

Australian and Russian Tourists' Perceptions of Phuket's Destination Image

Pichamon Thongkudam
MBA in Hospitality and Tourism
Faculty of Hospitality and Tourism
Prince of Songkla University, Phuket 83000
Email: konuke_eyrey@hotmail.com

Pornpisanu Promsivapallop, Ph.D.
Hospitality Management Research Unit
Faculty of Hospitality and Tourism
Prince of Songkla University, Phuket 83000
Email: promsivapallop@gmail.com

Abstract

This study presents the finding of the present destination image of Phuket perceived by Australian and Russian's tourists. The objectives are to determine whether there are differences on Phuket's destination image perceived by two nationalities. In addition, it aims to investigate the relationship between Phuket's destination image and future behavioral intentions. There were 450 questionnaires distributed to the tourists, only 410 valid questionnaires were completed. The analysis of findings indicated the influence of nationality in a way Phuket was perceived using four destination factors as the independent variables including natural and cultural environment, social and safety environment, variety of tourist infrastructures and attractions, public transportation and traffic. The results stated that public transportation and traffic had the highest mean difference in a way image was perceived between two nationalities; Australians mostly perceived Phuket as a good place to enjoy wide varieties of tourist infrastructures and attractions. Differently, Russians perceived Phuket as excellent natural and cultural environment than other counterparts. Nevertheless, Russians have higher positive attitudes on overall image and future behavioral intentions than Australians at the moderate positive level. The research also indicated the most influenced factor that has strongest impacts on three constructs; the natural and cultural environment played a direct relationship to overall image and future behavioral intentions for Australian. On the other hand, the social and safety environment directly influenced overall image and future behavioral intentions for Russian. Lastly, the investigation of Pearson Correlation concluded that overall image was in between moderate to large relationship to future behavioral intentions. It confirmed the internal relationship of three constructs which originally influenced by the perceived quality of Phuket as a tourists' destination

Keywords: Destination image, Russian tourists, Australian tourists, future behavioral intentions

1. Introduction

Tourism has been recognized as the economic activity which rapidly grows into the world's largest industry. Tourism activities could not exist without the potential tourists, Pike (2008) defined the meaning of tourist as a temporary visitor to a destination. In the eyes of the tourists, tourist destination may consist of many attractive tourist destinations with their unique characteristics. The studies indicated that the destination image perceived by visitors has played an important role in the destination selection process (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Crompton, 1979; Gallaza, Saura, & Garcia, Hunt, 1975; 2002). Several studies claimed evidence that most favorable destination in visitor's mind is more likely the destination with positive image (Crompton, 1979; Echtner & Ritchie, 1991; Kale & Weir, 1986). Especially positive images and high satisfaction level are more likely lead the tourists to revisit and recommend the destination to others (Milman & Pizam, 1995; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2005; Chen & Tsai, 2007). Hence, in tourism, future behavioral intentions are measured using two factors including the willingness to recommend (word of mouth/WOM) and revisit intentions (Bigne' et al., 2001; Chen & Gursoy, 2001; Baloglu et al., 2003; Petrick, 2004). Therefore, evaluation of current destination image and identify the importance of destination's attributes is necessary as the destination marketers to maintain the positive image and minimize the negative image in order to increase the destination positioning.

With the rapid tourism growth, Thailand has various tourist attractions on offer for tourists through all regions. One of the most crowded tourists' preferences is "Phuket" - an island in the Southern part of Thailand which has been publicized as one of the best tourist attractions in this region for sea, sand, and sun. Regarding to Travel and Leisure, the World's Leading Tourism Magazine, Phuket was awarded as the third best island in Asia (Travel & Leisure, 2009). The full supports from advertising, international awards, WOM and its beauties highly pushed up its position to become one of the best destinations the tourists

should not miss. With an anonymous numbers of tourists visited each year, however, there were a few nationalities which gradually grown from time to time and became the top two nationalities visited Phuket since 2009-2010 including Australian and Russian markets. Statistically, there were 335,000 Australians and 279,800 Russians visited Phuket (Office of Tourism Development, 2010). The objectives of this study are to find the differences of Phuket's destination image perceived by two nationalities and investigate the relationship between overall image and future behavioral intentions. The findings showed the actual image perceived and specified which destination attribute highly represented Phuket in general. Moreover, it emphasized the importance of maintaining the positive image in order to increase the future behavioral intentions of each nationality. So, the future destination management from both public and private sectors will directly work strength to the point and create better destination competitiveness.

