An Explanatory Model of Collaborative Online Travel Planning by Millennials

Abstract

This paper investigates how online travel can benefit from serving Millennials with collaboration support. We test whether the social richness of online shopping in pairs, connected by screen-sharing technology, contributes to a greater intent to purchase vacation travel. We conducted a field experiment with 150 subjects. A Partial Least Squares analysis of Collaboration, Ease of Use, Trust, and Perceived Effectiveness combined to explain Intent to Purchase with high variance explained (42.4%). The results shed light on the value proposition for offering collaboration support to Millennials. Future research will extend the results to other populations, task domains and devices.

1. Introduction

Until recently, online advice has come primarily from anonymous customer comments. Although such comments might help to gauge the wisdom of the crowd, they are not as convincing as a trusted advisor, e.g., a friend, who is well-known to the shopper. With recent technological advances, such interactions can take place easily online, e.g., through synchronous screen-sharing technology. Three models have emerged in the social shopping space: customer to crowd, customer to expert, and customer to trusted advisor. Tools such as Livelook, Clavardon, Twiddla, etc., permit real time shopping with a trusted advisor.

Forrester found that only forty-eight percent of leisure travelers believed travel sites, e.g., Travelocity or Expedia, would save them money and only thirty-four percent believed that their online travel planning showed them options and tradeoffs clearly [3]. Forrester found that advice from other travelers was considered more influential than the “advice” coming from marketers [3]. It appears that online e-travel users are interested in not only objective travel information from vendors, but also subjective yet trustworthy information. In addition, the online travel planning experience needs to be compelling and distinctive [4]. Socially-based computing is a phenomenon which appears to have strong promise in online retailing [5].

In the general population, seventy percent trust opinions of unknown users and ninety percent of online consumers trust recommendations from people they know [1]. In the online world, social network users are three times more likely to trust their peers' opinions over advertising when making purchase decisions [2]. In the younger population, e.g., Digital Millennials or simply Millennials, are online up to three hours per day for entertainment, peer communication, shopping and entertainment. They are the first generation to be immersed in mobile digital technology from a young age [6]. They engage in frequent online social networking with peers [6, 7]. As Millennials engage actively in social networking sites, it is only natural to expect shopping expectations to embody an online social dimension. One need only look at the growth of social shopping sites such as Kaboodle. Unique monthly visitors to Kaboodle have grown thirtyfold rising from 100,000/month in October 2006 to more than three million in January 2010 (according to Quantcast). Millennials often shop socially, relying on friends and family when making purchases, more so than any other age group [5]. Clearly, social computing, i.e., collaboration through a digital channel, is one way to reach Millennials.

Our purpose in this paper is to address how social computing affects Millennials’ intention to purchase in a context of online travel planning. The results of this study shed light on Millennials’ online travel planning preferences, and it provides guidance to web site designers incorporating social computing into online travel planning applications. Future research will extend the results to other task domains and devices, e.g., the mobile telephone.

2. Literature Review

This study is based on the literature of technology acceptance and computer mediated communication between people. We know that trust is fundamental and that social influence based on trust may improve processes or outcomes. Trust is a crucial factor in online shopping [8, 9]. Everard and Galletta found that the intent to purchase is influenced by the user’s trust in the online store, which is influenced directly by the user’s perception of quality and influenced indirectly by the web site’s flaws [10]. Other research has found perceived trust in the vendor to be an important indirect influence, mediated through the user’s attitude toward the vendor [11].

Perceived Ease of Use is a key factor for computer users [12-14], and they tend to adapt their strategy
selection to the type of decision aids available in such a way as to reduce effort [15]. Spending extensive time and effort without converging upon an adequate choice can easily lead to uncertainty and abandonment of the search process. In a study of college students’ online vacation travel planning, the more time that was used to search for an online vacation, the less the likelihood of achieving higher levels of satisfaction [16]. This is because too much effort is expended. If, however, search effort is reduced by using product comparison agents, e.g., search agents, a larger search space is likely to be examined [17]. When a recommendation agent is not only adopted and used, but its recommendations accepted, the result is an intent to purchase. Research in the adoption of recommendation agents has shown that trust as well as perceived ease of use and perceived usefulness influence the intent to adopt [18]. In the absence of search agents, travel planning in pairs could decrease the real and perceived search effort significantly.

