of Respondents

(N=605)	Percentage	University Profile
Male	31.2%	50.85%
Female	67.1%	49.15%

The tables above provide information to answer the fourth research question regarding socio-economic and demographic characteristics. The profile of the respondents shows that; the majority was female (67.1%); that the majority support themselves through school (51.9%); and there is a mean age of 25.94 years.

Table 8. Summary of Responses by College

	N	Percentage	University Profile
College of Agriculture	72	12.57%	9.19%
College of Arts and Sciences	171	29.84%	26.72%
Spears Business School	109	19.02%	20.10%
College of Education	91	15.88%	12.33%
College of Engineering	57	9.95%	14.62%
College of Human Environmental Sciences	73	12.74%	9.19%
Other			7.85%
Total	573	100%	100%

Table 8 displays the distribution of student responses among the different college on the Oklahoma State Campus. The majority of the respondents (29.84%) are from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Table 9. Area of Origin

	Percentage	OSU Profile	N (541)
Oklahoma	72.6%	77.04%	393
North Texas	2.8%		15
South Texas	1.5%		8
Kansas	2.2%		12
Missouri	0.2%		1
Arkansas	0.4%		2
North East	1.1%		6
South East	2.2%		12
East North Central	1.1%		6
East South Central	0.7%		4
West North Central	1.1%		6
Mountain Region	3.1%		17
Pacific Region	1.3%		7
US Territories	0.6%		3
Total	18.3%	15.90%	99
International Student	9.1%	7.06%	49
Total	100%	100%	541

Table 9 displays the proportion of Oklahoma State University students based on their area within the United States and the world. The majority of the respondents (72.6%) were from Oklahoma. The percentage of respondents that originated from other areas of the United States and from other areas of the world was higher than the University’s profile.

Websites Used and for What Type of Services:

When asked from what websites travelers used when making travel bookings from among Metasearch Engines, Full Service Travel sites, and Company travel sites, the responses varied. From among the metasearch engine group, the largest percentage of users used Cheapflights (24.6%) with Yahoo Farechase (9.8%) coming next in line among the users. Among the Full-service Travel sites the largest percentage of users used Expedia.com (65.3%) with Travelocity.com (58.25%) and Orbitz.com (52.2%) following behind there was a high percentage of use among the other websites as well.

Among the single service company travel sites airline companies received the highest percentage of use at 55% with 31.4% saying that they used hotel company websites.

Table 10. Metasearch Engines Used, multiple responses possible

Metasearch Engines (N=605)	Percent
AOL Pinpoint Travel	1.7%
Booking Buddy	2.1%
Cheapflights	24.6%
ITA Software	1.0%
Kayak	7.6%
Mobissimo	1.3%
Price Grabber	2.0%
QIXO	.8%
Side Step	4.3%
Travelzoo	6.3%
Yahoo FareChase	9.8%

Table 10 displays the metasearch engines that are most popular according to *Consumer Reports*. The most popular metasearch engine used by the respondents was Cheapflights (24.6%) the next popular metasearch engine is Yahoo FareChase (9.8%).

Table 11. Full Service Travel Sites Used, multiple responses possible

Full Service Travel Sites (N=605)	Percent
Cheapfares.com	9.9%
Cheaptickets.com	35.2%
Expedia.com	65.3%
Hotels.com	23.3%
Hotwire.com	18.3%
Orbitz.com	52.2%
Priceline.com	35.9%
Travelocity.com	58.25

Table 11 demonstrates the most popular full service sites according to *Consumer Reports*. The most popular full service website used by the respondents was Expedia.com (65.3%) with Orbitz.com (52.2%) coming second.

Table 12. Company Travel Sites Used, multiple responses possible.

Company Travel Sites (N=605)	Percent
Airline Company Website	55.0%
Car Rental Company	16.9%
Cruise Line Company	9.4%
Hotel Company Website	31.4%
Have never used	13.38%

Table 12 shows the most common types of travel companies that have websites which can make reservation. Among the travel company websites, airline company websites (55%) are the most commonly used by the respondents.

Table 13. Type of Service Used in Relation to Type of Provider Used, multiple responses possible.

N=605	Plane Reservation	Car Rental	Hotel Reservation	Cruise Line	Travel Packages	Any Type of International Accommodations
Traditional Travel Agent	12.7%	3.1%	5.8%	3.8%	7.4%	10.6%
Travel Metasearch Engines	8.8%	1.7%	4.1%	.7%	1.2%	2.0%
Online Full-Service Travel Sites	56.4%	14.5%	34.2%	2.1%	10.6%	11.1%
Online Company Travel Sites	18.3%	10.4%	30.7%	3.1%	2.1%	5.0%
Have Never Used	11.6%	17.0%	13.4%	19.2%	18.5%	17.2%

In table 13 it can be seen that online full-service providers retained the majority of the plane reservation category (56.4%) as well as hotel reservations (34.2%). However hotel company websites received the most responses among single service websites (30.7%). The full service travel sites lead the other sources in services used by respondents.

As it can be seen in Table 14 the majority of users originated from within the state of Oklahoma. This table shows how students associate with the different travel sources. The average times of usage from users were 4.6 with the standard deviation being 7.47. The majority of users are either classified as seniors, master students, and doctoral students. Also the majority of users are between the ages of 18 and 34 (56.86%). Almost

74% of users have used internet travel sites between 1 and 4 times in the past 6 months.