2. Literature review

2.1 Definition of Destination

Destinations are the places that attract the tourists for a temporary stay (Pike, 2004). World Tourism Organization defined a meaning of destination as "Local tourism destination" – physical space in which the tourist spends overnight, including tourism products, support services, attractions.

2.2 Definition of Image

Image defined by many authors as an individual's overall perception or total set of impressions of a place. In generally, image of the destination also significantly affect the tourist's decision making (Bigne, Sanchez & Sanchez, 2001).With a supporting analysis by United Nations World Tourism Organization (1979; Milman & Pizam 1995), image is explained as "an aura, an angel or a subjective perception which has been projected as the same message transmitter".

2.3 Destination Image Concept

Destination image is basically defined as an individual's mental picture or impression of a place, a product, or an experience (Milman and Pizam, 1995). According to Buhalis (2000) defined the destination image as a set of expectations and perceptions a particular

tourists has of a particular destination. The destination image can be recognized as the expression of knowledge, impression, prejudice, imagination and emotional thoughts of both an individual and group have on the specific destination (Lawson and Baud Bovy, 1977). According to Gunn (1972), organic image is formed at the beginning stage as the result of the expose to any non- tourism information sources such as newspaper, TV. Following by the induced image forming at the second stage as influenced by tourism information such as advertising, travel posters. After the actual visitation to the destination, tourists modify the induced image to become “modified-induced image” which means that the image can be changed through times and informational sources.

Woodside & Lysonski (1989) suggested the preference in destination decision process is based on the combination of affective and cognitive components. According to Baloglu & McCleary (1999), cognitive component of destination image formed from rational knowledge about the places, affective component of destination image from emotional feeling toward the places. Regarding to a common agreement among diverse researchers is that both cognitive and affective evaluations formed the overall tourists’ destination image formation. Cognitive component is defined as a beliefs or knowledge about the destination attributes. Affective component is defined as the feelings or emotional response towards destination attributes. (Gartner 1993; Baloglu and Mangalolu 2001; Pikkemaat and Peters 2003). Another studies from Echtner & Ritchie (1991) indicated that the evaluation of destination image need to consist of three dimension: cognitive (common attributes), affective (holistic image) and unique image.

Kozak (2002) noted a variety of influenced factors relatively affected the image such as age, income, personality, value of destination and motivation. Same as a study of Ritter (1987, 1989) mentioned that tourist’s perception is influenced by nationality which justified the differences in the way they perceived. Tourists in different cultures perceived differently (Mayo & Jarvis, 1981). People from individualistic cultures are motivated by convenience, pursuit of pleasure,

thrill, enjoyment and self-satisfaction. On the other hand, people from collective cultures are motivated by socializing and group activities in particular natural activities (Kozak, 2001).

2.4 Relationship of Image and Future Behavioral Intentions

The more favorable perceptions, the greater the likelihood of choosing a destination (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). It was suggested that images have an effect on post-visit behavior. Especially positive images and high satisfaction level are more likely lead the tourists to revisit and recommend the destination to others (Milman & Pizam, 1995; Rittichainuwat et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2005; Chen & Tsai, 2007). General behavioral intentions suggested that the future intentions are associated with the service provider’s ability to get customers to; (1) say positive thing about them (2) recommend them to others (3) remain loyalty (4) spend more (5) pay at premium (Zeithml et al., 1996).

3. Methodology

3.1 Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was comprised of four sections as follows; Section 1: Demographic profile of survey respondents. Section 2: Final of twenty-six destination attributes were employed to this study in the second section that consist of both cognitive and affective components and evaluated on 5 point Likert Scale as shown in figure 1. A list of attributes in this study has been analyzed and adopted from various former studies concerning with the measurement of destination images (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Gallarza, Saura et al, 2002; Pikkemaat & Peters, 2003). The structure of the scale was base on the following categories: *1 (Strongly Disagree)*, *2 (Disagree)*, *3 (Neutral/ Not Sure)*, *4 (Agree)* and *5 (Strongly Agree)* Section 3: Investigation the relationship of overall image with future behavioral intentions by using 7 point Likert-Type Scale in order to identify an interrelated possibility. The structure of the scale was base on the following categories: *1 (Very Negative)* to *7 (Very Positive)*.

The questionnaires were translated into two bilinguals - English and Russian to ensure that

the language barrier problem was eliminated and increase a convenience level for tourists.