Socially oriented consumers tend to seek opinions from “co-oriented peers” [19]. “Psychosocializing” consumers prefer friends and neighbors as information sources to advertisements or salespersons [20]. Such consumers pay attention to what their friends select and purchase [21], and peer feedback reinforces consumer product selection [22]. Millennials are increasingly engaged in social activities online through social shopping sites [23]. The experience of collaboration using navigation and chat technology with a partner greatly enhances social presence [24, 25]. Social interaction with a trusted partner is a mechanism designed to reduce effort, thereby paving the way to satisfactory outcomes. Research has shown that social presence, the perception of “being with someone,” can be enhanced with IT. Purchase intent can be increased with psychological warmth [26], social validation [27, 28], and consumer trust, as noted earlier.

Millennials are sensitive to peer pressure [7, 29, 30] and social validation [31], and they participate in networks of weak ties [32]. Millennials often spend time online, e.g., through MySpace and Facebook, for social reasons and can gain social capital by doing so [33]. An online exchange of social influence is more like a social gathering or a pleasurable social experience for its own sake. In such cases, hedonic rather than utilitarian factors are prominent. With Millennials, the converging to a desirable choice can be achieved quickly through sufficient social validation. That is, if a trusted friend validates the individual’s tentative choice, it becomes acceptable. The social interaction enables the sharing of opinions, which can lead to a wide-ranging discussion of vacation ideas or a focused task, e.g., online travel planning.

Interpersonal contact is particularly important to consumers when the transactions that take place are complex, requiring a fair amount of information exchange between parties [38]. Therefore, it is possible that consumers who indicate a desire for a rich communication channel to meet product and service requirements are likely to show less of a desire to use the web for commercial transactions [38-40]. However, recent social technologies, e.g., shared web browsing, may lower the tendency of users to go offline for their richness needs.

Retail strategies addressing customers’ social needs can improve store patronage, positive attitudes toward a store/brand, and extended shopping time and spending [34-36]. In an early study of shared online shopping by Microsoft, Farnham et al. reported that a) people generally preferred a shared browser to an unshared browser, and b) common ground may be enhanced with a WYSIWIS (What You See Is What I See) interface [37]. The results suggest that designers must balance features that support functionality or usability with features that support sociability. The present study extends their research and also confirms some of their findings.

3. Research Model

We expect that Millennials, who have a greater tendency to collaborate, e.g., seek opinions from a friend or seek a validation of their own opinion from a friend, will value collaboration support when shopping. Opinion seekers are individuals who search out advice from others when making a purchase decision and opinion leaders are individuals who try to influence the purchasing behavior of other consumers in specific product fields [28]. Flynn et al. developed scales for opinion leadership and opinion seeking in five studies [28]. Shoham and Ruvio replicated and extended their work to show that opinion leaders exert their expertise to influence the opinion seeker based on innovativeness, such as computer use for information search [41]. We hypothesize, based on Flynn’s work, the following:

$H1$: Collaboration will be positively correlated with Ease of Use of the shopping website.

Trust is important in any online e-commerce situation, and there is a simple way to increase trust; let the user choose a human partner to engage in joint decision making. The technology connecting the two
need not be sophisticated; it can be as simple as screen sharing and real-time communication between the users. The crucial point is that the technology itself will be perceived as trustworthy if it prompts the user to select a trusted human partner.

H2: **Collaboration will be positively correlated with Trust in the shopping website.**

Trust is necessary but not sufficient, however. What users need beyond trust is information, i.e., trustworthy opinions or advice, in an easy to use process.

H3: **Trust will be positively correlated with Ease of Use of the shopping website.**

We define Perceived Effectiveness as the extent to which an online shopper believes that using an information source would enable him or her to make a more informed decision when shopping online [42]. Online shopping tasks can vary widely. They may involve screening or sorting [43], single- or multiple-stage decision making [44], utilitarian or hedonic needs [45], or focusing on attitudes and beliefs [46]. Whatever the processes of the task, they should be easy to do and perceived to be effective, resulting in a good outcome.

H4: **Ease of Use will be positively correlated with Perceived Effectiveness of the shopping website.**

There is a significant stream of literature modeling intent to purchase [8, 10, 11, 46, 47]. It tends to require significant levels of trust.

