

# Do tourists seek the same information at destinations? Analysis of digital tourist information searches according to different types of tourists

Assumpció Huertas <sup>1</sup> and Orden-Mejía Miguel <sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Communication, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain. Email: [sunsi.huertas@urv.cat](mailto:sunsi.huertas@urv.cat)

<sup>2</sup> Facultat de Turisme i Geografia, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Tarragona, Spain. Email: [miguelangel.orden@estudiants.urv.cat](mailto:miguelangel.orden@estudiants.urv.cat)

\*Corresponding author

## Abstract

The study analyses the searches for digital tourist information that different types of tourists, with different characteristics and connectivity preferences, make at destinations on the main topics they may require, allowing to know which digital sources they use, but also at what moment and in what situation. The study was based on an online survey that asked users about searches for tourist information they made at the destination during their last trip. The results show that tourists increasingly seek more tourist information at the destination, and search differently depending on the topic and their connectivity preferences in the different digital channels and locations. The results will allow Destination Management Organizations (DMOs) to provide tourists with suitable information, at the time and place they so require.

**Keywords:** information search, type of tourist, digital channel, destination, context

**Citation:** Huertas, A. and Miguel, O-M. (2022). Do tourists seek the same information at destinations? Analysis of digital tourist information searches according to different types of tourists. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 32, 3211.



© 2022 The Author(s)

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## 1. Introduction

Tourist information search is one of the main factors influencing the tourist decision-making process (Xiang & Fesenmaier, 2020) as it decreases tourists' risk and uncertainty and increases the quality of the tourist experience (Cho, 2008; Tussyadiah & Park, 2011). In recent years, new technologies have changed the way tourists search for and share information (Del Chiappa & Baggio, 2015; Wang *et al.*, 2013), influencing tourism experiences (Hyun *et al.*, 2009; Sotiriadis, 2017). New technologies have allowed users to create information and content and become both searchers and content creators (Xiang & Fesenmaier, 2020).

Technological evolution and smartphones (Tussyadiah, 2016) and the spread of social media have brought about the emergence of a new, demanding tourist, who seeks tourist information at destinations in real time (Choe & Fesenmaier, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2014) using the phone as a personal travel assistant (Tussyadiah, 2014). The digital tourist (Benckendorff *et al.*, 2014; Pencarelli, 2019) is more demanding, more active, and uses new ways to seek and share information; and smart tourists use smart technologies and share their data interacting and co-creating more satisfying experiences (Femenia-Serra *et al.*, 2019).

Technology has also made tourism and destinations smart (Xiang & Fesenmaier, 2020). A complexity and diversity of channels, agents and digital platforms that provide tourist information have emerged (Benckendorff *et al.*, 2019). So, tourist destinations, striving to be competitive (Buhalis & Amaranggana, 2014), are adopting all this technology with the aim of offering more personalized services (Lamsfus *et al.*, 2015) allowing tourists to better attain their preferences (Vecchio *et al.*, 2018).

In this context, tourists plan their trips less, postpone decisions until they are actually on the trip (Fernández-Cavia *et al.*, 2020), and look for more information at destinations (Choe & Fesenmaier, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2014). Therefore, the success of destinations will depend on their ability to provide the information that tourists need at any moment by adopting the most appropriate technological tools (Neuhofer *et al.*, 2012). Moreover, in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, destinations, more than ever, need to find efficient ways to interact and communicate with tourists (García-Milon *et al.*, 2020; García-Milon *et al.*, 2021). Hence, destinations need to know what information tourists are looking for during the trip and where in order to provide the information they need in the most attractive way (Kotoua & Ilkan, 2017; Xiang & Pan, 2011).

Research in tourist information search has focused mainly on the sources of tourist information (Llodrà-Riera *et al.*, 2015), on information search processes (Foster, 2004) and on tourists' sociodemographic characteristics (Kim *et al.*, 2007; Okazaki & Hirose, 2009); mainly during the pre-trip planning stage (Liu *et al.*, 2019). But, technological developments have made information search processes increasingly complex, fragmented and non-linear (Xiang & Fesenmaier, 2020) and performed at all stages of the trip (Wang *et al.*, 2016). So, since studies about tourist information search during the trip are still scarce, the aim of the study is to analyse digital tourist information search at destinations.

