**Dev Jani / Winnie Nguni**

# Pre-trip vs. post-trip destination image variations: A case of inbound tourists to Tanzania

## Abstract

Despite the conceptual indications of destination image to vary with factors like travel status and tourist behaviour, there are few studies that have empirically researched the variations in destination image particularly in emerging destinations like those in Africa. This study aimed at testing the variation of pre- and post trip destination image held by inbound travellers to Tanzania. Four hypotheses were defined to test variation of destination image with travel status, destination familiarity, planning horizon, and sources of travel information. Data were collected from departing inbound tourists at major international airports using a self-administered questionnaire. Data from 294 dully filled questionnaires were subjected to descriptive tests, t-tests and ANOVA tests. The hypotheses testing the variation between pre and post destination image, visitation status, and planning horizon were partly rejected. The results indicate the post-trip destination image to be more favourable compared to the pre-trip image for some attributes. Differences in image were noted to vary between first time and repeat visitors, particularly those related to adventure, natural attractions, and the easiness in intra-destination travel. Generally, as the planning horizon increases the destination image becomes more favourable. The variation of destination image with sources of travel information was not upheld by the results. The results provide insights into destination marketing and destination experience management to tourism stakeholders.

**Key words**: destination image; pre-travel; post-travel; tourists; Tanzania

## Introduction

Destination image is agreeably a major factor that influences the potential tourist's destination choice (Gartner, 1993) as well as being an influence of the tourist subsequent satisfaction with the destination (Prayag, 2008; Prayag & Ryan, 2012) and their behavioural intentions towards the destination. Due to its practical importance, destination image has been studied for more than three decades. In simplistic terms, destination image pertains to sum of beliefs, attitudes and impressions held by a person towards a destination (Kotler, 1991). These beliefs, attitudes and impressions of a destination are supposed to be dynamic based on the tourist status of either pre or post visit (Jani & Hwang, 2011; Wang & Davidson, 2010; Yilmaz, Yilmaz, Icigen, Ekin & Utku, 2009), destination familiarity (Baloglu, 2001), supply factors like marketing, and factors related to the tourists (Tasci, Gartner & Cavusgil, 2007). Despite the travel status of the tourist having an impact on destination image held by the tourist, few empirical studies have focused on the dynamism as most research have focused on either the pre visit image (Frias, Rodgriguez, Casteneda, Sabiote & Buhalis, 2012; Lin, Chen & Park, 2012) or post image separately (Beerli & Martin, 2004).

It is a general belief that image formation in the tourists' mind develop through exposure to information (Beerli & Martin, 2004; Gartner, 1993) that creates and graduates the image from organic, to

**Dev Jani**, PhD, Department of Marketing, University of Dar es Salaam Business School, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;
E-mail: dev@udbs.udsm.ac.tz

**Winnie Nguni**, PhD, Department of Marketing, University of Dar es Salaam Business School, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania;
E-mail: winnienguni@udbs.udsm.ac.tz

induced, and finally to a complex image (Jeong, Holland, Jun & Gibson, 2012) reflecting pre-visit with non active information search to pre-visit active information search, and post-visit experiences respectively. Moreover, conceptually destination image have been indicated to vary with the sources of travel information (Gartner, 1993) and the time taken by travellers to plan their trip or planning horizon (Gitelson & Crompton, 1993) with few empirical studies done to affirm the variations. The understanding of the differences between the pre and post travel images have a practical implication as it aids tourism marketers in communicating with the potential tourists as well as managing the experiences in their destinations.

The few available research on the dynamism of destination image have focused on other contexts, apart from sub-Saharan African countries that have unique natural and cultural resources not available in other destinations. Given the current tourism growth rate for Africa in general being at an annual rate of 2% with sub-Saharan Africa growing at 3% for the year 2014 (UNWTO, 2015), it is imperative to ascertain the variations in destination image held by the tourists to the region in order to sustain the growth rate if not improving it. A country like Tanzania in East Africa with three of its tourist attraction attaining the status of natural wonders of Africa (Mount Kilimanjaro, Ngorongoro crater, and Serengeti wildebeest migration) as well as being ranked the fourth in natural attractions by the the Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Index of the World Economic Forum (Blanke & Chiesa, 2013) managed to attract only about 1 million tourists in 2012, representing a meagre of 2% of Africa's tourist market share (Blanke & Chiesa, 2013). With such disparity between attractiveness and tourism performance it is ideally positioned for testing the variations in destination image. The country's tourism performance might be due to the relatively poor country's image held by the tourists, among other factors. Since destination image varies with travel status of pre- and post travel, it is important to ascertain if the two images differ for Tanzania. If the post-trip image of the country is more favourable than the pre-trip then it can be concluded that the country has failed to market its unique attractions; on the other hand if the pre-trip image of the country is more favourable than the post trip then the country has failed to live up to expected tourists' experiences. The first case is likely to be the case of Tanzania given its natural attractions compared to the low number of tourist arrivals. As a means of affirming the relatively poor pre-trip Tanzanian image compared to the post-trip image, this study aimed at elucidating the pre- and post-trip image differences. From the fact that pre- and post-trip destination image is likely to be influenced by destination familiarity including previous visitation to a destination and knowledge about the destination (Baloglu, 2001), this study aimed at ascertaining image differences between first time visitors and repeat visitors to Tanzania, different time period used in planning the trip (planning horizon), and the usage of different sources of travel information.

