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Tourism Xenophilia: Examining Attraction to Foreignness

ABSTRACT

Individuals have demonstrated an attraction toward foreignness, which, arguably, constitutes a central reason to travel. Drawing on research from social and evolutionary psychology, the authors provide the first investigation of tourism xenophilia (TXI) which we define as individuals’ attraction toward the perceived foreignness of destinations. Across three studies, the authors conceptualize, develop, and apply a reliable, valid, and parsimonious TXI scale. The results show that TXI explains several important tourist and resident behaviors, such as willingness to engage with locals, willingness to stay at a B&B, intention to try local food, resident hospitality, support for immigration policies, and travel to foreign destinations. The authors also empirically investigate three key antecedents of TXI: promotion focus, boredom proneness, and mind-wandering. Finally, implications for academics and practitioners are discussed.

Keywords: tourism xenophilia, tourist behavior, evolutionary psychology, fundamental motives, intergroup bias
INTRODUCTION

“People travel to faraway places to watch, in fascination, the people they ignore at home.”

(Runes [cited in Potts 2003, 116])

Around the world, people are attracted to the foreign. Signs of cultural xenophilia — seeing individuals sporting everything from Japanese kanji tattoos to Guatemalan clothing — are common. Such attraction to what is foreign is far from a new phenomenon. Throughout history, people have been attracted to foreignness and the unknown (Stürmer et al. 2013). By the mere fact of being perceived as foreign, places, people, traditions, and objects elicit individuals’ fascination and curiosity, while familiar things do not spark the same reaction.

The innate attraction to foreignness has been a recurring theme in the literature and in explorers’ accounts of travelling (e.g., Goethe [in Bell 2016]; von Humboldt and Bonpland 1814) and has been studied under the label of xenophilia within the fields of psychology and anthropology. Xenophilia has been linked to a number of human beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors, such as individuals’ curiosity and tendency to seek contact with out-group members (Siem, Stürmer, and Pittinsky 2016) as well as genuine human interest in foreign cultures and traditions (Stürmer and Benbow 2017). However, xenophilia might also drive morally questionable behaviors that can have negative impacts on stakeholders, such as participation in indigenous and slum tourism (Bresner 2010; Frenzel 2012).

The tourism literature has also alluded to an attraction toward the unknown in the shape of motives (e.g., Dey and Sarma 2010; Pearce and Lee 2005) and tourist typologies based on relative preferences for familiarity versus foreignness (e.g., Cohen 1972; Plog 1974). However, it was neither the aim of these studies to examine xenophilia as a stable psychological trait in its own right nor to elaborate on the underlying reason for these tendencies.
Xenophilia has also been linked to the innate human desire for exploration (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018a) as manifested in the wish to investigate other countries, the ocean, and even outer space (NASA 2015). As Stephen Hawking (2018, 150) outlines, “we are, by nature, explorers” and “it is this driven curiosity that sent explorers to prove the Earth is not flat and it is the same instinct that sends us to the stars at the speed of thought, urging us to go there in reality.” Importantly, we add that this attraction to foreignness may be behind many travel activities of mankind. In this study, we investigate whether and how the phenomenon of xenophilia affects resident and tourist behavior, thus contributing to elucidating the core research question of why people travel (Pearce and Packer 2013).

Traditionally, academics and tourism managers have taken a functional approach to explaining tourist behavior. The functional approach, exemplified by the destination image literature, rests on the notion that tourists select a destination based on its objective performance-related quality (e.g., Balogu and McCleary 1999; Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2016). Complementary to the performance-related aspects of a destination, tourists consider symbolic meaning when making decisions. This approach is exemplified by studies focusing on self-congruity (e.g., Sirgy and Su 2000) and tourism ethnocentrism (Kock et al. 2018). The introduction of tourism xenophilia enhances this growing stream of literature which documents that tourist behavior is shaped by symbolic reasons that go beyond mere objective quality criteria.

The present study also has significant implications for tourism managers. Due to globalization and lower travel costs, it has become both easier and more affordable for tourists to vacation abroad. As a result, tourism managers are in a situation where they potentially can attract more tourists from abroad than ever before while also facing competition from within these countries. Understanding how tourists decide whether to spend their holiday domestically or abroad is, therefore, of strategic importance. In addition,
knowledge of xenophilia may provide tourism managers with new ways to segment the market and with insight into tourist-resident interaction, which is an important factor of the tourist experience (Kim 2014).

The present article develops a conceptual basis for the construct of tourism xenophilia (TXI) by integrating seminal research from social and evolutionary psychology. This basis is then used to conduct initial empirical examinations of the TXI phenomenon. By doing so, we provide the first investigation of the role of xenophilia in tourist behavior which we consider a key foundation for understanding why people travel.
INTRODUCING TOURISM XENOPHILIA

The term “xenophilia” stems from the ancient Greek “xénos,” signifying stranger or foreign, while “philia” means love or attraction. Psychologist and anthropologists have documented a tendency of individuals to be attracted to everything that is perceived as foreign. Indeed, xenophilia seems to be an anthropological constant of human civilizations (Stürmer et al. 2013). Perlmutter (1954, 293) defines xenophilia as a “love for strangers and foreigners,” while more recent literature refers to it as “an attraction to foreign people, cultures, or customs that manifests itself in curiosity and hospitality toward foreigners and benevolent cross-cultural exploration” (Stürmer et al. 2013, 832).