In addition, tourists have diverse profiles and look for information differently when travelling (Adhikary & Adhikari, 2019). Most studies that take into account the differences between tourists in digital tourist information search (Ford *et al.*, 2001; Grønflaten, 2009; Llodrà-Riera *et al.*, 2015) group tourists according to their demographic characteristics, but there are many more features for consideration, and also contexts and situations to take into account, because different tourists also seek information at different times and in different situations (Adhikary & Adhikari, 2019). In fact, not all tourists make similar use of technology to search for information at the destination (Fan *et al.*, 2019) nor do they seek the same

information (Kim *et al.*, 2007; Lu *et al.*, 2015; Okazaki & Hirose, 2009; Pearce, 2008). For instance, some tourists want to disconnect and use their mobile less when they are travelling (Egger *et al.*, 2020).

For all these reasons it is necessary to analyse the tourist information searches by different tourists during their trips taking into account their different characteristics and connectivity preferences, also in different contexts and situations. The aim of the study is to ascertain, broadly and comprehensively, the searches for digital tourist information that different types of tourists make at destinations on the main topics they may require, find out which digital sources they use, but also at what time and in what situation. Knowing about tourists' digital searches and their needs for tourist information will guide managers of DMOs to generate the information that each type of tourist needs through the channels they use, at the right time and in the right place. The study was based on an online survey that asked users about searches for tourist information they made at the destination during their last trip. In the data analysis, the descriptive method was used and different techniques were applied, such as the chi-square test and the analysis of multiple responses.

## **2. Research on tourist information search**

While tourists seek information without following specific parameters and without understanding the strategies they implement (Pirolli, 2016), feeling overwhelmed by the amount of digital information available (Lu & Gursoy, 2015), tourism marketers and DMOs increasingly need to know where and how tourists look for tourist information so they may improve the efficiency of this information (Xiang & Pan, 2011) and display it in the most personalized and engaging way at the closest moments to decision-making (Kotoua & Ilkan, 2017) to increase tourist satisfaction (Del Vecchio *et al.*, 2018). Therefore, tourist information search has become one of the main areas of study in tourism marketing (Liu *et al.*, 2019).

Studies on tourist information search began in the 1970s (Murphy & Rosenblood, 1974; Nolan, 1976) and proliferated in later decades. Firstly, they mainly focused on showing that tourist information search influences the tourism decision-making process (Um, 1992; Woodside, 1989) and the choice of destinations and attractions (Chadwick *et al.*, 1987; Moutinho, 1987). They also focused on search processes (Dellaert & Ettema, 1998; Jeng, 2002). The first comprehensive model on tourist information search, which considered the strategies, contingencies and sociodemographic characteristics of tourists in their search behaviours, was presented by Fodness and Murray (1999). Although it is a leading study in tourist information search, subsequent studies have not greatly expanded on it (Zarezadeh *et al.*, 2019).

Internet and information and communication technology (ICT) have had a major impact on tourists' information search (Benckendorff *et al.*, 2019; Buhalis & Law, 2008; Law *et al.*, 2014). Consequently, studies have focused on tourist information search through these new technologies, tourist information sources, initially concentrating rather on search engines (Fesenmaier *et al.*, 2011; Pan & Fesenmaier, 2006; Xiang & Pan, 2011; Xiang *et al.*, 2008) and later on social media and user-generated content (UGC) (Amaro *et al.*, 2016; Wang *et al.*, 2016; Xiang & Gretzel, 2010). Tourist information sources are key elements in the creation of the travel experience at destinations (Jeong & Shin, 2020; Um & Chung, 2021).

