WE INFLUENCE EACH OTHER IN DIFFERENT WAYS: A DYADIC EXAMINATION OF TPB IN PREDICTING COUPLE TOURISTS' REVISIT INTENTIONS

Chun JIANG

Mae Fah Luang University, School of Management, Chiang Rai, Thailand, e-mail: chun.jia@mfu.ac.th

Justin KRAEMER^{*} []

Mae Fah Luang University, School of Management, Chiang Rai, Thailand, e-mail: justin.kra@mfu.ac.th

Kenneth John BUTCHER®

Mae Fah Luang University, School of Management, Chiang Rai, Thailand, e-mail: kenneth.but@mfu.ac.th

Citation: Jiang, C., Kraemer, J., & Butcher, K.J. (2025). We influence each other in different ways: A dyadic examination of TPB in predicting couple tourists' revisit intentions. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 59(2), 595–607. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.59208-1440

Abstract: Couples make joint decisions for their shared travels. However, how such decisions are made, i.e., how different perceptions among two individuals interact and influence one another's decision-making remains less studied. Conventionally, tourists' decision-making literature were driven by an individual perspective, assuming one person's decision is made through his or her own perceptions, beliefs, emotions, and past experiences. Among the prevalent decision-making theories, Ajzen (1991)'s Theory of Planned Behavior is among the most widely adopted. The theory posits that a person's behavioral decision is subject to his or her Attitude toward the target behavior (Att), Subjective Norm (SN), and Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC). However, such individual-focused approach overlooks the influences of the person's relationship partner, who actively partakes the same decision-making. Couples' decision-making should be viewed in a dyadic perspective where both intrapersonal and interpersonal mechanisms should be examined. Built upon the theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and the Actor Partner Independent Model (APIM), this research examines the mutual influence in couple decisionmaking regarding their revisit intentions. Specifically, we posit that both intrapersonal and interpersonal influences of the TPB (attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavior control) impact on both members' revisit intentions. The research uses a cross-sectional design with quantitative methods. Dyadic data involving 125 couples (250 individual responses) were collected onsite and analyzed with APIM and structural equation modeling (SEM). Findings suggest that above and beyond the intrapersonal effects of the TPB (Attitude, SN, and PBC), interpersonal effects of TPB predictors also significantly influence revisit intentions. This research contributes to the tourist decision-making literature by extending TPB to dyads and provides a nuanced understanding of how couples make a tourist decision. Practically, our research provides implications for hospitality and tourist service providers in devising their marketing strategies, especially for those who target couple or family customers.

Keywords: TPB, APIM, couple tourists, decision-making, revisit intention, dyads, gender, attitudes, social influence, Thailand

* * * * * *

INTRODUCTION

Companions such as families and couples are groups that frequently travel together (Kim et al., 2020). Family tourism dominates the leisure travel market (Schänzel & Smith, 2014; Schänzel & Yeoman, 2015). Market data suggest that over 70% of tourists travel with their family members in Australia, Indonesia and Thailand (Li et al., 2020). The behaviors of family or couple travelers, particularly the outcome of their decision-making, significantly impact the revenue and profit of service providers (Sobaih et al., 2024). Therefore, understanding how couple tourists make their consuming decisions has drawn continued interest to researchers in tourism studies (Cosenza & Davis, 1981; Davis, 1976; Kim et al., 2020; Litvin et al., 2004; Qiao et al., 2022; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2019; Schänzel & Yeoman, 2015; Wang et al., 2004)

Within travelling families, various stakeholders might influence the decision-making of their joint vacation. However, heads of a household, often a man or a woman, are thought to be the main decision-makers (Kang & Hsu, 2004; Rojas-de-Gracia et al., 2017, 2019). For decades, researchers have attempted to understand how two individuals within a couple interact to reach their vacation decisions (Jenkins, 1978; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2020). Early research approached to separate the complex vacation decision-making process into categories of sub decisions and investigated who in the relationship made which specific decisions (Cosenza & Davis, 1981; Fodness, 1992; Jenkins, 1978; Litvin et al., 2004). Researchers emphasized the individual influence of both partners, often assuming a simplified model where vacation decisions were either made solely by men, solely by women, or jointly by both. For example, in Ritchie and Filiatrault's replication of Jenkins's (1978) family vacation decision-making study, men had more influence over decisions relating to budget and timing while women had more influence over lodging types and destination choices (Ritchie & Filiatrault, 1980). Recently researcher argues for a more inclusive approach because both the man and woman of a

^{*} Corresponding author

heterosexual couple make "joint decisions" (Barlés-Arizón et al., 2010; Cheng et al., 2019; Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2016; Kang & Hsu, 2005; Litvin et al., 2004; Mottiar & Quinn, 2004; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2019).

Yet, the precise mechanism of how these joint decisions is made remains unclear. Partners within a couple rarely share identical wants and needs for their joint vacation (Kang & Hsu, 2004, 2005), and each individual brings their own perceptions and opinions into the decision-making process. It is therefore important to understand how individuals' psychological factors interact and contribute to their joint decision-making. Answering the "how" question is important for hospitality businesses to develop effective marketing strategies (Aras, 2023; Litvin et al., 2004).

While how a couple makes their joint consuming decision is unknown, the individual decision-making process is well studied. The classic consumer behavior model (Engel et al., 1968) proposes that rational consumer decisions follow a sequence from attitude to intention to behavior (Decrop, 2006). Tourists' decision-making research mostly followed this grand consumer-behavior model because of the planning nature of most tourist products. Among various rational decision-making theories, the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB, Ajzen, 1991) is frequently used in the tourist decision-making literature for its simplicity and satisfactory explanatory (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Ulker-Demirel & Ciftci, 2020). However, the social psychological theory of TPB was designated to explain individual level decision-making processes.

Specifically, TPB posits that an individual's intention to perform a certain behavior can be predicted by three types of beliefs: a favorable attitude, endorsement from social referent groups (i.e. subjective norms), and perceptions of a personal capability of performing the target behavior (perceived behavioral control). When it comes to a couple unit of two individuals, the explanatory prowess of the theory is challenged. In the context of couple tourists, scholars shift their focus to relationship harmony of vacationing couples. This stream of research argues that a couple's consensus and conflict resolution tactics influence their travel experience and highlights the important role the relationship between partners (Kang & Hsu, 2004, 2005; Kozak, 2010; Kozak & Duman, 2012; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2019; Therkelsen, 2010). These researchers claim that happier couples enjoy their joint-vacations more, but did not answer how couples make their joint-decisions. As Rojas-de-Gracia et al. (2019) point out, until identifying the decision-maker, researchers can then explore influences of gender, psychological characteristics and other variables that may explain the joint decision-making. To fill this gap, this research uses the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM, Kenny et al., 2006) to explore both intrapersonal and interpersonal influences of the TPB predictors and couple's revisit intentions.

Psychologists have called to bring the relationship to consumer behavior research (Cavanaugh, 2016; Simpson et al., 2012b, 2012a) and provided a statistical solution to overcome the challenge of the independence assumption in statistical inferences (i.e., APIM). In the dyadic contexts such as couple tourists, according to the Interdependence Theory (Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J., 1978), two members are often not independent to each other due to their shared relationship and ongoing interactions. With this research, we aim to shed light on the complex dynamics of couple's decision-making regarding their revisit intentions. Guided by this objective, we attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ1. Do men and women members' TPB predictors (attitude, SN and PBC) influence their own revisit intention after controlling for the existence of their relationship partner and how?

