

PERCEPTIONS OF ADVERTISING BY DOG OWNERS AND NON-DOG OWNERS: AN
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

A Thesis
by
BAILEY ELIZABETH BELCHER

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

August 2011
Walker College of Business

PERCEPTIONS OF ADVERTISING BY DOG OWNERS AND NON-DOG OWNERS:
AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

A Thesis
by
BAILEY ELIZABETH BELCHER
August 2011

APPROVED BY:

Michael Dotson
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Dana Clark
Member, Thesis Committee

Eva Hyatt
Member, Thesis Committee

Joseph Cazier
Assistant Dean, Walker College of Business

Edelma Huntley
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

Copyright by Bailey Elizabeth Belcher 2011
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

PERCEPTIONS OF ADVERTISING BY DOG OWNERS AND NON-DOG OWNERS: AN
EXPERIMENTAL STUDY. (August 2011)

Bailey Elizabeth Belcher, B.S.B.A. Appalachian State University

MBA, Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Michael Dotson

More Americans are traveling with their pets every year. Unfortunately, not all travelers enjoy being surrounded by other traveler's pets. Hotels are having an increasingly difficult time reaching both target markets without turning away one or the other. The current study examines how each target market is affected by three differing levels of advertisements. The advertisements differ based on the involvement of pets in the advertisement. It was found that the advertisement with the most pet involvement turned away non-dog owners more than it attracted dog owners.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iv
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review	3
Hypothesis	10
Methodology	11
Short Qualitative Open Ended Interview.....	11
Experimental Design	13
Sample	14
Results.....	16
Results of both Non-Dog Owners and Dog Owners	16
Results of Dog Owners	18
Results of Non-Dog Owners	19
Implications	23
Limitations and Future Research	24
Conclusions.....	25
References	26
Appendix A.....	28
Appendix B.....	32
Vita	35

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality industry faces new issues revolving around travelers with pets. In recent years pet travel has increased dramatically with over half of all pet owners would like to travel with their pets (Karp, 2003). With this new demand in the industry, hotels are having a difficult time responding while keeping both dog and non-dog owners. Dog owners have a hard time finding locations that allow pets (Carr & Cohen, 2009). Hotels would like to reach this new consumer segment, but what type of advertising should be done to reach all types of consumers without driving any of them away? There is a need within the industry to study advertisements and consumer responses.

This experimental study attempts to begin to answer this question by using differing levels of advertisements to analyze consumer responses through behavioral intent. The advertisements will differ by levels of pet involvement. It is hypothesized that the advertisement with the most pet involvement will most attract pet owners rather than deter non-pet owners. Respondents to the survey will be randomly shown the advertisements through Survey Monkey and asked questions about their attitudes towards the hotel and their future actions. The analysis was completed using SPSS and is organized by total respondents, non-dog owners, and dog owners.

It is the purpose of this study to attempt to determine a general state of advertisement that is a good starting point for more branded ads towards consumers. Hopefully, this study will find a middle ground that lets pet owners know that their pets are welcomed at the

location while at the same time not driving business away with non-pet owners. Limitations do exist in the number of respondents and the generic under tones of the created advertisements.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Dog Ownership and Spending

The hospitality industry is a constantly changing industry. Consumer preferences for travel lodging are a growing research field as consumer's choice criteria evolves. A growing trend is consumers traveling with their pets. In 2003, 14% of adults were traveling with their pets to more than 20,000 pet-friendly properties (Wolff, 2003). A massive 65% of pet owners wanted to travel with their pets (Karp, 2003), and 78% of owners considered their dogs as family members (Carr & Cohen, 2009).

The pet industry has become bigger than ever. The pet care industry alone has doubled in size since 2000 and is expected to grow to over \$5.10 billion by 2011 (Campoy, 2010). In 2009, owners spent \$45 billion on pets including care, travel, and gifts. This demonstrates the potential profits to be made from pet owners within multiple industries (Elliot, 2010). In 2007 pet owners made \$8,000 more income per year than non-pet owners, perhaps demonstrating their ability to afford the cost for traveling with their pets (Karp, 2007). It is important to understand the impact this large segment of consumers can have and to understand their choice criteria for hotel selection. Looking at pet owners and non-owners individually is imperative to fully understand their impact on the industry.

Hospitality Industry

Although in 2003 strides were made to accommodate pet travelers, much work was still needed. As a consumer stated, "It would be nice to have more options to take them (pets)

along” (Carr & Cohen, 2009). Pet accommodations have continued to be offered more often by hotels. By 2006 over 50% of hotels in the United States allowed pets (Karp, 2007). Although there are many pet-friendly locations, there are also many restrictions hotels put on pet owners. For example, there may be a pet fee, limits on the weight of the pet or even limitations on the breeds allowed. Rules such as these and the non-barking policy prevent many owners from travel with pets (Bunderson, 2010). These restrictions are used not only to protect the staff but also allow non-pet owners to continue to stay at these hotels without worrying about the presence of pets (*Trip Advisor Sniffs*, 2010). It is obvious that hotels must consider pet travelers and the safety and happiness of non-pet owners.