## Destination image development

Defining destination image accurately has proven to be a challenge (Prayag, 2008; Stepchenkova & Mills, 2010; Tasci et al., 2007). This appears to be due to the presence of different destination image components as well as the dynamism of destination image. For instance Echtner and Ritchie (2005) indicate a destination image to vary on a continuum of functional-psychological characteristics. Echtner and Ritchie (2005) refer to the functional destination attributes to be those destination characteristics that are tangible and easily observable or measurable. The psychological characteristics of a destination on the other hand contrast those of functional by being abstract and not easily observed. Other researchers have focused on cognitive image, affective image (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Beerli & Martin, 2004; Lin, Morais, Kerstetter & Hou, 2007), as well as connotive image (Gartner, 1993) as

dimensions of destination image. Martin and Bosque (2008), in explaining destination image's cognitive and affective component, define the cognitive component as beliefs and knowledge a person has of a destination attributes. The affective part refers to the tourist feeling of a destination (Martin & Bosque, 2008). Since feelings are more subjective compared to beliefs/knowledge, the cognitive and affective part of destination image essentially reflects the functional and psychological dimensions of a destination image respectively. These myriad of conceptualization and different components of destination image have lead to different measurement of the concept with some researchers opting for the holistic overall destination image that factors in all the complexities of the concept (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999) or on one or more dimensions of the overall image. As some researchers have noted that the different image components make up the overall image (Kim & Yoon, 2003; Lin et al., 2007), this research opted for the operationalization of destination image as the overall image rather than as a sum of its components.

Up to date, the most comprehensive description of destination image development appears to be that of Gunn (1988). Gunn (1988) argues that image development process follows the sequence of accumulation of mental images of a destination, modification of the images through information, experiencing the destination, and modifying destination image after the trip. These steps were further integrated to form image types. Destination image types include organic, induced, and complex or modified image (Jeong et al., 2012). The organic image is created through non-commercial accumulated information sources, while the induced image is created through commercial sources (Echtner & Ritchie, 2005), like advertisements. The complex or modified image emerges after the tourist has travelled and experienced a destination. This evolution of destination image pertains to the process of information accumulation that lead scholars like Gartner (1993) to delineate different information sources or image change agents into categories to reflect image formation. Gartner's (1993) image change agents include overt, covert, autonomous, unsolicited, solicited and organic (see Gartner, 1993 for discussion on these agents). Lin et al. (2007) categorized destination image based on the effect of travel information search into baseline image and enhanced image with the former pertaining to the image held before collecting travel information, while the latter to the image after travel information were collected. The different categorization of destination image by different authors implies the concept is liable to be defined in various ways using different stages of travel and different sources of travel information. This study takes the stance that in spite of different categorization of destination image, the pre- and post-travel image is more stable and simpler than the other categorization. For example, the use of information in the initial stage of destination image formation image Lin et al. (2007) implies that tourists collect information only prior to their travel which is not the case (Vogt & Andereck, 2003) as tourist continue to collect travel related information during their travel.

## Pre-travel and post-travel image difference

Despite the theoretical underpinnings (Gartner, 1993; Echtner & Ritchie, 2003) indicating the evolution of destination image, few studies have embarked on ascertaining the destination image evolution. Studies that compared pre-trip and post-trip destination images (Lim, Chew, Lim & Liu, 2013; Wang & Davidson, 2010; Yilmaz et al., 2009) find the variation of destination image. Fakeye and Crompton (1991), in tracing the image development from organic to induced and finally to complex image, noted the presence of image differences between prospective, first time and repeat visitors. However, their study can be said to be only a proxy of the image development as the process was traced in different samples. Wang and Davidson (2010) noted a significant improvement between tourists' pre and

post-trip perception of Chinese tourists to Australia, based on a survey of tourists upon experiencing the destination. Jani and Hwang (2011), one of the few scholars focusing on Africa, researched the pre and post trip image differences between those who have visited Zanzibar Island and those who were anticipating travelling to that destination with the former having more positive image than the latter. Their study, however, failed to trace image development for the same tourists thus giving an incomplete image development process. Yilmaz et al's., (2009) tested differences in destination image between arriving and departing tourists to reflect pre and post-travel images. A highly contextual study by Vogt and Andereck (2003) through intercepting motorists in Arizona (USA) noted the image of the state to evolve as the motorists roamed over the state. The drawback of previous research on the changes in destination image emanates from the fact that most of the research utilized different respondents/sample for pre-post trip image change. This study aims at filling this gap by using the same sample for pre and post trip to Tanzania to ascertain the perceived image changes. The pre-trip destination image refers to the image of a destination held by an arriving tourist and developed thus from different informational stimulus. Post-trip destination image in this study is taken to be the consequential image held by the tourists after experiencing the destination in comparison with the pre-trip image held by the tourist before visiting the destination. The way post-trip image is conceived in this study implies it to be a modified or changed image. From the preceding discussion, the guiding hypothesis for this study is:

**H1**: there is a statistical significant difference between the pre- and post-trip destination image.

## Destination familiarity and destination image

Familiarity is a common concept in tourism literature that have been defined and operationalized differently (Baloglu, 2001: Gursoy & McCleary, 2004). Gursoy and McCleary (2003) perceive destination familiarity as the initial stages of destination knowledge that can lead to destination expertise that stands for better destination knowledge. Baloglu (2001) operationalized destination familiarity to be a combination of the amount of information collected by the tourists and previous experience with a destination. Baloglu (2001) points out that destination familiarity is a multidimensional construct with many diverse dimensions thus giving room for other dimensions that can influence familiarity or destination knowledge. Planning horizon (Gitelson & Crompton, 1993) or the time taken to plan a trip might be an influencing factor on destination familiarity since it indicates the time taken for a potential tourist to be exposed to different sources of information. Logically it seems to be important to factor in planning horizon on top of previous visit(s) to a destination and the sources of information used in ascertaining destination image differences held by tourists as there is a possibility of the images to be different under different familiarity dimensions. In testing these differences, this study hypothesized the following:

**H2**: there is a statistical significant difference in image change between first time visitors and repeat visitors to Tanzania.