RQ2. Do men and women members TPB predictors (attitude, SN and PBC) influence each other's revisit intention and how?

Using a sample of 125 heterosexual couples and dyadic data collected onsite, our research attempts to unravel the "how" question by investigating both intrapersonal and interpersonal influences of TPB predictors and revisit intentions within the couple contexts. Past research investigating social influence on decision-making often overlooked the role partners play. Guided by the framework of TPB and APIM, this research contributes to tourist behavior knowledge by separating the relationship partner from other social influence sources and empirically exploring the intrapersonal and interpersonal effects of TPB at the dyadic level. This research also benefits practitioners in the tourism and hospitality industry. Knowing that couples make joint decisions provides less resolution in targeting their marketing strategies.

Our research sets out to improve such segmenting precision while treating couples as the decision-unit. For example, by determining which member's attitude is more influential in not only their own but also their partner's revisit intention would allow for targeted service designs and marketing appeals. Similarly, knowing which member's social network is more influential can help marketers direct their marketing efforts with those social referent groups.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Tourism decision-making: theoretical background

The study of tourist decision-making largely follows the development of consumer behavior theories. From their early emphasis on subjective expected utility (SEU) to a much more nuanced perspective of adaptive decision-making (Smallman & Moore, 2010), the theoretical evolution reflects the complexity of consumer choices (Decrop, 2006). The early focus on individuals' pure rationality posited that consumers make choices based on cognitive evaluations of outcomes, and choose the alternative that maximizes their expected utility. The concept of "bounded rationality" then emerged, arguing consumers face constraints in information or time deficiency and tend to seek optimal instead of maximized utility. Later on, the concept of "adaptive decision-making" postulated that individuals consider various factors depending on specific situational contexts, personal characteristics, and their social environment. For example, when a decision involves others, various needs and wants are considered in reaching a compromise. Tourists' decision-making is influenced by many factors (Decrop, 2006; Decrop & Snelders, 2005; Engel et al., 1968; Loi et al., 2024). Decrop (2006) categorized major factors into three groups: socio-psychological variables (e.g. perceptions, attitudes), personal variables (e.g. needs and wants), and environmental variables (e.g. interpersonal and situational influences). Among the various constructs and theories explaining tourists' decision-making, the rational decision-making school of thought are continued to be used by tourism researchers (Cohen et al., 2014; Hasan et al., 2020; Loi et al., 2024).

TPB and revisit intention

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB, Ajzen, 1991) is widely adopted in understanding individual tourist decisionmaking, including revisit intention (Ulker-Demirel and Ciftci, 2020). Revisit intention, i.e., the likelihood of a visitor returning to a previously visited destination, is the extension of visitors' post-purchase evaluation (Um et al., 2006)5/14/2025 9:26:00 AM, and directly predicts brand loyalty. TPB posits that the intention is influenced by three major constructs: attitude, subjective norms (SN), and perceived behavioral control (PBC). Meta-analysis suggests that TPB robustly predicts individual's intentions and behaviors across various domains (Armitage & Conner, 2001). In tourism and hospitality contexts, the three main TPB constructs are defined as following:

Attitude refers to an individual's overall evaluation of the target experience, based on "expectancy-value". Attitude reflects the level of "liking" (Ajzen, 2020). One's attitude toward a service is formed through relevant accessible perceptions such as service quality (Han & Kim, 2010), servicescapes (Meng & Choi, 2018; Quintal et al., 2015), or relevant cues of festival attributes (Vesci & Botti, 2019). In most cases, an individual's attitude significantly predicts that individual's revisit intention (Bianchi et al., 2017; Hsu & Huang, 2012; Loi et al., 2024).

Subjective Norm (SN) refers to the perceived social influence to perform or not perform a target behavior. SN is influenced by both normative beliefs about what "significant others" think and descriptive beliefs about what "significant others" do (Ajzen, 2020). SN has been a strong predictor of a tourist's visit/revisit intentions (Han & Kim, 2010; Hsu & Huang, 2012; Juschten et al., 2019; Lam & Hsu, 2004, 2006; Nguyen et al., 2024).

Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) refers to an individual's perceived ease or difficulty in performing a target behavior. PBC is a significant predictor of revisit intention in various contexts, such as revisiting themed restaurants (Meng & Choi, 2018), green hotels (Han & Kim, 2010), and winery resorts (Quintal et al., 2015) but not in the context of revisiting festivals (Choo et al., 2016; Vesci & Botti, 2019). Despite criticisms regarding its assumptions of rationality and limited consideration of emotional and external factors (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Perugini & Bagozzi, 2001; Sniehotta et al., 2014; Ulker-Demirel & Ciftci, 2020), the TPB's simplicity, generalizability, and robust predictive ability make it a suitable tool for understanding tourist behavior (Armitage & Conner, 2001). However, TPB's focus on (independent) individuals overlooks the complex interplay of decision-making when more than one individual is involved, such as joint-decisions in group vacations (Cohen et al., 2014). Specifically, although TPB acknowledges social influence with the construct of SN, SN is ultimately internal to an individual perception. As a result, the non-independence of more than one decision-maker has been systematically omitted in TPB thus far.

Joint decisions in the couple vacation context

The research on vacation decision-making in couples has evolved from focusing on the relative influence of which decision men or women make to a consensus of joint decisions. Early on, studies often assumed decisions were made solely by either men, women, or both (Cosenza & Davis, 1981; Fodness, 1992; Jenkins, 1978). Recent literature highlights a democratic pattern where both partners have similar influences on vacation decisions (Barlés-Arizón et al., 2010; Kang & Hsu, 2005; Litvin et al., 2004, Mottiar & Quinn, 2004). For example, based on children's perceptions across 25 countries, Cheng and colleagues (2019) found that both men (fathers) and women (mothers) have a similar influence on vacation decisions. In another study of 375 heterosexual couple dyads, Rojas-de-Gracia et al. (2019) found that, except for information search, there is a "joint structure" in most sub-decisions. Some research has realized the importance of the dyadic approach in studying couple tourists but could not pinpoint how individual characteristics influence the dyadic decision. Researchers investigated how group-level characteristics such as couple cohesion and communication tactics influence decision satisfaction (Barlés-Arizón et al., 2010; Cheng et al., 2019; Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2016; Kang & Hsu, 2005; Litvin et al., 2004; Mottiar & Quinn, 2004; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2019). For example, Kozak (2010) studied a Turkish sample of 226 married individuals regarding their vacation planning and dining-out decision-making. They found that cooperative couples who compromise with their partners have higher satisfaction with their purchase and recommendation decisions. In other words, relationship harmony makes couples' tourism experience more enjoyable. However, less is known about individual factors nor their interactions in this process. One reason limiting researchers' investigation effort in studying couple tourists is the methodology, i.e. the independence assumption (Gullo, 2020; Simpson et al., 2012b).

This statistical premise requires that data points are independent to make unbiased estimations and valid inferences. In a couple dyad, however, both members' scores are often correlated (i.e. non-independent) because of their shared experiences and relationship. This "common fate" often leads to two members from a couple reporting more similar scores than other couple units (Kenny, 2006). For instance, as a couple, Mary's attitude toward the hotel they stayed in tends to be more similar to John's attitude than those outside of their relationship. For researchers, such common variation makes it "impossible" to separate the individual influences within a couple, other than aggregating to the dyadic level characteristics (Kang & Hsu, 2005; Rojas-de-Gracia et al., 2017, 2019; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2019). In this research, we attempt to solve the methodological challenge by extending the traditional TPB with the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) which provides a statistical solution (Kenny et al., 2006).