Figure 1: List of Destination Attributes to measure Phuekt's destination image



3.2 Data Collection

The questionnaire was conducted to collect a primary data and measure the tourists' perception about Phuket and the behavioral intentions. With the help of secondary data reviewed from previous literature concerning about the destination image, the measurement of destination, image formation. In order to make sure that the sampling units represented the target population and find a better choice to make the comparison between two groups of tourists more reliable. The sample size needed to be equally allocated with the same portion size, in the other word 450 questionnaires were equally distributed to tourists, 225 questionnaires for both Australian and Russian tourists after actual visit to Phuket. The questionnaire was mainly distributed at Phuket International Airport. However, the distributions of questionnaires have been expanded to other business areas in Phuket due to the low response, lack of interest and language barriers in getting to Russian tourists after few days observation. The expansion areas were covering Kata beach and Patong beach.

4. Analysis of findings

Regarding to the amount of 450 questionnaires were distributed to Australian and Russian tourists at the end there were 410 valid questionnaires in return belongs to Australian 220 and 190 from Russian respondents

4.1 Comparison between profile and Australian and Russian tourists

There was a great difference between respondents' gender completed by Australian and Russian tourists. Australian respondents were more likely responded by male (59.1%) and female (40.9 %), Russian respondents majorly were female (61.1%) and male (38.9%). Most of Australian respondents were travelled alone (46.8%), in contrast, Russian respondents were travelled with family and relatives (52.6%). Most of Australian respondents travelled to Phuket for leisure and holiday (43.2%), followed by visiting Phuket for study professional courses such as Thai boxing, Thai language (21.4%). On the other hand, Russian respondents travelled to Phuket only for leisure and holiday (100%). Majority of Australian respondents were the repeater (56.4%), the first time visitors (43.6%) different from Russian respondents were the first time visitors (86.8%) and repeaters (13.2%). Statistically, Australian had visited Phuket before approximately three times. Russian had mostly visited Phuket for the first time. No differences between the two groups for the "age", "education" and "household income" variable were observed.

4.2 Comparison of the mean scores between destination's attributes perceived by Australian and Russian tourists

According to the list of destination attributes mentioned in figure 1, there were 26 variables were adopted and employed in this part both cognitive and affective components. (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999; Gallarza, Saura et al, 2002; Pikkemaat & Peters, 2003) in order to investigate differences between tourists' perceptions about Phuket. The mean score explained performances of destination attributes each nationality perceived.

As the result showed in table 1, the most powerful attribute which Australian tourists

mostly perceived Phuket's image was "Good accommodation and restaurant facilities" (mean

Destination Attributes	Australian Respondents (n = 220)			Russian Respondents (n = 190)		
	Ranking	Mean	Std. Deviation	Ranking	Mean	Std. Deviation
Good accommodations / restaurants	1	4.54	0.592	1	4.39	0.695
Good scenery, landscape, beautiful beach	2	4.52	0.553	1	4.39	0.755
Good quality of accommodation	3	4.32	0.648	15	3.99	0.823
Friendly local people	4	4.26	0.724	3	4.37	0.661
Good Climate	5	4.25	0.706	4	4.35	0.796
Variety and fun	6	4.23	0.648	9	4.17	0.772
Good quality of local cuisine or foods	6	4.23	0.678	13	4.05	0.795
Sufficient night life and entertainments	8	4.16	0.786	14	4.01	0.891
Good reputation	9	4.15	0.702	5	4.32	0.688
Opportunity for freedom	10	4.10	0.698	7	4.23	0.753
Easy for accessibility	10	4.10	0.724	20	3.86	1.017
Satisfied experiences/ adventurous feeling	12	4.05	0.653	26	3.55	1.105
Good shopping places	13	4.05	0.851	16	3.92	0.899
Relaxing Atmosphere	14	3.98	0.794	10	4.16	0.792
Sufficient sport and recreation activities	15	3.89	0.866	17	3.91	0.88

Table 1: Mean ranking of Phuket's Destination Attributes by two nationalities

Good hospitality, honesty, receptiveness	16	3.86	0.84	11	4.12	0.853
Diversity of traditions/cultures	17	3.84	0.839	12	4.1	0.845
Family-oriented	18	3.80	0.988	8	4.19	0.789
International service quality standard	19	3.61	0.855	22	3.82	0.818
Personal Safety	20	3.55	0.952	18	3.89	0.885
Unspoiled nature	21	3.54	0.898	21	3.83	0.899
Reasonable prices	21	3.54	1.128	19	3.87	0.85
Cultural/ Historical attractiveness	23	3.43	0.906	23	3.8	0.862
High Standard for sanitation/ cleanliness	24	3.39	0.887	25	3.6	1.045
Good local transportation/ infrastructure	25	3.00	1.190	6	4.23	0.705
Traffic is good	26	2.84	1.123	24	3.7	1.018

* Note: Attribute rankings were based on mean scores measured on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