Xenophilia is conceptually anchored in socio-psychological theories on intergroup biases (e.g., Brewer 1999; Hewstone, Rubin, and Willis 2002) which are based on the idea that group membership is a salient characteristic used by individuals to distinguish between different kinds of people. Social psychologists make a distinction between positive and negative in-group and out-group biases. While the positive in-group bias of favoring one’s own group and the negative out-group bias of derogating other groups have been the focal points of many studies, the literature on positive out-group biases remains relatively sparse in comparison (Stürmer et al. 2013). This is at least in part due to a historical focus in the psychology literature on prejudice and intergroup conflict, stemming from a wish to explain events like the Holocaust, racial segregation in the U.S., and the Second World War (Siem, Stürmer, and Pittinsky 2016). However, psychologists document that individuals can feel attracted toward out-groups and foreignness in general (e.g., Perlmutter 1954; Siem, Stürmer, and Pittinsky 2016). For example, anthropologists have examined xenophilic tendencies among Greeks (Cabot 2017), and marketing researchers have found that consumers can harbor a preference for foreign products (Batra et al. 2000). Importantly, researchers have
called for an in-depth investigation of xenophilia in consumer behavior (e.g., Josiassen 2011; Kock et al. 2017), highlighting the potentially wide-reaching implications of this bias.

A number of tourism scholars have, often implicitly, discussed the importance of tourists’ attraction toward foreignness. In developing a tourism typology, Cohen (1972, 165) notes that modern man “is interested in things, sights, customs, and cultures different from his own, precisely because they are different.” Cohen argues that an appreciation of the experience of ‘strangeness’ has evolved, although people prefer this phenomenon to varying degrees. Based on a similar idea, Plog (1974) develops a continuum from allocentric to psychocentric tourists, while Gray (1970) speaks of sunlust and wanderlust. In regard to the latter, Gray (1970, 93) alludes to the human desire “to exchange the known for the unknown, to leave things familiar and to go and see different places, people and cultures or relics of the past.”

Mak, Lumbers, and Eves (2012, 178), furthermore, note that travelling is associated with the experience of ‘otherness’, i.e., “the sense of strange and unfamiliar created from specific subject positions which provide clear boundaries that divide individuals, cultures and races.” They specifically examine globalization and food consumption in tourism and argue that food consumption is an important way to experience the otherness of a given destination.

A distinct literature stream within tourism has also taken a more critical look at the consequences of (particularly privileged) travelers’ “obsession with the exotic other.” Slum and indigenous tourism are examples thereof as these activities involve an asymmetric power balance, often resulting in tourists’ consumption of “otherness” to little or no advantage for the locals (Bresner 2010; Frenzel 2012; Frisch 2012). However, scholars in this line of research have also documented benefits for the locals in actively responding to tourists’ search for otherness, including pride in sharing their culture and economic development (Ateljevic and Doorne 2005; Bresner 2010). Thus, while xenophilia in itself is a positive bias
toward foreignness, it may have both positive and negative consequences (Frenzel 2012; Siem, Stürmer, and Pittinsky 2016).

The tourist motivation literature has also hinted at the importance of xenophilia. Motives like *exploring the unknown or unfamiliar* have been included in a number of models (e.g., Dey and Sarma 2010; Figler et al. 1992; Kim and Kim 2015; Ooi and Laing 2010; Pearce and Lee 2005). Dey and Sarma (2010, 343) identify tourists’ motivation “to know the unknown,” Ooi and Laing (2010, 194) the motivation to “encounter the unknown,” Kim and Kim (2015, 517) measure the item “I feel a powerful urge to explore the unknown on vacation,” and Figler et al. (1992, 115) and Pearce and Lee (2005, 231) identify “exploring the unknown.” Although such ideas border on xenophilia, neither of these scholars take it further conceptually nor empirically or explain where the tendency stems from.

Motivated by the lack of research on xenophilia in tourism and its potentially important implications, we draw on seminal research from the fields of social and evolutionary psychology to inform our conceptualization of tourism xenophilia. We define TXI as *individuals’ attraction toward the perceived foreignness of destinations*. In line with previous research on xenophilia (e.g., Stürmer et al. 2013), the conceptualization highlights that it is individuals’ subjective perceptions of the foreignness of destinations that are the target of attraction. We further propose that TXI may manifest itself in curiosity and fascination toward foreign destinations. This is based on previous accounts that have linked xenophilia with curiosity to foreign objects (e.g., Stürmer et al. 2013) and the state of fascination (e.g., Chanlat, Davel, and Dupuis 2013).

Drawing also on evolutionary psychology, we propose that people harbor TXI because it has constituted an important survival mechanism for humans in the past. Modern humans have inherited psychological adaptations that helped our ancestors survive and reproduce (Schaller
et al. 2017). Addressing recent calls for advancing tourism research through evolutionary psychology (e.g., Crouch 2013; Kim and Seo 2018), we conceptualize TXI as the result of the innate human fundamental motives. For this purpose, we draw mainly on the fundamental motive of exploration, which rests on the idea that our prehistoric ancestors who lived as nomadic hunter-gatherers had to explore new regions to increase survival fitness (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018a).

Exploring new regions and thereby also engaging with out-group members was linked to many benefits for our ancestors, such as new opportunities for social exchange and gains in knowledge, potential mates, technology, warfare strategies, shelter, and food resources (Crouch 2013; Hawking 2018; Navarrete 2013). Xenophilia has, arguably, evolved as a way to incite people to engage in exploration activities. Indeed, a link between xenophilia and exploration has been suggested (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018a; Tuschman 2013). Tuschman (2013), for instance, notes that xenophilia has roots in the benefits of travelling across unfamiliar territory to seek out genetically different mates and that a xenophilic personality is linked to curiosity and “the travel bug.” Indeed, a natural attraction toward out-group members allowed our pre-human ancestors who lived in small groups to find new, genetically different mates to avoid weakness in offspring (Salvatore et al. 2017). However, xenophilia has also enabled our ancestors to obtain the other benefits linked to exploration (cf. above; Navarrete 2013; Stürmer et al. 2013; Thornhill and Fincher 2014). Based on this theoretical background, TXI can be understood as an attraction toward foreign destinations that can be traced back to an innate drive to explore beyond the borders of the in-group.
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

In the following section, we develop hypotheses about the effects of TXI on diverse and important intentional and behavioral constructs. This is based on the philosophy that the usefulness of a scale is determined by how well it predicts relevant and varied phenomena (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018b). While the outcomes in this study are of diverse nature, they have all been derived with a view to humans’ fundamental motive of exploration. For example, the chosen outcomes of resident hospitality and willingness to engage with locals derive from exploration in that exploring new regions and engaging with out-group members are intimately linked (Tuschman 2013). The diversity of the outcomes demonstrates the capacity of evolutionary psychology to highlight parallels between seemingly unrelated attitudes and behaviors (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018a). In addition, we develop hypotheses pertaining to three potential antecedents of TXI that are central to psychology research but have been neglected in tourism. In this way, we offer new interdisciplinary insights by pointing to the possible implications of such underlying psychological traits for tourism.