Several studies have analysed tourist information search behaviour and processes (Buhalis & Law, 2008; Kang *et al.*, 2020; Navío-Marco *et al.*, 2018; Yuan *et al.*, 2019; Zillinger, 2020), search characteristics and the experiences generated (Buhalis & Michopoulou, 2011; Ramkissoon & Uysal, 2011), the sources of information used by tourists (Almeida-Santana & Moreno-Gil, 2017; Ho *et al.*, 2012; Llodrà-Riera *et al.*,

2015; Murphy *et al.*, 2016), tourists' characteristics (Kim *et al.*, 2007; Okazaki & Hirose, 2009), as well as their necessities and motivations in the search (Fileri & McLeay, 2014; Ho *et al.*, 2012; Lengieza *et al.*, 2019; Wang *et al.*, 2016) mainly prior to the trip itself (Liu *et al.*, 2019) or some at all stages of a trip (Fernández-Cavia *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2016). But studies about digital tourist information search during the trip are still scarce.

Nowadays, the constant evolution of technology and the proliferation of smartphones has allowed tourists to search for information at destinations and make decisions right away. So, studies have emerged that analyse tourist information search during the trip showing that tourists can search for information anywhere and anytime (Kang *et al.*, 2021) through innovative technologies such as near-field communication technologies (Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020). Some have demonstrated the benefits that technology brings to tourists and the generation of tourist experiences (Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020; Wang *et al.*, 2014; 2016). But there has also emerged an opposed current of studies promoting digital-free tourism (Li *et al.*, 2018), which highlights the negative impacts of using technology and mobile devices while travelling (Egger *et al.*, 2020) as they prevent disconnection (Dickinson *et al.*, 2016) and distract tourists from the real tourist experience (Aye, 2018). Moreover, recently Zillinger (2020) showed that tourists continue to search both digital and analogue information sources. For all these reasons, it is necessary to know the different digital tourist information searches that tourists carry out depending on their degree of Internet connectivity during the trip.

Some studies have shown that tourists perceive information coming from other tourists as being more trustworthy (Choi *et al.*, 2018), while others have shown that both official channels and UGC have a similar influence on tourists' decisions (Lian & Yu, 2019). Recently, Kang, Kim and Park (2021) studied the information-seeking behaviour of tourists from a network perspective, taking into account both contingency factors and search results. Xiang and Fesenmaier (2020) have recently made an exhaustive compilation of studies about tourist information search, emphasizing the importance of personal tourist factors and also situational factors in the information search processes and highlighting that there is still a lot of research to be conducted on this issue. Hence, this study aims to find out how different tourists, with different levels of connectivity during the trip, look for information at destinations at different moments and in different situations.

### **3. Typologies of tourists and behaviours in digital tourist information search**

Numerous studies have analysed tourist information search to understand and predict tourist behaviour (Xiang, 2018; Yuan *et al.*, 2019), because knowing about tourists' information search is key to understanding their decision-making (Kang *et al.*, 2020). Studies focusing on information search and tourists' characteristics (Ho *et al.*, 2012; Jani *et al.*, 2014; Luo *et al.*, 2005; Pan & Fesenmaier, 2006; Pirolli, 2016) have evolved, shifting from demographic characteristics (Luo *et al.*, 2005) to take tourists' personalities (Jani *et al.*, 2014) or personal motivations (Pirolli, 2016) into account. Therefore, as tourists are diverse, it is necessary to analyse them and consider their characteristics and differences in tourist information search, not only taking into account the different sociodemographics and reasons for travel, but also the different use of technology when they travel and their search behaviours at different times and in different locations of the trip.

Traditionally, tourists travelled to escape and disconnect (Cohen *et al.*, 2014), but nowadays technological evolution and smartphones (Tussyadiah, 2016) and the spread of social media and UGC (Munar & Jacobsen, 2014) have brought about the emergence of a new, demanding tourist, who seeks tourist information at destinations in real time (Choe & Fesenmaier, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2014) using the

phone as a personal travel assistant (Tussyadiah, 2014). These new technologies allow people to be connected to their social networks in real time (Buhalis & Sinarta, 2019).