As more hotels become pet-friendly, there are many factors to be considered. To accommodate all parties, hotels often have pre-arranged rooms just for pets, similar to smoking rooms (Wolff, 2003). Some hotels put pet owners in the smoking rooms or dedicate certain floors and buildings to pet owners. The hotel industry has realized the profit potential traveling pet owners’ offer and is working to accommodate all consumer needs (Karp, 2003).

Hotels also need to consider added costs of becoming pet-friendly, including cleaning fees, which can be as high as \$150 per room. These costs add to a pet owner’s nightly travel expense as hotels add pet fees to their price to cover the costs (Karp, 2007). In one situation a man invested over \$1.5 million in his pet-friendly luxury hotel, and in the first two years he took a loss of over \$200,000. Another \$10 million dog park in Dallas closed in early 2010 because the overhead costs were too high to make a profit (Campoy, 2010). Although hotels take the risk of losing business when becoming pet-friendly, more statistics are coming out every year that push for pet-friendly accommodations (Karp, 2007).

Idaho is home to many hotels that are pet-friendly. Most pet-friendly hotels keep pets and their owners in a separate facility on the property. To help reach this market, hotels are educating their staff on new policies and making sure staff treats the animals as well as their owners (Bunderson, 2010). Even Disney has taken notice of this growing hospitality trend. In 2010 Disney opened its first luxury pet resort in Florida. The resort can hold 270 dogs and 30 cats while offering the best in luxury pet care. Pets have special play areas, spa rooms, pet suites with TVs, private rooms, and special beds (*Disney Opens Luxury*, 2010). These accommodations seem outrageous to some, but spending pet owners are more than willing to spoil their pets while on vacation. The VP of the Pet Care Association has been quoted stating, “In this industry, nothing is really too outrageous anymore” (Campoy, 2010, p. 1). Another hotel in Fort Worth, Texas has created a luxury pet resort worth \$4.4 million. This resort offers rooms for weddings with pet participants, parties and photo shoots. The hotel includes spa packages, pet treats, an expensive pet boutique, and luxury sleeping arrangements. Not only are resorts and hotels participating in this trend but shelters are becoming more lavish to target wealthier customers (Campoy, 2010). Airlines are also taking actions to target this industry (Karp, 2003) by offering accommodations for pet travel.

Incentives for hotels to accommodate both pet travelers and non-pet travelers are crucial to success. Accommodating both parties adds consumer loyalty to that hotel. With increased travel consumers are becoming more experienced. Their expectations for hotels have risen which has increased competition between hotels. Hotels must meet or exceed these expectations, which include pet policies that are respectful of pet owners and non-pet owners (Harris, 2010). Pet policies are great developments for traveling pet owners, but are also painful discoveries to the 17% of Americans that are allergic to pet allergens. Although

becoming pet-friendly targets a new segment for hotels, policies can cause numerous non-pet owners to avoid using a particular lodging facility. Inconsistencies between written policies and actual actions taken by the hotel create more uncertainty. Unfortunately, as hard as hotels try, many do not properly record which rooms are pet-friendly and which are not (Karp, 2007) leaving the cleanliness of each room questionable.

Research has shown that this market does exist, but hotels have yet to make a commitment to accommodate these travelers. It is difficult for pet owners to stay at luxury hotels and travel on airplanes without paying large fees. Owners have begun to sneak their pets onto planes, and into resorts and hotels (Elliot, 2010). Looking at air travel, 57% of pet owners found it acceptable to bring a dog into the cabin while 59% of non-pet owners were against it (*Trip Advisor Sniffs*, 2010). This demonstrates the ongoing battle between pet owners and non-pet owners and stresses that the hospitality industry should accommodate both segments.

Travel Choice for Pet Owners and Non-Pet Owners

Frequent Traveler Hotel Choice Criteria: Non-Pet Owners.

According to JD Power and Associates, frequent travelers are defined as “those who have traveled within North America more than 10 times in the past 12 months and are also members of a frequent hotel guest program provided by any brand” (*JD Power*, 2010, p. 1). By 2005, research began on consumer choice in the hotel industry. According to one study, service amenities were most important in consumer choice with leisure travel. These service amenities include customization features and technological improvements. The number one factor for leisure travelers was hotel type while technologies, like booking their stay online,

were second and customization factors including pet policies was third (Victorino, Verma, Plaschka, & Dev, 2005).

Analysis of another study concluded that several relationships exist between consumer choice, perceived quality, and brand equity. Positive statistical relationships exist between the following factors: 1-consumer choice factors and perceived quality, 2-perceived quality and brand equity, 3-consumer choice and brand equity, and 4-service quality, consumer choice factors and brand equity. This study confirms that consumer hotel choice is influenced by the perceived quality of the hotel and the brand equity (Vatjanasaregagul, 2007).