*Insert Figure 1 about here*

While we also hypothesize that TXI can influence tourists ’own travel, the first hypothesis centers on the effects of TXI on the individual’s intentions, not in their role as a tourist, but as a resident. The way in which residents welcome tourists has attracted only limited research (Sharpley 2014) but is considered to be important for the tourist experience (Freire 2009; Kim 2014), the formation of tourists’ destination image (Chen and Phou 2013; Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2016), and the relationship between tourists and residents (Chien and Ritchie 2018; Kock et al. 2018).
With this study, we propose that xenophilic individuals are more likely to be hospitable toward incoming tourists than non-xenophilic individuals. Incoming tourists may come to represent the foreignness of the countries they are from and, thereby, provide xenophilic individuals with a way to feel connected to such places. The xenophilic individuals can remain in their country of origin and still be able to experience the foreignness of foreign destinations represented by these out-group members, making them more likely to give them a warm welcoming.

*Hypothesis 1*: TXI has a positive effect on resident hospitality.

While xenophilic residents may be more likely to exhibit hospitality toward tourists, xenophilia among tourists may also influence how the latter interact with residents. Tourism scholars have for long recognized that tourists are interested in different degrees of contact with locals (e.g., Fan et al. 2017; Mo, Howard, and Havitz 1993). While some tourists may only engage with locals in the form of tour operators, others actively attempt to engage with residents (Cohen 1972). TXI may be able to account for such individual differences. In their study of tourist-host social contact, Fan et al. (2017), for example, note that tourists who seek strangeness may also wish to get involved in the local community by engaging with locals. It, therefore, seems reasonable to suggest that xenophilic tourists have a higher willingness to engage with locals when travelling abroad because this allows them to feel even closer to the foreign destination and have a richer experience of its foreignness.

*Hypothesis 2*: TXI has a positive effect on tourists’ willingness to engage with locals.

Researchers document that tourists seek to align their choice of accommodation with their overall reason for travelling (e.g., McIntosh and Siggs 2005). Tourists who are guided by their underlying attraction toward foreignness may seek accommodation that allows them to
get close to the local culture. Rather than staying in commercial and standardized hotel rooms that differ little across countries, they may be drawn toward accommodation like traditional bed and breakfasts (B&B) and Airbnb. This idea aligns with Lovel and Feuerstein’s (1992) assertion that tourists who have a strong desire to experience the local culture in an authentic way reject package deals and prefer to stay with locals. It is also supported by findings that wanting to have an authentic local experience is linked to staying at a B&B and Airbnb (e.g., Liang, Choi, and Joppe 2018; McIntosh and Siggs 2005; Tussyadiah 2015). Due to the recent success of Airbnb that now sells many millions of room nights annually and the sustained interest in B&Bs in general, understanding why tourists choose such types of accommodation is important (e.g., Wang, Asaad, and Filieri 2019). TXI can be a particularly relevant variable in this regard as xenophilic tourists may be more likely to stay at a B&B or Airbnb (referred to collectively as B&B from now on) when abroad to experience the foreignness of the destination more intimately (McIntosh and Siggs 2005).

Hypothesis 3: TXI has a positive effect on tourists’ willingness to stay at a B&B.

Food consumption when abroad can take several forms. Some tourists may simply seek out a food experience that is an extension of their daily routine at home (Mak et al. 2012). Trying local food is, conversely, an important component of travelling for other tourists (Ryu and Jang 2006). The wish that such tourists have to experience the local cuisine has been linked to an interest in foreignness by tourism researchers. Okumus, Okumus, and McKercher (2007), for example, linked local food consumption to a wish to experience exoticism, and Mak et al. (2012) noted that the consumption of local food is a way to contrast the daily and familiar life. The consumption of local food has also been linked to a wish to get closer to the local culture. That is, when eating foreign dishes, tourists are also experiencing the local culture (Chang, Kivela, and Mak 2010). Based on such previous accounts, we hypothesize
that TXI is a driver of tourists’ intention to try local foods as it enables them to experience the foreignness of the destination and to feel closer to the local culture.

*Hypothesis 4:* TXI has a positive effect on tourists’ intention to try local food.

TXI may not only affect tourists’ behavior at foreign destinations and how residents and tourists interact. It is also possible that it can have implications for residents’ general support for immigration policies in their home country. While accepting the presence of tourists in the home country is different to accepting the presence of immigrants, extant literature has also linked xenophilia with the latter. Stürmer et al. (2013) operationalized xenophilia itself as favorable attitudes toward making contact with immigrants. Providing further evidence for the hypothesis, Pittinsky and Montoya (2009) found that study participants who liked multiracial individuals were more likely to support social policies aimed at increasing this group’s rights and benefits. This finding indicates that having a positive attitude toward a given out-group can increase one’s likelihood of supporting policies aimed at helping the group. As such, TXI may lead people to be more supportive of immigration policies.

*Hypothesis 5:* TXI has a positive effect on residents’ support for immigration policies.