The digital tourist (Benckendorff *et al.*, 2014; Pencarelli, 2019) is more demanding, active, independent and informed and uses new ways to seek and share information (Buhalis & Law, 2008). Femenia-Serra *et al.* (2019) defined smart tourists as tourists that are open to sharing their data, that use smart technologies, and interact and co-create value, generating more satisfying experiences. The way consumers collect information and take tourism-related decisions has changed considerably and new technologies have increased their participation and value co-creation (Pencarelli, 2019). Despite this general evolution, currently not all tourists are digital tourists, and not all use ICT equally to search for information. Hence the need to study the different types of tourists through the creation of typologies. In tourism research, there have been many studies about types of tourists (Cohen, 1972; 1979; Pearce & Lee, 2005). Cohen (1972) and Fan *et al.* (2017) classified tourists according to their contact with locals or residents of destinations. With the emergence of ICT, tourists not only have contact with the locals of destinations, but also with the tourist information offered by the DMOs and other tourist services as well as with family and friends while travelling (Fan *et al.*, 2019). Connectivity has become a key topic in the tourism experience (Kirillova & Wang, 2016).

Fan *et al.* (2019) created a typology of tourists that not only took into account their technological capacity, but also the different types of connectivity that tourists wish to preserve through technology when travelling. In their typology, six types of tourists were found: Disconnected Immersive Travellers (T1) were tourists who are inactive on the Internet and social media, both regularly and when travelling. Digital Detox Travellers (T2) were tourists active on the Internet during their daily life, but inactive when travelling, for the purpose of disconnecting. Diversionary Travellers (T3) were tourists who connect with family, only when a moment arises during the trip or when there is access to the Internet. Dual Zone Travellers (T4) were tourists who remain connected to family even when travelling and sacrifice travel time out of responsibility, for example parents and businesspeople. Daily Life Controllers (T5) were tourists with a high presence in social media when travelling that share photos and experiences on the Internet. And finally, Social Media Addicts (T6) were tourists totally connected to family and social media and also with the trip and the people at the destination. Fan *et al.* (2019) also analysed the contact and the immersion that different types of tourists had between their home and away zones when they are travelling, showing that this involved different tourist behaviours.

Therefore, this study resorts to the classification of Fan *et al.* (2019) to analyse the different tourist information search behaviours, especially because it takes into account not only the tourists' level of ICT use, but also their level of voluntary connectivity via ICT at destinations during the trip in order to ascertain their searches for different topics at various moments and in various situations.

#### **4. Methodology**

Fundamental changes are taking place in digital tourism information search (Zillinger, 2020), and we need to know how they are influencing the searches of different types of tourists in different contexts and situations (Pirolli, 2016; Xiang, Wang *et al.*, 2015). Thus, the aim of this study, based on the typology of tourists following Fan, Buhalis and Lin (2019), was to find out the different behaviours of different tourists in digital information search taking into account the following variables: what they looked for, how they looked for it (searched aspects), and on which digital sources they looked for it, at different moments and in different situations in order to observe the digital tourist information searches by type of tourist.

#### 4.1. Survey and quantitative study

The study was based on an online survey that asked users about searches for tourist information they made at the destination during their last trip. Respondents completed a self-reporting questionnaire via the free online survey software, googleform. The sample was built by disseminating the questionnaire through contacts with professors and doctoral students at the Rovira i Virgili University (Spain) and other Latin American universities (Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral and Guayaquil University, Ecuador). Professors were asked to distribute the questionnaire link to their students, colleagues and other contacts via WhatsApp or email.

The questionnaire and its scales were based on previous studies (Bao, 2007; Fan *et al.*, 2019; Mitsche, 2005; Park *et al.*, 2020). The different topics were discussed and the scales were refined in terms of validity, clarity, readability and redundancy of the content. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first asked about the respondents' demographic aspects, type of destination and type of trip they made, and the type of tourist that they considered themselves to be, based on the classification of Fan *et al.* (2019). The second section asked about the search for digital information carried out by tourists at the destination regarding four topics: transportation, tourist attractions, food/restaurants, and leisure. Since previous studies on tourist information search have mainly focused on search processes and sources, there are also few studies that focus on the topics analysed, and the existing ones are not based on the same topics. While Mitsche (2005) analysed accommodation, attractions, destinations, transport, activities/leisure, among others, Ho and Liu (2005) analysed only destinations, flight tickets and tour packages. Bao (2007) analysed transportation, site, lodging and food, travel routes, travel cost, public security, weather and climate, and local culture; and Park *et al.* (2020) examined accommodation, shopping, food and beverages and transportation. Based on all these previous studies, the main topics that may interest tourists when they are at destinations have been selected, that is: transportation, attractions, food/restaurants, and leisure. If tourists had searched for information at the destination on any of these topics, they were asked to report in detail: what they had looked for, on what digital platform, at what time, and in what place. (See Appendix 1)