Of the respondents 71.82% originated from within Oklahoma.

Table 14. Usage in Relation to Demographic

	Number of times used N=546 Mean=4.59 SD=7.47							
Origination	1 to 2	3 to 4	5 to 6	7 to 8	9 to 10	11 to 12	13 or more	Total
Originate from Oklahoma	163 (34.3%)	100 (20.88%)	39 (8.14%)	11 (2.3%)	16 (3.34%)	5 (1.04%)	10 (2.09%)	344 (71.82%)
Originate Outside of Oklahoma	33 (6.89%)	24 (5.01%)	24 (5.01%)	1 (.21%)	5 (1.04%)	1 (.21%)	3 (.06%)	91 (19%)
International	19 (3.97%)	15 (3.13%)	7 (1.46%)	2 (.42%)	1 (.21%)	0	0	44 (9.19%)
Total	215 (44.89%)	139 (29.02%)	70 (14.61%)	14 (2.92%)	22 (4.59%)	6 (1.25%)	13 (2.71%)	479 (100%)
University Classification								
Freshman	20 (4.22%)	11 (2.33%)	3 (.63%)	2 (.42%)	1 (.21%)	1 (.21%)	0	38 (8.03%)
Sophomore	24 (5.07%)	7 (1.48%)	3 (.63%)	1 (.21%)	2 (.42%)	0	1 (.21%)	38 (8.03%)
Junior	25 (5.29%)	19 (4.02%)	8 (1.69%)	0	2 (.42%)	0	1 (.21%)	55 (11.63%)
Senior	53 (11.21%)	36 (7.61%)	14 (2.96%)	2 (.42%)	3 (.63%)	3 (.63%)	6 (1.27%)	117 (24.74%)
Master Student	50 (10.57%)	26 (5.5%)	24 (5.07%)	7 (1.48%)	6 (1.27%)	1 (.21%)	5 (1.06%)	119 (25.16%)
Doctoral Student	43 (9.09%)	36 (7.61%)	17 (3.6%)	1 (.21%)	8 (1.69%)	1 (.21%)	0	106 (22.41%)
Total	215 (45.45%)	135 (28.54%)	69 (14.59%)	13 (2.75%)	22 (4.65%)	6 (1.27%)	13 (2.75%)	473 (100%)
Age								
18 to 24	122 (26.99%)	77 (17.04%)	32 (7.08%)	8 (1.77%)	9 (1.99%)	2 (.44%)	7 (1.55%)	257 (56.86%)
25 to 34	54 (11.95%)	34 (7.52%)	24 (5.31%)	4 (.88%)	6 (1.33%)	2 (.44%)	3 (.66%)	127 (28.1%)
35 to 44	20 (4.42%)	12 (2.65%)	4 (.88%)	0	2 (.44%)	0	0	38 (8.41%)
45 to 54	6 (1.33%)	7 (1.55%)	5 (1.11%)	0	5 (1.11%)	1 (.22%)	1 (.22%)	25 (5.53%)
55 to 64	3 (.66%)	1 (.22%)	1 (.22%)	0	0	0	0	5 (1.11%)
Total	205 (45.35%)	131 (28.98%)	66 (14.6%)	12 (2.65%)	22 (4.87%)	5 (1.11%)	11 (2.43%)	452 (100%)

Reasons for Website Use and Habits Demonstrated

There are many reasons why a person prefers to shop on a particular website and questions to identify what the respondents preferred. The highest option that respondents say impacted their decision is price (4.63), on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). Price is

followed by the “Ability to Shop and Compare” (4.50), “Convenience” (4.45), and “Ease of Use” (4.35). The options that made the lowest score were “Affiliate Program” (2.41), “Brand Loyalty” (2.43), and “Display of Linked Services” (2.63).

The respondents shopping habits were also requested. The habit that many of the respondents said that they demonstrated was “Actively research travel site” (4.31) and “Discounts affect decision” (4.21). The habit that respondents say that they don’t demonstrate were “Use of only website” (1.66) and “Have “impulse bought”” (2.01).

Table 15. Reasons for Travel Website Usage, based on a five point Likert scale 1 being Least Important and 5 being Most Important.

Reasons (N=605)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Ability to book arrangements (make reservations on the site found)	4.15	1.032
Ability to perform restricted searches (for specific hotels, airlines, etc.)	3.53	1.278
Ability to shop and compare	4.50	.816
Affiliate program (partnered with other companies, i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)	2.41	1.270
Booking flexibility (No restrictions to required days, ability to change or cancel reservation, etc.)	3.73	1.172
Brand Loyalty (use only certain accommodations or websites)	2.43	1.335
Convenience (the ability to shop whenever you want)	4.45	.869
Customize travel plans/itinerary	4.11	1.030
Display of linked services (being linked to other services)	2.63	1.238
Ease of information retrieval (email, personal profile, etc.)	3.73	1.198
Ease of use	4.35	.888
Electronic documents (e-tickets, travel itinerary, etc.)	4.06	1.107
Electronic reminders/follow-up service	3.46	1.240
Price (the ability to find better rates)	4.63	.767
Quick downloads/uploads of information	3.61	1.137
Security (of the site to protect for personal information, i.e. Email address, credit card numbers, etc.)	3.97	1.206
Sorting Option (by rating, review, class, location, etc.)	3.67	1.114
Speed of confirmation of travel booking	3.89	1.083
Speed of website (how quickly does it process searches)	3.87	1.053
Transparent Pricing (additional fees, etc.)	3.97	1.057
Useful and Relevant information (ratings, reviews, etc.)	3.69	1.099
Visual Material (pictures, diagrams, etc.)	4.00	1.370

Table 15 displays the reasons that students choose the particular sites that they use and what characteristics they base their decision on. The four top rated reasons were price (4.63), ability to shop (4.50), convenience (4.45), and ease of use (4.35). Among these reasons the standard deviation is less than .90. The lowest rated reasons were brand loyalty (2.43) and affiliate program (2.41).