The next hypothesis suggests that TXI has an effect on not only intentions, but also on actual behavior. To argue for this hypothesis, we draw on seminal psychological accounts of attitude theory which suggest that individuals’ attitudes affect their behavioral intentions which, in turn, lead to actual behavior (Ajzen 2001; Ajzen and Fishbein 2005). According to attitude theory, tourists’ xenophilic tendencies would motivate them to act accordingly. As a result, tourists’ attraction toward foreign destinations is likely reflected in an intention to visit such places. Our study, thus, suggests that tourists’ level of TXI is a driver of willingness to visit foreign destinations. In addition, we examine the effect of willingness to visit on actual
behavior because tourism scholars point to a potential gap between behavioral intentions and actual behavior (e.g., Juvan and Dolnicar 2014). This is also in line with the approach taken by similar research on country biases (e.g., Josiassen 2011; Klein, Ettenson, and Morris 1998; Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2019). We, thus, hypothesize that willingness to visit foreign destinations will have a positive effect on actual behavior as indicated by the number of trips taken to such destinations.

*Hypothesis 6:* TXI has a positive effect on tourists’ willingness to visit foreign destinations.

*Hypothesis 7:* Willingness to visit foreign destinations has a positive effect on number of trips taken to foreign destinations.

Differences in individuals’ levels of TXI are likely to arise from a complex interplay of factors. We suggest that differences in individuals’ regulatory focus-orientation may contribute to these interindividual variations. Regulatory focus theory distinguishes between two independent and co-existing regulatory orientations: promotion focus and prevention focus (Higgins 1997). Prevention focused individuals strive toward the absence of negative outcomes, while promotion focused individuals emphasize the potential of positive outcomes and wanting to not miss out on opportunities. (Higgins 1997). The two regulatory foci have been linked to a variety of different outcomes. Promotion cues, relative to prevention cues, have, for example, been found to enhance creative thought (Friedman and Förster 2001), to be a predictor of subjective authenticity (J. Kim et al. 2019), and to attenuate negative effects of interracial contact on cognitive functioning (Trawalter and Richeson 2006). Conversely, prevention focus, relative to promotion focus, incites a preference for stability and the status quo (Westjohn et al. 2016).
While regulatory focus theory has seen broad application within the marketing literature, it has mostly been ignored within the field of tourism. Regulatory focus may impact levels of TXI, and we hypothesize that individuals’ degree of promotion focus is positively related to TXI. The basis is the notion that promotion focused individuals may develop an attraction to foreign destinations in their search for positive outcomes. They might also exhibit TXI as a way to avoid missing out on opportunities, and the hypothesized relationship aligns well with the view that “a promotion-focused person […] is open to change, more alternatives, and the unfamiliar” (Westjohn et al. 2016, 27).

Hypothesis 8: Promotion focus has a positive effect on TXI.

Another potential driver of TXI is boredom. Boredom constitutes a negative state that commonly arises in situations that are perceived to lack meaning, interest, and challenge (Struk et al. 2017). While boredom is said to serve the function of motivating people to modify their behaviors, researchers argue that individuals do not experience boredom to the same extent (e.g., Struk et al. 2017). We propose that boredom proneness is a driver of TXI as foreign destinations may represent excitement, foreignness, and dissimilarity and, thereby, an antidote to boredom. This aligns well with the notion that boredom incites an individual to undertake a search for “a novel and varied environment” (Vodanovich, Verner, and Gilbride 1991, 1144) and the argument within tourism that people travel to foreign countries in order to escape routine and alleviate boredom (e.g., Yoon and Uysal 2005). In addition, the hypothesis is supported by Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf’s (2018a) argument that boredom is an activating cue for the exploration system and subsequently xenophilia. While boredom in this case is seen as a state that situationally activates xenophilia, it seems reasonable to suggest that people who are particularly prone to boredom may exhibit a stable tendency toward the bias.
Hypothesis 9: Boredom proneness has a positive effect on TXI.

Humans spend significant amounts of time engaging in thoughts that are unrelated to the events in the here and now. These stimulus-independent thoughts have commonly been referred to as mind-wandering. Scholars have found that the propensity to mind-wander is a stable characteristic, representing individual differences (McVay, Kane, and Kwapil 2009). Mind-wandering is central to tourism where individuals may dream of foreign destinations and imagine themselves engaging in desirable leisure experiences (e.g., Goossens 2000; Snepenger et al. 2004; Urry 1990). According to Goossens (2000), experiential processes such as imagining and daydreaming even play an important role in vacation choice behavior. Against this background, the study hypothesizes that individuals who frequently engage in mind-wandering are more likely to exhibit TXI. As such, people who are prone to mind-wandering may find themselves getting absorbed in pleasant fantasies about foreign destinations, thus spurring curiosity and fascination toward such places. The attraction to foreign destinations is even likely to involve a degree of dreaming and fantasizing about such places.

Hypothesis 10: Mind-wandering has a positive effect on TXI.
STUDY 1: SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Developing a scale to measure TXI is necessary as no existing xenophilia scale can be meaningfully adapted to the tourism context. The scale items from Perlmutter (1957) center around the comparison between in-groups and out-groups, with the in-group being described in more negative terms than the out-groups. This tendency is exemplified by the item: “Most European girls make better wives than American girls.” Perlmutter’s scale therefore reflects an outdated understanding of biases and does not fit with the definition of TXI as a positive out-group bias and not a derogation of the in-group. Another way of measuring xenophilia is the scale proposed by Stürmer et al. (2013). Stürmer et al.’s (2013, 836) xenophilia scale suffers from two shortcomings: First, it is a cognitive, affective, and conative amalgam with, for example, some items capturing a cognitive facet (e.g., “I believe I understand what it is like to be an immigrant in this society”), some capturing an affective facet (e.g., “How comfortable are you in interactions with immigrants?”), and others capturing a conative one (e.g., “inviting immigrants as guests into one’s own home”). One of the problems arising from such a scale is that the inclusion of conative items in this scale renders attempts to link xenophilia to behavioral outcomes tautological. The scale is, therefore, of little use in tourism research that centers on empirical effects testing. Second, several items lack face validity as they do not unambiguously reflect a xenophilic predisposition (e.g., “I believe that I have a good understanding of how members of cultural or ethnic immigrant groups view the world”) (Stürmer et al. 2013, 836). The TXI scale is therefore developed in the following sections.