Table 2: Summary of Phuket’s Destination Image perceived by two nationalities

Nationality	Rank	Positive Image	Rank	Negative Image
Australian	1	Variety of accommodation, restaurant facilities	1	Traffic problem in Phuket
	2	Good scenery, landscape and beautiful beaches	2	Insufficient local transportation and infrastructure
	3	Good quality of accommodation	3	Standard for sanitation and cleanliness
	4	Friendly local people	4	Very few cultural and historical attractiveness
	5	Good climate	5	Reasonable prices for living
Russian	1	Variety of accommodation, restaurant facilities	1	Dissatisfied experiences and adventurous feeling
	2	Good scenery, landscape and beautiful beaches	2	Standard for sanitation and cleanliness
	3	Friendly local people	3	Traffic problem in Phuket
	4	Good climate	4	Very few cultural and historical attractiveness
	5	Good reputation	5	International service standard quality

= 4.54, S.D. = 0.592), followed by “Good scenery/landscape/beautiful beaches” (mean = 4.52, S.D. = 0.553), “Good quality of accommodation” (mean = 4.32, S.D. = 0.648). The lowest scores that Australian tourists perceived was “Traffic is good” (mean = 2.84, S.D. = 1.123).

scenery/landscape/beautiful beaches” (mean = 4.39, S.D. = 0.755), “Friendly local people” (mean = 4.37, S.D. = 0.061). The lowest scores that Russian tourists perceived was “Satisfied experiences/ Adventurous feeling” (mean = 3.55, S.D. = 1.105). Table 2 summarized the findings; the positive images perceived by two nationalities were quite similar in term of natural & atmosphere environments, wide variety for selections and friendliness. On the negative side, the similar problems that both nationalities perceived as the worst attributes and need to be improved such as traffic problem in Phuket, standard for sanitation & cleanliness and very few cultural and historical attractions for tourists. There were other distinct images perceived negatively by each nationality

On the other hand, Russian tourists had similar opinions of well-performed attributes. The most important attribute that Phuket’s image was perceived was “Good accommodation and restaurant facilities” (mean = 4.39, S.D. = 0.695), followed by “Good

and need for improvement in term of prices, service quality, dissatisfied experience & adventurous feeling.

4.3 Factor analysis of Image perceived by Australian and Russian tourists

Through KMO and Bartlett’s test, the result revealed that the KMO index was 0.848, and the index of Bartlett’s test was significant at < 0.01 which was strongly acceptable for this study to test factorability of factor analysis. 26 destination attributes or variables were factor analysis through the principle component analysis. The default output revealed that there were 4 components with the eigenvalues exceeding 1.0 could be extracted from the original data and represented the most important factor on the image perceived by

Australian and Russian respondents. There was 1 destination attribute items in factor 1 were dropped because of its communality below 0.3 could indicated that “Good climate” does not fit well with the other items in its component (Pallant, 2010) and 4 factor solutions were extracted by Varimax Rotation to represent the dimension of Phuket destination image as shown in table 3.

A clear result pointed out that the attributes of Phuket destination were grouped into 4 factors solutions and explained a total of 46.41% of the variance which represented that 4 factors could represent totally 46.41% of all variables. Through Cronbach’s alpha test, all the alpha coefficients of Phuket Destination factors were ranged from 0.523 – 0.792 which demonstrated that the high correlations existed between these variables and there was a good reliability existing in this study. The highest factor loading should be considered as having a greater impact on the factor’s label. Therefore, factor 1 was labeled as “Natural & Cultural Environment”; factor 2 referred to “Social & Safety Environmental”, ; factor 3 was labeled as “Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions”; factor 4 was labeled as “Public Transportation & Traffic.

In conclusion, factor 3 “Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions” was the highest mean score at 4.14. This pointed out that tourists perceived this factor as the most excellent performance that made Phuket’s destination image positively favorable than other factors as reflected by the highest mean scores in “Good accommodations and restaurants” (M = 4.47) and “Variety and fun activities” (M = 4.20). On the other hand, the mean score of factor 4 “Public Transportation & Traffic (M = 3.24)” was relatively lower than the other factors, which indicated that the tourists did not much positively perceive this factor as good as it should be. The lowest score was “Good traffic conditions” (M = 3.24), followed by; “Good local transportation/

infrastructure” (M = 3.25). The reason maybe that Phuket increased in the number of both immigrants and migrates.