**H3**: there are statistical significant differences in image change between tourists who had different planning horizons.

**H4**: users of different travel information sources significantly differ in the image of the destination.

## Methodology

This study utilized a positivistic paradigm through the use of a survey and quantitative approaches. The paradigm and the use of quantitative approaches were necessary as the topic has passed the exploratory stage with the contemporary research being geared at testing the concept under different contexts.

However, study of pre-post trip image formation and change pose certain methodological difficulties. Ideally, a study geared towards elucidating the pre and post trip image differences necessitates the use of the same sample of respondents (Wang & Davidson, 2010). Yilmaz et al. (2009), among the first to embark on elucidating the difference between pre and post destination image, used separate samples of arriving and departing tourists in capturing the pre and post destination image respectively. Such an approach might not reflect the actual changes in destination image occurring in the same person, rather the differences might be due to externalities emanating from individual differences as well as from travelling situations. Another approach in ascertainin image difference is through asking the same tourists to respond to a set of same paired items capturing the pre and post-trip image. Wang and Davidson (2010) utilized departing tourists in ascertaining the image differences by having a pair of 21 identical items with one pair item measuring pre-trip and the other post-trip destination image. Their approach could lead to response bias due to monotony in the statement. In contrast, this study used 14 destination image items that captured pre and post-trip destination image variations using the same items. The questions were framed in such a manner that indicates whether the image had changed or remained the same rather than asking the tourists to respond to items for pre and post-trip destination image. Such an approach is likely to lead to a more precise estimation of image difference/change from the same respondents. Moreover, the approach is more efficient and effective as the respondents have fewer set of items to respond to as well as being a lesser burden to the respondents as it avoids the need to respond to the same image variable twice when responding to pre and then to post-trip image separately.

A close-ended questionnaire was used for data collection. It consisted of three sections: the first captured demographic variables like age, gender, level of education; the second section contained variables pertaining to the trip planning and destination familiarity such as previous visitation status, planning horizon for the trip, and the sources of travel information, while the last section contained 14 items on destination image change and 4 items on satisfaction and behavioural intention. The 14 items capturing destination image change were derived from the literature (Beerli & Martin, 2004; Echtner & Ritchie, 2005; Wang & Davidson, 2010; Yilmaz et al., 2009) and included infrastructure, adventure, nature, friendliness of locals, suitability of the destination to the family, cleanliness, beauty, accessibility, culture, safety and security, and accommodations. To capture the image variations using single statements, prepositional words like 'after' or 'before' were used; example '*my impression of safety and security in Tanzania has increased after my visit to Tanzania*'. A 5-point Likert-type scale was used, with 5 indicating the strong agreement while 1 strong disagreement with the statement. The midway of the scale was 3 that indicated neutrality for the statements. For satisfaction, 2 items for measured the overall satisfaction level while the remaining 2 items evoked the revisit intention and readiness to promote the country through the word of mouth. Similarly, 5-point Likert type scale was used, with 5 standing for satisfaction/likely to behave and 1 for unsatisfactory experience/unlikely to behave, and with a neutral mid-point. As the aim of the study was to capture information from international tourist, questionnaire was developed in English.

Population for this study was defined as all international tourists departing Tanzania through its major Julius Kambarage Nyerere International airport in Dar-es-Salaam. Data collection took place in the

first two weeks of August, 2014 that coincided with the tourism season in the country. Convenient sampling was used as it was difficult to construct a sample frame of all departing tourists. Tourists in the departure lounge waiting to board their plane during the day were approached by trained research assistant. The research assistant approached and asked the traveller whether he/she was a Tanzanian resident or not, all who were not residents were considered to be potential respondents for the study. The research assistant explained the objectives of the study to the potential respondents; upon agreeing the respondent was given a questionnaire to fill. Before filling the questionnaire, the respondents were ensured anonymity as the questionnaire did not require one to fill in personal particulars like name and address. Efforts were made to ensure balance in the sample with respect to observable demographic variables like age and gender. A total of 300 questionnaires were completed with 294 questionnaires being full completed.

The collected data were subjected to descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. In testing the image variations (Hypothesis 1) the inferential statistics of one sample t-test was employed with the neutral value of 3 in the items as a testing value. ANOVA tests were used as inferential statistics for the remaining hypotheses. In deducing the mean differences between the test groups, the Scheffe post hoc test was used as it is regarded to be more conservative (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and thus being able to accurately identify the significance of the mean differences.