Table 16. Buying Habits that May be Demonstrated by Respondent, based on a five point Likert scale 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree.

Habit (N=605)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Actively research several travel sites before making a reservation	4.31	1.021
Believe that if you search long enough you will find a better price elsewhere	3.82	1.105
Discounts affect decision	4.21	.971
Have "impulse bought" trip accommodations	2.01	1.207
Length of traveling time determines choice	3.38	1.188
Look for more locations	3.44	1.152
Look for most convenient choice	3.81	1.040
Only look at the final cost	3.53	1.160
Surf travel sites even when you have no travel plans	2.76	1.493
Use only one website	1.66	1.041

Table 16 displays the habits that may have been demonstrated while making a travel booking. The highest rated habits that were demonstrated were actively research several sites before making a reservation (4.31) and discounts affect decision (4.21). The information in this table supports that price is a reason for purchases.

Sources of Discovery of Websites and the Influence of the Source

Table 17 displays the sources that respondents say they learned of the website that they have used before. This table also answers the third research question regarding the discovery of websites. Of all the possible sources that respondents viewed they said that Friends (58.5%), Television Advertising (45.5%), Family (42.4%), and Direct Search (41.5%) were where they learned their travel sources from. The lowest value from respondents said that Chat Rooms (1.7%) and Newsletters/Listserve (2.8%) are where they learned of their travel sources from. These sources are the most common sources that could be identified.

Table 17. Sources of Website Discovery

Source of Discovery (N=605)	Percentage
Banner Advertising	10.1%
Chat rooms	1.7%
Co-Marketing promotion through an affiliate (i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)	12.1%
Direct Email from company	9.3%
Direct Search (Search Engines)	41.5%
Family	42.4%
Friends	58.5%
Media Coverage (news reports, magazine articles, etc.)	25.0%
Newsletters/List serves	2.8%
Pop-up advertising online	7.4%
Print Advertising	8.8%
Radio Advertising	8.1%
Television Advertising	45.5%

Table 18 shows the influence of certain sources towards the respondents. This table demonstrates how influential certain sources are towards the students this answer the second research question. It appears that the most influential types of sources are by word of mouth through Family (4.16) and Friends (4.15) with Direct Searches (3.37) following behind. The least influential sources were Chat rooms (1.22) and Pop-up Advertisements (1.36).

Table 18. Influence of Sources, based on a five point Likert scale 1 being Least Important and 5 being Most Important.

Influence of Source (n=605)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Banner Advertising	1.61	.940
Chat rooms	1.22	.652
Co-Marketing promotion through an affiliate (i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)	2.08	1.143
Direct Email from company	2.06	1.205
Direct Search (Search Engines)	3.37	1.382
Family	4.16	1.162
Friends	4.15	1.140
Media Coverage (news reports, magazine articles, etc.)	3.04	1.219
Newsletters/List serves	1.96	1.018
Pop-up advertising online	1.36	.754
Print Advertising	2.30	1.221
Radio Advertising	2.23	1.197
Television Advertising	3.12	1.368

Number of Persons Traveling Based on Type and Percentage of Travel

The following tables demonstrate how college students interact with different types of travel. The average type of travel among college students varies. For business travel the average percentage of all travel was 40.34%, for leisure travel the average was 45.62%, and for visiting family the average was 42.10%. The majority (35.3%) of college students say that they travel for business or school only 5 to 15 percent of the time and the next largest group (18.3%) said that they traveled 45 to 60 percent. Those that do travel say that they travel for business travel alone 53.52% of the time. When asked the percentage of travel done for leisure 24.4% said that they traveled 5 to 15 percent and 19.3% said that they traveled 15 to 30 percent of the time. When college students do travel for leisure they stated that they traveled with 3 to 5 people 37.79% of the time while traveling as a couple 22.06%. Yet, to visit friends and family 26.9% said that they did so 5 to 15 percent of the time with 21% saying that they did so 15 to 30 percent of the time. When traveling to visit family and friends the respondents said that they traveled alone for the majority of the time (33.55%) while those traveling as a couple did so 25.17% of the time and 25.39% said that they traveled with 3 to 5 people.

Table 19. Distribution of Travel Percentages

	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Business Travel	40.34%	30%	31.74%
Leisure Travel	45.62%	45%	31.59%
Visiting Family	42.10%	35%	30.62%

Table 19 shows the average percentage of time that a college student travels from either business, leisure, or to visit family

Table 20. Percentage of Travel that is for Business

Percentage of Business Travel	Percent of Response
5-15	35.3%
16-30	15.7%
31-45	3.8%
46-60	18.3%
61-75	8.3%
76-90	11.2%
91-100	7.4%
Total (N=312)	100%

Table 20 shows a grouped distribution for the percent of travel among the business travel group. 35.3% respondents stated that they traveled for business 5 to 15 percent of the time.