4.4 The differences of Image perceived by Australian and Russian tourists by nationality

As shown table 4, it was found that every factor was significantly differences in term of tourist’s perceptions of Phuket between two nationalities. There was a significant difference in term of “Factor 1: Natural & Cultural”

Table 3: Factor analysis of Phuket's Destination Attributes

Factor grouping	Factor loadings	Communality	Mean	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Reliability coefficient
Factor 1: Natural & Cultural Environment			4.00	6.261	25.043	0.769
Diversity of traditions/cultures	.651	.531	3.96			
Opportunity for freedom	.620	.447	4.16			
Unspoiled natures	.598	.378	3.67			
Satisfied experiences/adventurous feeling	.578	.443	4.14			
Relaxing atmosphere	.583	.422	4.06			
Good scenery, landscapes, beautiful beaches	.504	.458	4.46			
Family-oriented destination	.554	.453	3.98			
Cultural/ Historical attractiveness	.478	.300	3.60			
Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment			3.89	2.163	8.652	0.792
Good hospitality, honesty, receptiveness	.624	.512	3.97			
Friendly local people	.624	.544	4.31			
International service quality standard	.603	.538	3.70			
Good reputation	.595	.516	4.23			
Easy for accessibility	.582	.361	3.99			
High standard for sanitation/cleanliness	.557	.435	3.49			
Personal safety	.507	.385	3.70			
Reasonable price	.449	.328	3.69			
Factor 3: Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions			4.14	1.669	6.677	0.778
Sufficient sport and recreation activities	.645	.490	3.89			
Sufficient nightlife/entertainments	.632	.457	4.10			
Good accommodations/ restaurants	.629	.487	4.47			
Good quality of local cuisines or drinks	.620	.545	4.15			
Good shopping places	.613	.422	3.99			
Variety and fun activities	.604	.518	4.20			
Good quality of accommodation	.569	.605	4.17			
Factor 4: Public Transportation & Traffic			3.24	1.510	6.042	0.523
Good traffic condition	.693	.516	3.24			
Good local transportation/ infrastructure	.672	.511	3.25			
Total variance explained					46.414	
Total scale reliability						0.868
KMO = 0.852			Bartlett's test of sphericity = 2983.125		df = 300	Sig = 0.000

Table 4: Comparison between 4 factors and nationalities

Destination Attributes	Australia			Russia			T-Test		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean Diff	T	P
Factor 1: (N = 408)	220	3.91	0.48	188	4.11	0.50	-0.21	-4.235	0.000*
Factor 2: (N = 409)	220	3.81	0.54	189	3.98	0.54	-0.17	-3.175	0.002*
Factor 3: (N = 410)	220	4.20	0.47	190	4.06	0.54	0.14	2.806	0.005*
Factor 4: (N = 410)	220	2.92	0.95	190	3.63	0.83	-0.71	-8.056	0.000*

Remark: * indicated statistically significant difference at $p < 0.001$, $p < 0.05$

between two nationalities at $p = 0.000$ which explained that Australian perceived the performance of factor 1 was good less than Russian at mean difference of 0.21

A statistically significant different at $p = 0.002$ was found the performance of “Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment” between two nationalities. It explained that Australian

perceived the performance of factor 2 was good less than Russian at mean difference of 0.17 A statistically significant different at $p = 0.005$ was found the performance of “Factor 3: Variety of tourist infrastructure and attractions” between two nationalities. It explained that Australian perceived factor 3 was good to more than Russian at mean difference of 0.14

A statistically significant difference at $p = 0.000$ was found in the performance of "Factor 4: Public transportation and traffic" between two nationalities. It explained that Australian perceived factor 4 was at average and less than Russian at mean difference of 0.71. Factor 4 indicated the most significantly different of perceived image between two nationalities.

4.5 The differences of Overall Image, Future behavioral intentions by nationalities

As shown in table 5, it was found that Russian seem to perceived the performance of Phuket slightly higher than Australian from the mean values as follow;

There was statistically significant difference between the overall image of Phuket and nationalities at $p = 0.004$. It was found that Australian has a little lower mean value than Russian at the mean difference 0.27 and both group of respondents perceived the overall image of Phuket at moderate positive.

A statistically significant difference at $p = 0.003$ was found in the difference of intention to revisit within the next 5 years between Australian and Russian. It explained that Australian perceived the possibility to return to Phuket within the next 5 years was at the level of moderately positive which less than Russian at the mean difference of 0.45

A statistically significant difference at $p = 0.023$ was found in the difference of intention to recommend to others between Australian and Russian. It explained that Australian perceived the possibility to recommend to others was at the level of moderately positive which less than Russian at the mean difference of 0.27.

4.6 The relationship between destination image to overall image and future behavioral intentions

Multiple Regression was conducted to identify which destination image factors were correlated strongly with the behavioral intention, three multiple regression analyses were performed using four factors of destination image attributes as the independent

variable. The dependent variables were two dimensions of behavioral intentions and one dimension of overall image of destination.