Hypotheses Development

Joint decisions by couples suggest that there is only one shared behavioral outcome for the dyad. For example, revisit or not. Although vacationing couples are treated as a single decision-making unit (Decrop, 2006, 2008), they are composed of

two individuals with unique needs and wants (Kang & Hsu, 2004, 2005). According to the Independence Theory (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978), individuals in close relationships influence each other's opinions and outcomes due to shared experiences and situations. This suggests that decision-making within a couple is not solely an individual process but involves mutual influences of two partner's perspectives and preferences. When a couple travels together, two individuals develop their own psychological formations (Lam & Hsu, 2006) influencing their revisit intentions. Under TPB framework, each partner's evaluation of the product (attitudes), susceptibility to social influence (SN), and perceived behavioral control (PBC), are positively associated with their own revisit intention. Previous research has provided abundant evidence that individual effects of attitudes, SN, and PBC jointly predict the revisit intention within the TPB framework, but such individual models ignored the potential impact of the relationship partner. There are two individuals in a heterosexual couple, and we anticipate by controlling the existence of the partner and their influence, each member's revisit intention is predicted by their own set of TPB predictors interpersonally. Specifically,

- For men: H1a: His attitude positively predicts his own revisit intention.
 - H1b: His SN positively predicts his own revisit intention.
 - H1c: His PBC positively predicts his own revisit intention.
- For women: H1d: Her attitude positively predicts her own revisit intention.
 - H1e: Her attitude positively predicts her own revisit intention.
 - H1f: Her attitude positively predicts her own revisit intention.

The Interdependence Theory suggests that close relationship partners rely on each other, provide emotional support, and affirm each other's behaviors and decisions (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). This interdependence may be embodied in the couple's course of interaction and relationship development. We presume that each member's attitude, SN, and PBC will not only influence their own intention but also their partner's revisit intention because couples have endured interaction and communication during their shared vacation (Kozak & Duman, 2012). For instance, in their research with 445 British families in Turkey, Kozak & Duman (2012) found that respondents revisit intention was significantly influenced by their spouses' vacation satisfaction. This indicates that if one partner holds a strong positive attitude towards a hotel, through communication, their preference may be learned by the other partner, who would therefore report higher revisit intention. Similarly, if one partner talks about how their friends (or other social referents) enjoyed their positive experiences, the other partner may also be persuaded, and their revisit intention enhanced. Furthermore, if one partner is confident in revisiting the hotel, their perceived control may as well empower the other half to feel the same.

Therefore, we anticipate that each partner's attitude, SN, and PBC influence the other's revisit intention. Specifically,

For men: H2a: His Attitude positively predicts her revisit intention.

H2b: His SN positively predicts her revisit intention.

H2c: His PBC positively predicts her revisit intention.

For women: **H2d:** Her Attitude positively predicts his revisit intention.

H2e: Her SN positively predicts his revisit intention.

H2f: Her PBC positively predicts his revisit intention.



Figure 1. Theoretical Framework: the APIM-TPB Model (Note: the postfix "_M" indicates the male partner of a heterosexual couple, while "_W" indicates the female partner; Double-headed dashed paths represent "non-independence" of scores within a couple dyad. The single-headed solid paths represent actor effects (intrapersonal), and the single-headed dashed lines represent partner effects (interpersonal)

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Design and sample

This study employed a cross-sectional design to investigate the dyadic influences within the TPB framework among a couple guests to a hotel. Specifically, both men and women partners' attitudes, SN, PBC, and revisit intention were assessed concurrently. Upon approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee of Mae Fah Luang University and prior consent from the business owners, we collected data onsite at three local resorts in Doi Mae between November 2022 and February 2023. Doi Mae Salong is a popular tourist destination in northern Thailand known for its mountainous scenery,

tea plantations, and Yunnanese culture. Two trained research assistants approached hotel guests at breakfast venues, inviting coupled guests to participate in the study in exchange for a pack of tea. The intercept approach allows respondents to reflect on their experience while their memory was still fresh (Quintal et al., 2015). With consent, participants simultaneously and independently completed an electronic questionnaire on their personal cell phones, ensuring independent responses. We included only mixed-sex couples where 1) both individuals were 18 years or older, 2) were in a romantic relationship, and 3) had experienced the hotel together. Screened questions were asked at the beginning of the questionnaire to ensure criteria 1 and 2. Criterion 3 was achieved verbally by the research assistants in-situ. We excluded same-sex couple responses because using sex as a variable to distinguish members in a dyad is the most common practice in couple research using APIM (Garcia et al., 2015). Furthermore, distinguishable and indistinguishable dyads apply to different analytical procedures (Garcia et al., 2015). 304 responses were collected, after excluding 5 same-sex couples (10 responses), 8 incomplete and 36 unmatchable responses, a final sample of 125 dyads (250 individuals) was included in this study.

Measures

Key constructs from the TPB (Attitude, SN, PBC, and revisit intention) were measured using established scales adapted from previous research (Juschten et al., 2019; Lam & Hsu, 2006; Quintal et al., 2010, 2015). The scales were contextualized to the hotel setting and assessed using seven-point Likert scales. Each construct consisted of three to four items which were then averaged. In this current research, revisit intention was measured with three items (e.g. "I plan to visit this hotel again") ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher mean values reflect higher possibility of revisiting.

Attitude refers to how much a customer likes her/his experience with the hotel stayed and was measured by three items with opposite semantic terms (e.g., "All things considered, I think staying in this hotel would be..." very unenjoyable (1) to very enjoyable (7). Higher mean values reflect higher degrees of liking of the hotel stayed. SN was measured with four items using semantically different phrases, such as: "They would think that I... should not (1) – should (7)... choose to stay in this hotel". A higher mean value means a higher level of "non-partner" social influence perceived. Prior TPB research treated SN as a lump sum of social influences from various reference groups such as family and friends, work colleagues, and tour agents. As we specifically study how individual members' perceived SN influences each other's revisit intention, we singled out the influence of the relationship partner from other "significant others". To achieve this, we provided oral and written instructions describing the "significant others" should not include the relationship partner whom they travelled with. PBC was defined as the extent to which a customer thinks they are confident in deciding to stay in the hotel of choice. PBC was measured using a three-item Likert scale, for which respondents were asked their level of agreement ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). e.g., "Whether or not I chose to stay in this hotel was entirely up to me". Previous studies supported the TPB scales' internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha > 0.72) (Quintal et al., 2015). For

Previous studies supported the TPB scales' internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha > 0.72) (Quintal et al., 2015). For the current study, Cronbach's alpha for the scales in every construct exceeded 0.9, suggesting good construct reliability (Hair, 2010). The questionnaire also collected demographic information including sex, age, education, employment status, and length of relationship, as summarized in Table 1. The timestamp and room number served later as the major basis for matching individual responses, which would then be restructured into dyadic datasets. Dyadic dataset structures are suitable for further structural model analysis (Kenny et al., 2006; Garcia et al., 2015). In this structure, one couple ID corresponds to two individual members (a man and a woman), and for each variable, there is a score for the men and women partners, indicated by "_M" and "_W" respectively. See specific measurement scales in Table 2.