The exploratory study approach was non-probabilistic, applying convenience sampling. To find errors and improve the survey, an online pilot test was conducted ( $n = 25$ ). Data collection was carried out from 17 December 2019 to 2 February 2020. The questionnaire was restricted to ensure that each respondent only submitted the questionnaire once. In addition, data quality control was performed by debugging the database in terms of unengaged responses and outliers (for continuous variables). Incomplete questionnaires, which did not fit the sample or which showed no relevance to the study, were removed. The sample size was 402 valid responses. The analysis was performed with a margin of error of  $\pm 5\%$ , a confidence level of 95%, and a variation of 50%, to obtain the most reliable results.

SPSS 25 statistical software was used to perform the data analysis. Univariate descriptive analyses were performed to determine the profile and type of tourist with which the participants self-identified, and a chi-square test was performed to identify the level of association between the types of tourists and the sociodemographic variables. In addition, an association multiple response analysis was carried out for the purpose of finding out the existing association between types of tourists and their digital search experience at the destination for each topic searched.

#### 4.2. Sample

Due to the huge amount of data generated by the study, and given that we were more interested in selecting tourists for their connectivity preferences during the trip than their sociodemographic characteristics, we analysed only two basic aspects concerning them: gender and age, solely with the

aim of knowing if they were younger or older. Moreover, following Park et al. (2021), tourists' typologies were taken as variables to discern the associations with other factors of contingency (such as type of trip and destination), to establish a broader view of the trips made, following a network perspective, because they could influence tourist information searches (see Table 1).

The sample consisted of 32.8% men and 67.2% women, with a fairly equitable distribution by age group: 53% under 30 years old and 47% over that age. In relation to the type of destination, they mostly travelled to heritage cities (38.6%), followed by high mountain destinations (27.1%), and coastal destinations (19.9%). The least visited destination was inland (14.4%). Regarding the type of trip, 50.2% prefer cultural tourism, followed by similar preferences for sun and beach tourism (20.1%) and nature (20.4%), with business tourism being the least practised among the sample analysed (9.2%).

**Table 1.** Sociodemographic aspects and travel preferences. (N = 402)

	T1 %	T2 %	T3 %	T4 %	T5 %	T6 %
<b>Gender</b>	27(6.7)	79(19.7)	129(32.1)	35(8.7)	101(25.1)	31 (7.7)
Male	13 (48.1)	30 (38)	41 (31.8)	14 (40)	25 (24.8)	9 (29)
Female	14 (51.9)	49 (62)	88 (68.2)	21 (60)	76 (75.2)	22 (71)
<b>Age</b>						
< 30	10 (37)	41 (51.9)	57 (44.2)	11 (31.4)	79 (78.2)	15 (48.4)
> 30	17 (63)	38 (48.1)	72 (55.8)	24 (68.6)	22 (21.8)	16 (51.6)
<b>Type of Destination</b>						
Coast	7 (25.9)	14 (17.7)	20 (15.5)	6 (17.1)	25 (24.8)	8 (25.8)
Heritage city	10 (37)	34 (43)	42 (32.6)	17 (48.6)	40 (39.6)	12 (38.7)
Inland	6 (22.2)	11 (13.9)	23 (17.8)	4 (11.4)	10 (9.9)	4 (12.9)
High mountain	4 (14.8)	20 (25.3)	44 (34.1)	8 (22.9)	26 (25.7)	7 (22.6)
<b>Type of Trip</b>						
Sun and beach	5 (18.5)	20 (25.3)	17 (13.2)	7 (20)	25 (24.8)	7 (22.6)
Culture	15 (55.6)	34 (43)	60 (46.5)	18 (51.4)	59 (58.4)	16 (51.6)
Active (Nature)	3 (11.1)	17 (21.5)	46 (35.7)	2 (5.7)	10 (9.9)	4 (12.9)
Work/Business	4 (14.8)	8 (10.1)	6 (4.7)	8 (22.9)	7 (6.9)	4 (12.9)