As shown in table 6,7 and 8, Australian tourists majorly expressed that "Factor 1: Natural & Cultural Environment" - unspoiled nature, relaxing atmosphere, diversity of traditions/cultures, opportunity for freedom, satisfied experiences/ adventurous feeling, good scenery/ landscapes/ beautiful beaches, family-oriented destination and cultural/historical attractiveness played the most effective relationship to the overall image of Phuket they perceived ($F = 19.210$, $\beta = 0.27$, $R^2 = 26.3\%$). Moreover, it was also positively influenced their intention to revisit within the next 5 years ($F = 11.659$, $\beta = 0.26$, $R^2 = 17.8\%$) and intention to recommendation to other ($F = 30.164$, $\beta = 0.45$, $R^2 = 35.9\%$).

On the other hand, Russian tourist majorly expressed that "Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment" such as good hospitality/honesty/receptiveness, friendly local people, international service quality standard, good reputation, easy for accessibility, high standard for sanitation/cleanliness, personal safety and reasonable price played the most effective relationship to the overall image of Phuket they perceived ($F = 11.840$, $\beta = 0.31$, $R^2 = 20.7\%$). Moreover, it was also positively influenced their intention to revisit within the next 5 years ($F = 16.267$, $\beta = 0.32$, $R^2 = 26.3\%$) and intention to recommendation to other ($F = 22.171$, $\beta = 0.41$, $R^2 = 32.6\%$).

4.7 Correlation among overall image and future behavioral intentions

Table 9, indicated the overall image, intention to revisit within 5 years and intention to recommend to others were related to each other with r-value ranging from .707 - .338 which showed a strength of large to moderate relationship of two variables. Overall image of Phuket has moderate relationship to intention to

Table 5: Comparison between overall image, future behavioral intentions and nationalities

Variables	Australian			Russian			T-Test		
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean Diff	T	P
Overall image of Phuket	220	5.60	0.99	189	5.88	0.93	-0.27	-2.861	0.004*
Intention to revisit within the next 5 years	220	5.47	1.76	189	5.92	1.27	-0.45	-2.974	0.003*
Intention to recommend to othes	220	5.83	1.22	190	6.10	1.18	-0.27	-2.289	0.023*

Remark: * indicated statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$

Table 6: Relationship of destination image with overall image

Predictor (N = 220)	Australia						Russia					
	Overall image of Phuket as a tourist destination						Overall image of Phuket as a tourist destination					
	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²
Factor 1: Natural & Cultural Environment	0.56	0.27	0.000*	19.21	0.513	0.263	0.34	0.19	0.028**	11.84	0.454	0.207
Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment	0.44	0.24	0.001**				0.52	0.31	0.000*			
Factor 3: Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions	0.23	0.11	0.112				-0.04	-0.03	0.761			
Factor 4: Public Transportation & Traffic	0.58	0.55	0.370				0.09	0.08	1.228			

Remark: * indicated statistically significant difference at* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table 7: Relationship of destination image with intention to revisit

Predictor (N = 220)	Australia						Russia					
	Intention to revisit within the next 5 years						Intention to revisit within the next 5 years					
	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²
Factor 1: Natural & Cultural Environment	0.96	0.26	0.001**	11.659	0.422	0.178	0.49	0.19	0.020**	16.267	0.513	0.263
Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment	0.84	0.25	0.001**				0.74	0.32	0.000*			
Factor 3: Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions	-0.09	-0.02	0.734				0.17	0.07	0.358			
Factor 4: Public Transportation & Traffic	-0.28	-0.15	0.019				0.06	0.04	0.537			

Remark: * indicated statistically significant difference at * $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.05$

Table 8: Relationship of destination image with intention to recommend

Predictor (N = 220)	Australia						Russia					
	Intention to recommend to others						Intention to recommend to others					
	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²	B	Beta (β)	Sig	F	R	R ²
Factor 1: Natural & Cultural Environment	1.16	0.45	0.000*	30.164	0.600	0.359	0.59	0.25	0.002**	22.171	0.571	0.326
Factor 2: Social & Safety Environment	0.45	0.20	0.003**				0.89	0.41	0.000*			
Factor 3: Variety of Tourist Infrastructures & Attractions	0.19	0.07	0.244				-0.12	-0.06	0.462			
Factor 4: Public Transportation & Traffic	-0.17	-0.13	0.026*				0.04	0.03	0.649			

Remark: * indicated statistically significant difference at * $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.05$

revisit within 5 years ($r = .338$, $n = 408$, $p = 0.000$), overall image of Phuket has large relationship to intention to recommend ($r = .528$, $n = 409$, $p = 0.000$) and intention to revisit within 5 years has large relationship to intention to recommend to others.

