Positioning: The Example of the Lower Rio Grande Valley in the Winter Long Stay Destination Market

JOHN L. CROMPTON, PAUL C. FAKEYE, AND CHI-CHUAN LUE

A primary target market for the subtropical lower Rio Grande Valley region of South Texas is long-stay winter visitors from the midwest states. This target market is aggressively pursued by other destinations with warm winter temperatures. This article describes a six-stage process that was used to develop a position for the Valley which is unique in the minds of its prospective target market visitors, clearly differentiating it from its competitors.

There is a relatively long tradition of undertaking image research in tourism, dating back at least to the early 1970s (e.g., Mayo 1973; Hunt 1971, 1975; Harris 1972; Demby 1970; Anderssen and Colberg 1973). However, the utility of traditional image research to marketers is limited because, although the strengths and weaknesses of specific image attributes are identified, no guidance is offered as to which attributes should be used in promotion of the destination. Several attributes are likely to emerge as strengths, but traditional image research does not address two key questions. First, which of the strong attributes are important to potential visitors in the target markets? It is probable that some of the perceived strengths should be disregarded because they are of minimal interest to potential visitors. Second, which of the strong attributes are unique and effectively differentiate a destination from competitors in its ability to meet target visitors' needs? Responses to these two questions are incorporated in the concept of positioning.

Positioning is the process of establishing and maintaining a distinctive place for a destination in the minds of potential visitors within target markets. The principle was expressed by Ries and Trout (1981) in the following terms:

> Instead of starting with yourself, you start with the mind of the prospect. Instead of asking what you are, you ask what position you already own in the mind of the prospect. Changing minds in our overcommunicated society is an extremely difficult task. It's much easier to work with what is already there (p. 193).

When a tourism destination establishes and maintains a distinctive positive place for itself in the minds of its target market visitors, it is said to be successfully positioned. In contrast to "image," position requires a frame of reference which is provided by competitive destinations. Positioning involves identifying potential visitors' perceptions of the strong attributes of a destination, comparing them with their perceptions of the attributes of competitive destinations, and selecting those which differentiate a destination from its

competitors. These features are then emphasized and form the cornerstone of marketing strategy. Success is most likely if a small number of differentiated features are emphasized since a larger number may result in a less incisive, more nebulous image.

The concept of positioning was first popularly articulated in 1972 by Ries and Trout in a series of articles entitled "The Positioning Era," published in *Advertising Age*. They later expanded upon these ideas in a book (Ries and Trout 1981). However, they viewed positioning in the limited context of advertising, stating that it was achieved by "manipulating customers' perceptions of reality" (Ries and Trout 1981, p. 242). This pioneering notion of positioning was subsequently expanded as it was recognized that it involved much more than creative advertising. Positioning shares the micro-economic roots of market segmentation (Haahti 1986). It is a stage subsequent to market segmentation at which the marketer determines which of the visitor target market's important needs a destination is better able to service than its competitors. Positioning is concerned with three issues: the segmentation decision, image, and selection of a destination's features to emphasize (Aaker and Shansby 1982).

In the tourism field, Woodside (1982) described a conceptual approach to effective positioning, using Nova Scotia as an example, which stressed using unique attributes of a destination to differentiate it from competitors. He suggested a key to successful positioning was matching benefits provided by a destination with benefits sought by a target market considering a visit to that destination. In addition to Woodside's conceptual contribution, Ries and Trout (1981) offer two detailed anecdotal experiences related to the positioning of Belgium and of Jamaica as tourism destinations. Empirical studies that have appeared in the tourism literature have usually incorporated multidimensional scaling techniques and include those reported by Anderssen and Colberg (1973), Goodrich (1978), Haahti (1986), and Fenton and Pearce (1988).

It may be argued that the positioning decision is the most critical strategic decision for a destination because it is central to determining visitors' perceptions and their choice decisions. "It is the key to developing an effective competitive posture" (Lovelock 1984, p. 134). Aaker and Shansby (1982) state,

John L. Crompton and Chi-Chuan Lue are at Texas A&M University in the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Sciences. Paul C. Fakeye is the Assistant Director of Tourism in the Republic of Benin. The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Chuck Snyder, McAllen Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Since all elements of the marketing program can potentially affect the position, it is usually necessary to use a positioning strategy as a focus for the development of the marketing program. A clear positioning strategy can insure that the elements of the marketing program are consistent and supportive (p. 56).