Table 21. Typical Number of Persons Traveling When on Business

Number of Persons on a Business Trip	Percent of Response
Alone	53.52%
Couple	13.46%
3 to 5 persons	11.54%
5 or more persons	8.65%
Varies	12.82%
Total (N=312)	100%

Table 21 shows the percent of business travel in relation to the number of persons on the trip. When the respondents traveled for business they traveled alone 53.52% of the time.

Table 22. Business Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel

Percent of Travel	Alone	Couple	3 to 5	5 or more	Varies	Total
5 to 15	58.2%	11.8%	10%	9.1%	10.9%	100%
16 to 30	51%	10.2%	18.4%	8.2%	12.2%	100%
31 to 45	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%	0%	25.0%	100%
46 to 60	56.1%	19.3%	8.8%	8.8%	7.0%	100%
61 to 75	76.9%	0%	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%	100%
76 to 90	60%	11.4%	11.4%	11.4%	14.3%	100%
91 to 100	39.1%	17.4%	8.75%	8.7%	17.4%	100%

Table 22 shows the relationship to the amount of travel for business and the number of person on the trip. The majority of the respondents stated that they traveled alone; the percentage of travel doesn't have an effect on the number of person who travel.

Table 23. Percentage of Travel that is for Leisure

Percentage of Leisure Travel	Percent of Response
5-15	24.4%
16-30	19.3%
31-45	8.1%
46-60	18.7%
61-75	6.6%
76-90	10.6%
91-100	12.3%
Total (N=471)	100%

Table 23 shows a grouped distribution for the percent of travel among the leisure travel group. 43.7% of the respondents traveled for leisure 5 to 30 percent of the time.

Table 24. Typical Number of Persons Traveling When for Leisure

Number of Persons on a Leisure Trip	Percent of Response
Alone	12.10%
Couple	32.06%
3 to 5 persons	37.79%
5 or more persons	6.58%
Varies	11.46%
Total (N=471)	100%

Table 21 shows the percent of leisure travel in relation to the number of persons on the trip. 69.85% of the respondents stated that they traveled with two to five people when traveling for leisure.

Table 25. Leisure Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel

Percent of Travel	Alone	Couple	3 to 5	5 or more	Varies	Total
5 to 15	18.3%	31.3%	30.4%	5.2%	14.8%	100%
16 to 30	27.5%	34.1%	22%	5.5%	11%	100%
31 to 45	15.8%	21.1%	44.7%	13.2%	5.3%	100%
46 to 60	9.1%	31.8%	44.3%	4.5%	10.2%	100%
61 to 75	9.7%	38.7%	32.3%	9.7%	9.7%	100%
76 to 90	10%	20%	58%	0%	12%	100%
91 to 100	6.9%	32.8%	37.9%	12.1%	10.3%	100%

Table 25 shows the relationship to the amount of travel for leisure and the number of person on the trip. The number of persons that the respondents stated they traveled with remains the same as with Table 24, with no effect related to the percentage of travel.

Table 26. Percentage of Travel Intended for Visiting Friends/Family

Percentage of Visits	Percent of Response
5-15	26.9%
16-30	21.0%
31-45	8.4%
46-60	17.9%
61-75	8.6%
76-90	7.0%
91-100	10.2%
Total (N=453)	100%

Table 23 shows a grouped distribution for the percent of travel among the Visiting Friends/Family travel group. 47.9% of respondents stated they traveled 5 to 30 percent for visiting friends and family.

Table 27. Typical Number of Persons Traveling When Visiting Friends/Family

Number of Persons on a Visit	Percent of Response
Alone	33.55%
Couple	25.17%
3 to 5 persons	25.39%
5 or more persons	3.97%
Varies	11.92%
Total (N=453)	100%

Table 21 shows the percent of friends and family travel in relation to the number of persons on the trip. The largest percentage of friends and family trips involved only one person traveling (33.55%).

Table 28. Family Visit Persons per Trip Compared to Percentage of Travel

Percent of Travel	Alone	Couple	3 to 5	5 or more	Varies	Total
5 to 15	28.7%	25.4%	32.8%	1.6%	11.5%	100%
16 to 30	31.6%	27.4%	23.2%	6.3%	11.6%	100%
31 to 45	31.6%	28.9%	34.2%	2.6%	2.6%	100%
46 to 60	40.7%	24.7%	22.2%	1.2%	11.1%	100%
61 to 75	48.7%	12.8%	12.8%	7.7%	17.9%	100%
76 to 90	40.6%	21.9%	28.1%	0%	9.4%	100%
91 to 100	54.3%	15.2%	10.9%	8.7%	10.9%	100%

Table 25 shows the relationship to the amount of travel for Friends/Family and the number of person on the trip. The information varies among travel for the purpose of visiting friends and family.

Internet Purchasing Behaviors

When prompted to answer how many times the respondents have used travel sites in the past 6 months, the average was 4.6 times. When asked what types of products the respondents purchase online other than travel the largest percentage of purchases were Music (45.5%), Tickets (45.1%), and Clothing (44.0%). The smallest percentage purchases were for Small Appliances (4.0%) and Specialty Services (4.0%). When asked about the amount of money spent online the average of the responses showed that when spending money for online travel the average was \$1,117.63 whereas when spending for all online products the average was \$1,050.65. Also when asked how much time is spent online the average response was 4.26 hours a day. According to a Surveying the Digital Future, 2004 the average American uses the internet 12.5 hours a week in 2003, this equals to approximately 1 hour and 47 minutes a day.