Table 9: Pearson Correlation among overall image and future behavioral intentions

	Overall Image of Phuket	Intention to revisit within 5 years
Overall Image of Phuket	1	
Intention to revisit within 5 years	.338**	
Intention to recommend to others	.528**	.707**

Remark : ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

5. Conclusions & Suggestions

The finding of this research attempted to present the differences between Phuket's destination image perceived by Australian and Russian, relations of overall destination image to future behavioral intentions as it may be very important for managerial implications of Phuket. It was clearly indicated that cultural diversity and individual's characteristics are highly influenced the perception of each nationality. Russian has more positive favor about Phuket in almost all aspects as they were more likely enjoying richness of cultural, natural sceneries, experienced good social - safety condition and fair transportation. But, Australian perceived good wide varieties of tourist infrastructures and attractions as their best perception more than other counterparts.

According to the finding, it is clearly supported the previous literature from Baloglu & McCleary (1999a,b), Stern & Krakover (1993) that perceptual/ cognitive and affective evaluations have a direct influence on the

overall image. It indicated that nationality in some context influenced the way people think about destination. The result was similar to the study of Pizam and Sussman (1995) confirmed that nationality influenced in evaluating the differences of tourists' behaviors. Same as a study of Ritter (1987, 1989) mentioned that tourist's perception is influenced by nationality which justified the differences in the way they perceived. Similar to other reviews (Bigne et al, 2001; Lee et al, 2005; Chi & Qu, 2008; Beerli & Martin, 2004), confirmed the positive and direct relationship between destination image and overall image. Holistic or overall image evaluation has greater influence than the sum of destination components. Most recognized appearance of Phuket majorly represents its whole image.

In addition, the most influential destination factor that has direct incidence to overall image, future behavioral intentions. It concluded that "Natural and Cultural of Phuket" played the strongest relations that much affected to its overall image, intention to revisit and intention to recommend for Australian tourists. Previous study expressed that a large proportion of Australian tourists seek to increase their knowledge by visiting into diverse cultures (Oh et al., 1995). Likewise, "Social and Safety of Phuket" played the strongest relations that much affected to its overall image, behavioral intentions for Russian tourists. Overall image has a positive and direct relationship with future behaviors of tourists, if Australian perceived Phuket's image favorably as natural and cultural glamour, they are more willing to spread these positive recommendations as well as undertake repeat visitation in the future similar to Russian.

Limitation of this research ignored to measure tourists' perception before and after actual visitation in order to evaluate how well the image is promoted and actual image. The study focused only two groups of population which did not represent other markets. Therefore, given the absence of evidence in the

part of research, future study should firstly focus on identifying the congruence and differences between projected and perceived image of Phuket. The findings are valuable to facilitate the destination marketing and examine the position of Phuket with respect to other competitors. Second, it could be better to study on the effect of primary source on pre-post visit image formation of Phuket. A comparison of pre-post experiences signifies the level of destination improvement and their current values in repeat's visitor minds. Third, it could be better to study of the secondary source on pre-visit image formation of Phuket. It will indicate the roles of all marketing materials in image formation and check their potentials to promote Phuket to the first time tourists. At the moment, Phuket is well projecting as natural and cultural flourish destination; it is initiative to enhance our positive destination awareness in today's competitive climate with the right destination marketing strategies. Consequently, tourism marketers should take into account of what will go into a plan. It is also important to pay attention on tourists' place of origin, socio-demographic and psychological of tourist as Phuket's image may perceived differently because of the cultural differences.

From now on, Phuket has to retain destination competitiveness, continue searching for new attractions and create distinctive tourism packages to differentiate from others reinforce positive images. In, conclusion, positive destination images generate not only the brand values, but also strengthen destination brand loyalty in term of future behavioral intentions (revisit and recommend) that tremendously make Phuket as one of competitive barriers in today's industry.