Analysis strategy

Descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions or means and standard deviations were obtained to summarize demographic characteristics. Pearson correlation coefficients were used to determine correlations and non-independence among variable scores between the men and women partners. For inferential analysis, we applied the Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM; Kenny et al., 2006) to examine both intrapersonal and interpersonal associations between attitude, SN, PBC, and revisit intention. The APIM is a statistical procedure for analyzing dyadic data. APIM suggests a couple member's predictor variable not only affects their outcome interpersonally (i.e. actor effect), but also affects their partner's outcome interpersonally (i.e. partner effect). In this study, actor effects referred to the impact of a person's attitude, SN, and PBC on their own revisit intention, and partner effects were the impact of a person's attitude, SN, and PBC on their own revisit intention. We adopted Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to test the APIM using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation as SEM allows for setting path constraints and model comparison tests. Following Garcia et al.'s (2015) recommendation, we used chi-square and Sampled Adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (SABIC) as indexes for model fit. All analyses were done in R, and a significance level of .05 was used throughout.

The APIM-SEM simultaneously estimates two structural equations, one for women's revisit intention (Int_W) and one for men's revisit intention (Int_M). We followed a three-step approach to test the APIM-SEM recommended by Gana & Broc (2019) and Garcia et al., (2015). Firstly, we estimated the baseline APIM where each partner's attitude, SN, and PBC are regressed on his/her own revisit intention as well as his/her partner's revisit intention, as depicted in Figure 1. This baseline model is saturated (df = 0) as we allowed all paths to vary freely. Secondly, to determine whether sex played a significant role and establish sex distinguishability of actor and partner effects, we created three sub-models, one for each predictor (attitude, SN, and PBC). In these submodels, we restricted the actor and partner effects to be equal across both members, for example, his attitude \rightarrow his intention = her attitude \rightarrow her intention (actor effect of attitude), and her attitude \rightarrow his intention = his attitude \rightarrow her intention (partner effect of attitude). By comparing the fit of each constrained submodel to the baseline model, we could assess whether accounting for within-couple sex differences significantly

improved the model's explanatory power. In other words, whether men and women influence themselves and their partners differently in the statistical sense. This sex difference would empirically justify the need to examine both members' scores in a dyadic unit, which is the premise for dyadic analysis with distinguishable dyads (Kenny et al., 2006). A significant decrease in model fit after constraining the effects equal across both members would mean that sex does make a difference (Kenny et al., 2006). Lastly, we selected the best-fitting model based on the Chi-square difference test and the SABIC criterion (Garcia et al., 2015). A non-significant Chi-square difference and a smaller SABIC indicate a better model fit. This best-fit model was then used to interpret the path coefficients and test our hypotheses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic characteristics of the couple dyads

This study included 250 respondents, with an equal distribution of men and women from 125 heterosexual couples (Table 1). Most were in dating relationships (83.2%).

Toblo 1	Domographi	a abaraatari	ation of room	ondonte (Sou	uroo: Author?	a own work)	(Note: N_25)	111
rable i	. Demogratin	c characteri	SUCS OF TESD	ondents too	uice. Autior :	S OWIL WOLKT	UNOLE. IN=2.30	
				((~ /

Demograph	ics (n=250)	Frequency	Percentage
sex	Female	125	50
	Male	125	50
Relationship Type	Dating	208	83.2
* **	Married	42	16.8
Relationship Length	less than 1 year	4	1.6
	1-3 years	6	2.4
	3-6 years	14	5.6
	6-9 years	28	11.2
	9-12 years	26	10.4
	12 years or longer	172	68.8
Age	18-20	5	2
	21-30	8	3.2
	31-40	83	33.2
	41-50	102	40.8
	51-60	42	16.8
	61 and above	10	4
Education	none	2	0.8
	Elementary	1	0.4
	High School	17	6.8
	College diploma	40	16
	Bachelor's Degree	132	52.8
	Master's Degree	44	17.6
	PhD or higher	14	5.6
Employment	Unemployed	27	10.8
	Part-time	21	8.4
	Full-time	202	80.8
Monthly income	9000 baht or less	8	3.2
	9,001-15,000	13	5.2
	15,001-25,000	26	10.4
	25,001-35,000	39	15.6
	35,001-45,000	34	13.6
	45,001-55,000	30	12
	55,001-65,000	16	6.4
	65,001 or more	84	33.6
Hotel stayed	Baan Seesee	134	53.6
	Baan Hom Muen Li	98	39.2
	Wang Put Tan	18	7.2
Number of Children	0	116	46.4
	1	49	19.6
	2	61	24.4
	3	18	7.2
	4	6	2.4

Table 2. Measurement	Scales and Iter	n Loading (Source: A	Author's own	work) (Note	e: N=250)
ruere zi medasarement	Seares and ree	I Doctaing (Domee.	internet b o min		

Items	Item loading
INT_M: Revisit intention of Men (alpha = 0.97)	
INT1_M: I plan to visitagain.	0.93
INT2_M: I will very much like to	0.98
INT3_M: I intend to visit next time	0.95
INT_W Revisit intention of Women (alpha = 0.96)	
INT1_W: I plan to visitagain.	0.93

INT2_W: I will very much like to	0.97
INT3_W: I intend to visit next time	0.92
Att_M: Attitudes of Men ($alpha = 0.95$)	
Att1_M: Boring/Fun	0.92
Att2_M: Unpleasant/Pleasant	0.92
Att3_M: Unenjoyable/enjoyable	0.95
Att_W: Attitudes of Women ($alpha = 0.91$)	
Att1_W: Boring/Fun	0.81
Att2_W: Unpleasant/Pleasant	0.93
Att3_W: Unenjoyable/enjoyable	0.92
SN_M: Subjective Norms of Men ($alpha = 0.95$)	
SN1_M: should not/ should	0.93
SN2_M: not approve/ approve	0.90
SN3_M: not choose/choose	0.91
SN4_M: not like/ like	0.92
SN_W: Subjective Norms of Women ($alpha = 0.94$)	
SN1_W: should not/ should	0.86
SN2_W: not approve/ approve	0.89
SN3_W: not choose/choose	0.91
SN4_W: not like/ like	0.95
PBC_M: Perceived behavioral control of Men (alpha = 0.92)	
PBC1_M: entirely up to me	0.95
PBC2_M: complete control whether	0.94
PBC3_M: Nothing prevented me	0.80
PBC_W: Perceived behavioral control of Women (alpha = 0.92)	
PBC1_W: entirely up to me	0.90
PBC2_W: complete control whether	0.94
PBC3_W: Nothing prevented me	0.84

Validity and reliability

Before proceeding with inferential analysis, we conducted tests to assess construct validity and reliability. Cronbach's alpha results suggested good internal consistency with alpha coefficients of 0.91~0.97. These values surpassed the recommended cutoff of 0.8 (Cortina, 1993). Before SEM, we performed confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The CFA item loadings, composite reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) indices indicated robust construct reliability and validity, surpassing the standard cutoffs of 0.7 and 0.5 (Hair et al., 2006) (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlation matrix, relia	ability, and validity indices	(Source: Author's own wo	ork) (Note *** p<0.001,	** $p < 0.05$ and *	p <0.1)
------------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	---------