Table 29. Items Purchased Online

Internet Purchases	Percentage of response (N=605)
Antiques and Collectibles	7.1%
Art, Decorations, Glass, and Pottery	8.1%
Baby Products	6.3%
Clothing	44.0%
Computer Products (hardware and software)	32.5%
Consumer electronics (cameras, cell phones, televisions, etc.)	29.6%
Craft Items	4.5%
DVDs, Movies, and Video games	36.9%
Financial Services (Insurance, loans, investments, tax help, etc.)	7.9%
Gift Certificates	11.4%
Health and beauty items (cosmetics)	18.0%
Home and Garden (tools, furniture, plants, etc.)	7.8%
Jewelry	7.6%
Music (downloads, CDs, etc.)	45.5%
Pharmaceuticals or medication	5.5%
Small Appliances (blender, microwaves, etc.)	4.0%
Specialty services (massages, internet subscriptions, etc.)	4.0%
Sporting Goods	11.1%
Tickets (concerts, events, movie tickets, etc.)	45.1%
Toy and hobby items	11.7%
Books	12.7%
Vehicle and Automotive parts	7.6%

Table 29 identifies products that respondents stated that they had purchased in the past six months. The three most popular online purchases by respondents were music (45.5%), tickets (45.1%), and clothing (44%). The three least popular online products were small appliances (4%), specialty services (4%), and craft items (4.5%)

Table 30 shows how much time is spent online in one day, how much money has been spent on online travel in the past 6 months, and how much money was spent for all online products excluding travel.

Table 30. Money and Time Spent Online

	Mean	Standard Deviation
Money spent for online travel (N=487)	\$1,117.63	\$1,688.92
Money spent for online products (N=477)	\$1,050.65	\$3,116.32
Amount of hours spent online each day (N=518)	4.26	2.828

Chapter Summary

Even though metasearch engines are fairly recent to the online travel market students do use them. Full service travel sites still remain dominate in the internet travel area among college students. The information shows that at least 65.3% of students have used these sites. Even though company travel sites offer the same products that the full service sites do it appears that they are not as popular. This may be because students demonstrate behaviors that encourage convenience, a one stop shop for all the travel needs, and to retain the ability to shop and compare prices. Prices is what the majority of students said that most influences their decision to buy online travel. Friends and family are the sources that most influence college students when deciding to shop for online travel. This is encouraging in that “word of mouth” and previous experiences of other have an impact with students. But at the same time it is not an area that is easily influenced by marketing.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary of Study

The purpose of this research project was to study the potential buying behavior of college students and their online travel booking habits. To collect the data an online questionnaire was created that was distributed to the entire student body of the Oklahoma State University. The questionnaire was distributed through the university's listserv network that has all the student email addresses listed. Information that is collected was stored on the university's database. The data was collected and was processed using SPSS (version 12.0.1). Out of 23,307 students at Oklahoma State University 22,821 qualified for the survey, since they were over the age of 18 and did not chose the university's privacy option. Of the 22,821 emails sent to students with the web link for the survey 605 responded resulting in a 2.65% response rate.

Summary of the Results

Table 15 provides the answer to research question 1. Table 15 shows the reasons students choose certain websites. The highest rated answer for making online purchase was price followed by the ability to shop and compare. It also appears that college students prefer to have convenience and ease of use as one of the motivators as well. At

the same time students also identified that they did not care for brand loyalty when it comes to making travel arrangements.

If you look at Table 18 the second research question can be evaluated. It seems that word of mouth, through friends and family, has the strongest influence on a student when trying to decide what website to use. The table also shows that there is very little influence when it comes to online advertising, such as pop-up ads and banner advertising.

The third research question is answered in many different areas. In relation to how students discover a website it is seen that friends and family were also good sources of discovery and not only influence. As it was seen in how influential sources were, online advertisements had little effect on discovery. In Tables 10 to 13 it can be seen that students interact with full service sites than they do with the other sources available. This may be due to the fact that they look for convenience and the ability to shop and compare when booking online, the other options only offer single services.

For the demographics, the majority of the respondents were classified as seniors, master students, or doctoral students (57.3%). The average age of the respondents was about 25.94 years of age and 67.1% of them were females. Many of the respondents originated from Oklahoma (70.9%) with an additional 15.9% coming from outside the state and 7.06% are from international origin.

Implications

One implication of this research is that there is a market for student travel. But there is a lack of brand loyalty not only for websites but for actual company names. The driving force behind the student travel market is the price and the information that is

provided to make that decision. Students use the internet not only to buy travel products but also a wide range of products. This shows that this information can also be applied to other of products.

Full service travel sites remain the most popular; this may be due to the fact that they can compare different products and that discounts can be applied to their selections. Metasearch and company sites are single product sites and do not allow for other services. This information is consistent with the students' preference for convenience and ease of use. The metasearch engines allow students to actively research their travel choices however they only focus on one type of service, airline reservation, hotel reservation, etc., this may lead to lack of use by college students for the lack of different services.

One of the key results from this study is that price, the ability to shop and compare, the ease of use, and convenience are variables that influences whether a student buys or not. These variables are easy to understand in that there is a benefit for having multiple selections available at a travel site. Also, students also demonstrated a habit of actively researching travel before making a reservation. This and the previous variables show that a student does not make abrupt decisions about how they spend their money.

