



Extraordinary Experience-Based Segmentation: The Case of Greek Summer Campers

Amalia Triantafillidou & George Siomkos

To cite this article: Amalia Triantafillidou & George Siomkos (2014) Extraordinary Experience-Based Segmentation: The Case of Greek Summer Campers, Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management, 23:2, 122-156, DOI: [10.1080/19368623.2013.766583](https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2013.766583)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2013.766583>



Accepted author version posted online: 08
Mar 2013.
Published online: 08 Mar 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 398



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

Extraordinary Experience-Based Segmentation: The Case of Greek Summer Campers

AMALIA TRIANTAFILLIDOU and GEORGE SIOMKOS

Department of Marketing, Athens University of Economics and Business, Athens, Greece

This study, using cluster analysis, segmented the Greek summer camping market based on the extraordinary experience scale proposed by Arnould and Price (1993), using cluster analysis. Four distinct segments were derived, namely: Social–Naturalist Campers, Indifferent Campers, Pure Naturalist Campers, and Adventurous–Experiential Campers. Furthermore, these segments were profiled based on several postvisit variables (i.e., satisfaction, intention to revisit, nostalgia, word-of-mouth (WOM) activity, and WOM praise). Finally, the study concludes with the development of marketing strategies for reaching and serving the most attractive segments.

KEYWORDS *camping experience, segmentation, Greek campers, word-of-mouth, revisit intention, nostalgia intensity*

INTRODUCTION

Camping is a significant tourism sector in the European Union. In 2008, tourists spent almost 15% of their nights on camping sites in the member countries (Demunter & Dimitrakopoulou, 2010). Despite its importance, camping has been quite overlooked in the tourism and consumer behavior research (Park, Ellis, Kim, & Prideaux, 2010). Camping can be regarded as an outdoor recreational “activity that takes place during a vacation or other recreational outing and involves spending one or more nights sleeping in a recreational vehicle, tent, or other form of temporary shelter situated on a campsite” (Echelberger & McEwen, 1986, cited by Janiskee, 1990, p. 388). It must be noted that the present study deals with a particular kind of

Address correspondence to Amalia Triantafillidou, c/o Prof. George Siomkos, Athens University of Economics and Business, 76 Patission St., 104-34, Athens, Greece. E-mail: amtriantafil@aueb.gr

tourist, the camper. As tourists, campers move away from their place of regular residence (Leiper, 1979) “for at least 24 hours for the purpose of leisure (i.e., recreation)” (Akis & Warne, 1994, p. 379), and lodge in commercial or non-commercial campgrounds (using a tent, car, recreational vehicle, etc.) during their vacation. Campers can stay in the campsite and enjoy the camping experience or can visit the nearest tourist attractions (Van Heerden, 2011). Connection with nature, social interaction, and feelings of escapism and self-renewal are critical components of the camping experience (Garst, Williams, & Roggenbuck, 2010). This particular form of experiential tourism (W. L. Smith, 2006) requires further investigation, since there is a need to design and manage the camping experience (Janiskee, 1990).

Living in an experiential economy, companies must design and offer memorable, personal experiences (Pine & Gilmore, 1998) to survive and gain a competitive advantage (Tsaur, Chiu, & Wang, 2007). According to Pine and Gilmore (1998), these experiences should simultaneously engage consumers’ senses as well as educate, entertain, and absorb them. Consumers desire physical, social, and creative experiences (Schmitt, 1999), which are pleasurable and provide feelings of escapism (Holbrook, 2000). Providing unique experiences involves delving into consumers’ thoughts, fantasies, and feelings (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982) in order to understand how they perceive experiences. It is important to note that understanding experiences is a difficult task, due to their subjective nature.

Brakus, Schmitt, and Zarantonello (2009) indicated that experiences differ in intensity. According to Caru and Cova (2003), experiences may be ordinary as well as extraordinary. *Extraordinary experiences* are defined as those “that are triggered by unusual events and are characterized by high levels of emotional intensity” (Arnould & Price, 1993, p. 25). Research into extraordinary experiences has focused primarily on adventure tourism activities, such as river rafting (Arnould & Price, 1993; Wu & Liang, 2011), skydiving (Celsi, Leigh, & Rose, 1993), and mountain biking (Dodson, 1996), as well as on leisure activities like participation in Rocky Mountain Rendezvous (Belk & Costa, 1998) and Camp Jeep events (Schouten, McAlexander, & Koenig, 2007). The vast majority of studies on extraordinary experiences are concerned with the content of these experiences and the development of instruments for measuring the experience. Few attempts have been made by researchers to introduce extraordinary experiences as an effective segmentation variable.

Hosany and Witham (2010) measured the experience of cruisers and examined the impact of the experience on their satisfaction and intentions. Their findings revealed that the intensity of the experience felt different for each individual tourist; thus, suggesting that experience can serve as an appropriate basis for segmenting the tourism market. In an early study, Cohen (1979) argued that different tourists may seek different modes of touristic experiences, implying that different categories of tourist exist, based

on the experience they live during a vacation. Specifically, Cohen presented five general categories of tourists according to the experiences they seek or have lived during their trips, namely: the recreational, the diversionary, the experiential, the experimental, and the existential tourist. However, one should bear in mind that the typology presented by Cohen was not tested empirically. Moreover, the concept of tourist experience in Cohen's study was defined in broader terms, including the benefits that modern tourists seek from a travel experience. Prentice, Witt, and Hamer (1998) segmented the tourists of Rhondda Heritage Park based on the combination of benefits sought and experiences that tourists lived during their visits. These experiences comprised four dimensions, namely: feelings, cognitive thoughts, impressions, and nostalgia, from which five clusters were derived. Low and moderate levels in all the dimensions were experienced by members of the first and second cluster, respectively. Respondents in the third and fifth clusters reported high levels in all dimensions except nostalgia, while the fourth cluster had the highest scores in all experiential elements.

The present study attempts to contribute to the existing tourism research literature by providing a new and effective way of segmenting the Greek summer camping market based on extraordinary experiences. Moreover, the segments derived from the analysis are then profiled using several postvisit experience variables, such as satisfaction, intention to revisit, nostalgia, word-of-mouth (WOM) activity, and WOM praise, as well as demographic variables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dimensions of Experiences

A review of scholarly literature on experience suggests experiences in different tourism and leisure settings share some common elements. These shared, interrelated dimensions include:

- *emotional experience*, where feelings of escapism, pleasure, challenge, and adventure are elicited;
- *scenery experience*, in which tourists feel closeness and satisfaction with nature/scenery/surroundings;
- *self-related experience*, which involves tourists' acquisition of new skills, education, self-transformation, and revitalization; and
- *interpersonal experience*, where tourists feel a sense of community as they develop strong bonds and friendships with individuals with whom they shared the experience.

The element of emotional experience was evident in a number of tourism and leisure settings. Otto and Ritchie (1996) incorporated the emotional dimension of the experience in the instrument they developed for

the measurement of service experience across three tourist sectors (i.e., airlines, hotels, and tours). Specifically, they suggested that during the service experience, tourists feel personally challenged, get excited, and feel free of obligations. Elements of entertainment and escapism were also perceived as important dimensions during experiences such as lodging (Oh, Fiore, & Jeoung, 2007) and cruising (Hosany & Witham, 2010). The entertainment aspects of these experiences were derived from the observation of tourists and their social interaction with other travelers. Moreover, these experiences transformed tourists—at least temporarily—as they escaped to different worlds and imagined that they played different roles during their vacations. Celsi et al. (1993) reported that skydivers escaped the ordinary as intense feelings of adventure, pleasure, flow, and total absorption arose. According to Privette (1983, p. 1362), flow is defined as “enjoyment, an intrinsically rewarding, or autotelic, experience.” In the context of mountaineering, Pomfret (2006) revealed that feelings of enthusiasm, satisfaction, and catharsis took place during this type of experience. Finally, intense emotional experiences, such as mountain biking, elicited feelings of total focus and absorption (Dodson, 1996).

Scenery or nature experience is another important dimension of the tourist experience. Harmony with nature was part of the extraordinary experience felt by river rafters (Arnould & Price, 1993). Specifically, Arnould and Price argued that the rafters experienced a strong connection with nature as they discovered new and different places. Within the context of a modern rendezvous experience, Belk and Costa (1998) found that worship of nature was a core essential of that experience. Pomfret (2006) revealed that mountaineers experienced a strong connection with the natural and wild environment.

Most of the time, the tourist experience results in the acquisition of knowledge and information (Otto & Ritchie, 1996). For example, the element of education was found during experiences such as lodging (Oh et al., 2007; Ismail & Melewar, 2010) and cruising (Hosany & Witham, 2010; Huang & Hsu, 2010). Even though learning new things is part of the tourist experience, more adventurous forms of tourism offer another aspect of self-related experience, that of revitalization and transformation of the self.

Dodson (1996), investigating peak experience during mountain biking, found that bikers derived value from the experience. Peak experiences, according to Maslow (1967, p. 9), are “moments of great awe, intense happiness, even rapture, ecstasy or bliss—moments . . . when all doubts, all fears, all inhibitions, all weaknesses were left behind.” During mountain biking, participants felt different and more positive about themselves (Dodson, 1996). Revitalization and transformation of the identity and self were found in a modern rendezvous experience of mountain men (Belk & Costa, 1998). In the context of mountaineering, participants tested their limits, found new meanings, got to know themselves, changed their perceptions

towards danger and risk, and developed and renewed their personality and identity (Pomfret, 2006). A skydiving experience also resulted in the “partial abandonment of an old self for a new favored identity” (Celsi et al., 1993, p. 15). According to Celsi et al., during their experience, skydivers wanted to increase their expertise in skydiving and their social recognition. Personal growth and renewal was also found during the experience of river rafting, as participants acquired and enhanced their skills, as well as feeling challenged and experiencing a sense of adventure (Arnould & Price, 1993).