We developed the TXI scale by following established scale development procedures (Kock et al. 2018). First, we generated an initial pool of 40 items by reviewing the psychology literature on xenophilia and intergroup biases (e.g., Siem, Stürmer, and Pittinsky 2016; Stürmer et al. 2013). To limit the number of items that were to be included in the questionnaire, we continued with two steps. First, we judged all items for redundancy and
ambiguous wording, leading to the deletion of 21 items. Secondly, three tourism and marketing researchers judged the items with regard to face validity (i.e., how well they reflected the intended construct) and content validity (i.e., how well they captured the full content of the construct) (Josiassen 2011). This led to the deletion of a further eight items, leaving 11 items for the subsequent analysis.

To provide an empirical test of the TXI scale’s validity and reliability and to further reduce its length, we included the TXI items and outcome variables in a questionnaire administered to a sample of U.S. respondents. We chose the U.S. because it constitutes the biggest outbound tourism market by number of tourists (UNWTO 2018). The US respondents were recruited from the Mechanical Turk (MTurk) online panel because it provides access to a large and relatively diverse group of participants and because such data has been found to be of equal or higher quality than, for example, data from student and public samples (Goodman and Paolacci 2017).

Certain questionnaire participants may engage in behaviors like satisficing or straight-lining (e.g., Barber, Barnes, and Carlson 2013). To detect and limit such forms of response bias in the data, we included an instructional manipulation check (IMC; ‘Please select Agree as the correct answer here’) in the questionnaire and excluded respondents who chose the wrong answer from the final sample (17 respondents; 4.72% of the total respondents). To reduce satisficing, the introduction of the questionnaire warned the participants that such a question would be used. In addition, respondents had to satisfy several classificatory requirements to be invited to answer the questionnaire (Kock et al. 2018). Respondents had to be 18 or older, have enough funds to travel (household income > $30,000), and have experience with travelling long distance (> 70 miles in the recent two years). The final sample consisted of 338 respondents (see Table 1 for sample characteristics).
Before carrying out an exploratory factor analysis on the 11 TXI items, we ensured that the data met both the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) criterion and Bartlett’s test of sphericity (BTS) (KMO = .957; BTS = 3422.069; d.f. = 55, p<.001). We then also conducted a parallel analysis (Horn 1965) to determine the dimensionality of the scale as the commonly employed Kaiser-Gutmann criterion often does not identify an appropriate number of factors (Lance, Butts and Michels, 2006). These procedures resulted in a one-factor solution, which provides empirical support for the contention that TXI is a unidimensional construct.

Further, we used four criteria to evaluate the items (Kock et al. 2018). First, we examined the item-to-total correlations and factor loadings sequentially with .4 and .5 as thresholds. Second, four items with high inter-item correlations were deleted because this indicated item redundancy. Third, we examined whether deleting any of the items would increase scale reliability. This, however, did not result in any further deletions. Lastly, we applied an iterated $\chi^2$-difference test procedure (Kock et al. 2018). After each iteration, we selected the item with the lowest item-to-total correlation. This item was deleted if its deletion would result in a higher fit, and if its deletion did not affect the conceptual meaning of the scale. In this way, five items were left in the final scale.

As visible from Table 2, the explained variation of the extracted factor was .75, while factor loadings ranged from .73 to .89. The average variance extracted (AVE) was .75 and the composite reliability (CR) was .94, indicating that the scale is a reliable measure of TXI.

Insert Table 1 about here

Insert Table 2 about here

We lastly examined whether age, gender, and education affect TXI by conducting Kruskal-Wallis H tests for all three variables. While there were no significant differences observed for
age ($\chi^2 = 1.031, p=.794)$ and education ($\chi^2 = 7.075, p=.132$), levels of TXI differed significantly for gender ($\chi^2 = 7.847, p<.01$) with women being higher on TXI than men.
STUDY 2: OUTCOME TESTING

Participants and procedures

Study 2 tests hypotheses one through five (Figure 1). For this purpose, we collected questionnaire data from a sample of U.S. respondents on MTurk and included the same classificatory and IMC questions as in Study 1. We collected 284 completed questionnaires and disqualified 34 respondents (10.69% of the total sample) for providing the wrong answer to the IMC.

Measures

As visible in Table 3, the questionnaire contained the newly developed TXI scale and the measures used to test hypotheses one to five. Tourists’ intention to try local food was adopted from Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf (2019) and tourists’ willingness to engage with locals and to stay at a B&B when abroad was adapted to the specific context from the intentions scale by Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf (2016). Further, we also included two outcomes that capture predispositions of residents: resident hospitality toward tourists and support for immigration policies. The measure for resident hospitality toward tourists was adopted from Kock et al. (2018) and a residents’ support for immigration policies scale was developed with point of departure in previous literature (e.g., Pérez 2010). This was done because existing scales on attitudes to immigration policies were too specific to be adapted to our context (e.g., Stupi, Chiricos, and Gertz 2016; Tartakovsky and Walsh 2016). All items were measured using a seven-point Likert scale.

All scales exhibited sufficient convergent validity with all standardized factor loadings being significant. The AVEs were above the threshold of .5, and composite reliabilities were above the threshold of .9, indicating satisfactory levels of reliability (Lance, Butts, and Michels 2006). To assess whether the scales exhibited discriminant validity, the Fornell-Larcker
criterion (1981) and the heterotrait-monotrait (HTMT) ratio criterion were used. Discriminant validity was established through the Fornell-Larcker criterion as the AVE of each construct was higher than the construct’s highest squared correlation with any of the other included constructs. The scales also passed the stricter HTMT ratio criterion as the ratio of the average of the heterotrait-heteromethod correlations to the average of the monotrait-heteromethod correlations ratio was below .85 (Kline 2011). In addition, all variance inflation factors (VIFs) were below seven, which indicates that collinearity was not harmful.