The study also found that friends and family have the most influence on the decision for website usage. Online advertisements were the least influential; these include banner advertising, chat rooms, pop-up advertising, and direct emails from the company. Television advertisements were the most influential of the media advertisements available to the students.

The average amount spent on online travel was higher than that of all online products purchased by the students in the past 6 months. Also the number of hours spent online by students was 4.26 hours a day. Where as the average hours spent online in 2003 was 12.5 hours a week or approximately 1.75 hours a day. This amount of usage may be related to the fact the students use the internet on a daily basis of education, socialization online, communication, and shopping.

Recommendations

Marketers should look to building their customers at an early age. If they were able to recruit and maintain a customer for many years the benefits of a return frequent traveler could be substantial. Marketers should begin with students when they first enter college or are traveling to visit college campuses while in high school. By having contact early marketers could provide discounts and provide students with a frequent user profile. By providing services before they leave for college there may be an early bond especially if family travels with them to visit college campuses. Also to provide discounts when they are traveling between two points, traveling from school to visit home, and could build a reputation of frequent use. Reputation appears to be the best way of being discovered by college students, since they are most influenced by friends and family when making travel decisions. If marketers are able to maintain a college student's loyalty throughout the college years and the loyalty could enter the career of a student, which a company could benefit from as well.

Marketers can also encourage the sharing of information among students, friends, and family by providing incentives among profile holders to recommend the travel site to

others. For example, if a profile holder recommended the site to several people they could build points towards a discount. Companies could also provide profile discounts to users toward travel packages during Winter break and Spring break.

Companies already market to college students for Winter and Spring Breaks, travel packages, but they should market throughout the year. College students travel at other times outside of university holidays, students travel for sporting events, concerts, “road trips,” and vacations. These are opportunities that are available to companies to exploit. College students want to travel and appear to have the income to travel. Companies could benefit from allowing long weekend travel packages, three to four days. Students can arrange their schedules to allow for long weekends for an entire semester. By providing an option for short trips companies could gain a foothold of frequent travelers. Also, by providing small packages they could also market them toward non-student travelers who are looking for long weekends from work.

Limitations and future research

The response rate for this survey was 2.65% which allowed for statistical analysis of the data. There are other ways that could be used to ensure a higher response rate. For example, sending reminder emails to subjects or to hold a raffle for prizes for participation however this would remove the opportunity to remain anonymous when subjects replied to the survey.

The responses to the survey did not fit the demographics of Oklahoma State University. A more detailed mailing list would be required to adhere to the university’s demographics. This however would not allow for anonymity.

A larger student population would be needed to generate a generic model. A larger population could be possible if partnered with several universities to conduct research. However with the ever changing technology the model created would not remain current for very long. This research would have to be done every couple of years to maintain the model.

The age of subjects comes into question when research is involved. Identifying buying behaviors of students before they reach college would allow for corrections in marketing techniques. However, being minors requiring parental consent to conduct research is a liability and time consuming. Also there are legal ramifications that pertain to a minor entering a contract.

REFERENCES

Bibliography

- Ahuja, M., Gupta, B., & Raman, P. (2003). An empirical investigation of online consumer purchasing behavior. *Communications of the ACM*, 46, 145-151.
- Bergen, K. (2004, March 16, 2004). Online travel takes off in a new direction Corporate accounts are being landed by agencies such as Expedia, Orbitz and Travelocity, which have already secured a niche in leisure bookings. *Chicago Tribune*, p. 4.
- Carr, N. (2005). Poverty, debt, and conspicuous consumption: university students tourism experiences. *Tourism Management*, 26(5), 797-806.
- Chang, M. K., Cheung, W., & Lai, V. S. (2005). Literature derived reference models for the adoption of online shopping. *Information & Management*, 42(4), 543-559.
- Cole, J. (2004). Now Is the Time to Start Studying the Internet Age. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(30), B.18.
- Computer and Internet Use in the United States: 2003*. (2005). Retrieved August 8, 2006. from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2005pubs/p23-208.pdf>.
- Demographics of Internet Users. (2006). Retrieved August 8, 2006, from http://www.pewinternet.org/trends/User_Demo_4.26.06.htm
- Gianforte, G. (2003). The world at our fingertips - How online travel companies can turn clicks into bookings. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(1), 79.
- Infoplease. (2006). Average Number of Vacation Days Around the World Per Year. Retrieved October 16, 2006, from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0922052.html>
- Internet Activities. (2006). Retrieved August 8, 2006, from http://www.pewinternet.org/trends/Internet_Activities_7.19.06.htm
- Jones, S. (2002). The Internet Goes to College: How students are living in the future with today's technology. *Pew Internet & American Life* Retrieved August 8, 2006
- Lenhart, A., Madden, M., & Hitlin, P. (2005). Teens and Technology: Youth are leading the transition to a fully wired and mobile nation [Electronic Version]. *Pew Internet and American Life Project*. Retrieved August 8, 2006.
- Lenhart, A., Rainie, L., & Lewis, O. (2001). Teenage life online: The rise of the instant-message generation and the Internet's impact on friendships and family relationships. Retrieved August 8, 2006
- Lueg, J. E., Ponder, N., Beatty, S. E., & Capella, M. L. (2006). Teenagers' use of alternative shopping channels: A consumer socialization perspective. *Journal of Retailing*, 82(2), 137-153.
- Neuborne, E., & Kerwin, K. (1999). Generation Y. *Business Week*(3616), 80.
- Neuharth, A. (2006). Should students play or work in summer?, *USA Today*.