# Results

The sample profile of the respondents is indicated in Table 1. Gender wise the sample was balanced. Age wise, majority were younger travellers with 67% under 34 years of age and more than three quarter (86.4%) had an education above high school. Most respondents have travelled with a companion or in a group of friend (84%). In terms of trip planning, for 60% of respondent's trip was planned for four or more months. More than half of the respondents (55.8%) indicate to have used a combination of sources of information. The usage of Internet and word of mouth from friends and relatives were almost similar in percentage, while printed sources of information like magazines, newspaper, and brochure were the least used. Such wide search for information is understandable given that for 79% of respondents this was their first trip to Tanzania. A large part of the sample – 43% were fully independent travellers, with further 28% on a partial and about the same number on a full package.

Table 1
**Socio-demographic profile of respondents and their familiarity with destination**

| Demographic/Familiarity | Frequency | % |
|---|---|---|
| **Gender (n=290)** | | |
| Male | 143 | 49.3 |
| Female | 147 | 50.6 |
| **Age in years (n=291)** | | |
| 15-24 | 75 | 25.8 |
| 25-34 | 119 | 40.9 |
| 35-44 | 41 | 14.1 |
| 45 and above | 56 | 19.2 |
| **Education (n=293)** | | |
| High school and below | 40 | 13.6 |
| College | 56 | 19.1 |
| University | 146 | 49.8 |
| Postgraduate | 51 | 17.4 |

Table 1 **Continued**

| Demographic/Familiarity | Frequency | % |
|---|---|---|
| **Pre-trip planning (n=294)** | | |
| Less than 1 month | 36 | 12.2 |
| 2-3 months | 81 | 27.6 |
| 4-6 months | 77 | 26.2 |
| More than 6 months | 100 | 34.0 |
| **Prior visitation to Tanzania (n=292)** | | |
| Yes | 61 | 20.9 |
| No | 231 | 79.1 |
| **Sources of travel information (n=294)** | | |
| Printed materials | 14 | 4.8 |
| Word of mouth | 56 | 19.0 |
| Internet | 60 | 20.4 |
| Combination of sources | 164 | 55.8 |

In testing the first hypothesis that was geared towards ascertaining image change between the pre and post-trip image of Tanzania, a series of one sample t-test with a test value of 3 was performed on the 14 image statements with the results displayed as Table 2. Among the 14 image items the t-tests indicates a significant statistical improvement in the image of Tanzania as the post-trip image is perceived to be more favourable than the pre-trip image. Only 1 statement pertaining to the infrastructure of the country indicates to have statistically significant gravitated towards the negative side with the pre-trip image being more favourable than the post-trip image. Three destination image attributes had t-values that were not statistically significant indicating an ambivalence of the pre and post-trip image held by the tourists. Since some of the destination image attributes were not significant, hypothesis 1 is partially rejected.

Table 2
**One sample t-test for pre and post-trip image differences**

| Destination image statement | Mean | St. dev. | t-value | Post-trip status |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Infrastructures (roads) | 2.72 | 0.987 | -4.793** | -VE |
| International standards | 2.83 | 0.969 | -3.019** | +VE |
| Adventurous | 4.10 | 0.898 | 20.973** | +VE |
| Nature | 3.89 | 0.928 | 16.399** | +VE |
| Friendly locals | 2.71 | 1.215 | -4.045** | +VE |
| Children and families destination | 2.91 | 0.977 | -1.500 | NIL |
| Beaches | 3.26 | 1.089 | 4.077** | +VE |
| National parks | 3.68 | 0.891 | 13.136** | +VE |
| Easy and comfortable travel | 2.89 | 1.092 | -1.768 | NIL |
| Unspoiled and undamaged environment | 3.22 | 2.649 | 1.341 | NIL |
| Flora and fauna | 3.52 | 0.960 | 9.311** | +VE |
| Historical or cultural | 3.47 | 0.989 | 8.047** | +VE |
| Good hotels/accommodation | 3.48 | 0.986 | 8.310** | +VE |
| Safety and security | 3.27 | 1.102 | 4.181** | +VE |

NB: ** p value<0.01, +VE Positive change, -VE Negative change

In statistically ascertaining the satisfaction level of the tourist with their Tanzanian trip together with their likelihood of revisiting the country and them being a good ambassador for the country in spreading good words to other potential tourists, one sample t-tests were performed with 3 being the test value. The results are presented in Table 3. All the scale items indicate to be statistically significant with the means being greater than the benchmark of 3 indicating the satisfaction of the tourists and likelihood to revisit the country given the opportunity as well as being good ambassador for the country.

Table 3
**One sample t-test for tourist satisfaction and behavioural intentions**

| Scale item | | Mean | St. dev. | t-value | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TS** | Satisfaction | 4.24 | 0.792 | 26.873** | +VE |
| | Happy with trip experience | 4.36 | 0.745 | 31.263** | +VE |
| **RI** | Revisit intention | 4.10 | 0.882 | 21.348** | +VE |
| **WOM** | Intention to spread positive WOM | 4.10 | 0.825 | 22.768** | +VE |

NB: TS-tourist satisfaction, RI-revisit intention, WOM-word of mouth,
** p value<0.01, +VE Positive change, -VE Negative change

The second hypothesis addressing the relationship between image variations and the tourists' previous visit to Tanzania was tested through independent sample t-tests with the results presented in Table 4. Only three destination image attributes including adventure, nature, and easy and comfortable transport are noted to vary between the tourist status of being repeat or first time visitor. The means for Tanzania being adventurous and having natural attractions are significantly higher for the first time visitors compared to repeat visitors. For the country having an easy and comfortable travel, the mean score for repeat visitors is significantly higher compared to the first time visitors. For the other destination image attributes, there are slight albeit statistically not significant differences. As a few of the destination image attributes differ significantly between the first time and repeat visitors, hypothesis 2 is partly rejected.