	Att_M	Att_W	SN_M	SN_W	PBC_M	PBC_W	Int_M	Int_W
Att_M	1							
Att_W	.21*	1						
SN_M	.58***	0.15	1					
SN_W	.21*	.70***	.29**	1				
PBC_M	.43***	0.05	.56***	0.16	1			
PBC_W	0.17	.46***	0.15	.55***	.22*	1		
Int_M	.48***	.20*	.81***	.25**	.57***	.25**	1	
Int_W	.27**	.59***	.36***	.64***	.24**	.47***	.42***	1
mean	5.88	5.81	5.66	5.76	5.08	5.39	5.47	5.46
SD	1.45	1.46	1.46	1.34	1.82	1.72	1.52	1.53
CR	0.95	0.92	0.95	0.95	0.93	0.92	0.97	0.96
AVE	0.91	0.85	0.94	0.92	0.87	0.86	0.88	0.86
Cronbach's alpha	0.95	0.91	0.95	0.94	0.92	0.92	0.97	0.96

Correlations and Nonindependence

As presented in the correlation matrix in Table 3, three distinct types of correlations were observed. Firstly, at the individual level, attitude, SN and PBC exhibit significant correlations with revisit intention for both men and women. Secondly, at the interpersonal level, one partner's attitude, SN, and PBC are associated with the other partner's revisit intention. Thirdly, correlations between men's and women's scores on the same constructs were observed. For instance, revisit intentions (Int_M and Int_W) are significantly correlated between men and women partners. This nonindependence between the two members justify the suitability for APIM.

Baseline APIM and model fit comparison

Following Kenny's three-step SEM approach to APIMs, we estimated the baseline (unrestricted) APIM model. See Figure 2. Table 4 presents the estimates. In the baseline model, we allowed all effects to vary without any restrictions, which is a saturated model with df = 0. As shown in Figure 2, the model explained 66.8% of the variance of men's revisit intention ($R^2 = 0.668$) and 50.5% of the variance of women's revisit intention ($R^2 = 0.505$).



Figure 2. The Baseline APIM Model (Source: Author's own work)

Since the baseline model is saturated with df = 0, Chi-square was not available. By SABIC, the baseline model fitted at 713.378. We then created submodels by constraining the actor and partner effects of each construct the same across sexes.

In submodels 1, 2, and 3 the effects of attitude, SN, and PBC were constrained as equal across men and women members respectively. Table 5 provides a comparison of the submodels against the baseline. As suggested in Table 5, submodel 3 with the actor and partner effects of PBC constrained equal across men and women has the best model fit. Submodel 3 has a df = 2, an insignificant and smallest Chi-square difference of 1.822 (p = 0.402), and the smallest SABIC of 711.868. Similar to the baseline model, submodel 3 explains 66.2% of variance of men's revisit intention ($R^2 = 0.662$) and 51.2% of women's revisit intention ($R^2 = 0.512$). Submodel 3 fits the data better than all other submodels and the baseline model. This suggests that there is no empirical sex difference in both actor and partner effect of PBC within couples.

However, there are significant sex differences in the effects of attitude and SN, as the SABIC of submodel 1 (attitudeconstrained) and submodel 2 (SN-constrained) are greater than that of the baseline (719.444, 717.838, and 713.378 respectively), and with significant Chi-square differences 7.792 (P = 0.02) and 9.398 (p = 0.009). In our dyadic TPB framework, sex distinguishability is established for attitude and SN, but not for PBC.

Effect	Coefficient	SE	р
Intercepts			
Men	0.187	0.454	0.680
Women	-0.222	0.557	0.690
Actor effects of Attitude			
Men (Att_M on Int_M)	-0.027	0.068	0.696
Women (Att_W on Int_W)	0.311	0.096	0.001
Partner effects of Attitude			
Men (Att_W on Int_M)	0.146	0.078	0.061
Women (Att_M on Int_W)	-0.008	0.084	0.926
Actor effects of SN			
Men (SN_M on Int_M)	0.717	0.076	0.000
Women (SN_W on SN_W)	0.346	0.112	0.002
Partner effects of SN			
Men (SN_W on Int_M)	-0.166	0.091	0.070
Women (SN_M on Int_W)	0.194	0.093	0.037
Actor effects of PBC			
Men (PBC_M on Int_M)	0.165	0.054	0.002
Women (PBC_W on Int_W)	0.114	0.069	0.099
Partner effects of PBC			
Men (PBC_W on Int_M)	0.120	0.056	0.002
Women (PBC_M on Int_W)	0.043	0.066	0.521

Table 5. Model Fit Comparison (Source: Author's own work) (Note N = 125. In model 01, the actor and partner effects of Attitude are constrained to be equal for men and women, releasing 2 degrees of freedom. Model 2 for SN constraints, and Model 3 for PBC)

Models	Chi-square	df	р	SABIC
Saturated Model	-	0	-	713.378
Submodel 1 (Att constrained)	7.792	2	0.02	717.838
Submodel 2 (SN constrained)	9.398	2	0.009	719.444
Submodel 3 (PBC constrained)	1.822	2	0.402	711.868

Model Selection

With the distinguishability test results by model fit comparison, we selected submodel 3 (PBC effects constrained equal) to interpret estimated results and test our hypotheses. Figure 3 and Table 6 presents the selected submodel and

coefficient estimates. On the intrapersonal level, men's revisit intention is significantly predicted by his own SN (beta = 0.725, p = 0.000) and a shared PBC (0.148, p = 0.000) but not his Attitude (p=0.766). As for women, her revisit intention is driven by all TPB predictors: her attitude (0.311; p = 0.001) SN (0.322; p = 0.003) and a shared PBC (0.148; p = 0.000).

Effect	Coefficient	SE	р
Intercepts		~	r r
Men	0.229	0.454	0.613 (n.s)
Women	-0.293	0.557	0.599 (n.s)
Actor effects of Attitude			
Men (Att_M on Int_M)	-0.020	0.068	0.766 (n.s)
Women (Att_W on Int_W)	0.311	0.095	0.001***
Partner effects of Attitude			
Men (Att_W on Int_M)	0.149	0.078	0.055*
Women (Att_M on Int_W)	-0.021	0.084	0.802(n.s)
Actor effects of SN			
Men (SN_M on Int_M)	0.725	0.073	0.000***
Women (SN_W on SN_W)	0.322	0.108	0.003***
Partner effects of SN			
Men (SN_W on Int_M)	-0.147	0.089	0.100*
Women (SN_M on Int_W)	0.169	0.088	0.054*
Actor effects of PBC			
Men (PBC_M on Int_M)	0.148	0.042	0.000***
Women (PBC_W on Int_W)	0.148	0.042	0.000***
Partner effects of PBC			
Men (PBC_W on Int_M)	0.089	0.042	0.034**
Women (PBC_M on Int_W)	0.089	0.042	0.034**

Table 6. Coefficient Estimates of PBC-Constrained Submodel

(Source: Author's own work) (Note N=125. The outcome variable is Revisit Intention)

These results suggest that the traditional individual level of TPB framework generally explains each member's decisionmaking patterns in the dyadic context, except for men's Attitude. On the interpersonal level, both men's and women's revisit intentions are positively influenced by each other's shared PBC (0.089, p = 0.034). However, when it comes to Attitude and SN, men and women influence each other differently. Specifically, at the 95% confidence interval, men's revisit intention is not influenced by her Attitude (0.149, p = 0.055) nor SN (-0.147, p = 0.100). But women's revisit intention is positively and significantly influenced by his SN (0.169; p = 0.054). These results suggest that above and beyond the actor effects, within the TPB framework, partner effects also exist in explaining each couple member's revisit intentions.