Insert Table 3 about here

Results

We checked for common-method bias (CMB) by conducting Harman’s one-factor test. The test yielded no differences and the marker variable did not correlate significantly with any of the other variables. To test the hypotheses, we then examined the developed model through a covariance-based structural equation modelling (CB-SEM) approach in AMOS 24. Satisfactory model fit was achieved ($\chi^2$/df = 2.609; CFI = .941; NNFI = .935; RMSEA = .075; SRMR = .0855).

The structural model shows support for the developed hypotheses with all five hypotheses being confirmed (Figure 2). First, TXI has a significant and positive effect on tourists’ preferences and behaviors. Specifically, TXI relates positively and strongly to tourists’ intention to try local food when abroad (.69; p<.001), tourists’ willingness to engage with locals when abroad (.70; p<.001), and willingness to stay at a B&B (.34; p<.001). These results indicate that xenophilic tourists have a strong intention to immerse themselves in the foreign destination through food, accommodation, and the locals themselves. Further, the path analysis also documents that TXI relates to the resident domain as it drives residents’
hospitality toward incoming tourists (.52; p<.001) and residents’ support for immigration policies (.36; p<.001).

*Insert Figure 2 about here*
STUDY 3: ANTECEDENTS TESTING

Participants and procedures

After having established the important role of TXI in shaping a range of tourist and resident predispositions and preferences, we now seek to explore what drives TXI and whether it has an impact on actual tourist behavior. The recruitment procedure was similar to the one in Study 2; we entered the same classificatory questions and IMC which disqualified 14 respondents (3.52% of the sample). A total of 380 completed questionnaires remained.

Measures

Table 4 shows all scales that we used in the questionnaire for Study 3, including their source in the literature and respective parameters. In addition to the TXI scale, the questionnaire included scales of relevance to hypotheses six to ten. Willingness to visit was measured by adapting the scale from Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf (2016), and respondents were asked how many holiday trips to foreign destinations they had taken in the last five years to measure actual travel behavior (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2019). Promotion focus was measured with three items adapted from Haws, Dholakia, and Bearden (2010), mind-wandering was measured with six items that we adapted from Carriere, Seli, and Smilek (2013), and boredom proneness was measured with five items adapted from Struk et al. (2017). For all three measures, we used purified scales of the original one and grounded that purification on statistical and judgmental criteria (Wieland, Kock, and Josiassen 2018). All constructs were measured on seven-point Likert scales. We found satisfactory composite reliabilities, as indicated by CR, and convergent validities, as indicated by factor loadings and AVEs. Discriminant validity was again established through the Fornell-Larcker criterion and the HTMT-ratio. Further, all VIFs were below seven, thereby indicating that multi-collinearity was not harmful.
Results

Similar to Study 2, CMB was not found to impair the obtained results. Thus, we proceeded with the analysis of the structural model. We fit the data to the model and obtained a satisfactory model fit ($\chi^2/df = 3.115; \text{CFI} = .930; \text{NNFI} = .92; \text{RMSEA} = .075; \text{SRMR} = .0637$). Importantly, TXI has a positive effect on tourists’ willingness to visit a foreign destination (.49, $p<.001$) which in turn impacts tourists’ actual travel to foreign countries (.46, $p<.001$). This result documents that xenophilic tourists do not only feel a higher inclination to travel abroad, but actually do travel abroad. Further, TXI positively relates to promotion focus (.47, $p<.001$), boredom proneness (.12, $p<.05$), and mind-wandering (.18, $p<.01$). These results confirm hypotheses six to ten.
CONCLUSION

This research is motivated by the idea that attraction to foreignness is a potentially important root of tourism. We drew on psychology research for the conceptual basis of tourism xenophilia and define it as individuals’ attraction toward the perceived foreignness of destinations. Over three studies, a psychometrically sound measure of TXI was developed and used to test ten hypotheses about its drivers and consequences. The results of the scale development demonstrate that the scale is a valid and reliable measure of TXI.

Study 2 and Study 3 show that TXI can be linked to several important tourist intentions. In the second study, it was found that individuals with higher levels of TXI are more willing to be hospitable to tourists, to engage with locals, to stay at B&Bs, and to try local foods when travelling. It was also found that TXI is positively linked to residents’ support for immigration policies, indicating that the bias reaches beyond the domain of tourism. In the third study, we found that TXI affects actual tourist behavior mediated by willingness to visit a foreign destination. We also identified three antecedents of the construct: promotion focus, boredom proneness, and mind-wandering.

Our study provides several contributions to theory. First, we contribute to the literature on symbolic reasons for travelling (e.g., Luna-Cortés, López-Bonilla, and López-Bonilla 2018; Sirgy and Su 2000) by introducing tourism xenophilia as a key reason for going abroad that goes beyond objective quality and value criteria. More specifically, this study contributes to the emerging literature on intergroup biases in tourism (e.g., Chien and Richie 2018; Kock et al. 2018) by positioning TXI as a positive foreign country bias. A big picture implication is, thus, that people’s attraction to foreignness should be considered a key reason for travelling and that future studies that set out to examine international travel may benefit from including it in their nomological networks.
Second, TXI may also inform future studies on tourist motivation (e.g., Dey and Sarma 2010; Pearce and Lee 2005) by explaining why a variety of motives exists. In initial support of this, the TXI outcomes of intention to try local food and willingness to engage with locals resemble motives such as “trying new food” (Yoon and Uysal 2005) and “meeting the locals” (Pearce and Lee 2005). TXI is, thus, an underlying trait which symptoms can be found across many more specific tourist motivations and, ultimately, behaviors.