H5: **Trust will be positively correlated with Perceived Effectiveness of the shopping website.**

We define Intention to Purchase from the website as the person’s subjective assessment of his or her intention to execute a transaction. We expect that users’ intention to purchase is linked to the suitability of the site’s user interface as well as the perceived social / technological richness of the website, i.e., how user-centric it is [48]. We expect that Trust, Ease of Use, and Perceived Effectiveness will provide a strong socio-technical mechanism for enhancing the intention to purchase the travel plan. Formally,

H6: **Trust will be positively correlated with Intent to Purchase the travel plan.**

H7: **Ease of Use will be positively correlated with Intent to Purchase the travel plan.**

H8: **Perceived Effectiveness will be positively correlated with Intent to Purchase the travel plan.**

In sum, we expect that users’ intent to purchase is linked to the trust, ease of use, and perceived effectiveness in the collaborative shopping process. Social shoppers (the traveler and his or her helper) can use each other as a reality check, as validation, for making a travel plan choice. We expect users who have stronger collaboration to have more positive perceptions of the trust and ease of use in the shopping process. The intent to purchase, which is specifically the intent to book the vacation, should be influenced by all these factors. Combining the eight hypotheses, we propose the research model in Figure 1. We expect all influences to be positive.
The research model in Figure 1 adapts the Technology Acceptance Model [49, 50] to include Collaboration and Trust. We selected Perceived Effectiveness, rather than Perceived Usefulness, because Perceived Effectiveness is more specific to the task at hand. We chose Intent to Purchase, because without it, there is little chance of an actual purchase.

4. Research Design and Methods

The units of analysis were pairs of Millennials engaged in online travel planning. We based this study on a pilot-test with Millennials recruited from undergraduate MIS and Marketing classes. Our pilot-test results supported our proposed model. We therefore set aside that dataset and conducted a field study of Millennials recruited by MarketTools’ Zoomerang service. MarketTools is a leading online survey company which fields anonymous surveys to large online panels of subjects who meet all the pre-qualification screening criteria. Our screening criteria were the following: 18-27 years of age, having broadband Internet connection. We sampled from the United States, obtaining a sample of 150 subjects.

The task design was deliberately simple and open-ended (see Appendix). Each subject was asked to find a partner online with whom they could perform the travel planning task. Subjects collaborated in pairs using LiveLOOK, a screen sharing utility, and either used voice or text chat, whichever they preferred.

We assumed that each subject would choose a partner of adequate knowledge and skill to perform the task, since it would be one of travel planning, but without an actual transaction taking place. Only the initial subject would complete the survey after completing the task with a partner. Subjects were assumed to have a budget of $2500.

We used validated survey instruments whenever possible for the constructs of the model. Ease of Use, Trust, Perceived Effectiveness and Intent to Purchase were reflective constructs. We defined collaboration differently, as a combination of opinion seeking, opinion leading, and, *ex post*, how well the collaboration was perceived to have been.

5. Results

Descriptive statistics for 150 subjects are shown in Table 1, along with Convergent-Discriminant validity shown in Table 2.
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Reflective Items (Likert 1-7), Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Intent to Purch.</th>
<th>Ease of Use</th>
<th>P. Effectiveness</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>stdev</th>
<th>PLS loading</th>
<th>t-stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intpurch1</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>87.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intpurch2</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>63.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intpurch3</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>66.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease1</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>43.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease2</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>112.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>55.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect1</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>81.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect2</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>88.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect3</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>88.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust1</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>55.08***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust2</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>41.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach Alpha</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Rel.</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Reflective Items (Likert 1-7), Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Variance Extracted</th>
<th>Intent to Purchase</th>
<th>Ease of Use</th>
<th>P. Effectiveness</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intent to Purchase</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Use</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Effectiveness</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 describes the structural model in a partial least squares (PLS) analysis using PLS-Graph version 3.0 (build 1130) with bootstrapping resampling [51-55].

The numbers on each link are analogous to beta weights in a regression, showing the relative magnitude of influence. The graph shows that Ease of Use has its variance explained 30.7% by Collaboration and Trust. The variance explained for Trust is 49.0%, coming entirely from Collaboration. The variance explained is 65.1% for Perceived Effectiveness, influenced by Ease of Use and Trust. Finally, the variance explained is 42.4% for Intent to Purchase, influenced by Ease of Use, Trust and weakly from Perceived Effectiveness. Overall, the variance explained is quite high, with Collaboration and Trust playing vital roles. All hypotheses are supported, except for H8, which is almost supported (p < 0.078). The variance explained ranges from 30.7% to 65.1%, with an average of 46.8%.
Figure 2: Results

6. Discussion, Implications and Future Directions

Our result is a strong, parsimonious model of intent to purchase. It shows that collaboration is key, triggering a cascade of positive influence, trust in the website and shopping process, ease of use in the website (partly because the workload is shared), and perceived effectiveness in selecting a good travel plan, which one would intend to purchase. It should not be surprising that collaboration has such positive influence, or that ease of use and trust are key factors. One might be surprised that ease of use has only a moderate influence on intent to purchase or that perceived effectiveness has a not quite significant influence on intent to purchase. It seems that trust plays such an important, central role in the nomological network [9, 45, 56], that it diminishes the influence of ease of use and perceived effectiveness.