The interaction with other tourists is another critical element of the tourist experience (Otto & Ritchie, 1996; Huang & Hsu, 2010; Ismail & Melewar, 2010). Social interaction was a basic dimension of the mountaineering experience, during which mountaineers developed special groups and communities (Pomfret, 2006). Furthermore, the shared experiences of mountain men in a modern rendezvous elicited a strong sense of bonding between the participants (Belk & Costa, 1998). These interpersonal aspects of experience were termed by Arnould and Price (1993) as *communitas*, to describe the feelings of closeness to friends and of belonging to a team that river rafters experienced. A sense of *communitas* was also evident among skydivers, who reported that they created special relationships and friendships with others, while they shared a special language in order to describe their experiences (Celsi et al., 1993).

In the aforementioned studies, experience was measured in different ways. For example, the studies of Celsi et al. (1993), Belk and Costa (1998), and Pomfret (2006) used qualitative methods for investigating the content of experience. In some quantitative studies, experience was treated as a unidimensional construct (Dodson, 1996; Ismail & Melewar, 2010). This approach, however, does not account for the complex nature of the tourist experience (Volo, 2009) and the different components that comprise it. According to Lee, Dattilo, and Howard (1994), experience from leisure and tourism activities should be treated as a multidimensional construct.

Several researchers have operationalized experience as a multidimensional scale. For example, Otto and Ritchie (1996) measured service experience based on four factors, namely: hedonics, peace of mind, involvement, and recognition. However, the scenery or nature experience was not incorporated into their instrument. Oh et al. (2007) developed a four-dimensional instrument for the measurement of the lodging experience, based on the conceptual framework proposed by Pine and Gilmore (1999). These four experiential dimensions were education, esthetics, entertainment, and escapism. Huang and Hsu (2010) operationalized the experience of cruisers as a six-dimensional construct composed of factors such as learning, relaxation, self-reflection, family relations, fitness, and people. It must be noted that the two latter scales did not account for the elements of challenge and adventure that tourists might feel during their experience. Arnould and Price (1993) proposed a three-factor scale for the measurement

of the extraordinary experience of river rafters. These factors were Harmony With Nature, *Communitas*, and Personal Growth and Renewal. Although Arnould and Price's scale was not replicated and validated by other studies, it was considered as the most complete and appropriate for this study. This scale included, among others, items for measuring the adventurous and self-transformational aspects of an experience. Since camping is a form of "soft" adventure tourism (Hudson, 2003) that involves connection with nature and self-transcendence, Arnould and Price's scale was considered to be the most suitable for this study.

The Experiential Nature of Camping

Summer camping is deemed as an appropriate context for the investigation of extraordinary experiences, mainly because it offers campers enjoyment, connection to nature, and personal education (Mohd, Yaman, Keat, & Wai, 2005; i.e., elements that can be found in extraordinary experiences). Belk and Costa (1998) suggested that the essentials of fantasy and extraordinary experience could be found in the settings of summer camps.

Connection with nature is one of the basic motivations that drive campers to campgrounds (Valentine, 1992). It is also characterized as an intensely social experience (Hendee & Campbell, 1969, p. 14) that enhances campers' social relations with other campers (Gursoy & Chen, 2012). Generally, vacation experiences enhance tourists' personal development and growth (Desforges, 2000; Nyaupane, Teye, & Paris, 2008). The same can be argued for camping experiences; Conelly (1987) found that a critical factor for a satisfactory camping experience is the revitalization and self-renewal of campers during their vacation. Given these observations made by previous studies, the basic dimensions of extraordinary experiences appear to be easily found in a camping experience. Thus, it seems that camping is an appropriate field not only for researching extraordinary experiences, but also for investigating postvisit perceptions.

Segmentation in Tourism

Nowadays, marketers have realized that the notion of mass marketing does not exist (Dibb, 1998), and markets do not consist of one single type of consumer, but of numerous different, homogenous segments of consumers, in terms of characteristics (i.e., demographics, psychographics, behavioral, etc.) and responses to marketing stimuli. Thus, market segmentation helps marketers effectively target different consumer groups in a profitable manner (Bock & Uncles, 2002). Kotler (1989) argued that market segmentation is a tool used for analysis of markets prior to the development of appropriate marketing strategies. During the first stage, marketers select the appropriate basis of segmentation and develop the profile of each segment that is derived

from the process. In the second stage, each segment is evaluated and decisions are made regarding which segment or segments should be targeted. Finally, in the third stage, appropriate marketing mixes are designed for the targeted segments.

In tourism research there are numerous segmentation studies that can be grouped into five categories, according to the stage of consumption of the tourist product. As Table 1 shows, the vast majority of segmentation studies focus on the stages prior to and during the consumption of the tourist product, and have used travel motives, benefits sought, activity participation, and expenditures as the basis for segmentation. Little emphasis has been given to segmentation variables that belong to the postconsumption stage. Moreover, with regards to the stage during the consumption of the tourist product, few studies have used tourist experience as a basis for segmentation of the tourist market.

Bigné and Andreu (2004) investigated tourists at museums and theme parks in Spain and segmented them based on their emotional experiences; the pleasure and arousal derived from their visits. Hence, tourists were grouped into two categories, namely: tourists with low emotional experience and tourists with high emotional experience. However, as was mentioned above, emotional experience is just one facet of a tourist product and cannot reflect the total essence of the tourist experience.

As previously detailed, Prentice et al. (1998) incorporated the concept of experience in the benefit segmentation for tourists at Rhondda Heritage Park. The study adopted the view that the tourist experience is reflected in the feelings, nostalgic memories, cognitive thoughts, and impressions of tourists regarding the heritage park. Similarly to the aforementioned study, Prentice et al. did not include all the dimensions that represent the tourist experience.

Based on the previous analysis, it can be argued that there is a need to carry out a segmentation analysis based on a more integrated and holistic view of the tourist experience. This way tourists will be differentiated based on the real experience felt during their trips, and meaningful marketing strategies could be developed to effectively position the experiential tourism product.

Postvisit Experience

Experience does not end with the core consumption stage but continues as consumers relive the past in their memories, feel nostalgia about the experience, and share their experiences with important others (Nicosia, 1966; Arnould, Price, & Zinkhan, 2002). Therefore, the postexperience stage is often characterized by *extreme nostalgia intensity* and *interpersonal communication* (i.e., WOM).

TABLE 1 Previous segmentation studies based on the consumption stage

Stage	Variable(s)	Examined sample	Authors
Personal inputs	Personal values	Norwegian respondents	Mehmetoglu, Miner, Graumann, and Greibokk (2010)
	Lifestyle	Residents of Spain (short leisure journeys)	González and Bello (2002)
	Novelty seeking	Vacation travelers to Alaska	Snepenger (1987)
	Sensation seeking	Visitors in Ontario parks (Canada)	Galloway (2002)
Pretravel Stage/Preconsumption Stage of tourist product	Sentiments toward marketing	Recent destination visited by Virginia residents	Chen (2003)
		Backpackers in Australia	Loker-Murphy (1996)
	Motives	Tourists to National Kenyan Reserves	Beh and Bruyere (2007)
		Residents of Switzerland ages 55 and older regarding national and international trips	Boksberger and Laesser (2009)
Involvement		Korean overseas golf travelers	J. H. Kim and Ritchie (2010)
		Winter sport tourists in north Greece	Alexandris, Kouthouris, Funk, and Giovani (2009)
		American visitors to 48 contiguous states, Alaska, and Hawaii	Fesenmaier and Johnson (1989)
		Attendees to international track and field athletics in Eugene, Oregon in 1989	Dimanche, Havitz, and Howard (1993)
Benefits sought		International visitors to Macau (China)	W. G. Kim, Park, Gazzoli, and Sheng (2011)
		North American visitors to Latin America	Sarigöllü and Huang (2005)
International tourist role		Attendees of the 11th Annual National Conference of Returned Peace Corps	Mo, Havitz, and Howard (1994)
		Volunteers and students of undergraduate studies at a west coast university	
Use of travel agents		Participants of travel fair and furniture exhibition in Singapore	Goldsmith and Litvin (1999)

(Continued)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Stage	Variable(s)	Examined sample	Authors
During travel Stage/Consumption Stage of tourist product	Perceptions of information sources	Tourists from Turkey (employees at Istanbul-based companies)	Alvarez and Asugman (2006)
	Selection criteria	Senior motor coach travelers that had taken a tour in the past 12 months	Hsu and Lee (2002)
	Travel mode choice (package and independent mode)	Visitors of two nature based attractions (wilderness centers) in Northern Norway	Mehmetoglu (2006)
	Attitudes toward Internet use in vacation decision making	English tourists in an Turkish Aegean summer resort	Duman and Tanrisevdi (2011)
	Activity participation	Hong Kong travelers who took or intent to take a trip overseas	Hsieh, O'Leary, and Morrison (1992)
	Type of attraction visited	Visitors in North Queensland	Moscardo, Pearce, and Morrison (2001)
	Expenditures	Visitors at nine sites across the Path of Progress National Heritage Tour Route in Southwestern Pennsylvania	Kerstetter, Confer, and Bricker (1998)
	Emotions	Visitors in Brittany (France)	Legohérel (1998)
	Benefits realized	Taiwanese travelers to Guam	Mok and Iverson (2000)
	Intensity of travel choices (i.e., transport, accommodation, attraction visited)	Visitors of museums and theme parks (Spain)	Bigné and Andreu (2004)
Destination image	Canadian, American, and Japanese Visitors to Hawaii	Woodside and Jacobs (1985)	
	International Tourists in New Zealand (Murchison/Reefton, Arthur's Pass, Haast)	Becken, Simmons, and Frampton (2003)	
	Farm tourists in Taiwan	Chen, Chang, and Cheng (2010)	

Posttravel	Benefits gained and experience	Visitors to Rhondda Heritage Park	Prentice, Witt, and Hamer (1998)
Stage/Postconsumption	Mode of experience	Athletes attending the World Masters Games in Canada	Walker, Hinch, and Higham (2010)
Stage of the tourism product	Satisfaction	Visitors to mountainous region of Hepeiros (Greece)	Tsiotsou and Vasioti (2006)
Mix of consumption	Loyalty	Cruiser to a 7-day Caribbean voyages	Petrick and Sirakaya (2004)
Stages of tourist products	Stages of change of tourists	Residents from Champaign Urbana (Midwestern United States) regarding getaway market.	Mackay and Fesenmaier (1998)
	Motivation, destination preferences and activity participation	Nature travelers from Australia	Lang and O'Leary (1997)

NOSTALGIA EXPERIENCE

Remembered experience can be seen in the demand for memorabilia (Pine & Gilmore, 1999), where consumers need to connect their experience with objects in order to relive a pleasant past. It is nostalgia that relates past events or experiences with individuals (Holak & Havlena, 1992). Tourism experiences are regarded as “once-in-a-lifetime events” (Otto & Ritchie, 1996; J.-H. Kim, Ritchie, & McCormick, 2010) with strong emotional content. Thus, they are capable of producing strong nostalgic memories (Baumgartner, Sujan, & Bettman, 1992). Since nostalgia is an outcome of a personal experience, it is proposed that experiences carry nostalgic meanings.