Service innovation has become a requirement by consumers since this is a convenient way to differentiate them. Innovations in the industry include hotel type, use of information technology, and customization of service. A study found the most valued technological innovations include a wake up system, electronic door locks, in-room pay-per-view, multiple phone lines, video library, personal computers, voice mail, video check out, electronic in-room safes, and a software library (Victorino et al., 2005).

Customization is the most influential factor to consumers and is the most difficult and expensive to implement. One study suggested categories for consumer choice decisions: hotel type, price, loyalty/frequent user programs, eating options, office facilities and technology options, customization options, and hotel amenities. This researcher focused on hotel type, technology, and customization. The study ultimately found that business travelers look most at hotel type while leisure travelers care most about technology and customization. In the end, service innovation did make a huge impact on the consumer's decision (Victorino et al., 2005).

Why Pet Owners Travel with Pets and Their Hotel Choice Criteria.

Dog owners have many reasons for wanting to travel with their pets: The dog is part of the family, it helps the family relax, it makes the vacation more pleasurable, people avoid feeling guilt for leaving the dog behind, people love their dogs, they feel safer when the dog is with them, it is cheaper/more convenient to take the dog along, it makes the dog happy, and people can avoid making their dogs depressed (Carr & Cohen, 2009). For pet owners, a hotel's pet policy is included in the perceived quality factors. A 2010 study showed that in 2009 61% of pet owners were traveling with their pets, 26% thought of their pets as an inseparable part of the family, and 14% felt that traveling with their pets cost less than leaving them behind (*Trip Advisor Sniffs*, 2010). Even 28% of people traveling with pets say they would rather travel with their pets than their spouse (*More Than Half*, 2010). When pet owners are traveling, 44% say they look for how much designated green space is available and another 16% look for pet daycare at the hotel (*Trip Advisor Sniffs*, 2010).

The most used sources pet owners use to find pet-friendly accommodations are the internet and friends (Carr & Cohen, 2009). According to Expedia, 56% of travelers choose their destinations online. This increase in online consumer research has prompted many travel agencies to shift their advertising budgets to online versus offline media (*New Research from Expedia*, 2010). There are many websites dedicated to helping pet owners travel, but a 2009 study found the number one reason people don't travel with their pets was because it was too hard to find locations that accepted pets (Carr & Cohen, 2009).

Why Non-Pet Owners Don't Want Pets Traveling.

One study ranked the top annoyance for travelers is people traveling with pets. In mass transportation the most common annoyances were allergy issues (39%) and loud pets

(26%). For irritations with the pet owner, the most common annoyances were owners not picking up after pets (56%), bringing pets into inappropriate places (35%), and owners expecting other travelers to treat their pets like humans (*Trip Advisor Sniffs*, 2010). Overall, non-pet owners have numerous reasons for not wanting people to travel with their pets, but it is up to the hotel industry to find a happy medium between the two parties.

Attitude Toward the Advertisement

A 2008 study by Um looked at the relationship between advertising appeals and brand loyalty. Advertising appeals are either emotional or rational, and brand loyalty focuses on attitudinal or behavioral. The study created advertisements for two products, one high involvement the other low involvement. It cited previous research that found there are more positive reactions to emotional appeal advertisements. A study also looked at the Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM) and people's reaction to emotional versus rational advertising appeals. Researchers found rational appeal is more effective when the involvement is high and emotional appeal works when the involvement is low. A high involvement product is one where a high volume of thought is taken into consideration about the product. With low involvement products the consumer is using very little thought to make a purchase. This study found the effectiveness of the advertisement depends on the types of products it is advertising. Generally speaking, a person's attitude towards an ad does not affect brand loyalty. The findings also suggest that when looking at the effectiveness of an advertisement, the company must also measure brand affect, brand identification, brand trust, and brand loyalty (Um, 2008).

HYPOTHESIS

The major hypothesis for this study is that in general dog owners would be affected by the pet photo, high, advertisement. Dog owners will have the most positive reaction to the pet photo ad because it is the most dog-friendly.

Other research questions include: 1) Owners will be more apt to stay at the hotel in the pet photo advertisement, 2) non-owners will be more apt to stay at the hotel in the no pet ad and 3) women will want to travel with the pets more than males.

METHODOLOGY

Short Qualitative Open Ended Interview

Introduction.

Before creating the survey it was decided to complete a short qualitative open ended interview for further research. I interviewed both dog owners and non-dog owners individually on a public outdoor walking area. Both dog owners and non-dog owners of all ages can be found in this area. I approached citizens and asked if they would be willing to participate. Respondents were told that the interview was not invasive and would take about 5 minutes. Respondents were asked questions in conversation style and responses were recorded to transcribe later. Main questions were about general feelings about dogs and travel with dogs. I also asked respondents how they felt hotels should handle advertising their pet policy to both pet owners and non-pet owners. An equal number of dog owners and non-dog owners were interviewed until responses began to repeat and no new information was brought forth. When asked, respondents gave a range of ages from mid-20s to mid-60s with answers from both genders.

Results.