Zhu and Benbasat found significant benefits associated with collaborative browsing support [57, 58]. Our findings are consistent with theirs: the benefits of collaboration support with simple technologies, e.g., co-browsing and chat, can create social presence and influence perceived ease of use, trust in the online process, perceived effectiveness, and intent to purchase.

We investigated one social shopping application among young consumers aged 18-27. Overall, we see high variance explained and all of the hypotheses supported, except for one that is almost supported. This suggests that we have a good explanatory model of Intent to Purchase in the limited context of Millennials engaged in online travel planning for vacations. These results suggest that a travel site aimed at similarly aged consumers, such as STA Travel, might gain a competitive benefit by providing simple screen-sharing technology support.

This study contributes to the IS literature by investigating the collaborative shopping experience among Millennials planning a vacation. We are not claiming that social validation and peer influence are true only for Millennials, but Millennials are a good population with which to start. They are early adopters of new technology, highly sensitive to peer opinions and less open to the opinions of others, e.g., authorities. We encourage other researchers to question whether different age groups collaborate similarly or differently.

We investigated pairs of shoppers. Our approach was appropriate to this context because the quality of the collaborative online shopping experience involves an amalgam of inter-personal communication methods and real-time coordination between friends to influence each other 1) directly by co-browsing, and 2) indirectly through verbal coordination. Therefore, this study has made a theoretical contribution to IS research by identifying the roles of co-browsing technology and inter-shopper communication in collaborative online shopping for travel. Future research should consider larger groups (3+) of consumers engaged in collaborative shopping activities. In this field study we did not control the communication process. Some subjects used cell phones; others chose Instant Messaging or Skype. Future studies might standardize communication used by subjects while co-browsing rather than let it vary.

Our findings have several practical implications. First, our findings highlight the roles of the ease of use
and trust in a collaborative shopping process among Millennials. Specifically, we show that shopper perceptions may be influenced by the collaboration of shopping partners. Vendors should consider whether to bring together shoppers with friends, experts, or a wider community. To affect consumers’ intent to purchase, vendors should enhance the trustworthiness and ease of use of online shopping sites while integrating social networking mechanisms to tap collaboration possibilities with pre-existing user relationships.

The ForeSee Results report indicates that a total of 56 percent of shoppers at top e-retail Web sites who interact with social media Web sites have elected to "friend" or "follow" or "subscribe" to a retailer on social networking sites like Facebook, Twitter or YouTube [59]. Shoppers are apparently choosing to engage in relationships with retailers on social sites. We anticipate that Facebook will continue to provide opportunities for retailers.

There appears to be a number of business models emerging in the social shopping space other than the co-browsing approach adopted in this study. Bloomingdales for example tested a “magic mirror” in their New York store whereby female shoppers could select a dress from a menu and see the dress superimposed on their reflection. The shopper could then share this picture with Facebook friends to get immediate feedback. We anticipate a growth in iPhone/Android applications enabling shoppers in physical stores to gain feedback from trusted social network friends. Other social shopping models include influential shoppers who gain followers, as in Twitter.

This study is a significant proof of concept and stepping stone to pursue in several different dimensions and to test several key distinctions:

1. Larger social group sizes. Larger groups introduce greater complexity of social dynamics, greater pooling of knowledge, but also greater chance of miscommunication;
2. Higher cost categories of services, e.g., Fidelity and Schwab are interested in helping the overwhelmed individual investor [60]. Greater expense should entail a greater need/desire to provide collaboration support, particularly something with significant market risk or rebalancing effort;
3. Cultural factors affecting social travel planning by Millennials in other countries. There could well be U.S.-based assumptions we are making about Millennials, decision making, and social dynamics. Broadening our scope to other cultures would help determine whether those assumptions hold or vary across cultures.