Table 4
**One sample t-test on the effect of previous visit and changes in image**

| Destination image statement | Mean | | t-value |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Repeat visitor | 1st time visitor | |
| Infrastructures (roads) | 2.92 | 2.68 | 3.659 |
| International standards | 2.67 | 2.87 | -1.447 |
| Adventure | 3.76 | 4.19 | -2.693* |
| Nature | 3.68 | 3.95 | -2.017* |
| Friendly locals | 2.83 | 2.67 | 0.959 |
| Children and family friendly destination | 2.90 | 2.91 | -0.058 |
| Beaches | 3.20 | 3.26 | -0.380 |
| National parks | 3.62 | 3.70 | -0.611 |
| Easy and comfortable travel | 3.20 | 2.80 | 2.520* |
| Unspoiled and pristine environment | 3.00 | 3.09 | -0.626 |
| Flora and fauna | 3.32 | 3.57 | -1.809 |
| Historical or cultural attractions | 3.59 | 3.44 | 1.060 |
| Good hotels/accommodation | 3.29 | 3.53 | -1.706 |
| Safety and security | 3.23 | 3.27 | 1.272 |
| Satisfaction | 4.07 | 4.29 | -1.936 |
| Happy with trip experience | 4.23 | 4.40 | -1.504 |
| Revisit intention | 4.18 | 4.07 | 0.838 |
| Intention to spread positive WOM | 4.08 | 4.10 | -0.147 |

* p value<0.05

In testing if there are statistically significant differences in the destination image between different groups of tourists with different pre-trip planning time (Hypothesis 3), a series of one way ANOVA was used with the Scheffe post hoc test to ascertain which groups have means that differ significantly. The results of the tests are presented as Table 5. Generally, the means become more favourable with the increase in the planning horizon. Four (4) destination image attributes indicates to differ with the

four groups of tourist's planning horizons, specifically these are beaches, national parks, hotel/accommodation, and safety and security. In exploring the relationship between planning horizon with tourist satisfaction and behavioural intentions, one way ANOVA test was employed with the results included in Table 5. The results indicate the means for satisfaction and behavioural intentions (likelihood of revisiting the country when opportunity arises and being a good ambassador for the country) to increase significantly at p-value of 0.05. These results consequently led to the partial rejection of hypothesis 3.

Table 5
**ANOVA test for planning horizon and destination image attributes**

| Image attribute | Means for destination image change for planning horizon in months | | | | F-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <1 | 2-3 | 4-6 | >6 | |
| Infrastructures (roads) | 2.69 | 2.65 | 2.71 | 2.80 | 0.350 |
| International standards | 3.21 | 2.81 | 2.79 | 2.74 | 2.059 |
| Adventurous | 4.11 | 3.93 | 4.14 | 4.21 | 1.581 |
| Nature | 3.89 | 3.84 | 3.89 | 3.93 | 0.142 |
| Friendly locals | 2.91 | 2.85 | 2.53 | 2.67 | 1.316 |
| Children and families destination | 3.12 | 2.94 | 2.78 | 2.93 | 1.006 |
| Beaches | 2.77[a] | 3.19[ab] | 3.36[b] | 3.41[b] | 3.424* |
| National parks | 3.29[a] | 3.56[ab] | 3.72[ab] | 3.90[b] | 5.109* |
| Easy and comfortable travel | 2.57 | 2.98 | 2.74 | 3.04 | 2.294 |
| Unspoiled and undamaged environment | 2.97 | 3.17 | 2.88 | 3.19 | 1.767 |
| Flora and fauna | 3.49 | 3.37 | 3.53 | 3.65 | 1.290 |
| Historical or cultural | 3.34 | 3.35 | 3.38 | 3.68 | 2.320 |
| Good hotels/accommodation | 3.40[a] | 3.28[a] | 3.38[a] | 3.75[b] | 3.973* |
| Safety and security | 2.89[a] | 3.21[ab] | 3.26[ab] | 3.46[b] | 2.549* |
| Satisfaction | 3.89[a] | 4.19[ab] | 4.29[b] | 4.38[b] | 3.714* |
| Happy with trip experience | 4.06[a] | 4.36[ab] | 4.35[ab] | 4.48[b] | 2.914* |
| Revisit intention | 3.83[a] | 4.19[ab] | 3.91[ab] | 4.27[b] | 3.898* |
| Intention to spread good WOM | 3.58[a] | 4.14[b] | 4.14[b] | 4.21[b] | 5.678* |

NB: [a] and [b] indicate similarity in group means
* p value<0.05

A series of one-way ANOVA was used in testing hypothesis 4 relating the destination image and the sources of travel information used with the results shown in Table 6. All the destination image attributes indicate to have means that do not differ statistically between the groups that use different sources of travel information. For likelihood of revisiting the country, those who used the Internet had lower means compared to those who used printed materials, word of mouth, and those who used combined sources of travel information. Since most of the destination image attributes did not differ between the different sources of travel information used, hypothesis 4 is rejected.