- Nyheim, P. D., McFadden, f. M., & Connolly, D. J. (2005). *Technology Strategies for the Hospitality Industry*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- O'Connor, P. (2003). On-line pricing: An analysis of hotel-company practices. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 44(1), 88-96.
- Oklahoma State University Student Profile: Fall Semester 2006. (2006). Retrieved October 6, 2006
- Stillwater Public Schools 2006-2007 School Calendar. (2006). Retrieved November 26, 2006, from <http://www.stillwater.k12.ok.us/dnn/Portals/0/Files/cal0607.pdf>
- Surveying the Digital Future*. (2004.). USC Annenberg School Center for the Digital Future.
- Suzukamo, L. B. (2002, September 16, 2002). Students are wired for life, study finds. *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, p. A1.
- Travelers' Use of the Internet - 2005 Edition [Electronic (2005). Version]. *Travel Industry Association of America*. Retrieved September 8, 2006.
- Wikipedia. (2006, August 8, 2006). from <http://en.wikipedia.org>
- Yesawich, P. C. (2006a). Internet searches to be easier with new domain. *Hotel and Motel Management*, 221(1), 12.
- Yesawich, P. C. (2006b). Online travel yields same looking, more booking. *Hotel and Motel Management*, 221(7), 12.

APPENDIX A

Internet Travel Booking Activities Among College Students

You have been selected to participate in a research study. This email is to outline the purpose of this study and describe your rights as a participant. This survey is completely voluntary if you do not wish to participate you may exit whenever you wish.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of this research is to identify what college students, like you, use in the way of internet travel.

Procedures: This is a web survey. You will be asked to answer questions that refer to your online usage behaviors. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes of your time.

Risks of Participation: There are no known risks associated with this survey which are greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Benefits: This study will benefit the academic field in that there is little research on the travel habits of college students. This study may also influence the policies of online travel principles, future research, and new marketing.

Confidentiality and Participant Rights

The researcher guarantees the following conditions:

1. No personal information such as name, address, or student id is going to be asked
2. All responses are anonymous and confidential.
3. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at anytime.
4. All data will be stored and only accessible to the investigators.

If you wish participate in this survey please click on the hyperlink below. If you do not wish to participate please feel free to delete this email.

http://fp.okstate.edu/palakur/Travel_Survey/Survey/Survey.htm

If you have any questions feel free to contact:

Principle Investigator:

Joseph Moreo
Master's Student
Hotel and Restaurant Administration
Oklahoma State University
210 HESW
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
(405)744-6713
joseph.moreo@okstate.edu

Subject's Rights:

Sue Jacobs, Ph.D.
Chair, Institutional Review Board
Oklahoma State University
219 Cordell North
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74078
(405)744-1676
irb@okstate.edu



APPENDIX B

1. Which websites have you visited for shopping/buying for travel accommodations in the past 6 months? (Please check all that apply)

Metasearch Engines (Search engines that locate prices among different databases)

- AOL Pinpoint Travel
- Booking Buddy
- Cheapflights
- ITA Software
- Kayak
- Mobissimo
- Price Grabber
- QIXO
- Side Step
- Travelzoo
- Yahoo FareChase

Full-service Travel Sites (Sites that provide reservations for airlines, car rentals, hotel, etc.)

- Cheapfares.com
- Cheaptickets.com
- Expedia.com
- Hotels.com
- Hotwire.com
- Orbitz.com
- Priceline.com
- Travelocity.com

Single-service Travel Sites (Sites that provide only one product or service)

- Airline Company website
- Car Rental Company website
- Cruise Line website
- Hotel Company website

- Other
- Have never used any
- Choose not to answer

2. How many times have you used these or similar websites in the past 6 months to shop/buy travel arrangements?

Times used Choose not to answer

3. What providers have you used to make travel arrangements and for what services? (Please check all that apply)

Providers	Domestic Travel					International Travel
	Plane Reservation	Car Rental	Hotel Reservation	Cruise Line	Travel Packages	Any Type of Accommodations
Traditional Travel Agent (Cowboy Travel, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Travel Meta Search Engines (Kayak, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online Full-Service Travel Sites (Expedia.com, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online Company Travel Sites (Hyatt.com, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other <input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have not made any reservations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Choose not to answer

4. If you use online travel websites what are your reasons for using them?

Reasons	Least Important		Most Important	
	1	2	3	4
Ability to book arrangements (make reservations on the site found)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to perform restricted searches (for specific hotels, airlines, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ability to shop and compare	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Affiliate program (partnered with other companies, i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Booking flexibility (No restrictions to required days, ability to change or cancel reservation, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Brand Loyalty (use only certain accommodations or websites)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Convenience (the ability to shop whenever you want)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Customize travel plans/itinerary	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Display of linked services (being linked to other services)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Ease of information retrieval (email, personal profile, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Ease of use	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Electronic documents (e-tickets, travel itinerary, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Electronic reminders/follow-up service	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Price (the ability to find better rates)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Quick downloads/uploads of information	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Security (of the site to protect for personal information, i.e. Email address, credit card numbers, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Sorting Option (by rating, review, class, location, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Speed of confirmation of travel booking	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Speed of website (how quickly does it process searches)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Transparent Pricing (additional fees, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Useful and Relevant information (ratings, reviews, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Visual Material (pictures, diagrams, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5