Note. Age:  $\chi^2 = 39.410$ , *Sig* = 0.000; Type of Tourism:  $\chi^2 = 51.748$ , *Sig* = 0.000 Source: authors' own.

The association of the types of tourists established by Fan et al. (2019) with sample demographics and travel preferences shows significant differences by age groups ( $\chi^2 = 39.410$ , *Sig* = 0.000). Table 1 shows that the majority of T5 tourists, those who have a high presence in social media when they travel and who tend to share photos and their experiences on the networks, are under 30 years old; unlike T1 tourists, who are inactive on the Internet both habitually and when they travel, or T4 tourists, who keep in contact with home even when they travel, basically due to family or work responsibilities, most of whom are older than thirty years of age. In addition, tourists who connect with home only when they have access to Internet or downtime during their trip (T3) and those who share their experiences on the networks (T5) prefer to visit a cultural destination. There were no significant differences regarding gender and type of destination.

## 5. Results

### 5.1. Search results for transportation at destinations

A total of 304 respondents (75.6% of the sample) inquired about transportation at the destination. Thus, the information on how to move around the destination is less and less planned in advance and the information is mostly sought when the tourist is there.

**Table 2.** Search on transportation by type of tourist (N = 304)

Search	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)	T6 (%)	Total
<b>Type of Transport</b>							
Public Transport	5 (38.5)	36 (62.1)	70 (67.3)	17 (65.4)	61 (75.3)	17 (73.9)	206
Buses	6 (46.2)	26 (44.8)	37 (35.6)	9 (34.6)	39 (48.1)	7 (30.4)	124
Trains	6 (46.2)	27 (46.6)	40 (38.5)	6 (23.1)	34 (42.0)	10 (43.5)	123
Underground	3 (23.1)	19 (32.8)	40 (38.5)	5 (19.2)	39 (48.1)	13 (56.5)	119
Car hire	3 (23.1)	9 (15.5)	14 (13.5)	3 (11.5)	9 (11.1)	5 (21.7)	43
Boats	1 (7.7)	4 (6.9)	6 (5.8)	4 (15.4)	9 (11.1)	5 (21.7)	29
Taxis	0 (0.0)	3 (5.2%)	6 (5.8)	2 (7.7)	1 (1.2)	2 (8.7)	14
Flights	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (3.8)	0 (0.0)	1 (4.3)	3
<b>Searched aspects</b>							
How to get to	12 (75.0)	50 (74.6)	86 (77.5)	18 (60.0)	73 (81.1)	24 (88.9)	263
Schedule	10 (62.5)	40 (59.7)	77 (69.4)	18 (60.0)	60 (66.7)	16 (59.3)	221
Location	13 (81.3)	32 (47.8)	70 (63.3)	11 (36.7)	58 (64.4)	16 (59.3)	200
Routes	10 (62.5)	35 (52.2)	57 (51.4)	11 (36.7)	49 (54.4)	17 (63.0)	179
Prices	10 (62.5)	30 (44.8)	56 (50.5)	8 (26.7)	46 (51.1)	16 (59.3)	166
<b>At what moment</b>							
When required	8 (50.0)	36 (53.7)	83 (74.8)	19 (67.9)	70 (77.8)	22 (81.5)	238
During the day	5 (31.3)	24 (35.8)	32 (28.8)	6 (21.4)	36 (40.0)	6 (22.2)	109
On reaching destination	6 (37.5)	24 (35.8)	27 (24.3)	9 (32.1)	25 (27.8)	9 (33.3)	100
Leaving the hotel	3 (18.8)	12 (17.9)	18 (16.2)	7 (25)	15 (16.7)	6 (22.2)	61
At breakfast	1 (6.3)	9 (13.4)	12 (10.8)	2 (7.1)	16 (17.8)	6 (22.2)	46
Before travelling	2 (12.5)	3 (4.5)	10 (9.0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.1)	0	17
<b>Digital channels</b>							
Google Maps	5 (31.3)	22 (40)	28 (35)	8 (34.8)	26(41.9)	10(43.5)	99
Tourist web pages	7 (43.8)	17 (30.9)	21 (26.3)	8 (34.8)	19 (30.6)	8 (34.8)	80
Google	4 (25)	16 (29.1)	28 (35)	7 (30.4)	20 (32.3)	3 (13)	78
Apps	3 (18.8)	6 (10.9)	12 (15)	3 (13.0)	7 (11.3)	4 (17.4)	35
Social media	2 (12.5)	4 (7.3)	7 (8.8)	-	10 (16.1)	2 (8.7)	25
TripAdvisor	1 (6.3)	2 (3.6)	4 (5)	1 (4.3)	3 (4.8)	3 (13)	14
Booking	-	1 (1.8)	7 (8.8)	1 (4.3)	3 (4.8)	2 (8.7)	14
Blogs	-	2 (3.6)	4 (5)	-	6 (9.7)	-	12
<b>Where</b>							
At the accommodation	11 (68.8)	51 (76.1)	83 (77.6)	22 (75.9)	62 (71.3)	22 (81.5)	251
In the street	8(50)	37 (55.2)	62 (57.9)	20 (69.0)	58 (66.7)	17 (63.0)	202
In a bar/restaurant	3 (18.8)	24 (35.8)	56 (52.3)	10 (34.5)	45 (51.7)	12 (44.4)	150
In an attraction queue	1 (6.3)	3 (4.5)	6 (5.6)	4 (13.8)	4 (4.6)	6 (22.2)	24
At a tourist attraction	1 (6.3)	4 (6.0)	5 (4.7)	4 (13.8)	6 (6.9)	2 (7.4)	22