DEVELOPMENT OF A POSITIONING STRATEGY

The purpose of this article is to illustrate the process of positioning a destination, using the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas as a case study. Concern for positioning comes after market segments have been identified and target markets chosen (Morrison 1989). The six stages involved in developing a positioning strategy, which formed the framework for this study, were adapted from Aaker and Shansby (1982) and Morrison (1989):

1. Identify the competitive destinations.

2. Identify potential visitors' perceptions of the destination of interest's strengths and weaknesses.

3. Identify the benefits sought by potential visitors in the target market.

4. Identify potential visitors' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of preferred competitive destinations.

5. Determine how potential visitors perceive the destination relative to its competitors.

6. Select the optimum position for the destination.

The target market of concern was long stay winter visitors who are known colloquially as "snowbirds." They are almost all over the age of 55 and they originate from the Great Lakes and Midwestern states and from Canada. They leave their homes in October or November and move for a three- to five-month period to the warm subtropical winter climate of southern California, Arizona, Florida, or the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas. At these destinations, they live primarily in recreational vehicles or mobile home parks. In this increasingly competitive long-stay winter visitor market, effective positioning is one of the most critical tasks in marketing.

THE SAMPLE

Details of the sample and data-collection procedures have been described earlier (Fakeye and Crompton 1991). The sample was drawn from three different groups comprised of 390 people from the Great Lakes states or Midwestern states who had never been to the Lower Rio Grande Valley for a winter vacation, 289 individuals who had visited the Valley for the first time within the past year, and 297 visitors who had been coming to the area for two years or more. Data were collected by mail survey and the 568 usable questionnaires represented a 61% overall response rate.

PROCEDURES

The first stage in the study framework was to identify competitive destinations to the Valley. This was operationalized in two ways. First, respondents were asked in an open-ended question to list other winter destinations they had visited in recent years. Almost 70% of the sample reported they had vacationed at other winter destinations in recent years. The destinations that attracted most respondents were Florida (48%), Arizona (33%), and California (13%). No other winter destination had been visited by more than 3% of this group. These empirical data verified the observations of tourism professionals in the Valley that these three destinations were the Valley's primary competitors.

A second operationalization for identifying competitive destinations was achieved by asking respondents an open-ended question, "If you had the necessary resources to spend the winter at your ideal destination where would you go?" Since the sampling frame was comprised of individuals who had visited the Valley or who were believed to have some interest in doing so, it was not surprising that 51% cited the Valley as their ideal winter vacation site. Other destinations selected by respondents were Hawaii, 19%; Arizona, 10%; Florida, 9%; and California, 9%. The inclusion of Hawaii in this second list of competitive destinations was probably attributable to the operational question removing the constraint of cost. A decision was made to include Hawaii in the set of competitive destinations because it was thought that using it as a source for comparison with the Valley might yield helpful positioning insights.

Stage 2 of the study framework required the identification of potential visitors' perceptions of the Valley's strengths and weaknesses. Most discussions of the benefits sought by visitors have tended to revolve around the concepts of "pull" and "push" factors (Crompton 1979). Push factors refer to the social-psychological benefits offered by a destination's facilities, attractions or people. Following this taxonomy, sections were included in the questionnaire to measure the Valley's perceived strengths and weaknesses in facilitating dimensions of both the pull and push benefits sought by potential visitors. The process of developing the sets of push scales and pull scales has been described by Fakeye and Crompton (1991).

To fulfill the requirements of stages 3 and 4, it was necessary to identify the benefits sought by winter visitors and their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the preferred competitive destinations they had identified. To operationalize this, the sets of pull and push items were used. The introductory rubric to the pull attributes read, "The following statements relate to the ideal destination you named. Please show the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements with reference to that destination." Similarly, directions for the push attributes said, "Please circle the appropriate number on the scale to indicate how important each of the following items is in your preference for your ideal place."