All dog owners described their dog as a part of the family and stated that as the main reason they wanted to travel with them. Owners used the internet to locate lodging that allowed pets and found it difficult to find these locations. Some wanted the hotel to be dog-friendly while others wanted attributes such as no cage rules while the dog is left alone in the

room, a place where the dog could run, and places for them to use the restroom. The main concerns this group had were that the hotel cleaned the room well.

Dog owners that did not travel with their pets were also surveyed. The majority of dogs played a part of family within the respondents' lives although there was a single respondent that said the dog played a protective and companion type of role. Examples of reasons why these people did not travel with their dogs include that the dog is too young and rambunctious, they also have kids and traveling with both is too much, they feel that it will be too difficult and therefore have yet to try, or they feel that it stresses the dog out too much. Their main concern about staying in a hotel with their pet was the irritation other travelers.

Most non-dog owners are neutral with whether or not people should travel with their dogs. As long as the dog is well trained and clean, most respondents did not mind if people traveled with pets. Their main concerns about hotels allowing dogs were cleanliness of the rooms and grounds, noise levels, and allergies. Comparisons were made of traveling with dogs to traveling with kids, that there are going to be typical nuances that are to be expected. Here a comparison was also made to smoking and non-smoking rooms. In smoking rooms there are concerns about left over smells and overall cleanliness. This comparison seemed to be an easy way for these people to relate to hotels allowing dogs.

Dog owners suggested hotels advertise that they have a pet policy and include separation of rooms similar to smoking and non-smoking rooms. Dog owners want advertising since it is hard to find pet-friendly hotels. The majority of dog owners said hotels should advertise their pet policy "loudly" because it is important to both dog owners and non-dog owners. The majority of non-dog owners saw advertising a pet policy as a double-edged sword. Respondents said it would bring in more customers, but at the same time it may

steer others away that do not want to deal with issues associated with dogs being in a hotel. Respondents also wanted hotels to keep strict records of which rooms held dogs and not change the rooms once the policy is made to protect its cleanliness. These responses gathered were used in the creation of the main survey.

Experimental Design

Design.

This experiment is built with a 2 x 3 factorial design. Factor 1 is dog ownership, which has 2 levels: dog owner and non-dog owner. Factor 2 is the manipulations, which are the advertisements that have been created. There are 3 levels of advertising treatments. Level 1 is the “low” level of manipulation with no pet reference, level 2 is the “medium” level of manipulation with a link for pet amenities, and the final level 3 represents a “high” level of manipulation with the link, a dog photo and a motto including both human and pet.

Creation of the Advertisements.

It was decided to use an advertisement that simulated an internet homepage for a hotel. Three different levels of advertisements were created. One has no mention of pets, another has little mention of pets, and the final one heavily supports pets. The first ad with no mention of pets can be found in appendix B as Figure 1. This first advertisement is labeled as the no pet ad for its low pet involvement. The second advertisement which has a minimal amount of pet advertising is Figure 2 in appendix B and is labeled as the pet link ad. Finally, the pet photo advertisement has the highest amount of pet advertising and is Figure 3 in appendix B. Figure 3 is labeled as the pet photo ad.

Measures and Content of Survey.

There are five measures used in the survey: respondent current behavior, personal beliefs, attitude towards the advertisement, beliefs about the hotel, and behavioral intent. Respondent current behavior is used for example to find how much planning they put into travel, how they relate to their dogs, etc. The personal beliefs section is to understand how the respondent views dogs in general, their hygiene, hotels in general, and more specifically hotels that allow dogs. In the questions, respondents were asked specific questions targeted towards the advertisement shown to the respondent. Respondents are also asked their views on the hotel based on the advertisement. Questions are geared towards views on the hotel upkeep, staff, and how they believe their stay would be. Finally respondents have questions regarding their behavioral intent. These questions center on whether respondents would actually stay at the hotel, with or without their families, how safe they would feel at the hotel, etc.

The survey comprised of three organized sets of questions. There are questions given to all respondents, questions specifically for dog owners and questions given only to non-dog owners. The items were measured on a five point likert scale, 1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree unless otherwise noted. After a favorable pre-testing of the survey, the surveyor went on to send the survey out to the main respondents. The survey is labeled as study 1 in Appendix A.

Sample

Respondents were gathered through a snowballing email strategy to ensure the most diverse group of respondents. An email was created asking for participation until at least 300 respondents were gathered. Below is a chart summarizing the demographics.