Figure 3. Paths and Coefficients of the PBC-constrained Model (Source: Author's own work)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Building upon TPB, we extended the boundary of individual consumer behavior by examining a couple tourists' decision-making dynamics in APIM. With data collected from both members of 125 heterosexual couples (250 respondents) who have experienced their joint stay in a local hotel in northern Thailand, we explored the potential mutual influences between couple members in the mechanism of their post-experience decision-making. In our APIM by SEM approach, we simultaneously modeled for both men and women members' revisit intentions, while acknowledging the non-independence across different sexes. Aiming at exploring how joint decisions are made between two individual members of a couple regarding a revisit, we hypothesized that couple members' TPB predictors of Attitude, SN, and PBC predict their own revisit intention interpersonally (H1), and their partner's revisit intention (H2) interpersonally. Our results provided partial support to both sets of hypotheses. We now discuss the main findings and how they inform both theory and practice.

Sex differences within TPB in the couple context

Through model comparison, we justified the distinguishability of sex in effects of Attitude and SN, but not for PBC. This finding necessitated studying couples as the decision-making unit (Decrop, 2006) while examining each individuals' decision formation. Previous studies found sex as a moderator in various evaluation outcomes in the consumer decision-making domain. Such studies compared male and female groups as two groups of individuals. Our distinguishability test results indicate that sex difference in TPB predictors takes effect even when we study tourists at the couple level, which allows for further analysis of sex roles in the unit of couples. Traditional dichotomy of sex has drawn a lot of research interest and generated interesting knowledge which leads to a gender-role stereotype. In Meyers-Levy & Loken's (2015) review, they outlined five types of sex differences among these two groups of individuals. For instance, females are more other-oriented, and males are more self-oriented. Specifically in research applying TPB, contradicting results exist: e.g., females are more strongly influenced by SN and PBC in their willingness to pay for pro-environmental causes (López-Mosquera, 2016). Males are more strongly influenced by their social referents (SN) in their intention to visit green restaurants (Moon, 2021).

However, in the context of couple tourists, individual level of sex difference, or sex stereotype lacks accuracy because the two sexes are nested in one dyadic unit. Consider: while your boyfriend and mine are both male, their shared sex role might still have different implications in our unique relationships. In other words, examining sex difference with the couple text they are in allows for improved resolution of sex difference. Especially when such difference is important to identify roles within couples. Rojas-de-Gracia et al. (2019) claimed that only a clear identification of the decision-maker within a couple can allow further investigating of sex, motivations, attitudes, and other characteristics. We filled this gap with APIM. Besides sex distinguishability, APIM further allowed us to empirically examine how men and women influence themselves and their better half in making their decisions regarding revisiting a hotel.

Intrapersonal influences

We hypnotized in H1 that in the couple travel context, intrapersonal effects of TPB predictors positively influence their revisit intentions, and H1 are largely supported. Table 7 presents the test results. With H1, we confirmed TPB's explanatory ability intrapersonally, while controlling for couple partners. Our results suggested men's revisit intention is predicted by his SN and PBC but not his attitude (-0.020, p = 0.766), while women's revisit intention is predicted by all of the TPB predictors. Previous studies extensively used TPB to study consumers' decision-making, and our results aligned their results. Our findings contributed another empirical evidence supporting TPB, while controlling for couple partners. Interestingly, our findings suggest men's attitude does not predict his revisit intention to the hotel (-0.020, p = 0.766), unlike their female partners (0.311, p = 0.001). This suggests women's 'liking of the hotel has more influence compared to men's preference. The result aligns with previous findings on women's 'gatekeeper' (Mottiar & Quinn, 2004) or 'dominating'' roles (Kim et al., 2010; Litvin et al., 2004; Rojas-de-Gracia et al., 2018; Rojas-de-Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2018) in making travel related decisions especially for accommodation. Wang & Li, (2021) found that mothers (women) have a stronger individual identity and thereby the main decision maker. This implies that women's attitude is decisive in their family travels. Our finding concurs this result, but with more nuances within the couple context. The result that men's attitude failed to predict even his own intention implies that women's decision-making is not swayed by his tastes and liking of the hotel.

Hypothesis	Result	Coefficient	p-value
H1a: His Attitude \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Rejected	-0.020	0.766
H1b: His SN \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Supported	0.725	0.000
H1c: His PBC \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Supported	0.148	0.000
H1d: Her Attitude \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Supported	0.311	0.001
H1e: Her SN \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Supported	0.322	0.003
H1f: Her PBC \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Supported	0.148	0.000

Table 7. Test Results of Hypotheses 1 (Source: Author's own work)

Interpersonal influences

By H2, we hypothesized that interpersonal effects of TPB predictors positively influence each other' revisit intention. Table 8 presents the results of Hypotheses 2.

Hypothesis	Result	Coefficient	p-value		
H2a: Her Attitude \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Rejected	0.149	0.055		
H2b: Her SN \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Rejected	-0.147	0.100		
H2c: Her PBC \rightarrow His Revisit Intention	Supported	0.089	0.034		
H2d: His Attitude \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Rejected	-0.021	0.802		
H2e: His SN \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Supported	0.169	0.054		
H2f: His PBC \rightarrow Her Revisit Intention	Supported	0.089	0.034		

Table 8. Test Results of Hypotheses 2 (Source: Author's own work)

Most interestingly, we empirically tested partner effects of TPB in predicting couple members' revisit intentions. Above and beyond the intrapersonal influences, our findings suggest that interpersonal (partner) effects do exist. Specifically, men influence women with his SN, and women's social influence on men seems significant, and a shared PBC influences each other's revisit intention with no sex differences. Wang & Li (2021) reported that fathers (men) play an unimportant "passive role" in the decision-making. In contrast, our findings highlighted the influence of his SN on not only his but also her revisit intention (0.169, p = 0.054). This indicates men's social influence might have a critical role in shaping the couple's decision-making. Interestingly, men's revisit intention seems to only subject to his own predictors (expect for a shared PBC), while women's intention is predicted by both her TPB and his SN. This may be explained by women's otherorientation (Meyers-Levy & Loken, 2015) that women makes her decision with more sensitivity to conditions, including how her partners' social network would evaluate the hotel, while men tend to be more self-oriented in his decision-making.

Implications

There has been a persistent lack of theory in guiding quantitative research in couple tourism decision-making (Gracia & Alarcón-Urbistondo, 2016). Our research advanced in family vacation studies by examining dyadic members' mutual influences in their different patterns of decision-making. By quantifying the intrapersonal and interpersonal influences between couple members under the TPB framework, we provided a more nuanced picture of how couples' influence each other in their revisit intentions. This provides fresh insights into the body of literature especially in couple tourists' decision-making. Methodologically, our approach revealed a more nuanced picture of patterns in couple decision-making with quantitative precision. Rojas-de-Gracia et al., (2019) noted the challenge of having to identify the decision-maker before investigating motivations and characteristics of couple members in the family tourism research, and our research provided another solution. Practically, our study offers valuable insights for tourism and hospitality providers targeting couple tourists. Recognizing that women's (instead of the men's) positive attitudes drive the couple's decision-making, tourism and hospitality businesses are advised to prioritize there marketing emphasis toward women's tastes and preferences, as they are the gatekeeper. Additionally, while positive social influence from both men and women is important, men's social network seem more influential as it not only predicts his but also her revisit intention.