It was anticipated that the most important benefits sought by potential visitors in the target market would be manifested in the selection of their ideal destination and their responses to its specific attributes. The procedure adopted to operationalize step 3 of the study framework did restrict respondents to identifying only the range of benefits that had been identified for the Valley. It is possible that respondents may have sought other benefits that were not associated with the Valley and there was no opportunity for these to be expressed. However, since the focus of the study was to position the Valley, there appeared to be no utility to exploring benefits that were not perceived to be available there.

The optimal approach to determining how potential visitors perceive the relative strengths and weaknesses of each of the five competitive destinations would be for each respondent to evaluate all of them. However, it was considered likely that a request to complete the pull and push attributes for all five destinations would have resulted in an unacceptably long questionnaire and a very low response rate. Hence,

TABLE 1

DOMAINS EMERGING FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS OF IMPORTANCE RATINGS FOR PUSH ITEMS

Push Attribute Domains	Factor Loadings	Cronbach Alpha
Factor I: Escape from Pressures		.94
To help release some built-up tensions	.79	
To give my body rest	.78	
To feel less tied down for awhile	.74	
To help get rid of some anxieties	.74	
To get away from the usual demands of life	.70	
To relax physically	.67	
To have a change from my daily routine	.64	
To experience tranquility	.60	
To improve my physical health	.52	
To explore and evaluate myself	.46	
Factor II: Social Interaction		.88
To be with people of similar interests	.77	
To be with my friends	.77	
To be with people who enjoy what I do	.76	
To do things with my companions	.73	
Because the people there are considerate	.48	
Factor III: Enjoy the Natural Environment		.82
To enjoy the smells and sounds of nature	.71	
To enrich myself intellectually	.55	
To be in close contact with nature	.55	
To explore new and different things	.51	
Because I was curious to see the area	.48	
To enjoy the quietness and serenity there	.46	
Factor IV: Seeking Warm Weather		.87
Because the temperature would be nice there	.75	
Because the weather is warmer than my home	.82	
Factor V: Escape from Crowds		.84
To get away from crowds of people	.69	
To get away from crowded situations for awhile	.65	
Factor VI: Family Togetherness		.77
To visit relatives	.76	
To help bring my family together more	.75	

a decision was made to limit evaluation to each respondent's ideal destination. Although this surrogate approach represented a compromise, it ensured that the strongest positive perceptions of the competing destinations were obtained from respondents.

Stage 5 in the positioning process required a determination of how potential visitors perceived the Valley relative to its main competitors. Visitors are likely to select between competitive destinations on the basis of perceived differences between them, and the most important attributes are not always those that distinguish between competitive destinations (Lovelock 1984). For example, this study revealed that the most important of the push attribute domains was seeking warm weather (Table 1); the aggregated mean scores of the items that comprised this factor were higher than those on any other factor. However, all five destinations were perceived by respondents to offer similarly warm weather, so this is not likely to be an attribute that influences winter visitors to select the Valley in preference to its competitors. Concern is with identifying the determinant attributes (Lovelock 1984); that is, those that do determine selection. These may be of lesser importance to visitors, but they are the attributes where significant differences between the destinations are apparent to visitors.

Identification of these determinate attributes was made statistically by use of factor analyses and t-tests. Some of the positioning studies reported in the tourism field have elected to use multidimensional scaling rather than factor analysis (Goodrich 1978; Anderssen and Colberg 1973; Haahti 1986; Fenton and Pearce 1988). Both are descriptive techniques used to reduce data so as to make them more manageable and meaningful. Indeed, multidimensional scaling began primarily as a variant of factor analysis in the late 1930s (Fenton and Pearce 1988). However, factor analysis was selected in this study because it permitted t-tests to be performed on the factor scores, so statistical differences to ascertain the deterministic attributes between the Valley and its competitive destinations could be identified.

Two iterated principal factor analyses with a varimax rotation were undertaken of the ideal destinations' pull items and push items aggregating all respondents. This procedure was used rather than the more common principal components technique because there was no theoretical basis for assuming the error variance represented a relatively small proportion of the total variance. A series of t-tests were undertaken on the mean factor scores of each domain emerging from these factor analyses seeking differences between the Valley and each of its competitors.