Table 1: Respondent Demographics

Total Number Respondent	338		Number of Dog-Owners	162	Number of Non-Dog Owners	177
Variable	Total Frequency	Total Percentage	Dog-Owner Frequency	Dog-Owner Percentage	Non-Owner Frequency	Non-Owner Percentage
Gender: Male	105	32	49	31	56	34
Female	219	68	111	69	108	66
Age: <18	2	1	1	1	1	1
19-34	96	29	47	29	49	30
35-49	88	27	56	35	32	19
50-64	78	24	38	24	40	24
65+	61	19	18	11	43	26
Marital Status: Single	65	20	30	19	35	21
Living Together	26	8	11	7	15	9
Divorced	17	5	5	3	12	7
Married	208	64	110	69	98	60
Widowed	8	3	3	2	5	3
Education: <HighSchool	46	14	20	13	26	16
2 yr Degree	59	18	27	17	32	19
4 yr Degree	142	44	72	45	70	42
Masters +	77	24	39	25	38	23
Income: \$25,000	53	17	26	16	37	22
\$26,000-\$45,000	60	19	36	22	24	14
\$46,000-\$75,000	67	21	31	19	36	22
\$76,000-\$100,000	67	21	28	18	39	23
\$101,000-\$150,000	41	13	20	13	21	13
\$151,000+	29	9	19	12	10	6

RESULTS

Results were imported into SPSS. Two types of analyses were done on three different groups. Two way ANOVA and GLM analysis were done on dog owners, non-dog owners, and the two combined. Below are the results and findings organized by the three groups.

Results of both Non-Dog Owners and Dog Owners Combined

Two way ANOVAs and GLMs were completed in multiple ways for the total group of respondents. ANOVAs were done on the advertisement, behavioral intent, and hotel questions in the survey. After those analyses were completed, ANOVAs were done by gender and random advertisement assignment. Table 2 shows the significant ANOVA analyses for the total respondents by treatment level.

Table 2: Significant Findings of Total Respondents by Level of Treatment

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Low	MEAN 2-Medium	MEAN 3-High	F	SIG
I find this ad to be appealing	3.8182	3.6869	3.4153	7.655	.001
Based on this ad, this hotel is very appealing to me.	3.6330	3.6020	3.3333	4.150	.017
This advertisement shows a hotel that I would be interested	3.8818	3.7677	3.3983	11.506	.000
Overall, I like this hotel.	3.7727	3.7374	3.4310	7.067	.001
I would stay at this hotel for a business trip.	3.7064	3.4227	3.0847	14.159	.000
I would stay at this hotel for a personal trip.	3.7706	3.5758	3.2881	10.134	.000
I would stay at this hotel with my family.	3.7339	3.6667	3.3136	8.885	.000
I believe that I would get a good night's sleep here.	3.6481	3.6162	3.3534	5.626	.004
I would feel comfortable staying in this hotel.	3.7156	3.6263	3.4746	3.124	.045
I believe the furniture in this hotel is very clean.	3.5727	3.5253	3.3220	3.497	.031
The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.	4.0182	3.6531	3.8291	3.838	.023

Table 3 shows the significant ANOVA analyses for the total respondents findings by gender level.

Table 3: Significant Findings of Total Respondents by Gender

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Male	MEAN 2-Female	F	SIG
I like to travel.	4.2667	4.4658	4.949	.027
I travel mostly for business	2.4190	1.9037	17.336	.000
I travel mostly for pleasure.	3.7524	4.1239	9.420	.002
I put a great amount of time and effort into planning my trips.	3.7500	3.9817	5.316	.022
The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.	3.5524	3.9770	14.330	.000

There were 16 total questions found to have significance. Overall, those who saw the pet photo ad were least favorable about the hotel and those who saw the no pet ad were most favorable. Those who saw the pet link ad were always in the middle, however, leaning towards the positive side. The differing levels of ads did not affect the respondent's views of the majority of the cleanliness questions, or their views about the safety of the hotel or the appeal of the amenities. Females reported that they had more involvement in planning personal trips and indicated a higher level of concern for quality than males.

GLM analyses were conducted on questions answered by both segments based on the random advertisement they were shown and by dog ownership. Overall the GLM analyses show that total respondents shown the no pet advertisement are more favorable towards the ad and hotel than those shown the pet photo ad. Those shown the no pet ad were also more favorable towards staying at the hotel for multiple reasons, while those shown the pet photo ad were least likely to stay. Also, dog owners have a more favorable outlook towards the ads than non-dog owners, especially non-dog owners shown the pet photo advertisement. Dog owners shown the no pet advertisement were more favorable towards the hotel while non-dog owners shown the pet photo ad were least favorable.

Results of Dog Owners

The same ANOVA and GLM analyses were completed on dog owners. Table 4 details the analysis broken down by treatment level and Table 5 is broken down by gender.

Table 4: Significant Findings of Dog Owners by Level of Treatment

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Low	MEAN 2-Med	MEAN 3- High	F	SIG
I would stay at this hotel for a business trip.	3.7288	3.3673	3.3400	3.544	.031
I would feel safe leaving my dog unattended in this hotel's room.	3.0333	3.4800	3.2000	3.462	.034

Table 5: Significant Findings of Dog Owners by Gender

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Male	MEAN 2- Female	F	SIG
I travel mostly for business	2.3878	1.9820	5.094	.025
The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.	3.4898	4.0182	11.412	.001
I have stayed many times at a hotel with my dog.	2.4694	2.0000	4.927	.028

Dog owners have five instances of significance with the ANOVA analyses. It was found that males are more likely than females to travel for business and have stayed at a hotel with their dog in the past. Females, however, are more likely to look at quality first when choosing a hotel. It was found that those shown the no pet ad feel the least safe leaving their dog unattended in the hotel room and those shown the pet link ad felt the most safe leaving their dog. The final significance was that dog owners shown the pet photo ad were least likely to stay at the hotel for a business trip while those shown the no pet ad were most likely.