Choose not to answer

5. Do you exhibit any of these habits when you shop for travel arrangements?

Habit	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree
Actively research several travel sites before making a reservation	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Believe that if you search long enough you will find a better price elsewhere	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Discounts affect decision	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Have "impulse bought" trip accommodations	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Length of traveling time determines choice	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Look for more locations	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	

Look for most convenient choice	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Only look at the final cost	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Surf travel sites even when you have no travel plans	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Use only one website	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5

Choose not to answer

6. How did you learn of the websites you have used in the past 6 months? (Check all that apply)

- Banner Advertising
- Chat rooms
- Co-Marketing promotion through an affiliate (i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)
- Direct Email from company
- Direct Search (Search Engines)
- Family
- Friends
- Media Coverage (news reports, magazine articles, etc.)
- Newsletters/List serves
- Pop-up advertising online
- Print Advertising
- Radio Advertising
- Television Advertising
- Other
- Choose not to answer

7. How influential are these sources to your decision to book with the website?

Source	Not Influential	Very Influential
Banner Advertising	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Chat rooms	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Co-Marketing promotion through an affiliate (i.e. Hotels.com and Hertz)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	
Direct Email from company	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5	

Direct Search (Search Engines)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Family	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Friends	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Media Coverage (news reports, magazine articles, etc.)	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Newsletters/List serves	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Pop-up advertising online	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Print Advertising	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Radio Advertising	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Television Advertising	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5
Other <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> 1 <input type="radio"/> 2 <input type="radio"/> 3 <input type="radio"/> 4 <input type="radio"/> 5

Choose not to answer

8. What percentage of your trips fall into the following categories and how many people do you normally travel with?

Business (School/Work related)

Leisure (Vacations, Spring Break, etc.)

Visiting Friends and Family

Other

Choose not to answer

9. Have you purchased any other internet products (other than Travel) online in the past 6 months? (Please check all that apply)

- Antiques and Collectibles
- Art, Decorations, Glass, and Pottery
- Baby products
- Clothing
- Computer products (hardware and software)
- Consumer electronics (cameras, cell phones, televisions, etc.)
- Craft items

- DVDs, Movies, and Video games
- Financial services (insurance, loans, investments, tax help, etc.)
- Gift certificates
- Health and beauty items (cosmetics)
- Home and Garden (tools, furniture, plants, etc.)
- Jewelry
- Music (downloads, CD, etc.)
- Pharmaceuticals or Medication
- Small appliances (blenders, microwaves, etc.)
- Specialty services (Massages, internet subscriptions, etc.)
- Sporting goods
- Tickets (concerts, events, movie tickets, etc.)
- Toys and Hobby items
- Vehicle and automotive parts
- Other
- Choose not to answer

10. How much do you estimate you spent on online travel purchases in the past 6 months?

\$ Choose not to answer

11. How much do you estimate that you spent on all online purchases, excluding travel, in the past 6 months?

\$ Choose not to answer

12. On average how much time do you use the internet each day in terms of hours spent online? (all sources include cell phones, PDAs, computers, etc.)

Hours Choose not to answer

13. What is your University classification?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Master Student
- Doctoral Student
- Post-Doctoral Student
- Choose not to Answer

14. Are you a Full-time or Part-time Student?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Choose not to Answer

15. How is your college tuition paid? (Check all that apply)

- Family Support
- Loans
- Scholarships
- Self Support
- Choose not to Answer

16. What is your age?

- Choose not to answer

17. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Choose not to answer

18. What is your Major? (Please choose from your college)

College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources	<input type="text"/>
College of Arts and Sciences	<input type="text"/>
Spears School of Business	<input type="text"/>
College of Education	<input type="text"/>
College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology	<input type="text"/>
College of Human Environmental Sciences	<input type="text"/>

Choose not to answer

19. What is your personal total annual income from all sources? (Salary/wages, scholarships, lottery winnings, etc.)

\$ Choose not to answer

20. What is the total annual income from all sources for your parents/guardians?

\$ Choose not to answer

21. You are a resident of what state?

International

Choose not to answer

APPENDIX C

Your responses have been submitted into the database.

Thank you for your participation

APPENDIX D

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date: Monday, September 18, 2006
IRB Application No HE0694
Proposal Title: Internet Travel Booking Activities Among College Students

Reviewed and Exempt
Processed as:

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 9/17/2007

Principal Investigator(s)

Joseph Moreo 2131 W. Sunset Stillwater, OK 74074	Radesh Palakurthi 210E HES Stillwater, OK 74078
--	---

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,



Sue C. Jacobs, Chair
Institutional Review Board

VITA

Joseph Christopher Moreo

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: INTERNET TRAVEL BOOKING ACTIVITIES AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Major Field: Hotel and Restaurant Administration

Biographical:

Education:

Graduated from Oklahoma State University with a Bachelor of Science of Hotel and Restaurant Administration in December of 2004

Completed the Requirements for the Hotel and Restaurant Administration Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in December 2006

Experience:

Academic Work Experience:

Graduate Teaching Assistant and Instructor, Hotel and Restaurant Administration: Basic Food Production Lab, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma

Undergraduate Teaching Assistant, Hotel and Restaurant Administration: Quantity Food Production Lab, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma

Professional Experience:

Kitchen Supervisor and Line Cook, Karsten Creek Golf Course; Cowboy Dining LLC. Stillwater, Oklahoma

Floor Manager, Service Supervisor, and Bartender, Stillwater Country Club, Stillwater, Oklahoma