These nostalgic memories of tourists can be rooted in the social aspects of touristic experiences. Wildschut, Sedikides, Arndt, and Routledge (2006) revealed that nostalgic experiences are triggered most of the time by the social interactions of the individuals. Holbrook and Schindler (2003) arrived at the same conclusion that consumer nostalgia is often related to the social relationships of individuals. Moreover, within the context of sport tourism, researchers found a positive relationship between the sense of *communitas* felt by sport tourists and their nostalgic memories (Fairley, 2003; Fairley & Gammon, 2005).

SHARING EXPERIENCES: WOM COMMUNICATION

In their proposed and validated measurement model regarding service experience, Otto and Ritchie (1996) incorporated the element of interpersonal communication that occurs during the postvisit stage (*experiences are shared later*). WOM communication can be regarded as an outcome of a consumption experience (Anderson, 1998). In fact, according to Richins (1984; cited in Sundaram, Mitra, & Webster, 1998), WOM is a “form of interpersonal communication among consumers concerning their personal experiences with a firm or a product,” or a service.

Core and Postvisit Experience

Arnould and Price (1993) found a strong relationship between the satisfaction of river rafters and all three dimensions of the extraordinary experience (i.e., Harmony With Nature, *Communitas*, Personal Renewal and Growth). Laing and Crouch (2005), investigating extraordinary experiences of tourists in the world’s frontiers (i.e., diving and hiking poles, ocean rowing, and mountain climbing), found that satisfaction was a result of these experiences. Extraordinary experiences are comprised of flow as well as peak experiences (Schouten et al., 2007). In the context of flow, Wu and Liang (2011) found a positive relationship between the flow experience of river rafters and satisfaction. Moreover, satisfaction is an important outcome of a peak experience (Beedie & Hudson, 2003). Extraordinary experiences seem to have a positive impact on participants’ satisfaction with the experience.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The research objectives of the present study are threefold. First, the extraordinary experience scale proposed by Arnould and Price (1993) is validated in the context of summer camping. Second, the Greek summer camping market is segmented based on the extraordinary experiences of summer campers. And last, the resultant segments of summer campers are profiled based on several postvisit experience variables, such as satisfaction, intention to revisit, nostalgia, WOM activity and praise, as well as demographic variables.

METHODOLOGY

Construct Measures

In order to measure the experience of summer campers, this study used the revised version of the extraordinary experience scale of river rafting that was developed by Arnould and Price (1993). Although several of the items of Arnould and Price's scale have been used in other studies (Hopkinson & Pujari, 1999; Chang & Horng, 2010), the complete scale has not previously been used and validated by any of those studies. However, this scale was chosen because of its distinctiveness in measuring respondents' perceptions about the level of connection to nature, social bonding, challenge, escapism, and self-transformation they felt. These elements were not found simultaneously in other experience scales, and seem to be particularly applicable to this research. Moreover, the scale can measure the intensity of the *extraordinariness* of the experience; thus, it will help to distinguish respondents that had ordinary experiences from those that had extraordinary experiences. This scale was modified in order to fit the camping experience. The extraordinary experience scale was a three-factor construct with each of the factors (i.e., Harmony With Nature, Communitas, Personal Growth and Renewal) represented by six items. The items of the extraordinary experience scale began with the phrase "During my summer camping vacations I felt." WOM communication was measured using WOM activity and WOM praise scales, which were developed by Harrison-Walker (2001). Specifically, four items were used to measure WOM activity and two items for WOM praise. The nostalgia intensity scale proposed by Holak and Havlena (1998) was used to measure this aspect of the camping experience. This scale consisted of four items, and was modified in order for the respondents to indicate the nostalgia intensity of their camping experiences. Three items were used to measure campers' overall satisfaction (Oliver, 1980; Bodet, 2008). All items of the aforementioned scales were evaluated on five-point Likert scales ranging from (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*. Finally, the intention to revisit the campsite scale was taken from Grewal, Krishnan, and Sharma (1998) and

included two items. These two items were evaluated using a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*very low*) to 5 (*very high*).

Data Collection

An online version of a self-administered questionnaire was designed, and a convenience sampling approach was used. Specifically, the link for the online survey was forwarded by the owners of various Greek camping sites to their Facebook members. In total, approximately 22,800 members were informed about the online survey. The posts regarding the survey were renewed frequently in order to improve the response rates. Respondents were prompted to remember their recent camping experience and then fill out the questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed so that respondents were required to answer all the questions before submitting their responses. Hence, no incomplete questionnaires were obtained. The online survey was completed by 421 respondents.

The sample consisted of 40.5% males and 59.5% females. Most respondents were young campers less than 35 years of age (almost 90.7%) and unmarried (85%). The majority of participants were either students (28.7%) or private sector employees (32.9%). Moreover, 56.5% of respondents earned less than 1,200 Euros (about US\$1,534.56) per month. Table 2 shows further details of the sample's demographic characteristics.

TABLE 2 Demographic characteristics of the sample

Demographic variable	Frequencies (%)	Demographic variable	Frequencies (%)
Gender		Marital status	
Male	165 (40.5)	Unmarried	346 (85)
Female	242 (59.5)	Married	57 (14)
		Divorced	4 (1)
Age		Occupation	
Under 19 years	15 (3.7)	Freelancer	90 (22.1)
19–24 years	134 (32.9)	Unemployed	42 (10.3)
25–35 years	220 (54.1)	Private sector employee	134 (32.9)
36–50 years	35 (8.6)	Housewife	2 (0.5)
51–65 years	3 (0.7)	Retired	2 (0.5)
		Student	117 (28.7)
Education		Civil sector employee	20 (4.9)
Primary school education	9 (2.2)	Monthly income	
High school	118 (29.0)	Under 800€	105 (25.8)
Technological educational institution graduate	85 (20.9)	800€–1200€	125 (30.7)
Bachelor's degree	124 (30.5)	1201€–2000€	93 (22.9)
Master's degree	66 (16.2)	2001€–3000€	47 (11.5)
PhD	5 (1.2)	3001€–5000€	20 (4.9)
		More than 5000€	17 (4.2)

It should be noted that the selected commercial campsites were located near beaches surrounded by Mediterranean greenery. At these locations, campers could lodge in tents, mobile homes, and recreational vehicles. In addition, they could enjoy the sea and natural scenery, as well as engage in a wide range of outdoor recreational activities. For these reasons, the beach camping experience was the main focus of the present study.

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Experience Scale

The initial sample consisted of 421 respondents. Confirmatory factor analysis, using Amos 8.0, was performed in order to verify the three-item factor structure of the experience scale proposed by Arnould and Price (1993). The analysis was initiated with 18 items. Baumgartner and Homburg (1996) indicate that when conducting structural equation modeling analysis using the maximum likelihood estimation method, the data should show approximate multivariate normality. Thus, the critical ratio of multivariate kurtosis that Amos estimated, and that stands for the Mardia's normalized estimate of multivariate kurtosis, was checked. In order for the data to be multivariate normal, this critical ratio should be smaller than 5.00 (Bentler, 2005). For the initial model, the multivariate kurtosis index was 29.05 with a critical ratio of 11.01, therefore indicating non-normality. Moreover, the goodness-of-fit measures of the initial 18-item model suggested a poor fit of the data (p value = .000, $\chi^2/df = 5.24$, GFI = 0.84, CFI = 0.88, NNFI = 0.86, RMSEA = 0.101). As a result, the researchers turned to observations with the biggest Mahalanobis distance (known as outliers) and modification indices, in order to decrease the multivariate non-normality and to increase the strength of the data fit. After removing 14 observations with the largest Mahalanobis distance and excluding three items from the initial scale (namely, "I felt freedom from obligations," "I felt I pulled my weight," and "I felt I made new skills"), based on the modification indices, the data showed approximate multivariate normal distribution (multivariate kurtosis index = 10.96, c.r. = 4.89). The values of the indices GFI, CFI, and NNFI (TLI) of the respecified model exceeded the 0.90 criterion. The RMSEA value was smaller than the 0.07 threshold proposed by (Bentler, 1992; p value = .000, $\chi^2/df = 2.93$, GFI = 0.92, CFI = 0.96, NNFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.069), suggesting a reasonably good model fit. Hence, the final sample consisted of 407 respondents.