RESULTS

The 29 push items loaded on six factors using the crite-

TABLE 2

MEAN PUSH FACTOR SCORES FOR THE VALLEY AND ITS COMPETITORS

Factor	Valley n = 222	Florida n = 30	California n = 29	Arizona n = 26	Hawaii n = 81
I. Escape from Pressure	.133	−.030	−.128	−.025	−.049
II. Social Interaction	.208	.040	−.137	−.278[a]	−.322[a]
III. Enjoy the Natural Environment	−.113	.013	−.173	−.022	.202[a]
IV. Seeking Warm Weather	−.009	−.171	−.223	−.078	.210
V. Escape from Crowds	.022	−.238	−.323	−.507[a]	−.362[a]
VI. Family Togetherness	−.019	.023	.026	.380	−.087

[a] Scores that are significantly different from those recorded for the Valley.

TABLE 3
DOMAINS EMERGING FROM FACTOR ANALYSIS OF IMPORTANCE RATINGS FOR PULL ITEMS

Pull Attribute Domains	Factor Loadings	Cronbach Alpha
Factor I: Quality of Life		.85
Low cost of living	.80	
Lack of traffic congestion	.68	
Plentiful RV/mobile home parks	.65	
Friendly people	.63	
Convenient proximity to Mexico	.62	
Good medical facilities	.54	
Ample local information	.52	
Good opportunities for volunteering	.48	
Factor II: Natural Ambiance		.83
Attractive scenery	.74	
Pleasant weather	.59	
Beautiful greenery	.70	
Relaxing atmosphere	.52	
Good beaches	.58	
Beautiful parks	.60	
Factor III: Cultural Opportunities and Attractions		.80
Plentiful array of concerts	.66	
Plentiful array of festivals	.65	
Good birdwatching opportunities	.53	
Beautiful wildlife refuges	.46	
Plentiful cultural and historical sites	.46	
Factor IV: Transportation and Accommodation		.78
Good car rental facilities	.73	
Good bus system	.70	
Good condominiums/apartments	.52	
Convenient airline schedules	.47	
Factor V: Shopping and Recreation		.67
Good shopping centers	.57	
A wide variety of types of food	.53	
Good highways	.45	
A wide variety of recreational activities	.43	
Factor VI: Evening Entertainment		.70
Good nightlife possibilities	.66	
A variety of good bars	.61	
A variety of good ballrooms	.46	

rion of eigenvalues which exceeded one (Table 1). Two items

— "to get exercise" and "to be where living is fairly safe" — were discarded because their loading on each factor was less than .40. These six factors explained 53% of the total variance, and the Cronbach alphas ranged from .94 to .77. Moreover, most of the factor loadings were greater than .50, implying a reasonably high correlation between the six factors and their individual items. The only item which loaded above .40 on two factors was "to get away from crowds of people," which recorded a .41 loading on Factor I and .61 on Factor V. Given its higher loading on Factor V, it was assigned to that factor.

Table 2 reports the mean factor scores for each of the five destinations. These five destinations accounted for the preferred location of 388 respondents. The remaining 180 respondents identified other preferred locations. The Valley scored higher than all of its competitors on Factors I, II and V, suggesting that any positioning theme related to the push attributes should emerge from these three factors. A series of t-tests was undertaken to identify significant differences (.05 level) between the mean factor scores reported by those identifying the Valley as their ideal destination and those selecting each of the other four competitive destinations. Those competitive destination scores which were significantly different from the Valley scores are indicated by a superscript "a." There were no significant differences on Factor I, which indicated that, although Texas scored higher than its competitors, the difference was not sufficient to provide a unique positioning theme. However, in Factors II and V there were significant differences between Texas and both Arizona and Hawaii. The significantly greater emphasis placed on the Social Interaction and the Escape from Crowds domains by those identifying the Valley as their ideal destination suggests that these two domains may be useful in selecting the Valley's optimum position.

The same procedures were adopted for the pull items. Table 3 shows the six factors that emerged. They accounted for 60.8% of the variance and the Cronbach alphas ranged from .85 to .67. Two items — "good resorts" and "good golf courses" — were discarded because they did not attain a loading of at least .40 on any of the factors. The items "relaxing atmosphere" and "good highways" both loaded saliently on Factor I with loadings of .44 and .41, respectively. However, they were assigned to Factors II and IV, respectively, because they loaded higher on these factors. The mean factor scores are shown in Table 4 and those which are significantly different from the Valley scores are indicated by a superscript "a." The t-tests showed that the Valley was perceived as being significantly superior to all of its competitors on Factor I, which was termed Quality of Life. This suggests the items in this factor should be central in positioning strategy for the Valley.