Businesses are therefore advised to appeal to their guests' (especially the male partners') willingness to generate positive word-of-mouth, for example, by providing them incentives to share their experiences on social media, providing discount promotion to those recommended guests, or crafting marketing messages with male perspective, and direct their testimonials at male guests' friends and colleagues. At the same time, businesses are advised to ease couple tourists' logistical concerns, such as emphasizing on convenience features, and couple-friendly environment in their marketing message, as PBC, although not sex-specific, is a significant predictor of couple members' revisit intention.

Limitations and Future Directions

Our research does not come without limitations. As discussed earlier, at the 95% confidence interval, in our model, apart from the shared PBC, we only found one significant partner effect (Men's SN→Women's revisit intention). Studies with larger samples will likely yield more significant results. Secondly, we excluded same-sex couples in order to test sexdistinguishable dyads. Future research is encouraged to be more inclusive by studying on homosexual couples. APIM can also accommodate indistinguishable dyads, which can help future researchers gain more understanding on how same-sex couples make their tourism decisions. Our study focused on romantic couple decision-making dynamics. However, family vacations often involve additional stakeholders, particularly children (Khoo-Lattimore et al., 2015; Thornton et al., 1997; Wang et al., 2004) or cross-generation members (Wang & Li, 2021) Future research designs are encouraged to include more family members to investigate decision-making dynamics within bigger groups. Furthermore, we provided empirical analysis to data collected in the Asian context, given that couples' communication styles might be different across different cultures especially compared to the west, scholars in the west with accessible data might provide further insights to the

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, C.J. and J.K.; methodology, C.J. and J.K.; software, C.J. and J.K.; validation, C.J., J.K.; and K.J.B.; formal analysis, C.J.; investigation, C.J.; data curation, C.J.; writing - original draft preparation, C.J.; writing - review and editing, C.J. and J.K.; and K.J.B.; visualization, C.J.; supervision, J.K.; project administration, C.J. and J.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: Not applicable.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study may be obtained on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: The research is partially funded by MFU PhD Dissertation Support.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 2(4), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195

Aras, S. (2023). Research on the motivations and intentions of potential cruise passengers in turkey. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 49(3), 885–892. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.49305-1089

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analytic review. British Journal of Social Psychology, 40(4), 471–499. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939

- Barlés-Arizón, M. J., Fraj-Andrés, E., & Matute-Vallejo, J. (2010). Identification of the profiles of women who take holiday decisions. *Tourism Review*, 65, 4–17. https://doi.org/10.1108/16605371011040870
- Bianchi, C., Milberg, S., & Cúneo, A. (2017). Understanding travelers' intentions to visit a short versus long-haul emerging vacation destination: The case of Chile. *Tourism Management*, 59, 312–324. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.08.013
- Cavanaugh, L. A. (2016). Consumer behavior in close relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10, 101–106. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.copsyc.2015.11.004
- Cheng, I., Su, C., Liao, H., Lorgnier, N., Lebrun, A. M., Yen, W. S., Lan, Y. F., & Huang, Y. (2019). Adolescents' perceptions of mother– father dominance in family vacation decisions: A 25-society study. *Service Business*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-019-00404-6
- Choo, H., Ahn, K., & Petrick, J.F. (2016). An integrated model of festival revisit intentions: Theory of planned behavior and festival quality/satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 818–838. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-09-2014-0448
- Cohen, S., Prayag, G., & Moital, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17, 872–909. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2013.850064
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.1.98
- Cosenza, R. M., & Davis, D. L. (1981). Family Vacation Decision Making Over The Family Life Cycle: A Decision And Influence Structure Analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 20(2), 17–23. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758102000203
- Davis, H. L. (1976). Decision Making within the Household. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 2(4), 241. https://doi.org/10.1086/208639 Decrop, A. (2006). *Vacation decision making*. CABI.
- Decrop, A. (2008). Group decision making. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-045080-3.50019-6
- Decrop, A., & Snelders, D. (2005). A grounded typology of vacation decision-making. *Tourism Management*, 26, 121–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2003.11.011
- Engel, J. F., Kollat, D. T., & Blackwell, R. D. (1968). *Consumer behavior*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. https://books.google.co.th/books ?id=Nk3x7wDYa5UC
- Fodness, D. (1992). The Impact of Family Life Cycle on the Vacation Decision-making Process. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(2), 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759203100202
- Gana, K., & Broc, G. (2019). Structural equation modeling with lavaan. ISTE Ltd, John Wilery & Sons, Inc.
- Garcia, R. L., Kenny, D. A., & Ledermann, T. (2015). Moderation in the actor-partner interdependence model: Moderation in the APIM. Personal Relationships, 22(1), 8–29. https://doi.org/10.1111/pere.12060
- Gracia, M. N. R., & Alarcón-Urbistondo, P. (2016). Toward a gender understanding of the influence of the couple on family vacation decisions. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 20, 290–298. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TMP.2016.09.008
- Gullo, K. (2020). A multi-dimensional approach to social relationships in consumer behavior. Doctoral dissertation]. Duke University. https://hdl. handle. net/10161/20959.
- Hair, J. F. (Ed.). (2010). Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective (7. ed., global ed). Pearson.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis. Uppersaddle River*. NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Han, H., & Kim, Y. (2010). An investigation of green hotel customers' decision formation: Developing an extended model of the theory of planned behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(4), 659–668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.01.001
- Hasan, A. A. T., Biswas, C., Roy, M., Akter, S., & Kuri, B. C. (2020). The applicability of theory of planned behaviour to predict domestic tourist behavioural intention: The case of Bangladesh. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 31(3), 1019–1026. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.31313-536
- Hsu, C. H. C., & Huang, S. (Sam). (2012). An Extension of the Theory of Planned Behavior Model for Tourists. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(3), 390–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348010390817
- Jenkins, R. L. (1978). Family vacation decision-making. Journal of Travel Research, 16, 2–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728757801600401
- Juschten, M., Jiricka-Pürrer, A., Unbehaun, W., & Hössinger, R. (2019). The mountains are calling! An extended TPB model for understanding metropolitan residents' intentions to visit nearby alpine destinations in summer. *Tourism Management*, 75, 293–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.05.014
- Kang, S. K., & Hsu, C. (2004). Spousal Conflict Level and Resolution in Family Vacation Destination Selection. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 28, 408–424. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348004265281
- Kang, S. K., & Hsu, C. (2005). Dyadic consensus on family vacation destination selection. *Tourism Management*, 26, 571–582. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2004.01.002
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. (1978). Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence. Wiley.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). Dyadic data analysis. Guilford Press.
- Khoo-Lattimore, C., Prayag, G., & Cheah, B. L. (2015). Kids on Board: Exploring the Choice Process and Vacation Needs of Asian Parents With Young Children in Resort Hotels. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 24, 511–531. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.914862
- Kim, E. J., Tanford, S., & Choi, C. (2020). Family versus couples: How travel goal influences evaluations of bundled travel packages. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 26(1), 3–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766719842325
- Kim, S. S., Choi, S., Agrusa, J., Wang, K. C., & Kim, Y. (2010). The role of family decision makers in festival tourism. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 308–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.004
- Kozak, M. (2010). Holiday taking decisions The role of spouses. *Tourism Management*, 31, 489–494. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TOURMAN.2010.01.014
- Kozak, M., & Duman, T. (2012). Family Members and Vacation Satisfaction: Proposal of a Conceptual Framework. International Journal of Tourism Research, 14, 192–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/JTR.847
- Lam, T., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2004). Theory of Planned Behavior: Potential Travelers from China. Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 28(4), 463–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348004267515
- Lam, T., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2006). Predicting behavioral intention of choosing a travel destination. *Tourism Management*, 27(4), 589–599. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.02.003
- Li, M., Lehto, X., & Li, H. (2020). 40 Years of Family Tourism Research: Bibliometric Analysis and Remaining Issues. Journal of China Tourism Research, 16, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/19388160.2020.1733337