The reliability, as well as convergent and discriminant validity of the revised model of the camping experience, were then assessed. Moreover, the model showed adequate internal reliability, as Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the three experience factors ranged from 0.82 to 0.92, exceeding the 0.70 criterion suggested by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). All the

standardized coefficients of the 15 indicators were significant (critical ratios > 1.96 , p value = .000) and exceeded the 0.50 threshold (Janssens, de Pelshacker, van Kenhove, & Wijnen, 2008; Table 3). The average variance extracted (AVE) for the factors Harmony With Nature and Communitas was 0.49, slightly below Fornell and Larcker's (1981) critical value of 0.50, while for the factor Personal Growth and Renewal the AVE was 0.70. Furthermore, composite reliabilities of all experience factors exceeded the 0.70 accepted value criterion (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Hence, it can be argued that the experience scale showed acceptable levels of convergent validity. Finally, discriminant validity of the experience scale was established. Since the AVE of each factor was larger than the square of the correlation between the examined factor and the rest of the factors in the experience scale (Table 4).

TABLE 3 Descriptive statistics, validity, and reliability measures and standardized regression weights of final scales

Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Standard loadings
Harmony With Nature (AVE = 0.49, CR = 0.83, $\alpha = 0.83$)			
I felt harmony with nature	3.55	1.15	0.65
I felt like I explored new worlds	2.62	1.28	0.79
I felt like I escaped into a different world	3.37	1.32	0.77
I felt I got a new perspective on nature	2.96	1.36	0.69
The camping was like getting away from it all	4.07	1.18	0.60
Communitas (AVE = 0.49, CR = 0.89, $\alpha = 0.85$)			
I felt in harmony with others	2.88	1.24	0.64
I felt I interacted well with others	2.99	1.22	0.68
I felt I made new friends	3.17	1.38	0.72
I felt my skills were appreciated by others	2.65	1.26	0.77
I felt needed by a group	2.41	1.25	0.67
Personal Growth and Renewal (AVE = 0.70, CR = 0.92, $\alpha = 0.92$)			
I felt a sense of adventure and risk	2.52	1.34	0.91
I felt personally challenged	2.57	1.38	0.94
I felt an adrenalin rush	2.46	1.41	0.88
I felt I learned new things	2.73	1.38	0.74
I felt I tested my limits	2.52	1.45	0.69

Note. AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability; α = Cronbach's alpha.

TABLE 4 Interconstruct correlations

Discriminant Validity for the Camping Experience Scale	Harmony With Nature	Communitas	Personal Growth and Renewal
Harmony With Nature	0.49		
Communitas	0.43	0.49	
Personal Growth and Renewal	0.45	0.42	0.70

Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Postexperience Constructs

Table 5 presents some descriptive statistics, as well as the validity and reliability measures of the scales, used to measure the postexperience constructs (nostalgia intensity, satisfaction, WOM activity, WOM praise, and revisit intentions). Specifically, for the nostalgia intensity scale, the item “I have very little desire to reexperience the past” was dropped from further analysis since it had an insignificant and very small standardized coefficient (standardized coefficient = 0.007, p value = .900). The revised nostalgia intensity scale, as well as the other constructs (i.e., satisfaction, WOM activity, WOM praise, and revisit intentions), had good reliability and validity, as Table 5 indicates.

Cluster Analysis

To segment summer campers based on extraordinary experience, the following steps were taken using the framework of Hair and Black (2000):

- Step 1: The data were screened for outliers and multicollinearity.
- Step 2: The sample was split into two groups, the study group ($n = 213$) and the validation group ($n = 194$), to validate the initial cluster solution.
- Step 3: Factor scores were produced for the extraordinary experience variables, which served as input for the cluster analysis. The use of factor scores as inputs for cluster analysis produces reliable clusters (Lilien & Rangaswamy, 2004) and helps researchers reduce a large number of variables to a smaller number of factors that retain the information of the original data (Grover & Vriens, 2006). In order to create the factor scores, varimax rotation using SPSS Version 17.0 was performed (Lilien & Rangaswamy, 2004) and regression method was used. As suggested by Mooi and Sarstedt (2011), regression method is an appropriate way for generating factor scores that will be used in subsequent analysis.
- Step 4: A two-stage clustering procedure was employed. Firstly, a hierarchical cluster analysis was performed applying the Ward's method. Moreover, Euclidean distance was chosen as a similarity measure. Then, K-means cluster analysis was conducted to partition the data in the number of clusters that resulted from the hierarchical clustering and assign each case to clusters (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). It must be noted that this two-step clustering procedure is an efficient and reliable approach for cluster analysis, as it eliminates the weaknesses and combines the strengths of both methods (Punj & Stewart, 1983).
- Step 5: The identified clusters were interpreted based on their differences in the three extraordinary experience dimensions using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Moreover, dependent t -tests were run

TABLE 5 Descriptive statistics, validity and reliability measures, and standardized regression weights of postvisit experience scales

Items	Standard loading	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis
Nostalgia intensity (AVE = 0.71, CR = 0.88, $\alpha = 0.88$)					
I felt a longing for the past experience.	0.876	3.437	1.344	-0.394	-1.035
The experience is highly nostalgic.	0.843	3.930	1.416	-0.385	-1.167
The experience is a very gratifying one for me.	0.831	3.970	1.148	-1.040	-0.290
WOM activity (AVE = 0.66, CR = 0.88, $\alpha = 0.88$)					
I mention this camping service to others quite frequently.	0.817	4.012	1.183	-1.080	0.252
I've told more people about this camping service than most other camping services.	0.797	3.975	1.288	-1.114	0.083
I seldom miss an opportunity to tell others about this camping service.	0.822	3.073	1.492	-0.104	-1.391
When I tell about this camping service I tend to talk about the camping service in a great detail.	0.825	3.326	1.376	-0.375	-1.057
WOM praise (AVE = 0.61, CR = 0.75, $\alpha = 0.82$)					
I have only good things to say about this camping service.	0.803	2.960	1.387	-0.080	-1.237
I am proud to tell others that I use this camping service.	0.761	3.117	1.464	-0.153	-1.367
Satisfaction (AVE: 0.90, CR: 0.96, $\alpha = 0.96$)					
I am satisfied with my decision to visit this campsite.	0.934	3.958	1.189	-1.076	0.280
I think that I did the right thing by deciding to visit this campsite.	0.972	3.921	1.198	-1.020	0.150
My choice to visit this campsite was a wise one.	0.949	3.864	1.207	-0.954	0.029
Revisit intention (AVE = 0.85, CR = 0.92, $\alpha = 0.94$)					
The likelihood that I would consider visiting this campsite again is . . .	0.860	3.948	1.272	-1.105	0.167
If I were to visit a campsite, the probability that I would visit this campsite is . . .	0.845	3.901	1.284	-1.020	-0.068

Note. WOM = word of mouth; AVE = average variance extracted; CR = composite reliability; α = Cronbach's alpha.

for each cluster, comparing the means between the three experience dimensions to identify the most salient extraordinary experience dimension for each cluster (Walker, Hinch, & Weighill, 2005).

- Step 6: The clusters were validated in two ways: (a) by comparing the clusters, which were profiled according to their demographic characteristics, on variables not used in the cluster analysis (i.e., satisfaction, nostalgia intensity, WOM activity, WOM praise, and revisit intentions); and (b) by repeating the cluster analysis on the validation group.

Cluster Analysis Results

Outliers were diagnosed by checking the z-scores and Cook's distance values of all observations. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), z-scores of variables help to find univariate outliers, while Cook's distance values identify multivariate outliers. Moreover, observations with standardized z-scores above 3.29 and Cook's distance values larger than 1 can be regarded as outliers. In the present data, z-scores of all cases were smaller than -2.60 and 2.05 ; the calculated Cook's distance values were all less than 0.061 . Overall, no univariate or multivariate outliers were identified.

The level of multicollinearity was assessed using two measures, namely: the tolerance value and the variance inflation factor (VIF; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). As Hair et al. (1995) note, tolerance values below 0.1 and VIF values above 10 indicate high collinearity. For the extraordinary experience variables, tolerance values were all greater than 0.16 and VIF values were all below 6.091 . Thus, acceptable levels of multicollinearity were found for the variables.

For the study group, hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted on the factor scores of the three extraordinary experience dimensions. The agglomeration schedule was examined to determine the cluster solution (Jurovski & Reich, 2000). Based on the largest jump in the values of agglomeration coefficients, four clusters were identified. Final cluster centers were used in order to describe the clusters (Norusis, 2008) and label them. Cluster 1 ($n = 66$) had lower than average values for all the three factor scores (i.e., harmony with nature, *communitas*, and personal growth and renewal) and it was labeled Indifferent Campers. Cluster 2 ($n = 51$) had higher than average values only in the Harmony With Nature factor; thus, it was termed Pure Naturalist Campers. Cluster 3 ($n = 55$) exhibited higher than average values for all the three factors, and the highest value on the Personal Growth and Renewal factor compared to the other three clusters. Hence, it was labeled Adventurous-Experiential Campers. Cluster 4 ($n = 41$) was named Social-Naturalist Campers, since it had higher than average values on the factors *Communitas* and Harmony With Nature. Moreover, the value of *Communitas* was higher than the value of Harmony With Nature.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to examine if there were significant differences in the mean scores of the three extraordinary experience dimensions across the four clusters (see Table 6).

Results of the analysis of variance indicated that the four clusters differed significantly at the $p < .05$ level, $F(3, 209) = 89.14$, $p = .000$, in the Harmony With Nature scores. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test showed that Indifferent Campers ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 0.58$) had significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores in the Harmony With Nature dimension than the other three clusters, whereas Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.7$) did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from Social-Naturalist ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 0.66$) and

TABLE 6 ANOVA of extraordinary experience factors—study group

Dimensions	Average <i>M</i> scores				<i>F</i> value
	Indifferent Campers	Pure Naturalist Campers	Adventurous–Experiential Campers	Social–Naturalist Campers	
Harmony With Nature	2.21	3.80	3.97	3.49	89.14*
Communitas	2.26	2.14	3.81	3.48	70.43*
Personal Growth and Renewal	1.79	2.41	4.13	1.73	131.05*

* $p < .05$.

Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.69$). However, Social–Naturalist Campers had significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores in the harmony with nature dimension than Adventurous–Experiential Campers.

With regards to the Communitas dimension, the analysis of variance indicated that there was a statistically significant difference at the $p < .05$ level across the four clusters, $F(3, 209) = 70.43$, $p = .000$. Post hoc comparisons revealed that Indifferent Campers ($M = 2.26$, $SD = 0.76$) and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.69$) had significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores in the Communitas dimension than Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 0.79$) and Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.68$). Indifferent Campers did not differ significantly from Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.69$). Moreover, Social–Naturalist Campers did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from Adventurous–Experiential Campers.

The four clusters also differed significantly at the $p < .05$ level in the scores regarding the personal growth and renewal factor, $F(3, 209) = 131.05$, $p = .000$. Results of the Tukey post hoc test found that Indifferent Campers ($M = 1.79$, $SD = 0.71$) and Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.57$) had significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores in the personal growth and renewal dimension compared to Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.41$, $SD = 0.91$) and Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.61$). Indifferent Campers and Social–Naturalist Campers did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from each other. Moreover, Adventurous–Experiential Campers had significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores in the personal growth and renewal dimension compared to Pure Naturalist Campers.

INDIFFERENT CAMPERS

Indifferent Campers experienced low levels of Harmony With Nature, Communitas, as well as Personal Growth and Renewal. Also, Indifferent campers had the lowest scores in the harmony with nature dimension compared to the other clusters. Within-cluster differences on the extraordinary experience dimensions were assessed using a series of dependent *t*-tests. The

first dependent test ($t = -0.59$, $df = 65$, $p = .551$) indicated that Indifferent Campers did not differ significantly at the $p > .05$ level in the degree of Harmony With Nature and Communitas they had experienced. The second ($t = 5.53$, $df = 65$, $d = 0.68$, $p = .000$) and third dependent tests ($t = 5.72$; $df = 65$, $d = 0.70$, $p = .000$) disclosed that Indifferent Campers experienced significantly ($p < .05$) lower levels of personal growth and renewal than Harmony With Nature and Communitas. However, the significant differences between the dimensions were relatively small. Thus, it can be argued that the basic characteristic of Indifferent Campers is the low levels of personal growth and renewal that they felt during the camping experience, as measured by the study's instruments.

PURE NATURALIST CAMPERS

This cluster had the second-highest mean scores on the Harmony With Nature and Personal Growth and Renewal dimensions and the lowest mean value on the Communitas dimension compared to the other clusters. Paired sample t -tests indicated that all differences between each pair of dimensions were significant at ($p < .05$). Pure Naturalist Campers experienced significantly more Harmony With Nature than Communitas ($t = 20.18$, $df = 50$, $d = 2.82$, $p = .000$) and Personal Growth and Renewal ($t = 14.36$, $df = 50$, $d = 2.01$, $p = .000$). Furthermore, a significant, but small difference was found between the dimensions of Communitas and Personal Growth and Renewal ($t = 2.77$, $df = 50$, $d = 0.38$, $p = .008$). Harmony with nature was the most distinguishing feature of Pure Naturalist Campers.

ADVENTUROUS-EXPERIENTIAL CAMPERS

This cluster had the highest mean scores across all three factors, and by far the highest mean score on the personal growth and renewal factor, compared to the other clusters. Dependent t -tests revealed that there were no significant differences ($p > .05$) between Harmony With Nature, Communitas ($t = 3.97$, $df = 54$, $p = .077$), and Personal Growth and Renewal ($t = -1.89$, $df = 54$, $p = .063$). On the contrary, Adventurous-Experiential Campers felt significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher levels of Personal Growth and Renewal than Communitas ($t = 3.35$, $df = 54$, $d = 0.45$, $p = .001$). Personal Growth and Renewal was the most profound aspect of the extraordinary experience felt by Adventurous-Experiential Campers.

SOCIAL-NATURALIST CAMPERS

This cluster had the second-highest mean score on the Communitas dimension and the lowest mean score on the Personal Growth and Renewal factor across the clusters. Social-Naturalist Campers felt the same levels of Harmony

With Nature and Communitas ($t = 0.09$, $df = 40$, $p = .926$). However, members of this cluster felt significantly ($p < .05$) lower levels of personal growth and renewal than Harmony With Nature ($t = -17.28$, $df = 40$, $d = 2.70$, $p = .000$) and Communitas ($t = -14.98$, $df = 40$, $d = 2.34$, $p = .000$). Thus, Communitas and Harmony With Nature were the primary dimensions of the extraordinary experience of Social–Naturalist Campers.

Cluster Validation

Postexperience variables such as nostalgia intensity, satisfaction, WOM activity, WOM praise, and revisit intentions, as well as demographic variables, were used to validate and profile the four clusters. In order to test whether differences between the four clusters existed with regards to the postexperience constructs, ANOVA was run. Several postvisit variables were significantly, negatively skewed, violating the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Specifically, Levene's test was performed to test whether the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met. Square transformations ($Y' = Y^2$) were used to normalize the skewed distributions and eliminate the homogeneity of variance problem (Kleinbaum, Kupper, Nizam, & Muller, 2008). If the transformations did not establish homogeneity of variance, non-parametric tests, such as the Kruskal-Wallis H test, were performed. Table 7 presents the results of ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis H tests.

NOSTALGIA INTENSITY BY CLUSTER SEGMENT

With regards to nostalgia intensity, Levene's statistic was nonsignificant ($p > .05$; Levene's statistic = 2.178, $p = .092$), suggesting that the homogeneity of variances assumption was not violated and that ANOVA could be used. Results of ANOVA are presented in Table 7. ANOVA shows that the

TABLE 7 Parametric and nonparametric ANOVA of postexperience scales for the study group

Postvisit constructs	Indifferent Campers	Pure Naturalist Campers	Adventurous–Experiential Campers	Social–Naturalist Campers	<i>F</i> value
Nostalgia intensity ^a	2.79	3.50	4.13	4.00	19.49
Satisfaction ^b	12.44	16.45	19.90	19.89	13.13
WOM activity ^a	3.09	3.39	4.21	3.90	12.33
WOM praise ^a	2.39	2.91	3.88	3.08	14.96
					<i>H</i> value
Intention to revisit ^c	76.90	104.07	128.55	130.20	30.96

Note. WOM = word of mouth.

^aAverage means score of the raw data. ^bAverage means score of the transformed data. ^cMean rank based on the means of the raw data.

four segments differ significantly at the $p < .05$ level, $F(3, 209) = 19.49$, $p = .000$, in respect of the nostalgia intensity of the camping experience. Specifically, Adventurous–Experiential Campers reported the highest levels of nostalgia intensity, followed by Social–Naturalist Campers. Pure Naturalist Campers reported moderate nostalgia intensity levels, while Indifferent Campers reported that their camping experience was not so highly nostalgic. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test revealed that Adventurous–Experiential Campers felt significantly ($p < .05$) more nostalgia intensity ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.88$) than Indifferent Campers ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.15$) and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.16$). Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.88$) did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) in nostalgia intensity from Adventurous–Experiential Campers and Pure Naturalist Campers. Moreover, Indifferent Campers ($M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.15$) felt significantly ($p < .05$) lower levels of nostalgia intensity compared to the other three clusters.

SATISFACTION LEVEL BY CLUSTER SEGMENT

In the case of satisfaction, Levene's statistic was significant at the $p < .05$ level (Levene's statistic = 7.654, $p = .000$). Thus, the analysis proceeded with a square transformation. Running the Levene's test for the transformed satisfaction scale, the hypothesis of equal variance was accepted. Therefore, the analysis continued with ANOVA (Table 7), which revealed significant differences, $F(3,209) = 13.13$, $p = .000$, across the four cluster segments based on their satisfaction levels. It was found that Adventurous–Experiential Campers and Social–Naturalist Campers were the most satisfied with their camping experience, followed by Pure Naturalist and Indifferent campers. Results of the Tukey post hoc test found that the clusters Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 19.90$, $SD = 6.50$), Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 19.89$, $SD = 6.71$), and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 16.48$, $SD = 7.60$) did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from each other in the satisfaction mean scores. As would be expected, Indifferent campers ($M = 12.44$, $SD = 8.33$) were significantly ($p < .05$) less satisfied than the other three clusters.

WOM ACTIVITY BY CLUSTER SEGMENT

With regards to WOM activity, Levene's statistic was nonsignificant at the $p < .05$ level (Levene's statistic = 2.314, $p = .077$), and ANOVA was used (Table 7). Results of ANOVA, $F(3,209) = 12.33$, $p = .000$, suggested that the four clusters differed in terms of WOM activity levels. Specifically, Adventurous–Experiential Campers were the most active WOM-givers, followed by Social–Naturalist Campers. Pure Naturalist Campers engaged in a moderate WOM activity level, while Indifferent campers engaged in WOM activity to a lesser extent. Post hoc comparisons indicated that the

Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 4.21$, $SD = 0.98$) engaged in significantly ($p < .05$) more WOM activity than Indifferent Campers ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.18$) and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.13$), but did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) from Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.98$). No significant differences ($p > .05$) were found between Pure Naturalist Campers and Social–Naturalist Campers as well as Indifferent Campers. Moreover, Indifferent Campers engaged in significantly ($p < .05$) less WOM activity than Social–Naturalist Campers.