TABLE 4
MEAN PULL FACTOR SCORES FOR THE VALLEY AND ITS COMPETITORS

Factor	Valley n = 222	Florida n = 30	California n = 29	Arizona n = 26	Hawaii n = 81
I. Quality of Life	.375	-.833[a]	-.828[a]	-.251[a]	-.930[a]
II. Natural Ambience	-.321	.009	-.169	-.215	.656[a]
III. Cultural Opportunities and Attractions	-.187	.105	.136	.070	.301[a]
IV. Transportation and Accommodation	.247	.005	.332	.181	-.146[a]
V. Evening Entertainment	.044	.245	.255	.269	-.154
VI. Shopping and Recreation	.167	.184	-.080	-.310[a]	.100

[a] Scores that are significantly different from those recorded for the Valley.

TABLE 5
DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PUSH FACTOR SCORES FOR NONVISITORS WHO INTEND TO VISIT THE VALLEY IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS AND THOSE WHO DO NOT OR WHO ARE UNDECIDED

	Intend to Visit n = 87	Do Not Intend to Visit or Undecided n = 45
Factor I	.006	−.003
Factor II	−.071	−.277
Factor III	.188	−.033
Factor IV	−.219	−.193
Factor V	.297	.264
Factor VI	.312[a]	−.013[a]

[a] Scores that are significantly different.

An alternative and complementary approach to selecting determinate attributes that may be useful for positioning is to identify the domains that differentiate between those winter visitors who plan to return to the Valley (or in the case of nonvisitors those who intend to visit in the next five years) and those who do not. This was achieved by conducting a series of t-tests seeking significant differences (.05 level) on each of the push and pull factors, within each of the nonvisitor, first-timer, and repeater segments. The results are shown in Tables 5-8.

Differentiating attributes for both first-timers and repeaters emerged on Factor II, Social Interaction, on the push domains (Table 6) and Factor I, Quality of Life, on the pull domains (Table 8). Those who expected to return placed greater importance on social interaction and on quality of life, as defined by the factor's attributes, than those who did not plan to return. Among repeat visitors, there was also a significant difference in importance attached to Escape from Pressure, Factor I of the push factors, by those who planned to return (Table 6). In the segment of respondents who had never been to the Valley, Family Togetherness, Factor VI of the push factors, and Factor III of the pull domains, Cultural Opportunities and Attractions, were differentiating attributes (Tables 5 and 7).

DISCUSSION

Stage 6, the final stage in development of a positioning strategy, is to select the optimum position for the destination.

Aaker and Shansby (1982) note that positioning by attribute, the approach adopted in this study, is the most frequently used positioning strategy. They suggest that only one or at the most two attributes should be used and caution, "It is always tempting to try to position along several attributes. However, positioning strategies that involve too many attributes can be most difficult to implement. The result can often be a fuzzy confused image."

The convergence of results emerging from the statistical analyses offer some clear guidelines for positioning the Valley. The Valley was scored significantly higher than all its competitors in Quality of Life (Table 4) and this factor was deterministic in differentiating between those who expected to return to the Valley and those who did not among both first-timers and repeaters (Table 8). Similarly, the analyses reveal that the Valley was scored higher than all its competitors and was significantly differentiated from two of them on the Social Interaction factor (Table 2), and that this factor effectively differentiated between those who expected and did not expect to return in both the first-timer and repeater segments (Table 6).

Looking at the items that comprise these two factors, it appears that the competitive strengths the Valley can exploit to its advantage are two:

1. Low cost of living in the area, including plentiful recreation vehicle and mobile home sites, with adequate medical facilities and no traffic congestion. (It is important to convey that the low cost of living does not imply that quality of life amenities are low.)

2. Opportunities for socially interacting with similar others, including friendly local people and involvement in volunteerism.