Third, the present study is one of the first attempts in the tourism literature to use an evolutionary psychology lens to develop a theoretical framework, containing various novel hypotheses on often neglected tourism phenomena. Evolutionary psychology holds a lot of promise (Kim and Seo 2018; Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2018a), and the present research is a testament to it. Importantly, by introducing TXI, this study is the first to conceptually elaborate on a link between exploration and a proximate-level phenomenon. We thereby show that our interest in travelling can be linked back to evolutionary pressures to gain access to new mates, knowledge, and other resources (e.g., Crouch 2013; Navarrete 2013). By identifying exploration as an underlying reason for the existence of xenophilia, we additionally contribute to marketing and psychology research on intergroup biases (e.g., Balabanis and Diamantopoulos 2016; Stürmer et al. 2013).

Fourth, our nomological networks document that TXI can shape people’s intentions and behaviors, both in their roles as tourists and residents. This is a particular strength of the construct that may be of benefit to studies that set out to examine phenomena in both the tourist and resident realms. TXI can even be of use for studies that examine tourist and resident behavior together, such as when the relationship between these two stakeholders is analyzed. Our results show that TXI determines residents’ and tourists’ intention to interact with each other, thereby contributing to the burgeoning research stream that examines conflicts between residents and tourists (Chien and Ritchie 2018). However, scholars should
not view TXI as a phenomenon that explains purely positive outcomes. That is, behavioral intentions such as willingness to engage with locals may explain attitudes and behaviors from genuine interest in listening and learning from locals to ‘gazing’ upon the less powerful in the search for foreignness (Stone and Nyaupane 2019), potentially through somewhat controversial forms of tourism, such as slum and indigenous tourism (Bresner 2010; Frenzel 2012). TXI may, therefore, provide researchers with a way to study both desirable and undesirable tourism phenomena and, in turn, a way to better understand and manage participation in such tourist activities.

The present study also has implications for practice. The identification of TXI as a stable psychometric mental property that was found across three studies means that tourism managers can identify segments with specific levels of TXI. These segments could in turn be targeted with tailored communication efforts according to TXI levels. Firms could allocate resources relative to TXI levels because potential tourists with higher TXI levels may be easier to convert to become a customer than persons lower on TXI. On the other hand, TXI levels can also aid in better satisfying the wants and needs of lower TXI tourists. For example, low TXI tourists may not want to be involved in the local culture but rather travel in groups and have accommodation at a hotel or resort where more of his or her country-men are staying. Major international hotels may be particularly interested in individuals who travel but who are relatively low on TXI, while Airbnb and other providers of a more immersed experience might be more interested in targeting higher TXI tourists. Similarly, hotel managers may want to adjust the selection of dishes depending on the TXI levels of the clientele. If the clientele is of higher TXI levels then local and exotic (to the international tourist) cuisine may be preferred, while lower TXI level tourists may prefer a more global cuisine or even, if possible, cuisine from their home country.
Further, TXI can be used as a vehicle to manage relationships between tourists and residents and particularly potential conflicts between these two parties (Chien and Ritchie 2018). Our research indicates that TXI positively relates to residents’ hospitality as well as tourists’ willingness to engage with residents. This finding helps shed light on the observation that some destinations experience support for (increased) tourism, while other destinations experience resistance, indicating that levels of TXI of the two parties may shape the relationships beyond criteria such as perceived positive impact (Nunkoo and So 2016), perceived environmental impact (Stylidis et al. 2014), and quality of life (Woo, Kim, and Uysal 2015).

Our research also identifies potential sources of TXI that may serve as remedies if TXI levels are low. Such more reluctant residents may be driven by a prevention focus to a higher extent than what higher TXI individuals are. This prevention focus may cause a preference for the status quo. One way to address this could be to assure residents that a plan for increased tourism will not create many changes at the destination. This might lower resistance to tourism from such low TXI residents. It might even be possible to increase support for tourism, particularly among low TXI residents, by making and communicating plans to spend the increased tourism revenue on maintaining some of the local buildings, sites, and places of employment. If low TXI residents understand that tourism is what helps maintain the status quo at their local destination, they could be much more receptive of tourism. The understanding that promotion focus is a driver of TXI implies many such solutions to tourism practitioners.

While promotion focus may be the main driver of TXI in our study, boredom proneness and mind-wandering were also identified as drivers. Tourism managers could use this new knowledge to target potential tourists in terms of product, message, and media. For example, destinations could create and communicate tours and make a variety of experiences more
readily available to tourists. The media used to communicate to the target group could be chosen where there is a proclivity for boredom proneness and mind-wandering and where impressions change repeatedly and rapidly. Tourism managers might be able to access such individuals via social media sites such as Twitter. In terms of advertising on television, it may be preferable to advertise on channels that broadcast many series rather than full-length movies that demand more time and, for example, lower proneness to boredom.

Limitations and Further Research

The present research has certain limitations that invite future studies. First, the same intergroup biases generally exist across all cultures (e.g., Hewstone, Rubin, and Willis 2002), making TXI a potentially pancultural phenomenon. The present study, however, relies on a sample of U.S. residents. Future research is invited to broaden this scope and to test for cultural differences in levels of TXI and its impacts. Second, while TXI is considered a relatively stable psychological trait, contextual cues may modify how it is expressed in different situations. Such moderators would be interesting to test in order to understand TXI and its effects across various contexts. Third, the present study relies on survey-based self-reports. This approach is meaningful for our study because TXI is a latent construct which is not directly observable or objectively measurable; hence it is best captured by the reliable and valid measurement instrument we develop herein. However, we call for future studies that incorporate the developed TXI scale into methodological setups which measure behavior directly, rather than behavioral intentions. For example, having access to tour operators would allow researchers to test for xenophilic tourists’ actual consumption of local food when travelling abroad. Though, such field data also has its drawbacks because other explanations such as involvement with food or financial resources cannot be ruled out.
Fourth, to explore the predictive capabilities of TXI on accommodation choice, we capture both Airbnbs and traditional B&Bs with the same measure. The literature on non-hotel forms of accommodation is somewhat limited but indicates that in many contexts, the motivations for choosing a traditional B&B and an Airbnb are the same (e.g., Guttentag et al. 2018; McIntosh and Siggs 2005; Stringer 1981). However, motivations for choosing Airbnb listings vary greatly as often reflected in whether the tourist rents an entire home or co-habits with the host (Lutz and Newlands 2018; Guttentag et al. 2018). The latter scenario is expected to overlap greatly with B&B accommodations, while the former is likely to be a rather distinct experience. This constitutes a possible limitation of this study, and we urge further research to investigate whether there might be a differential effect of TXI on B&B and Airbnb.