WOM PRAISE BY CLUSTER SEGMENT

For the WOM praise construct, Levene's test failed to reject the hypothesis of equal variances across the four segments (Levene's statistic = 1.81, $p = .146$). Thus, an ANOVA was performed (Table 7). The analysis revealed significant differences across the four segments with regards to WOM praise levels, $F(3,209) = 14.96$, $p = .000$. Again, Adventurous–Experiential Campers seemed to be the greatest ambassadors of the camping experience. High levels of positive WOM communication were also generated by Social–Naturalist Campers, followed by Pure Naturalist Campers. Indifferent Campers showed the lowest levels of WOM praise.

Results of the Tukey post hoc comparisons revealed that Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.26$) engaged in significantly ($p < .05$) more positive WOM than all the other three clusters. Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.29$) differed significantly ($p < .05$) in the levels of WOM praise from Indifferent Campers ($M = 2.39$, $SD = 1.26$) and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.29$). No significant differences were found between Indifferent Campers and Pure Naturalist Campers.

REVISIT INTENTIONS BY CLUSTER SEGMENT

In the case of revisit intentions, the Levene's statistic was significant at the $p < .05$ level (Levene's statistic = 12.02, $p = .000$), and square transformation was applied on the revisit intention variables to normalize the distributions. However, the transformations did not yield normal distributions (Levene's statistic = 5.21, $p = .002$), and thus, the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance test was used. The Kruskal-Wallis test (Kruskal-Wallis $H = 30.96$, $p = .000$) suggested that significant ($p < .05$) differences existed between the four clusters regarding their revisit intentions to the campground (Table 7). Results indicated that the probability that Social–Naturalist campers would return to the campground they visited was the highest amongst the four segments (M rank = 130.20). Adventurous–Experiential Campers reported the second-highest revisit intention likelihood (M rank = 128.55). The group of Pure Naturalist Campers reported a moderate intention to revisit the campsite

(M rank = 104.07), whereas Indifferent Campers were the segment with the lowest revisit intention probability (M rank = 76.90).

CLUSTER ANALYSIS OF VALIDATION GROUP

To further validate the four derived clusters, cluster analysis was repeated on the validation group. Again, a four-cluster solution was identified based on the largest jump in the values of the agglomeration coefficient. The cluster profiles of the validation group were highly similar to the cluster profiles of the study group. According to the final cluster centers, Cluster 1 ($n = 47$), like the Social–Naturalist Campers, had higher than average values in the factor scores of *Communitas* and *Harmony With Nature*. Cluster 2 ($n = 50$), as the Pure Naturalist Campers, had higher than average values in the *Harmony With Nature* factor. Cluster 3 ($n = 50$), similar to the Indifferent Campers, had lower than average values in all three extraordinary experience factors. Cluster 4 ($n = 47$), like the Adventurous–Experiential Campers, had above average values in all three factors.

One-way analysis of variance was performed to reveal cluster differences across the three extraordinary experience dimensions for the validation group (see Table 8). Significant differences at the $p < .05$ level were found between the four clusters in the scores of all three dimensions, namely *Harmony With Nature*, $F(3, 90) = 80.45$, $p = .000$, *Communitas*, $F(3, 190) = 91.76$, $p = .000$, and *Personal Growth and Renewal*, $F(3, 190) = 92.51$, $p = .000$. Results of the Tukey post-hoc comparisons for the validation group were similar to those obtained from the study group, except for the nonsignificant differences ($p > .05$) that were found between: (a) Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.73$) and Adventurous–Experiential Campers ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.67$) with regards to *Harmony With Nature*; and (b) Social–Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.07$, $SD = 0.66$) and Pure Naturalist Campers ($M = 2.35$, $SD = 1.00$) with regards to *Personal Growth and Renewal*. Based on the above results, the four-cluster solution can be considered as relatively stable and valid.

TABLE 8 ANOVA of extraordinary experience factors—validation group

Dimensions	Average M scores				F value
	Indifferent Campers	Pure Naturalist Campers	Adventurous–Experiential Campers	Social–Naturalist Campers	
Harmony With Nature	2.14	3.72	3.93	3.60	80.45
Communitas	2.01	2.08	3.56	3.52	91.76
Personal Growth and Renewal	1.80	2.35	4.22	2.07	92.51

* $p < .05$.

Demographic Profile of the Four Clusters

In order to develop the demographic profile of each segment, chi-square tests were performed to see whether there was a relationship between the demographic variables and cluster membership. Based on the findings, the four clusters did not differ significantly ($p > .05$) with respect to gender, $\chi^2(3) = 3.62$, $p = .305$, $V = 0.13$, age, $\chi^2(12) = 17.63$, $p = .127$, $V = 0.28$, marital status, $\chi^2(6) = 2.03$, $p = .917$, $V = 0.09$, education, $\chi^2(15) = 18.33$, $p = .246$; $V = 0.293$; occupation, $\chi^2(18) = 18.97$, $p = .393$, $V = 0.29$; and monthly income, $\chi^2(15) = 20.10$, $p = .168$, $V = 0.30$. These findings support the argument of Prentice et al. (1998, p. 15) that “socio-demographics are largely irrelevant in the understanding of tourist experiences.” Moreover, these findings probably reflect the homogeneity of the sample in terms of age, marital status, and life stage.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

The present study validated the extraordinary experience scale proposed by Arnould and Price (1993) in the context of summer camping. Moreover, this study also provided evidence regarding the appropriateness of extraordinary experience as an effective segmentation basis. Therefore, further empirical support to Cohen’s (1979) and Prentice et al.’s (1998) views that tourists differ in the experience they have during their summer vacations is provided.

Four distinct segments of summer campers were identified based on their camping experience, namely: Indifferent Campers, Pure Naturalist Campers, Social–Naturalist Campers, and Adventurous–Experiential Campers. These segments were then described according to their postvisit behavior and intentions (i.e., nostalgia intensity, satisfaction, WOM activity and praise, and revisit intentions).

Just like Cohen’s (1979) recreational and diversionary types of tourist, Indifferent Campers did not experience high levels of *Communitas* and *Personal Transformation*. Pure Naturalist and Social–Naturalist Campers might represent Cohen’s experiential type of tourist. These campers, even though they experienced high levels of *Harmony With Nature* and *Communitas*, did not experience revitalization and rejuvenation. Deeper modes of experiences were yielded by Adventurous–Experiential Campers, who felt strong *Harmony With Nature*, *Communitas*, and *Personal Growth and Renewal*. These campers could represent Cohen’s experimental or existential type of tourist, due to their deep engagement and commitment to the camping experience.

Once the segmentation has been finalized, segments should be prioritized based on criteria such as future response, reachability by promotional messages, and potential of gaining a competitive advantage (Wind & Thomas, 1994). Marketers should put their emphasis on the most valuable

and profitable segments. Based on the findings, Adventurous–Experiential Campers and Social–Naturalist Campers were the most satisfied customers and felt the highest levels of nostalgia intensity compared to the other two segments. Moreover, these two segments had a higher likelihood to make positive recommendations and to revisit the campsites. Thus, they can contribute much to the profitability of campsites, since their members are loyal customers with a high referral value. Camping marketers could focus their efforts on attracting and retaining these two profitable segments. According to Payne and Frow (1997), though, marketing efforts also need to be directed towards segments that have the potential to become profitable. Even though Pure Naturalist and Indifferent campers contributed least to the profitability of campsites, appropriate marketing strategies directed towards these segments could enhance their satisfaction, loyalty, and referral value. Marketers, therefore, should prioritize their efforts on Adventurous–Experiential Campers, followed by Social–Naturalist Campers, Pure Naturalist Campers, and Indifferent Campers. The prioritized segments should then be targeted with appropriate marketing strategies.

Adventurous–Experiential Campers, who were the most satisfied and active WOM-givers, exhibited the highest levels of extraordinary experience. Given this, it could be argued that experience seems to be the key for retaining Adventurous–Experiential Campers and Social–Naturalist Campers and satisfying Pure Naturalist Campers and Indifferent Campers. In accordance with Van Heerde’s (2005) suggestion, the present study indicates that camping experiences should be appropriately designed and managed for each segment. It is herein recommended that camping marketers should design complementary services, in addition to the core camping service, based on the three experiential dimensions (i.e., a different complementary service for each experiential dimension). It is very important that these complementary services are not offered in the same volume to all four segments, since they differ in terms of the experiential dimensions. Marketers should attempt to develop special programs for each segment in order to enhance those specific dimensions that the study found to be low. For example, Pure Naturalist Campers and Indifferent Campers did not report the high levels of social and interpersonal experiences that the other two target segments expressed. Hence, camping marketers should increase the level of social experience felt by these segments. An appropriate program should be developed and communicated through traditional and new media. This program should include activities that would increase the interaction between campers. For instance, special music nights could be organized where interested campers would sing or play instruments. Drama nights could also be organized, and campers would be able to show off their acting abilities and work with other campers as well. Moreover, off-camp trips could be another way for creating bonds between campers in order to enhance the feeling of *Communitas*. Activities for increasing the social aspects of the camping experience should also be

incorporated into the program designed for Social–Naturalist Campers, but to a lesser extent.

Moreover, Social–Naturalist Campers, Indifferent Campers, and Pure Naturalist Campers exhibited low levels of self-related experience. Camping marketers should develop complementary services in order to increase the level of personal growth experienced by these three segments. These campers did not report experiencing personal reward during their vacations in summer campsites. Hence, marketers should engage these campers in a number of activities that might improve their skills and knowledge, as well as challenge them. Appropriate programs should be developed and promoted for these particular segments. For example, such a program could include special workshops where campers, inspired by the natural scenery, could learn to paint during their vacations. In addition, the program could incorporate lessons in photography and crafts such as woodwork, etc. Archery lessons could offer another challenging way to enhance the self-related dimension of the camping experience, as campers could master their skills in an interesting practice. Programs designed for Indifferent campers should also incorporate to a high degree activities related with nature, such as swimming contests, fishing, hiking, boating, or sailing, which would increase the level of contact with nature. To a lesser extent, nature-related activities could be designed to reinforce the harmony with nature felt by Social–Naturalist Campers and Pure Naturalist Campers. In this way, Indifferent Campers, Social–Naturalist Campers, and Pure Naturalist Campers could be transformed into Adventurous–Experiential Campers, and, consequently, their nostalgia intensity, satisfaction, WOM recommendations, and revisit intentions would increase.

