

# Using Facebook for travel decisionmaking: an international study of antecedents

Article

Accepted Version

Tables

Mariani, M. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7916-2576, Ek Styven, M. and Ayeh, J. K. (2019) Using Facebook for travel decision-making: an international study of antecedents. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 31 (2). pp. 1021-1044. ISSN 0959-6119 doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2018-0158 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/79982/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See <u>Guidance on citing</u>.

To link to this article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2018-0158

Publisher: Emerald

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <u>End User Agreement</u>.

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur



## CentAUR

## Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Construct	Cronbach's	AVE	ITU	ATT	PEOU	PU	ENJ	TRU
	α							
Intention to use (ITU)	.879	.661	(.813)					
Attitude (ATT)	.928	.722	.434	(.850)				
Perceived ease of use (PEOU)	.882	.718	.018	.112	(.847)			
Perceived usefulness (PU)	.962	.836	.835	.506	.021	(.914)		
Enjoyment (ENJ)	.919	.740	.206	.271	.260	.234	(.860)	
Trustworthiness (TRU)	.936	.783	.074	.218	.152	.092	.183	(.885)

### Table 1. Reliability, AVE and correlation matrix (CFA results)

Note: Diagonal values (in parenthesis) represent the square root of AVE.

		Italy	Sweden	Total N=426
		<i>n</i> =141	<i>n</i> =285	
Gender (%)*	Male	31.9	46.7	41.8
	Female	66.7	52.3	57.0
	N/A	1.4	1.1	1.2
Age (%)**	16-24	58.6	41.3	47.0
	25-40	41.4	58.7	53.0
Occupation (%)**	Student	76.4	43.9	54.6
	Working	16.4	40.0	32.2
	Unemployed	2.9	7.4	5.9
	Other	4.3	8.8	7.3
Travel experience (mean, 1-7) <sup>n.s.</sup>		4.34	4.48	4.43
Facebook use frequency (mean, 0-4) <sup>n.s.</sup>		1.94	1.74	1.80
No. of Facebook friends (mean, 1-7)**		5.57	3.95	4.49

Differences between countries: \*) significant at p < .05; \*\*) significant at p < .01 (two-tailed);

n.s. = non-significant (p>.05)

Hypotheses	Path coefficient	t	Supported?
H1a PU → ATT	.571	17.747**	Yes
H1b PU $\rightarrow$ ITU	.897	19.063**	Yes
H3a ATT → ITU	.019	.594	No
H4b ENJ $\rightarrow$ ATT	.145	4.567**	Yes
H4c ENJ → ITU	.017	.699	No
H4d ENJ $\rightarrow$ PU	.434	11.505**	Yes
H5a TRU → PU	.117	3.259**	Yes
H5b TRU $\rightarrow$ ATT	.231	7.950**	Yes
H5c TRU → ITU	016	.679	No

 Table 3. Results of hypothesis testing

\*) Significant at p<.05; \*\*) significant at p<.01 (one-tailed)

Note: H2a, H2b, H2c, and H4a are excluded as they relate to Perceived Ease of Use, which was dropped from the model.

Path	Standardized	l path estimates	Significance of difference between			
	(Unconstrained model)		path estimates under constraint			
	Italy	Sweden	Change in $\chi^2$	р		
	( <i>n</i> =141)	( <i>n</i> =285)				
PU → ATT	.590**	.542**	2.883	.090		
PU → ITU	.930**	.869**	.409	.522		
ATT → ITU	125 (ns)	.095*	4.743	.029		
ENJ $\rightarrow$ ATT	.067 (ns)	.217**	1.676	.195		
ENJ $\rightarrow$ ITU	.080 (ns)	012 (ns)	1.111	.292		
$\mathrm{ENJ}  \mathrm{PU}$	.461**	.458**	.142	.706		
TRU $\rightarrow$ PU	.223**	.066 (ns)	1.834	.176		
TRU $\rightarrow$ ATT	.232**	.218**	.196	.658		
TRU → ITU	011 (ns)	004 (ns)	.003	.955		
Model fit indexes						
$\chi^2/df(p)$	1.594 (.00)	1.874 (.00)				
CFI	.953	.973				
RMSEA	.065	.055				
Squared multiple con	rrelations					
Perceived usefulness	.297	.246				
Attitude	.534	.627				
Intention to use	.786	.869				

### Table 4. Multigroup analysis – Italy vs. Sweden

\*) Significant at *p*<.05; \*\*) significant at *p*<.01; ns) non-significant (*p*>.05) (one-tailed)

Groups compared	Change in χ2	р
Italy vs. Sweden	4.743	.029
16-24 years vs. 25-40 years	.035	.851
Men vs. women	.138	.711
Students vs. non-students	1.024	.312
Fewer vs. many Facebook friends	.232	.630

**Table 5.** Multigroup analyses of Attitude  $\rightarrow$  Intention to use



**Figure 1.** Proposed Model of Online Travel Consumers' Intention to Use Non-Travel-Specific SM for Travel Planning



Figure 2. Revised Structural Model