Because of the intangible nature of a destination, an explicit positioning strategy is valuable in helping prospective visitors to get a "mental fix" on it that may otherwise be amorphous (Lovelock 1984). The two unique strengths identified by the analyses provide a focus which should guide all service, marketing, and communication decisions. They appear to describe the unique niche which the Valley occupies in the increasingly competitive winter visitor market.

The two positioning attributes may be difficult to evaluate by prospects because they are "hidden" qualities, not obvious to anyone who has not been there. Communicating these qualities distinctively and convincingly to prospects will be challenging. However, the competitive destinations provide a frame of reference for such communications. Con-

TABLE 6
DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PUSH FACTOR SCORES OF REPEAT AND FIRST-TIME VISITORS WHO EXPECTED TO RETURN TO THE VALLEY NEXT SEASON AND THOSE WHO EXPECTED NOT TO RETURN OR WHO WERE UNDECIDED

	First-Time Visitors		Repeat Visitors	
	Expect to Return n = 99	Do Not Expect to Return or Undecided n = 89	Expect to Return n = 183	Do Not Expect to Return or Undecided n = 55
Factor I	.088	−.104	.091[a]	−.284[a]
Factor II	.040[a]	−.201[a]	.232[a]	−.195[a]
Factor III	.030	.131	−.106	−.127
Factor IV	.175	.074	.006	.017
Factor V	−.059	−.051	−.094	−.184
Factor VI	−.030	.171	−.058	−.220

[a] Scores that are significantly different.

TABLE 7

**DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PULL FACTOR
SCORES FOR NONVISITORS WHO INTEND
TO VISIT THE VALLEY IN THE NEXT
FIVE YEARS AND THOSE WHO DO NOT
OR WHO ARE UNDECIDED**

	Intend to Visit n = 87	Do Not Intend to Visit or Undecided n = 45
Factor I	.138	−.031
Factor II	−.001	−.266
Factor III	−.012[a]	−.504[a]
Factor IV	−.066	.142
Factor V	−.098	−.253
Factor VI	−.159	−.353

[a] Scores that are significantly different.

trasting the Valley's position on these attributes with that of competitors is likely to be effective. This may be done by using testimonials from existing Winter Texans, with whom prospects can identify, extolling these attributes and contrasting them favorably with the relatively high cost of living and fewer social interaction opportunities they have experienced at the competitive destinations.

The analyses of prospective visitors who intended and did not intend or were undecided about visiting the Valley did not suggest alternative positioning themes. The failure of the quality of life and social interaction domains to differentiate between them appears to confirm that they are hidden qualities of which prospects are not currently aware.

The position is likely to appeal to large numbers in the target market and has the considerable advantage of appearing to be "real" in the visitors' minds. This latter point is crucial:

> Don't try to be something you are not. It is tempting but naive —
> and usually fatal — to decide on a positioning strategy that exploits
> a market need or opportunity but assumes that your product is
> something it is not . . . Make sure the product can deliver what it
> promises and that it is compatible with a proposed image (Aaker
> and Shansby 1982, p. 62).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Wind (1978), in his seminal article, suggested that three bases for segmentation or a hybrid of them were preferred:

product usage, product preference, and benefits sought. These three descriptions were used in this study. Product use was operationalized by selecting a sample of nonvisitors, first timers, and repeaters. Product preference was determined by respondents' responses to the five competitive destinations. Benefits sought was measured by the pull and push attributes. The use of these bases is likely to create segments that are actionable from a marketing standpoint. In the context of a discussion related to segmenting the Canadian tourism market it was observed,

> In the authors' experience segmentation based on benefits desired
> is usually the most meaningful type to use from a marketing
> standpoint as it directly facilitates product planning, positioning,
> and advertising communications (Young, Ott, and Feigin 1978, p.
> 406).

Interest in the winter long stay destination market is likely to increase as it grows in size with the "graying of America," the movement towards earlier retirement, and the improved health and vigor of future retirees. Competition will intensify and for destinations to secure the greatest return on their marketing investments; it will be essential to establish a distinctive, positive and unique position in the minds of prospective target visitors.