At present there are a number of different social shopping models. It is uncertain which, if any, will prevail in the future. It would therefore be prudent to conduct controlled experiments and field research to investigate the impact on Intent to Purchase of the following dimensions:

1. Technology design: Co-browsing, sharing bookmarks, dual cursor control, shared reviews; platform-integrated Chat or VoIP with selected friends or links to online social network contacts vs. stand-alone cell phone voice and/or texting;
2. Source of assistance: Based on online crowd wisdom, with an online expert, a group of trusted friends, vs. one trusted friend;
3. Venue: Shopping online, or in physical stores with the assistance of online social networks, e.g., iPhone applications.

Further studies will go beyond travel planning to shopping for more abstract services, to other utilitarian or hedonic activities in domains of greater complexity, and with other devices, e.g., mobile ones.

7. Appendix: Survey Instruments

Collaboration [28]
- Other people frequently come to me for advice about choosing a vacation package.
- People that I know choose a vacation package based on what I have told them.
- I often influence peoples' opinions about vacation packages.
- I like to get others' opinions before I buy a vacation package.
- I feel more comfortable buying a vacation package when I have gotten other peoples' opinions on it.
- When choosing a vacation package, other peoples' opinions are important to me.
- My shopping partner was the best person to help with this travel task.

Trust [9, 61]
- The website is trustworthy.
- The website has more to lose than to gain by not delivering on its promises.

Ease of Use [13, 50]
- My interaction with the system is clear and understandable.
- I find the system to be easy to use.
- I find it easy to get the system to do what I want it to do.

Perceived Effectiveness [42]
- I believe that using this travel site is an effective way of vacation planning.
- Using this travel site I can increase my vacation planning effectiveness (i.e., plan a good vacation).
- Using this travel site I can increase my vacation planning efficiency (i.e., plan a good vacation using minimal time and effort).

Intention to Purchase from the Website [10, 62]
- If this vacation package were competitively priced, I would consider buying it from this travel site.
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9. Appendix – Task Description

STEP 1: CONTACT A FRIEND

Please contact a friend right now to help you plan a vacation for yourself. It will take less than 15 minutes of their time. You may use any method you like to reach your friend (phone or Internet), but please do it now. The next step will involve synchronizing your computer screen with your friend's computer screen, so make sure your friend has access to a computer. When you have found a friend, please continue.

STEP 2: SHOW YOUR SCREEN TO YOUR FRIEND

You will be using an Internet service called livelook.net to show your computer screen to your friend. You are the leader, planning a vacation for yourself. Your friend can see what you are doing and assist by offering advice, but he or she cannot control your screen.

1. Click livelook.net (opens in a new browser window).
2. Have your friend open a browser and go to livelook.net as well.
3. Click the green SHOW MY SCREEN button. (If you are a first time visitor to livelook.net, click the Free Trial button, complete the form, and click Accept and Continue. Then click SHOW MY SCREEN again.)
4. Give your friend your LiveLOOK# and ask him/her to enter it in the orange SEE A SCREEN box.
5. Do not accidentally close the Livelook window.

STEP 3: PLAN YOUR VACATION

Spend about 10 minutes planning a spring vacation to Cancun, Mexico for just yourself at studentcity.com (opens in a new browser window). Note: This is only a travel planning exercise; you will never need to provide your credit card information at any time, nor will you have to purchase a vacation. You will be travelling to Cancun alone on March 14th, 2009 and will return on March 21st, 2009. Your total budget is $2500. Assume that any money saved can be used for extra vacation activities.

1. Complete the “Price a Trip” form as shown in Figure below. Select the airport nearest to you, and select the Flight+Hotel package.
2. Select, with the help of your friend, a hotel based on price, amenities, and past reviews.
3. Record the price for your vacation. You may record the above information on paper, in a new document, or simply by keeping your StudentCity shopping window open while you complete a survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where to? Cancun, Mexico</th>
<th>Price a Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When? March 14-21, 2009</td>
<td>Week of Mar 14, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Where? Your Nearest Airport</td>
<td>From Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package? Flight + Hotel</td>
<td>Package?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who? One Adult</td>
<td>150th LOWEST PRICE GUARANTEE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. References

7. Temkin, B., et al., Gen Y Is Truly Different; Design Accordingly. 2007, Forrester Research: Cambridge, MA.
59. Retailer, I., Tower Records hikes conversion rates 50% with modified site search, in Internet Retailer. 2004.