References

- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K.W. (1999a). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 868-897.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K.W. (1999b). US international pleasure travelers' images of four Mediterranean destinations: A comparison of visitors and nonvisitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(2), 114-129.
- Baloglu, S., Pekcan, A., Chen, S.L & Santos, J. (2003). The relationship between destination performance, overall satisfaction, and behavioral intention for distinct segments. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 4(3-4), 149-165.
- Baloglu, S., & Mangalolu, M., (2001). Tourism Destination Images of Turkey, Egypt, Greece and Italy as perceived by US-based Tour Operators and Travel Agents. *Tour. Manage.* 22(1):1-9
- Beerli, A. & Martin, J. (2004) Factors influencing destination image. *Annual of Tourism Research*, Vol.31, No.3, pp.128-37.
- Bigne', E., Sanchez, M. I., Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behavior: Inter-relationship. *Tourism Management*, 22, 607-616.
- Buhalis, D. (2000). Marketing the competitive destination in the future. *Tourism Management*, vol.21, no.1, pp97-116.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). An assessment of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol.17, no.4, pp18-23.
- Chi, C.G-Q., & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the structural relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: An integrated approach. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 624-636.
- Chen, J., & Gursoy, D. (2001). An investigation of tourists' destination loyalty and preferences. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13, 79-86.
- Chen, C., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluation factors affect behavioral intentions. *Tourism Management*, 28 (4), 1115-1122.
- Echtner, C.M., & Brent Ritchie, J.R. (1991). *The measurement of tourism destination image*. Calgary: University of Calgary. Unpublished paper.
- Echtner, C., & Ritchie, J.R. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol.31, no.4, pp3-13.
- Gallaza, M.G., Saura, I.G.& Garcia, H.C. (2002). Destination image: towards a conceptual framework. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29, 56-78.
- Gartner, W.C. (1993). Image formation process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, vol.2, no.2/3, pp191-215.
- Gunn, C. (1972). *Vacationscape*. Austin: Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas.
- Hunt, J.D. (1975). Image as a factor in tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol.13, pp1-7.

- Kale, S.H., & Weir, K.M. (1986). Marketing Third World countries to the Western traveler: The case of India. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(2) (Fall), 2-7.
- Kozak, M. (2001). Repeater's behavior at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(3), 784-807
- Lawson, F., & Baud-Bovy, M. (1977). *Tourism and Recreational Development*. London: Architectural Press.
- Lee, C., Lee, Y. & Lee, B. (2005). Korea's destination image formed by the 2002 World Cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol.32, no.4, pp839-58.
- Mayo, E. & Jarvis, L. (1981). *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling of Travel Services* (Boston: CBI Publishing Co.,Inc).
- Milman, A.G. & Pizam, A. (1995). The role of awareness and familiarity with a destination: The central Florida case. *Journal of Travel Research*, 3, 21-27.
- Office of tourism development. (2010). *Statistic Tourist Arrival to Phuket in 2010*. Department of Tourism, Phuket office.
- Oh, H.C., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P.A. (1995). Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivation: A canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14, 123-137.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *Spss survival manual a step by step guide to data analysis using Spss 4th edition*. Australia, Mcgrow-hill education.
- Petrick, J.F. (2004). The role of quality, perceived value and satisfaction in predicting cruise passengers' behavioral intentions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 397-407.
- Pike, S. (2008). *Destination Marketing: An integrated marketing communication approach*. New York: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Pike, S. (2004). *Destination Marketing Organizations*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Pikkemaat, B., & Peters, M. (2003). Sports and More: A students' image analysis of the city of Innsbruck. *Sport and Tourism*. P.Keller and T. Bieger. St. Gallen, AIEST. 45:155-173.
- Pizam, A., & Sussman, S. (1995). Does nationality affect tourist behavior? *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(4), 901-917.
- Ritter, W. (1987). Styles of tourism in the modern world. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 12(1), 3-8.
- Ritter, W. (1989). On deserts and beaches: Recreational tourism in the Muslim world. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 14(2), 3-10.
- Rittichainuwat, B.N., Qu, H., & Brown, T.J. (2001). Thailand's international travel image. *Cornell Hotel & Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42 (2), 82-95.
- Reisinger, Y. & Turner, L.W. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Behavior in Tourism Concepts and Analysis*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Limited.
- Stern, E., & Krakover, S. (1993). The formation of a composite urban image. *Geographical Analysis*, 25(2), 130-146.
- Travel & Leisure. (2009). World's Best Awards Survey Methodology. [Online] Retrieved on December 18, 2009 from <http://www.travelandleisure.com/worldsbest/2009/islands/asia-islands/109>
- United nations World tourism organization. (1979). Destination Management. [Online] Retrieved on December 22, 2009 from <http://destination.unwto.org/en/content/conceptual-framework-0>
- Woodside, AG. & Lysonski, S. (1989). A General Model of Traveler Destination Choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, vol.27, no.4, pp8-14.
- Zeithmal, V.A., Bitner, L. L., & Parasuraman, A. (1996). The behavioral consequences of service quality. *Journal of Marketing*, 60 (April), 31-46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1251929>