Adventurous–Experiential Campers should become the top priority target for camping marketers, as they could become loyal customers. These campers provide camping businesses the opportunity to develop a competitive advantage based on the extraordinary experiences they offer. In order to turn these campers into loyal customers, the starting point is experience consistency. As S. Smith and Wheeler (2002) suggested, experiential businesses should be able to produce the same experience time after time. After consistency is secured, camping marketers should try to enhance and improve their experiential offering. Adventurous–Experiential Campers should be engaged in the activities suggested above, but to a lesser extent. In addition, these campers could become passionate advocates of the campsites if an appropriate motive is given to them, for example, a special offer or a discount for every new customer they bring in to the business. Lastly, marketers could offer memorabilia to all segments in order to enhance their nostalgia experience, and therefore increase their WOM recommendations to other potential customers.

Another critical finding of this study was that the interpersonal dimension of the experience seems to impact on the postvisit perceptions,

behaviors, and intentions of summer campers. As the level of social experience increases, so does the nostalgia intensity felt by campers, their WOM activity and praise, as well as their intentions to revisit the campsite. Similar to sport tourists (Fairley, 2003; Fairley & Gammon, 2007), the sense of *communitas* felt by summer campers influences their nostalgia experience with the campsite.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present study has several limitations. The first limitation relates to the scale used to measure the experience of campers. This study used Arnould and Price's (1993) extraordinary experience scale. Relying on this scale could be problematic, since it was not tested by other studies in different tourism settings and cultures. Further validation and replication of the scale is needed. Moreover, extraordinary experience may be a poor proxy for the experience of campers. Campers' experience could have been measured differently using other multi-dimensional scales that measure pleasurable tourist experiences (Oh et al., 2007; Huang & Hsu, 2010).

This study used a structured questionnaire in which respondents rated their level of agreement with the extraordinary experiential elements. Consequently, the marketing implications regarding the segmentation results should be viewed cautiously, as respondents did not express their perceptions about the camping experience. This limitation could be addressed by using in-depth interviews to investigate the experience lived by campers. Also, conducting segmentation based on experience sought by campers could lead to more effective strategies for marketers.

A third limitation concerns the use of an online survey and the representativeness of the sample. The survey employed a convenience sample, as respondents were only Greek campers who had a Facebook profile. Facebook users in Greece are mainly young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 and male (Socialbakers, 2012). The Facebook population may not be representative of the Greek population who visit campsites during their summer vacations. Since the study did not include non-Facebook members, results should be generalized and interpreted with care. Campers who are not Facebook users may differ in their perceptions about the camping experience. Mixed-mode surveys (both online and paper) could control the sampling bias.

A fourth limitation stems from the use of cluster analysis as a segmentation method. Given its exploratory nature, cluster analysis is highly sensitive to the variables (Hair & Black, 2000), data, and methods used for clustering (Saunders, 1980). Different data and methods may result in different cluster solutions. Moreover, there are no clear guidelines for the determination of the number as well as the definition of clusters, which may result in considerable

researcher bias (Punj & Stewart, 1983). In addition, the use of factor scores as input for cluster analysis may affect the cluster results, as information from the original data could be lost.

FUNDING

This research has been co-financed by the European Union (European Social Fund [ESF]) and Greek national funds through the operational program “Education and Lifelong Learning” of the National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), Research Funding Program: Heracleitus II. Investing in knowledge society through the European Social Fund.

REFERENCES

- Akis, S., & Warne, J. (1994). A descriptive analysis of North Cyprus tourism. *Tourism Management, 15*(5), 379–388.
- Alexandris, K., Kouthouris, C., & Funk, D., & Giovani, C. (2009). Segmenting winter sport tourists by motivation: The case of recreational skiers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 18*(5), 480–499.
- Alvarez, M., & Asugman, G. (2006). Explorers versus planners: A study of Turkish tourists. *Annals of Tourism Research, 33*, 319–338.
- Anderson, E. W. (1998). Customer satisfaction and word of mouth. *Journal of Service Research, 1*(1), 5–17.
- Arnould, E., Price, L., & Zinkhan, G. (2002). *Consumers*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Arnould, E. J., & Price, L. L. (1993). River magic: extraordinary experience and the extended service encounter. *Journal of Consumer Research, 20*(1), 24–45.
- Baumgartner, H., & Homburg, C. (1996). Applications of structural equation modeling approach in marketing and consumer research: A review. *International Journal of Research in Marketing, 13*(2), 139–161.
- Baumgartner, H., Sujan, M., & Bettman, J. R. (1992). Autobiographical memories, affect and consumer information processing. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 1*(1), 53–82.
- Becken, S., Simmons, D., & Frampton, C. (2003). Segmenting tourists by their travel patterns for insights into achieving energy efficiency. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(10), 48–56.
- Beedie, P., & Hudson, S. (2003). Emergence of mountain-based adventure tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*(3), 625–643.
- Beh, A., & Bruyere, B. L. (2007). Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management, 28*(6), 1464–1471.
- Belk, R. W., & Costa, J. A. (1998). The mountain man myth: A contemporary consuming fantasy. *Journal of Consumer Research, 25*(3), 218–240.
- Bentler, P. M. (1992). *Structural equations program manual*. Los Angeles, CA: BMDP Statistical Software.

- Bentler, P. M. (2005). *EQS 6 structural equations program manual*. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Bigné, E., & Andreu, L. (2004). Emotions in segmentation: an empirical study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 682–696.
- Bock, T., & Uncles, M. (2002). A taxonomy of differences between consumers for market segmentation. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19, 216–219.
- Bodet, G. (2008). Customer satisfaction and loyalty in service: Two C = concepts, four constructs, several relationships. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 15(3), 156–162.
- Boksberger, P. E., & Laesser, C. (2009). Segmentation of the senior travel market by the means of travel motivations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(4), 311–322.
- Brakus, J., Schmitt, B., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: What is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 73(3), 52–68.
- Caru, A., & Cova, B. (2003). Revisiting consumption experience: A more humble but complete view of the concept. *Marketing Theory*, 3(2), 267–286.
- Celsi, R. L., Rose, R. L., & Leigh, T. W. (1993, June). An exploration of high-risk leisure consumption through skydiving. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20, 1–23.
- Chang, T.-Y., & Horng, S.-C. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring experience quality: The customer's perspective. *The Services Industries Journal*, 30(14), 2401–2419.
- Chen, J. (2003). Market segmentation by tourists' sentiments. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 178–193.
- Chen, J., Chang, L.-L., & Cheng, J.-S. (2010). Exploring the market segments of farm tourism in Taiwan. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 19(4), 309–325.
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Journal of the British Sociological Association*, 13(2), 179–201.
- Conelly, N. A. (1987). Critical factors and their threshold for camper satisfaction at two campgrounds. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 19(3), 195–173.
- Demunter, C., & Dimitrakopoulou, C. (2010). *Camping holidays in the European Union: More than 350 million nights spend on campsites in 2008*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Desforges, L. (2000). Traveling the world—identity and travel biography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27, 926–945.
- Dibb, S. (1998). Market segmentation: strategies for success. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 16(7), 394–406.
- Dimanche, F., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1993). Consumer involvement profiles as a tourism segmentation tool. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 1(4), 33–52.
- Dodson, K. J. (1996). Peak experiences and mountain biking: Incorporating the bike into the extended self. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 23, 317–322.
- Duman, T., & Tanrisevdi, A. (2011). Profiling English tourists visiting Turkey based on attitudes toward Internet use in vacation decision making. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 20(5), 525–550.

- Echelberger, H., & McEwen, D. (1986). *Camping: A literature review: Appendix to the report of President's Commission on Americans Outdoors*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Fairley, S. (2003). In search of relived social experience: Group-based nostalgia sport tourism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(3), 284–304.
- Fairley, S., & Gammon, S. (2005). Something lived, something learned: Nostalgia's expanding role in sport tourism. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 8(2), 182–197.
- Fesenmaier, D. R., & Johnson, B. (1989). Involvement-based segmentation: implications for travel marketing in Texas. *Tourism Management*, 10(4), 293–300.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39–50.
- Galloway, G. (2002). Psychographic segmentation of park visitor markets: Evidence for the utility of sensation seeking. *Tourism Management*, 23(6), 581–596.
- Garst, B., Williams, D., & Roggenbuck, J. (2009). Exploring early twenty-first century developed forest camping experiences and meanings. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 32(1), 90–107.
- Goldsmith, R. E., & Litvin, S. W. (1999). Heavy users of travel agents: A segmentation analysis of vacation travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(2), 127–133.
- González, A. M., & Bello, L. (2002). The construct “lifestyle” in market segmentation: The behaviour of tourist consumers. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(1/2), 51–85.
- Grewal, D., Krishnan, R., & Sharma, A. (1999, May). *Value-based marketing strategies?* Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the Academy of Marketing Science, Coral Gables, FL.
- Grover, R., & Vriens, M. (2006). *The handbook of marketing research: Uses, misuses, and future advances*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gursoy, D., & Chen, B. (2012). Factors influencing camping behavior: The case of Taiwan. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 21(6), 659–678.
- Hair, F., Anderson, R., Tatham, R., & Black, W. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis with readings* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hair, J. F., & Black, W. (2000). Cluster analysis. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding more multivariate statistics* (pp. 147–204). Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Harrison-Walker, J. L. (2001). The measurement of word-of-mouth communication and an investigation of service quality and customer commitment as potential antecedents. *Journal of Services Research*, 4, 60–75.
- Hendee, J. C., & Campbell, F. L. (1969, October). Social aspects of outdoor recreation—the developed campground. *Trends*.
- Holak, S. L., & Havlena, W. J. (1992). Nostalgia: An exploratory study of themes and emotions in the nostalgic experience. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 19, 380–387.