Table 6
**ANOVA test for sources of travel information and destination image attributes**

| Image attribute | Means for destination image change for sources of information | | | | F-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Printed | WOM | Internet | Combination | |
| Infrastructures (roads) | 2.88 | 2.55 | 3.00 | 2.70 | 1.483 |
| International standards | 2.92 | 2.95 | 2.79 | 2.76 | 0.724 |
| Adventure | 4.23 | 3.98 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 1.123 |
| Nature | 4.07 | 3.68 | 4.14 | 3.88 | 2.075 |
| Friendly locals | 2.60 | 2.79 | 3.21 | 2.69 | 1.063 |
| Children and family friendly destination | 3.05 | 3.07 | 2.86 | 2.81 | 1.461 |
| Beaches | 3.27 | 3.16 | 2.93 | 3.32 | 0.746 |

Table 6 **Continued**

| Image attribute | Means for destination image change for sources of information | | | | F-value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Printed | WOM | Internet | Combination | |
| National parks | 3.52 | 3.62 | 3.86 | 3.75 | 1.327 |
| Easy and comfortable travel | 2.90 | 2.71 | 3.00 | 2.93 | 0.609 |
| Unspoiled and pristine environment | 3.13 | 3.14 | 3.14 | 3.03 | 0.275 |
| Flora and fauna | 3.45 | 3.55 | 3.43 | 3.55 | 0.209 |
| Historical or cultural attractions | 3.37 | 3.80 | 3.50 | 3.39 | 2.695 |
| Good hotels/accommodation | 3.52 | 3.553 | 3.50 | 3.45 | 0.128 |
| Safety and security | 3.15 | 3.43 | 3.36 | 3.25 | 0.669 |
| Satisfaction | 4.10 | 4.27 | 3.93 | 4.31 | 1.823 |
| Happy with trip experience | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.00 | 4.42 | 1.825 |
| Revisit intention | 4.00[a] | 4.16[a] | 3.50[b] | 4.16[a] | 2.849* |
| Intention to spread positive WOM | 4.00 | 4.09 | 3.79 | 4.16 | 1.250 |

* p value<0.05

# Conclusions

The study aimed at elucidating the variations between the pre- and post-trip image of inbound tourists to Tanzania as well as ascertaining the variation of destination image with tourists' planning horizons, previous visitation, and the source of information used during their travel planning. The destination image for many attributes improved significantly after visitation. Generally, the tourists were satisfied with their Tanzanian experiences and they are likely to revisit when the opportunity arises as well as being good ambassadors for the country. First time visitors have higher image of the country on adventure and nature compared to repeat visitors while repeat visitors perceive the country to have an easy and comfortable travel than first timers. Planning horizon has an influence on some destination image held by the tourists while the source of information used by travellers does not influence the destination image.

The noted positive and negative image shifts between pre- and post-trip image of Tanzania serves in informing the country's destination marketers and managers in tourism related businesses. The significant negative shift in the country's image in its infrastructure coupled by the low mean for the country's easiness and comfortable travel within the country albeit the mean being non significant ($p<0.05$), indicates the low level development of its infrastructure that gives message to the government to improve the infrastructure. The ambivalence tourist perception of the country being good for children and family might be due to the country's' and tourism business over reliance on safari and nature based tourism at the expense of utilizing and/or developing alternative tourist attractions. This implies the destination managers including managers for tourism business to improve their facilities, infrastructures, as well as increasing attractions for the whole family. For the other destination image perceptions that improved after visitation is a good signal as it indicates the tourists to have enjoyed the destination in those attributes. Despite indicating improvement in image after visitation for some image attributes, the positive shifts that indicate the pre-visit image to be relatively lower compared to post-trip image might lead into potential tourist to select other alternative destinations with more favourable pre-trip images. This is in line with the general beliefs that the pre-trip destination image to be one of the key determinants in destination selection (Um & Crompton, 1990). Borrowing from the expectation-disconfirmation model of customer satisfaction (Oliver, 1997), narrowing the gap between pre- and post-trip destination images, destination marketers and tourism managers should ensure that they communicate with the potential tourists in an effective and efficient ways to create

the desirable image as well as serving the tourists in accordance to the way they have communicated with the tourists. Consequently this study partially rejects the first hypothesis.

The majority of the tourists in the current study sample were first time visitors as well as having relatively longer planning horizons of more than a month coupled with the use of multiple sources of information. This might be due to Tanzania being a long haul tourist destination for its European and American main markets (URT, 2013). Being a long haul destination implies an increased in perceived travel risks as the potential tourist are likely to have lesser knowledge about the destinations. This is in line with Schmallengger and Carson's (2008) observations of long haul international tourists having relatively longer planning horizons. Quintal, Lee and Soutar (2011) indicates the extent of travel information search to depend on the tourist perceived risks. The planning horizon concept used in this study relates with the extent of travel information search and thus it can be concluded that tourists to Tanzania have longer planning horizons to reduce the perceived travel risks of related to the long haul travel to Tanzania. The reliance of more than one source of travel information with substantial tourists using their social networks (friends and relatives) in obtaining travel information might be due to the long haul destination for the majority of tourists visiting the country. As per Gartner's (1993) indication of tourists' high credibility of word of mouth as a source of information, the current research findings with high usage of word of mouth can be taken as an indication of the long haul destination status of the country. For destination marketers in a country like Tanzania, these findings implies that the marketers need to need to communicate with the long haul American and European markets continuously to ensure the potential tourists can get information about the country. The high use of Internet and word of mouth by tourists as well as their combination in getting travel information implies marketers should use these sources extensively compared to the use of print media that are losing ground in informing the potential tourists.