The findings of this study are limited by the sample that was used. The numerical bias among respondents in favor of selecting the Valley as their ideal destination was a function of the way in which the sample was collected. However, some positive aspects were associated with using this sampling frame. Most of the sample were active winter visitor travelers. The organic image of the destinations was assessed, along with the more realistic induced or complex image (Gunn 1972) which emerged as a result of experience. Many of the respondents had visited not only the Valley, but also one or more of its competitors.

Despite the limitations of the sample, the findings intuitively appear to be sound among those involved in attracting Winter Texans to the Valley. However, it would obviously be prudent to use a more representative sampling frame to confirm the position themes identified in this study before committing consistently to these themes for the long term which is necessary for positioning to be effective. Irrespective of the study's findings, the major purpose of the study was to illustrate the process of finding a position for a destination and the sample provided data which adequately served that purpose.

TABLE 8

**DIFFERENCES IN THE MEAN PULL FACTOR SCORES OF REPEAT AND FIRST-TIME
VISITORS WHO EXPECTED TO RETURN TO THE VALLEY NEXT SEASON
AND THOSE WHO EXPECTED NOT TO RETURN OR WHO WERE UNDECIDED**

	First-Time Visitors		Repeat Visitors	
	Expect to Return n = 99	Do Not Expect to Return or Undecided n = 89	Expect to Return n = 183	Do Not Expect to Return or Undecided n = 55
Factor I	.021[a]	−.237[a]	.141[a]	−.332[a]
Factor II	.122	−.018	−.129	.013
Factor III	.044	−.196	.185	.169
Factor IV	.049	−.036	−.013	.047
Factor V	.082	.120	.012	−.074
Factor VI	.047	.010	.174	−.038

[a] Scores that are significantly different.

REFERENCES

Aaker, D. A., and J. G. Shansby (1982). "Positioning your Product." *Business Horizons,* May-June: 56-62.

Anderssen, P., and R. Colberg (1973). "Multivariate Analysis in Travel Research: A Tool for Travel Package Design and Market Segmentation." *The Travel Research Association, Fourth Annual Conference Proceedings,* pp. 225-240.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). "Motivations for Pleasure Vacations." *Annals of Tourism Research,* 6 (4): 408-24.

Demby, E. H. (1970). "Travels Not So Far Away." *Proceedings of the Annual Council for Travel Research Conference.*

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys.* New York: John Wiley.

Fakeye, P. C., and J. L. Crompton (1991). "Image Differences between Prospective, First Time, and Repeat Visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley." *Journal of Travel Research,* 30 (Fall): 10-16.

Fenton, M., and P. Pearce (1988). "Multidimensional Scaling and Tourism Research." *Annals of Tourism Research,* 15: 236-54.

Goodrich, J. N. (1978). "A New Approach to Image Analysis through Multidimensional Scaling." *Journal of Travel Research,* 16 (Winter): 3-7.

Gunn, C. A. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions.* University of Texas, Austin: Bureau of Business Research.

Haahti, A. J. (1986). "Finland's Competitive Position as a Destination." *Annals of Tourism Research,* 13, 11-35.

Harris, L. (1972). "The Challenge of Research in the Coming Era of Travel." *Third Annual Conference Proceedings of the Travel Research Association.*

Hunt, J. D. (1971). "Image — A Factor in Tourism." Fort Collins: Colorado State University, unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.

——— (1975). "Image as a Factor in Tourism Development." *Journal of Travel Research,* 13 (Winter): 1-7.

Lovelock, C. H. (1984). *Services Marketing.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mayo, E. J. (1973). "Regional Images and Regional Travel Behavior." *Proceedings of the Travel Research Association Fourth Annual Conference.* Salt Lake City: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah, August, pp. 211-18.

Morrison, A. M. (1989). *Hospitality and Travel Marketing.* Albany, NY: Delmar.

Ries, A., and J. Trout (1981). *Positioning: The Battle for Your Mind.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Wind, Y. (1978). "Issues and Advances in Segmentation Research." *Journal of Marketing Research,* 14: 317-37.

Woodside, A. G. (1982). "Positioning a Province Using Travel Research." *Journal of Travel Research,* 20 (Winter): 2-6.

Young, S., L. Ott, and B. Feigin (1978). "Some Practical Considerations in Market Segmentation." *Journal of Marketing Research,* 15 (August): 405-12.