- Holak, S. L., & Havlena, W. J. (1998). Feelings, fantasies, and memories: An examination of the emotional components of nostalgia. *Journal of Business Research*, 42, 217–226.
- Holbrook, M. B. (2000). The millennial consumer in the texts of our times: Experience and entertainment. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 20(2), 178–192.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, W. J. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(2), 132–140.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Schindler, R. (2003). Nostalgic bonding: Exploring the role of nostalgia in the consumption experience. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 3(2), 107–127.
- Hopkinson, G., & Pujari, D. (1999). A factor analytic study of the sources of meaning in hedonic consumption. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(3/4), 273–294.
- Hosany, S., & Witham, M. (2009). Dimensions of cruisers' experiences, satisfaction, and intention to recommend. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 351–364.
- Hsieh, S., O'Leary, J., & Morrison, A. (1992). Segmenting the international travel market by activity. *Tourism Management*, 13(2), 209–223.
- Hsu, C. H. C., & Lee, E.-J. (2002). Segmentation of senior motorcoach travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(4), 364–374.
- Huang, J., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2010). The impact of customer-to-customer interaction on cruise experience and vacation satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(3), 79–92.
- Hudson, S. (2003). *Sport and adventure tourism*. New York, NY: The Haworth Press.
- Ismail, A. R., & Melewar, T. C. (2010, April). *A structural model to examine the antecedents and consequences of customer with experiential brands*. In Proceedings of the 6th Thought Leaders International Conference on Brand Management, Lugano, Switzerland.
- Janiskee, R. L. (1990). Resort camping in America. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 385–407.
- Janssens, W., de Pelshmacker, P., van Kenhove, P., & Wijnen, K. (2008). *Marketing research with SPSS*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Jurowski, C., & Reich, A. (2000). An explanation and illustration of cluster analysis for identifying hospitality market segments. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 24(1), 67–91.
- Kerstetter, D., Confer, J., & Bricker, K. (1998). Industrial heritage attractions: Types and tourists. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(2), 91–104.
- Kim, J. H., & Ritchie, B. W. (2010). Motivation-based typology: An empirical study of golf-tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/1096348010388661
- Kim, J.-H., Ritchie, J. R. B., & McCormick, B. (2010). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*. doi:10.1177/0047287510385467
- Kim, W. G., Park, Y., Gazzoli, G., & Sheng, E. (2011). Benefit segmentation of International travelers to Macau, China. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(1), 28–57.

- Kleinbaum, D., Kupper, L., Nizam, A., & Muller, K. (2008), *Applied regression analysis and other multivariate methods* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Kotler, P. (1989). From mass marketing to mass customization. *Strategy & Leadership*, 17(5), 10–47.
- Laing, J., & Crouch, G. (2009). Myth, adventure, and fantasy at the frontier: Metaphors and imagery behind an extraordinary experience. *International Journal of Travel Research*, 11(2), 127–141.
- Lang, C.-T., & O’Leary, J. T. (1997). Motivation, participation, and preference: A multi-segmentation approach of the Australian nature travel market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 6(3/4), 159–180.
- Lee, Y., Dattilo, J., & Howard, D. (1994). The complex and dynamic nature of leisure experience. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(3), 195–211.
- Legohérel, P. (1998). Toward a market segmentation of the tourism trade: Expenditure levels and consumer behavior instability. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 7(3), 19–39.
- Leiper, N. (1979). The framework of tourism: Towards a definition of tourism, tourist, and the tourist industry. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 390–407.
- Lilien, G., & Ramaswamy, A. (2004). *Marketing engineering: Computer-assisted marketing analysis and planning*. Victoria, Canada: Trafford Publishing.
- Loker-Murphy, L. (1996). Backpackers in Australia: A motivation-based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 5(4), 23–45.
- MacKay, K. J., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (1998). A process approach to segmenting the gateway travel market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 7(3), 1–39.
- Maslow, A. (1967). Lessons from the peak experience. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 2, 9–18.
- Mehmetoglu, M. (2006). Segmenting the nature-based tourists based on travel mode choice. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 14(4), 47–67.
- Mehmetoglu, M., Miner, K., Graumann, C., & Greibokk, J. (2010). The relationship between personal values and tourism behaviour: A segmentation approach. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 16(1), 17–27.
- Mo, C., Havitz, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Segmenting travel markets with the International Tourism Tole (ITR) scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(1), 24–31.
- Mohd, A., Yaman, A. R., Keat, T. C., & Wai, Y. H. (2005). Campers’ characteristics, recreation activities and related forest camping attributes in Shah Alam agriculture Park, Selangor. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(9), 1546–1552.
- Mok, C., & Iverson, T. (2000). Expenditure-based segmentation: Taiwanese tourists to Guam. *Tourism Management*, 21, 299–305.
- Mooi, E., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). *A concise guide to market research: The process, data and methods using IBM SPSS Statistics*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Moscardo, G., Pearce, P., & Morrison, A. (2001). Evaluating different bases for market segmentation: A comparison of geographic origin versus activity participation for generating tourist market segments. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 10(1), 29–49.
- Nicosia, F. M. (1966). *Consumer decision processes*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Norusis, M. (2008). *SPSS 16.0 Statistical procedures companion* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Press.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Nyaupane, G. P., Teye, V., & Paris, C. (2008). Innocents abroad: Attitude change toward hosts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(3), 650–667.
- Oh, H., Fiore, A. M., & Jeoung, M. (2007). Measuring experience economy concepts: tourism applications. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(2), 119–132.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 460–469.
- Otto, J. E., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(3), 165–174.
- Park, J., Ellis, G. D., Kim, S. S., & Prideaux, B. (2010). An investigation of perceptions of social equity and price acceptability judgments for campers in the U.S. national forest. *Tourism Management*, 31, 202–212.
- Payne, A., & Frow, P. (1997). Relationship marketing: Key issues for the utilities sector. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 13(5), 463–477.
- Petrick, J. F., & Sirakaya, E. (2004). Segmentation cruisers by loyalty. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(2), 472–475.
- Pine, B., & Gilmore, J. (1998, July/August). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 97–105.
- Pine, B., & Gilmore, J. (1999). *The experience economy*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pomfret, G. (2006). Mountaineering adventure tourists: A conceptual framework for research. *Tourism Management*, 27(1), 113–123.
- Prentice, R. C., Witt, S. F., & Hamer, C. (1998). Tourism as experience: The case of Heritage Parks. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 1–24.
- Privette, G. (1983). Peak experience, peak performance, and flow: A comparative analysis of positive human experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(6), 1361–1368.
- Punj, G., & Stewart, D. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(2), 134–148.
- Sarigöllü, E., & Huang, R. (2005). Benefits segmentation of visitors to Latin America. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 277–293.
- Saunders, J. A. (1980). Cluster analysis for market segmentation. *European Journal of Marketing*, 14(7), 422–435.
- Schmitt, B. (1999). Experiential marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 15(1/3), 53–67.
- Schouten, J. W., McAlexander, J. H., & Koenig, H. F. (2007). Transcendent customer experience and brand community. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 35, 357–368.
- Smith, S., & Wheeler, J. (2002). *Managing the customer experience*. London, England: Prentice Hall.
- Smith, W. L. (2006). Experiential tourism around the world and at home: Definitions and standards. *International Journal of Services and Standards*, 12(1), 1–14.
- Snepenger, D. J. (1987). Segmenting the vacation market by novelty seeking role. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(2), 8–12.

- Socialbakers. (2012). *Greece Facebook statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialbakers.com/facebook-statistics/greece>
- Sundaram, D. S., Mitra, K., & Webster, C. (1998). Word-of-mouth communications: A motivational analysis. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25, 527–531.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tsaur, S.-H., Chiu, Y.-T., & Wang, C.-H. (2007). The visitors behavioral consequences of experiential marketing. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 21(1), 47–64.
- Tsiotsou, R., & Vasioti, E. (2006). Satisfaction: A segmentation criterion for “short term” visitors of mountainous destinations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 20(1), 61–73.
- Valentine, P. (1992). Review: Nature-based tourism In C. M. Hall & B. Weiler (Eds.), *Special interest tourism* (pp. 105–127). London, England: Belhaven Press.
- Van Heerde, C. H. (2010). An exploratory analysis of leisure caravanning in the Kruger National Park in South Africa. *Innovative Marketing*, 6(1), 66–72.
- Van Heerden, N. (2011). Self-drive tourism in South Africa with specific emphasis on caravanning. In B. Prideaux & D. Carson (Ed.), *Drive tourism: Trends and emerging markets*. Milton Park, UK: Routledge.
- Volo, S. (2009). Conceptualizing experience: A tourist based approach. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 18(2/3), 111–126.
- Walker, G. J., Hinch, T., & Higham, J. (2010). Athletes as tourists: The roles of mode experience and achievement orientation. *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 15(4), 287–305.
- Walker, G. J., Hinch, T. D., & Weighill, A. J. (2005). Inter- and intra-gender similarities and differences in motivations for casino gambling. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 27(2), 111–130.
- Wildschut T., Sedikides C., Arndt, J., & Routledge, C. (2006). Nostalgia: Content, triggers, functions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(5), 975–993.
- Wind, Y., & Thomas, R. J. (1994). *Segmenting industrial markets*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Woodside, A. G., & Jacobs, L. W. (1985). Step two in benefit segmentation: Learning the benefits realized by major travel markets. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(1), 7–13.
- Wu, C. H.-J., & Liang, R.-D. (2011). The relationship between white-water rafting experience formation and customer reaction: A flow theory perspective. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 317–325.