The indifferences in many of the image attributes between the first time visitors and repeat visitors observed in this study reflect findings from some previous studies (e.g. Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). This might imply image saturation (Jeong & Holland, 2012) to occur during the first time visit a destination and thus making subsequent visits to have no additional effects. The two image attributes (adventurous and nature) that decreased with repeat visitation might imply that first time tourists to Tanzania were much amazed by the abundant nature and the Safari travel that are the main tourist attractions for the country. This further strength the destination image saturation notion as the subsequent visitation to the destination leads no further improvement of the destination image. Practically, these findings suggest product diversification and improvement in the destination in order for the repeat visitors to experience something new that will lead into continuous destination improvement with subsequent visitations. The perception of Tanzania having an easy and comfortable travel that was higher for repeat visitors compared to first time visitors seem to go contrary to the saturation concept. This might be due to increase knowledge of the repeat visitors making them to know the destination infrastructure better that their counterparts. This shouldn't blind the destination managers into complacency but to continuous improve their infrastructure that will lead into more favourable designation image. From the study findings, the second hypothesis is thus generally rejected.

The results for the test of image differences between tourists with different planning horizons (H3) indicates four destination image attributes to improve significantly with the increase in the planning horizons while the other image attributes did not differ significantly with the planning horizons. Thus this study partially rejects the hypothesis with respect to those attributes that were not statistically significant. Beach and national parks among the image attributes that improved significantly with an

increase in planning horizons are the two main tourist attractions in the country. The other two include accommodation and safety/security in the country. These results imply that destination marketers can ensure the image held by the tourists is favourable if they can communicate with their potential tourists well in advance prior to their actual travel. With the development of information communication technologies and the Internet, the destination marketers can electronically hook up with tourism stakeholders globally like travel agents in the source markets that can provide them with an early alarm showing the potential tourists considering their destinations. Upon receiving such alarms, the destination marketers can send information about their destinations that will make the tourists to be well conversant with the destination and thus planning their trip well in advance. The increase in the levels of tourist satisfaction and their positive behavioural intentions (revisiting and word of mouth) with the increase in their planning horizons further justifies the need for destination marketers to communicate with their potential tourists well in advance prior to their travel into the destinations.

Contrary to hypothesis 4, the results indicate the destination image not to vary with the use of different sources of travel information. Compared to previous studies that indicate a specific type of information source to have a significant influence on the image of the destination (Frias, Rodriguez & Castaneda, 2008; Hanlan & Kelly, 2005; Molina, Gomez & Martin-Consuerga, 2010), the current study findings shed light on to the means of promoting Tanzania as a touristic destination. Since there were no statistical differences in destination image between the different sources of travel information, Tanzanian destination marketers can opt to use any of the information sources in any combination with the assurance that they will be effective as the other sources. A possible reason for the lack of differences in destination image by the different sources of travel information might be due to the exoticness of Tanzania and its lack of presence in popular media implying most of the potential tourists to lack an organic image of the country. The possibility of lacking an organic image of Tanzania by the tourists imply that the tourists form a concrete image of Tanzania after they have made a decision to travel thereafter collecting information that form the induced image which is similar to tourists using different sources of travel information.

Theoretically and methodologically, this study provides some implications. The overall general trend in the improvement of destination image after travel like other previous studies (Wang & Davidson, 2010) upholds the dynamism perspective of destination image. Methodologically, the successful use of single items to appraise the changes in destination image used in this study validates the application of such approach on top of the conventional use of paired items for pre- and post-trip destination image and the use of longitudinal studies that trace the change in destination image. The method has several advantages including minimization of boredom to the respondents and the likelihood of either not responding or responding without reading the questionnaire by the respondents in the longer questionnaires.

Despite the study being informative to destination marketers and academia, the study had several limitations that should be considered in extending the study results. From the fact that the study was carried in an African country particular Tanzania, the image change for the different destination attributes observed in this study should not imply that other studies undertaken in different context should be the same. Since destination image varies with destinations, then logically different results from different destinations might differ from those observed in this study. Moreover, from the fact that destination image vary from time to time for the same destination (Tasci & Holecek, 2007), the results from this study undertaken for the particular period (i.e. 2013) should not imply that the results will hold forever for the country. Future research could be directed towards complimenting this study by extending destination image comparison in other contexts.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the University of Dar es Salaam Business School under BSPS III DANIDA Grant [2013].

# References

Baloglu, S. (2001). Image variations of Turkey by familiarity index: informational and experiential dimensions. *Tourism Management, 22*(2), 127-133.

Baloglu, S. & McCleary, K. W. (1999). U.S. international pleasure travellers' image of four Mediterranean destinations: a comparison of visitor and no visitor. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*, 144-152.

Banyai, M. & Glover, T. D. (2012). Evaluating research methods on travel blogs. *Journal of Travel Research*, *51*(3), 267-277.

Beerli, A. & Martin, J. D. (2004). Tourists' characteristics and the perceived image of tourist destinations: a quantitative analysis- A case study of Lonzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management, 25*(5), 623-636.

Blanke, J. & Chiesa, T. (2013). *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report: Reducing Barriers to Economic Growth and Job Creation*. Geneva: World Economic Forum.

Chon, K. S. (1991). Tourism destination image modification process: marketing implications. *Tourism Management, 12*(1), 68-72.