- Litvin, S. W., Xu, G., & Kang, S. K. (2004). Spousal Vacation-Buying Decision Making Revisited across Time and Place. Journal of Travel Research, 43, 193–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268232
- Loi, N. A., Nguyen, Q. N., & Huong, N. T. L. (2024). The impact of decision-shaping factors and the moderating role of perceived risk on international tourists' destination choice: The case of the mekong delta, vietnam. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 57(4 supplement), 1964–1973. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.574spl10-1363
- López-Mosquera, N. (2016). Gender differences, theory of planned behavior and willingness to pay. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 45, 165–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2016.01.006
- Meng, B., & Choi, K. (2018). An investigation on customer revisit intention to theme restaurants: The role of servicescape and authentic perception. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 30(3), 1646–1662. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-11-2016-0630
- Meyers-Levy, J., & Loken, B. (2015). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what lies ahead. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25(1), 129–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2014.06.003
- Moon, S. J. (2021). Investigating beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding green restaurant patronage: An application of the extended theory of planned behavior with moderating effects of gender and age. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 92, 102727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102727
- Mottiar, Z., & Quinn, D. (2004). Couple dynamics in household tourism decision making: Women as the gatekeepers? Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10(2), 149–160. https://doi.org/10.1177/135676670401000205
- Nguyen, T. V., Bui, T. Q. T., & Bui, L. P. (2024). Integrating tpb, vab and generation theory in studying the green tourism behavior of generation Z: A study in Vietnam. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 57(4 supplement), 1930–1940. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.574spl07-1360
- Perugini, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2001). The role of desires and anticipated emotions in goal-directed behaviours: Broadening and deepening the theory of planned behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(1), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164704
 Qiao, G., Cao, Y., Chen, Q., & Jia, Q. (2022). Understanding Family Tourism: A Perspective of Bibliometric Review. *Frontiers in*
- Qiao, G., Cao, Y., Chen, Q., & Jia, Q. (2022). Understanding Family Tourism: A Perspective of Bibliometric Review. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 937312. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.937312
- Quintal, V. A., Lee, J. A., & Soutar, G. N. (2010). Risk, uncertainty and the theory of planned behavior: A tourism example. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 797–805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.08.006
- Quintal, V. A., Thomas, B., & Phau, I. (2015). Incorporating the winescape into the theory of planned behaviour: Examining 'new world' wineries. *Tourism Management*, 46, 596–609. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.08.013
- Ritchie, J. R. B., & Filiatrault, P. (1980). Family Vacation Decision-Making—A Replication and Extension. Journal of Travel Research, 18(4), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758001800401
- Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., & Alarcón-Urbistondo, P. (2018). Couple Roles in Subdecisions on Family Vacations. Cornell Hospitality Quarterly, 59(2), 160-173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1938965517734941
- Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., & Alarcón-Urbistondo, P. (2019). Couple's Decision-Making Process and Their Satisfaction with the Tourist Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 58(5), 824–836. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287518785052

Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., & Alarcón-Urbistondo, P. (2020). Importance of family for individual tourist satisfaction. Annals of Tourism Research, 85, 103031. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.103031

Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., Alarcón-Urbistondo, P., & Casado-Molina, A. (2019). Is asking only one member of a couple sufficient to determine who influences tourism decisions. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 12, 55–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JDMM.2019.03.005

- Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., Alarcón-Urbistondo, P., & González Robles, E. M. (2018). Couple dynamics in family holidays decision-making process. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2016-0562
- Rojas-de-Gracia, M. M., Alarcón-Urbistondo, P., & Robles, E. M. G. (2017). Couple dynamics in family holidays decision-making process. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 30, 601–617. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-10-2016-0562
- Schänzel, H. A., & Smith, K. A. (2014). The Socialization of Families Away from Home: Group Dynamics and Family Functioning on Holiday. *Leisure Sciences*, 36(2), 126–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2013.857624
- Schänzel, H. A., & Yeoman, I. (2015). Trends in family tourism. Journal of Tourism Futures, 1(2), 141-147. https://doi.org/10. 1108/JTF-12-2014-0006
- Simpson, J. A., Griskevicius, V., & Rothman, A. J. (2012a). Bringing relationships into consumer decision-making. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22(3), 329–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2012.05.004
- Simpson, J. A., Griskevicius, V., & Rothman, A. J. (2012b). Consumer decisions in relationships. Journal of Consumer Psychology, 22(3), 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.09.007
- Smallman, C., & Moore, K. (2010). Process studies of tourists' decision-making. Annals of Tourism Research, 37(2), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.10.014
- Sniehotta, F. F., Presseau, J., & Araújo-Soares, V. (2014). Time to retire the theory of planned behaviour. *Health Psychology Review*, 8(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2013.869710
- Sobaih, A. E. E., Gharbi, H., Zaiem, I., & Aliane, N. (2024). The impact of agrotourism destination image on tourist's loyalty in zaghouan, tunisia: Moderating role of visit's experience. *GeoJournal of Tourism and Geosites*, 56(4), 1700–1707. https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.56425-1339
- Therkelsen, A. (2010). Deciding on Family Holidays—Role Distribution and Strategies in Use. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27, 765–779. https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2010.526895
- Thornton, P., Shaw, G., & Williams, A. M. (1997). Tourist group holiday decision-making and behaviour: The influence of children. *Tourism Management*, 18, 287–297. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(97)00017-4
- Ulker-Demirel, E., & Ciftci, G. (2020). A systematic literature review of the theory of planned behavior in tourism, leisure and hospitality management research. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 43, 209–219. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.04.003
- Um, S., Chon, K., & Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents of revisit intention. Annals of Tourism Research, 33(4), 1141–1158. https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.annals.2006.06.003
- Vesci, M., & Botti, A. (2019). Festival quality, theory of planned behavior and revisiting intention: Evidence from local and small Italian culinary festivals. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 38, 5–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.10.003
- Wang, K., Hsieh, A. T., Yeh, Y. C., & Tsai, C. W. (2004). Who is the decision-maker: The parents or the child in group package tours? *Tourism Management*, 25, 183–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00093-1
- Wang, Y., & Li, M. (2021). Family Identity Bundles and Holiday Decision Making. Journal of Travel Research, 60(3), 486–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287520930091

Article history:	Received: 01.12.2024	Revised: 07.03.2025	Accepted: 07.04.2025	Available online: 14.05.2025
------------------	----------------------	---------------------	----------------------	------------------------------