There were also several GLM analyses done with just dog owners in relation to the random advertisement they were assigned and their gender. The GLM analysis shows only two instances of significance. Dog owners shown the no pet ad were most likely to stay at the hotel for a business trip while dog owners shown the pet photo ad were least likely to stay

there for a business trip. Also, female dog owners are more likely to believe that the grounds are well maintained than male dog owners.

Results of Non-Dog Owners

The final group of analyses was completed on those respondents who are non-dog owners. The same ANOVA and GLM analysis were completed. Table 6 and Table 7 include the ANOVA findings.

Table 6: Significant Findings of Non-Dog Owners by Level of Treatment

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Low	MEAN 2-Med	MEAN 3- High	F	SIG
I find this ad to be appealing	3.7400	3.4898	3.1618	6.798	.001
Based on this ad, this hotel is very appealing to me.	3.4800	3.4375	3.0147	4.805	.009
This advertisement shows a hotel that I would be interested	3.7800	3.7143	3.0882	12.039	.000
Overall, I like this hotel.	3.7000	3.6122	3.1791	7.432	.001
I would stay at this hotel for a business trip.	3.6800	3.4792	2.8971	12.497	.000
I would stay at this hotel for a personal trip.	3.7600	3.4898	3.0882	9.145	.000
I would stay at this hotel with my family.	3.6735	3.5714	3.0882	7.938	.001
I believe that I would get a good night's sleep here.	3.6122	3.6327	3.1667	7.488	.001
This hotel offers amenities that are appealing to me.	3.3400	3.4082	3.0588	3.413	.035
The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.	4.1000	3.6250	3.7647	3.190	.044

Table 7: Significant Findings of Non-Dog Owners by Gender

VARIABLE	MEAN 1-Male	MEAN 2-Female	F	SIG
I like to travel.	4.2679	4.5556	6.056	.015
I travel mostly for business	2.4464	1.8224	13.285	.000
I travel mostly for pleasure.	3.6607	4.1869	9.374	.003
I put a great amount of time and effort into planning my trips.	3.7679	4.0561	5.035	.026
The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.	3.6071	3.9346	4.123	.044

For non-dog owners there were 15 instances of significance in the ANOVA analysis. Overall the data indicated that non-dog owners shown the pet photo advertisement were least likely to agree with the following statements while those shown the no pet ad were most likely to agree: finding the ad appealing, finding the hotel appealing, finding the hotel amenities appealing, being interested in staying at the hotel, liking the hotel shown to them, and getting a good night's rest. In addition, those shown the pet photo ad were least likely to stay for a business or personal trip and stay with their family while those shown the no pet ad were most likely.

Relating to gender, female non-dog owners were more likely than male non-dog owners to like to travel, travel mostly for pleasure, put time and effort into planning the trip and look at quality as the first factor when choosing a hotel. On the other hand, males were more likely to travel for business.

Along with the ANOVA analysis, a GLM analysis was also completed for non-dog owners. This GLM analysis showed 13 instances of significance. Non-dog owners shown the

no pet ad were most likely than those shown the pet photo ad to find the ad and hotel appealing, to be interested in staying at the hotel and overall like the hotel. Followed were non-dog owners that were shown the pet link ad and least likely were non-dog owners that were shown the pet photo ad.

Non-dog owners shown the no pet ad were most likely to stay at the hotel for a business or personal trip and stay with their family. Following was non-dog owners shown the pet link ad, and finally non-dog owners shown the pet photo ad were least likely. Non-dog owners shown the pet link ad were most likely to believe they would get a good night's sleep at the hotel, then came non-dog owners shown the no pet ad, and finally non-dog owners shown the pet photo ad were least likely to feel that they would get a good night's rest

When analyzing the data by gender, male non-dog owners are more likely than female non-dog owners to stay at the hotel for a business trip, believe that the hotel is clean, feel more comfortable staying at the hotel, feel safe walking at night, and believe that the floors of the hotel are clean.

IMPLICATIONS

The following is a summarizing list of the overall implications of the results:

- Instead of dog owners being affected by the dog photo ad, it was found that non-dog owners were actually the ones affected by the dog photo advertisement. The dog in the pet photo advertisement did not attract dog owners but actually turned away non-dog owners.

- Females in all three groups of analyses were found to plan their trips and look at quality as the first factor when choosing a hotel.

- Males traveled the most for business while females noted to travel most for pleasure.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The sample taken for this study was limited in its scope. Although respondents were gathered through a snow ball effect, it was not fully representative of the entire United States.

In order to get a more detailed analysis, future research should include a broader reach of respondents demographically and geographically which a greater number of respondents gathered overall. It would be very interesting to get more detailed information from the two segments of respondents about how they reacted to the differing levels of advertisements. Further research in this area would offer hotels a better idea how to reach both target markets without turning away potential consumers. As consumers change their preferences every year, continued research in this area is crucial for the hospitality industry to best reach their consumers.