Choo, C. S., Jani, D. & Hwang, Y. H. (2011). Differences in travel motivations by tripographics: push and pull factor approach. *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Research, 23*(1), 667-681.

Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (1993). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, *14*(1), 37-48.

Echtner, C. M. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2005). The measurement of destination image: an empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research, 31*(4), 3-13.

Fakeye, P. C. & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeate visitors to the Lower Rio Grand Valley. *Journal of Travel Research, 30*(2), 10-16.

Frias, D. M., Rodriguez, M. A. & Castaneda, J. A. (2008). Internet vs. travel agencies on pre-visit image formation: An information processing view. *Tourism Management, 29*, 163–179.

Frias, D. M., Rodgriguez, M. A., Casteneda, J. A., Sabiote, C. M. & Buhalis, D. (2012). The formation of a tourist destination's image via information sources: the moderating effect of culture. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 14*(5), 437-450.

Gartner, W. C. (1993). Image formation process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *2*(2/3), 191-215.

Gitelson, R. J. & Crompton, J. L. (1993). The planning horizons and sources of information used by pleasure vacationers. *Journal of Travel research*, *21*(3), 2-7.

Gunn, C. (1988). *Vacationscapes: Designing tourist regions*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Gursoy, D. & McCleary, K. W. (2004). An integrated model of tourists' information search behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(2), 353-373.

Hanlan, J. & Kelly, S. (2005). Image formation, information sources and an iconic Australian tourist destination. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 11*(2), 163-177.

Hsieh, H. F. & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research, 15*(9), 1277-128.

Jani, D. & Hwang, Y. H. (2011). User-generated destination image through Weblogs: a comparison of pre- and post-visit images. *Asia pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 16*(3), 339-356.

Jeong, C. & Holland, S. (2012). Destination image saturation. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 29*, 501-519.

Jeong, C., Holland, S., Jun, S. H. & Gibson, H. (2012). Enhancing destination image through travel website information. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 14*, 16-27.

Kim, S. & Yoon, Y. Y. (2003). The hierarchical effects of affective and cognitive components of tourism destination image. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 14*(2), 1-22.

Lim, C., Chew, S. L., Lim, Z. Y. & Liu, W. (2013). Pre- and post-vistit perceptions of youth tourists to China. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2013.849637.

Lin, C. H., Morais, D. B., Kerstetter, D. L. & Hou, J. S. (2007). Examining the role of cognitive and affective image in predicting choice across natural, developed, and theme-park destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*, 183-194.

Lin, Y. H., Chen, C. C. & Park, C. W. (2012). The salient and organic images of Taiwan as perceived by Mainland Chines tourists. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 17*(4), 381-393.

Martin, H. S. & Bosque, I. A. R. (2008). Exploring the cognitive-affective nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management, 29*, 263-277.

Molina, A., Gomez, M. & Martin-Cousuerga, D. (2010). Tourism marketing information and destination image management. *African Journal of Business Management, 4*(5), 722-728.

Newsome, D., Moore, S. A. & Dowling, R. K. (1998). *Natural Area Tourism: Ecology, Impact and Management*. Cahnnel View Publications.

Oliver, R. L. (1997). *Satisfaction: A behavioural perspective on the consumer*. New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Prayag, G. (2008). Image, satisfaction and loyalty-the case of Cape Town. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research, 19*(2), 205-224.

Prayag, G. & Ryan, C. (2012). Antecedents of tourists' loyalty to Mauritius: the role and influence of destination image, place attachment, personal involvement, and satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research, 51*(3), 342-356.

Quintal, V. A., Lee, J. A. & Soutar, G. N. (2011). Tourists' information search: the differential impact of risk and uncertainty avoidance. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *12*(4), 321-333.

Ritchie, J. R. & Hudson, S. (2009). Understanding and meeting the challenges of consume/tourist experience research. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 11*, 111-126.

Schmallenger, D. & Carson, D. (2008). Information search and trip planning behaviour of international and domestic four wheel drive travellers in Central Australia. *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Council for Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education* (CAUTHE) (pp. 1-10). Gold Coast, 11-14 February, 2008. Surfers Paradise, QLD, Australia.

Stepchenkova, S. & Mills, J. E. (2010). Destination image: a meta-analysis of 2000-2007 research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 19*(6), 575-609.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tasci, A. D. A & Holecek, D. F. (2007). Assessment of image change over time: the case of Michigan. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 13*(4), 359-369.

Tasci, A. D. A., Gartner, W. C. & Cavusgil, S. T. (2007). Conceptualization and operationalization of destination image. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *31*(2), 194-223.

Um, S. & Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*, 432-448.

UNWTO. (2015). *Tourism Highlights*. Retrieved December 20, 2015 from http://www2.unwto.org/annualreport2014).

Vogt, C. A. & Andereck, K. L. (2003). Destination perceptions across a vacation. *Journal of Travel Research, 41*, 348-354.

Wang, Y. & Davidson, M. C. G. (2010). Pre- and post-trip perceptions: an insight into Chinese package holiday market in Australia. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 16*(2), 111-123.

Yilmaz, Y., Yilmaz, Y., Icigen, E. T., Ekin, Y. & Utku, B. D. (2009). Destination image: a comparative study on pre and post trip image variations. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management, 18*, 461-479.

Submitted: 13/08/2015
Accepted: 14/03/2016