This research also points to other possibilities for future study. An important theoretical basis for this article is evolutionary psychology, and we welcome more studies in tourism research with this theoretical basis. The better we understand how evolutionary pressures manifest themselves in our modern lives, the better we can become at harnessing the consequences for the benefit of tourists, residents, tourism firms, and society. We also urge researchers to investigate alternative drivers and outcomes of TXI, particularly with a focus on explaining both desirable and undesirable consequences of the bias. The potential link between TXI and willingness to engage in indigenous or slum tourism could, for instance, be examined. TXI could also be investigated as a driver of engagement in new forms of tourism, such as space tourism (Olya and Han 2019). Similarly, we call for studies investigating how TXI relates to specific motivations, such as motivations connected to Cohen’s (1972) tourist typology (Gursoy et al. 2015). Lastly, since TXI, arguably, is an influential reason behind tourism, it would be interesting to understand if and how individuals that are low on TXI can be motivated to travel. This research on TXI, thus, opens up diverse and fruitful avenues for future study.
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Figures and Tables

Figure 1: The Tourism xenophilia framework
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Study 1</th>
<th>Study 2</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;30 years</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59 years</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;59 years</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished a master’s degree or higher</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished a bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at university</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished secondary school</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finished primary school</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample characteristics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs/Items</th>
<th>Item Mean</th>
<th>Item Loadings</th>
<th>Corrected Item-to-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Scale parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am fascinated with foreign destinations. (‘Fascination’)</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foreign destinations are magical to me. (‘Magical’)</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My curiosity is aroused by foreign destinations. (‘Curiosity’)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foreign destinations incite my spirit of discovery. (‘Discovery’)</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foreign destinations are thrilling to me (‘Thrill’)</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composite reliability (CR)          .94
Average variance extracted (AVE)   .75
Explained variation of extracted factor   .75

Table 2: Parameters of the TXI scale

Notes: The items are scored on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree”; 7 = “strongly agree”).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism xenophilia (newly developed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am fascinated with foreign destinations. (‘Fascination’)</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foreign destinations are magical to me. (‘Magical’)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My curiosity is aroused by foreign destinations. (‘Curiosity’)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foreign destinations incite my spirit of discovery. (‘Discovery’)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foreign destinations are thrilling to me (‘Thrilling’)</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intention to try local food (Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2019)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am curious to try local food that I don’t know.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When travelling, I like to taste local food.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy local food when travelling.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When eating abroad, I prefer the local food alternative.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to engage with locals when abroad (adapted from Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I intend to engage with the locals on my next holiday to a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will engage with the locals the next time I go on holiday to a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On my next holiday to a foreign destination, I will definitely try to engage with the locals.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to stay at a B&amp;B when abroad (adapted from Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I intend to stay at bed and breakfast on my next holiday to a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The next time I go on vacation to a foreign destination, I will stay at a bed and breakfast.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is very likely that I would choose to stay at a bed and breakfast when I travel to a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents’ hospitality toward tourists (Kock et al. 2018)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I try to be helpful if a tourist asks me for help.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I happily interact with tourists.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I have the opportunity, I am hospitable toward tourists.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would do my bit to make the U.S. a welcoming country for tourists.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support for immigration policies (newly developed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The U.S. should allow foreigners to come and live here.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The government should put more effort into improving the societal position of immigrants.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It should be easier for immigrants to acquire American citizenship.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I support increased government spending to help immigrants adjust to living in the U.S. 
5. It is important that the U.S. is good at welcoming immigrants/should be better at welcoming immigrants.

Table 3: Constructs and their parameters used in Study 2
Figure 2: Structural equation modelling results of Study 2

Model fit: ($\chi^2$/df = 2.609; CFI = .941; NNFI = .935; RMSEA = .075; SRMR = .0855)  * = p<.05; ** = p<.01; *** = p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct/Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tourism xenophilia (newly developed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I am fascinated with foreign destinations.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foreign destinations are magical to me.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My curiosity is aroused by foreign destinations.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Foreign destinations incite my spirit of discovery.</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foreign destinations are thrilling to me</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to visit (adapted from Kock, Josiassen, and Assaf 2016)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I intend to spend my next holiday at a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The next time I go on vacation, I will choose a foreign destination.</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is very likely that I would choose a foreign destination as my tourist destination.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mind-wandering (adapted from Carriere, Seli, and Smilek 2013)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I allow my thoughts to wander on purpose.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I enjoy mind-wandering.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I allow myself to get absorbed in pleasant fantasy.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I find my thoughts wandering spontaneously.</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I mind-wander my thoughts tend to be pulled from topic to topic.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I mind-wander even when I’m supposed to be doing something else.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boredom proneness (adapted from Struk et al. 2017)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I often find myself at “loose ends,” not knowing what to do.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I find it hard to entertain myself.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It takes more stimulation to get me going than most people.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In most situations, it is hard for me to find something to do or see to keep me interested.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unless I am doing something exciting, even dangerous, I feel half-dead and dull.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion focus (adapted from Haws, Dholakia, and Bearden 2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. When I see an opportunity for something I like, I get excited right away.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I frequently imagine how I will achieve my hopes and aspirations.</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I see myself as someone who is primarily striving to reach my “ideal self” – to fulfill my hopes, wishes, and aspirations.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Constructs and their parameters used in Study 3
Figure 3: Structural equation modelling results of Study 3