CONCLUSIONS

This experiment found 36 instances of significance in the ANOVA analysis. Respondents were shown three levels of advertisements and results were gathered on total respondents, dog owners, and non-dog owners. Total respondents overall were least favorable towards the pet photo advertisement and most favorable towards the no pet ad. Analysis of dog owners showed that those shown the pet photo ad felt the safest. Owners shown the pet photo ad also were least likely to stay for business while those shown the no pet ad were most likely. Finally non-dog owners demonstrated the pet photo advertisement was least agreeable while the no pet ad was most agreeable.

The key findings are that the dog pictured in the pet photo advertisement hurt the perception of the hotel by the non-dog owners. The dog pictured actually did not help the dog owners in their decision making. Overall, I conclude that whether hotels allow pets or not, they should not put animals in their advertisements to attract pet owners.

REFERENCES

- Bunderson, G. (2010). Some Idaho hotels are happy to accommodate travelers with pets. *The Idaho Business Review*, 87504022. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- Campoy, A. (2010, 11 September). At This Hotel, Even a Pooch Can Live in the Lap of Luxury. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://online.wsj.com>
- Carr N., & Cohen, S. (2009). Holidaying with the family pet: no dogs allowed! *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 290-304. Retrieved from <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/thr/>
- Disney opens luxury pet resort.* (2010). VMSD. Retrieved from <http://vmsd.com/>
- Elliot, C. (2010). *Traveling with pets (but first, a chihuahua-on-a-place story)*. Retrieved from <http://www.consumertraveler.com>
- Harris, M. (2010, 1 July). Guest requests getting outrageous at hotels. *PostMedia News*. Retrieved from <http://www.vancouversun.com>
- JD Power: Guest satisfaction increases despite recession.* (2010, 27 July) HNN Newswire. Retrieved from <http://www.hotelnewsnow.com>
- Karp, H. (2007, 11 October). Hotels go to the dogs; Allergic, animal-averse struggle to find truly pet-free rooms. *Wall Street Journal*, 00999660. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- Karp, J. (2003). Changing legal trends for the traveling pet. *San Diego International Law Journal*. Retrieved from Westlaw database.

- More than half of people traveling with pets frustrated by lack of pet-friendly accommodations, AAA and Best Western Survey Says.* (2010, 11 September). PR Newswire. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- New research from Expedia Media provides insight into destination marketing trends.* (2010, 23 July). HSMAI. Retrieved from <http://www.hsmai.org/Events/NewsDetail.cfm?id=4047575>
- Trip advisor sniffs out top ten pet-friendly hotels: survey reveals U.S. travelers lap up the chance to tote their furry friends on trips.* (2010, 11 September). PR Newswire. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- Um, N. (2008). Revisit elaboration likelihood model: How advertising appeals work on attitudinal and behavioral brand loyalty centering around low vs. high-involvement product. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 7 (1).
- Vatjanasaregagul, L. (2007). The relationship of service quality, consumer decision factors and brand equity. *ProQuest Database*, AAT 3269304.
- Victorino, L., Verma, R., Plaschka, G., & Dev C. (2005). Service innovation and customer choices in the hospitality industry. *Managing Service Quality*, 09604529. Retrieved from ProQuest database.
- Wolff, C. (2003). How to cater to the four-legged market. *Lodging Hospitality*, 01480766. Retrieved from ProQuest database.

APPENDIX A

Study 1: Content of Main Survey

All of the questions were asked as strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree unless otherwise noted.

1. Do you currently own a dog as a pet?

Yes or No

If Yes.

2. How much quality time do you spend with your dog each day

None

1-2 hours

3-4 hours

4-5 hours

5+ hours

3. I have stayed many times at a hotel with my dog.
4. I am a picky traveler.
5. I like to travel.
6. I travel most for business
7. I travel most for pleasure.
8. I put a great amount of time and effort into planning my trips.
9. The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.
10. When I stay at a hotel I check for a pet policy.
11. When looking for a hotel, whether or not they allow dogs is my first priority.
12. My dog is a member of the family.
13. My dog is my best friend.
14. I feel that I spoil my dog.
15. I treat my dog the same way that everyone else treats their dog.
16. I believe dogs in general are well behaved.
17. In general I believe dogs are well mannered.
18. I believe in general that dogs are not noisy.
19. I believe that dogs are not high strung.
20. In general I believe that dogs are clean.
21. I think it is easy to find a hotel that allows dogs.
22. I find this ad to be appealing.
23. Based on this ad, this hotel is very appealing to me.
24. This advertisement shows a hotel that I would be interested in staying at.
25. Overall, I like this hotel.

26. I would feel safe leaving my dog unattended in this hotel's room.
27. While staying at this hotel I would not be concerned about my dog's health.
28. I believe this hotel is clean.
29. I believe this hotel's staff is friendly.
30. I believe the grounds of this hotel are well maintained.
31. I believe that I would get a good night's sleep here.
32. I would feel safe while staying at this hotel.
33. I would feel comfortable staying in this hotel.
34. I feel safe walking around this hotel at night.
35. I believe the furniture in this hotel is very clean.
36. I believe the floors of this hotel are very clean.
37. If staying at this hotel, I would be very concerned about its overall cleanliness.
38. This hotel offers amenities that are appealing to me.
39. I would stay at this hotel with my dog.
40. When selecting a hotel I only consider hotels that allow dogs.
41. I would stay at this hotel even if it did not allow dogs.
42. While traveling with my dog I would be willing to pay more for greater amenities for my dog.
43. How much more would you be willing to spend to get more dog related amenities.
 - None
 - \$5-\$10
 - \$11-\$20
 - \$21-\$35
 - \$36-\$50
 - \$51+
44. I would stay at this hotel for a business trip.
45. I would stay at this hotel for a personal trip.
46. I would stay at this hotel with my family.

If No.

47. I am a picky traveler.
48. I like to travel.
49. I travel most for business
50. I travel most for pleasure.
51. I put a great amount of time and effort into planning my trips.
52. The quality of the hotel is the first factor I look at when planning my stay.
53. When I stay at a hotel I check for a pet policy.
54. When looking for a hotel, whether or not they allow dogs is my first priority.
55. If a hotel allowed dogs I would not stay there.
56. I would be more willing to stay at a hotel that allows dogs if they were kept on a separate floor.
57. I am comfortable around dogs that I do not know.
58. I believe dogs in general are well behaved.
59. In general I believe dogs are well mannered.
60. I believe in general that dogs are not noisy.

61. I believe that dogs are not high strung.
62. In general, I like animals.
63. In general, I like dogs.
64. In general, I believe that dogs are clean.
65. In general, I believe that people take care of their dog's health and hygiene.
66. I find this ad to be appealing.
67. Based on this ad, this hotel is very appealing to me.
68. This advertisement shows a hotel that I would be interested in staying at.
69. Overall, I like this hotel.
70. I believe this hotel is clean.
71. I believe this hotel's staff is friendly.
72. I believe the grounds of this hotel are well maintained.
73. I believe that I would get a good night's sleep here.
74. I would feel safe while staying at this hotel.
75. I would feel comfortable staying in this hotel.
76. I feel safe walking around this hotel at night.
77. I believe the furniture in this hotel is very clean.
78. I believe the floors of this hotel are very clean.
79. If staying at this hotel, I would be very concerned about its overall cleanliness.
80. This hotel offers amenities that are appealing to me.
81. I would stay at this hotel for a business trip.
82. I would stay at this hotel for a personal trip.
83. I would stay at this hotel with my family.
84. I would stay at this hotel only if I had no other choices in lodging.
85. I would stay at this hotel only if I knew I would not be located near or in a pet room.

Demographics Asked To All Respondents.

86. Your age?
 - <18
 - 19-34
 - 35-49
 - 50-64
 - 65+
87. Your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
88. Your marital status?
 - Single
 - Living together
 - Divorced
 - Married
 - Widowed
89. The number of children you have living at home
 - Fill in the blank

90. Highest level of education you have completed?

- High School or less
- 2 year Associates degree
- 4 year Bachelors degree
- Masters degree or higher

91. What is your yearly income?

- <\$25,000
- \$26,000-\$45,000
- \$46,000-\$75,000
- \$76,000-\$100,000
- \$101,000-\$150,000
- \$151,000+

APPENDIX B

Figure 1: No Pet Advertisement

Traveler's Point Hotel

You're Home. Phone: 555-5555 Fax: 555-5556

Reservations

Amenities

Locations

Guest Reviews



Comfortable beds. Clean rooms. Friendly staff.

Figure 2: Pet Link Advertisement

Traveler's
Point Hotel

You're Home. Phone: 555-5555 Fax: 555-5556

Reservations

Pet Amenities

Amenities

Locations

Guest Reviews



Clean rooms. Friendly staff. Comfortable beds. Pet friendly.

Figure 3: Pet Photo Advertisement

Traveler's
Point Hotel

Where You and Your Dogs are Home. Phone: 555-5555 Fax: 555-5556

Reservations

Pet Amenities

Amenities

Locations

Guest Reviews



Pet friendly. Comfortable beds. Clean rooms. Friendly staff.

VITA

Bailey Elizabeth Belcher was born to Jim and Susie Belcher in Blowing Rock, NC. After completing High School with honors in Mooresville, NC, she went to attend Undergraduate Studies at Appalachian State University. Bailey graduated from ASU in May of 2010 with an undergraduate BSBA degree in Marketing. From there she began her Master in Business Administration in August 2010 at Appalachian State University. In August 2011 Bailey commenced work towards her MBA with a concentration in General Management.

The future holds great opportunities for Ms. Belcher including marriage on August 20, 2011. She will also move to Asheville to work in the field of Market Research after graduation. Bailey's permanent address is in Mooresville, NC. She is thankful for the education and skills she has retained from ASU and looks forward to her future career opportunities.