Note: (N= number of tourists that search for transport at destination).

Source: authors' own

Frequencies are the number of searches (multiple answers allow more than one per tourist). Percentages have been extracted by the number of tourists in each group.

As can be seen in Table 2, the majority searched for public transport, and among them groups T5 (75.3%), those who most shared their experiences on the networks, and T6 (73.9%), the social media 'addicts', obtained the highest search percentages; unlike T1, the most inactive on the Internet, who performed a higher number of searches for trains and buses.

The most sought aspects about transportation were: how to get to a place, schedules, and location on the map. No great differences are observed by tourist groups in terms of the aspects sought, but those who searched the most about how to get to a place were also T6 (88.9%), social media addicts, and T5 (81.1%), who most share content.

It was observed that the main search time for all tourist groups was when they needed it, which confirms the change in search behaviour at the destination, which is less planned in advance, and corroborates previous studies (Kang *et al.*, 2020; Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020).

The digital channels where they search for the information were: in first place Google Maps, highlighting T6 (43.5%) and T5 (41.9%) with highest percentages, followed by tourism web pages where T1 obtained the highest percentage (43.8%). The third most used digital channel was the Google search engine, in which T3 and T5 are the most prominent. Thus, it is observed that different types of tourists look for information on transport from different sources. This corroborates the results of Fodness and Murray (1999), which showed that tourists using different means of transport also had different information search strategies and relied on different sources. The results also showed that the most connected tourist groups search on more specific and specialized platforms for the information they need, such as Google Maps. This is in line with the study of Xiang, Magnini and Fesenmaier (2015), which stated that tourists are learning to perform more specialized searches in the different channels according to what they are looking for.

The main place where they perform the search for transport is at their accommodation, before leaving, followed by in the street and in bars or restaurants. It is observed that those who connect most in the street are the groups with the greatest connectivity (T4, 69%; T5, 66.7% and T6, 63%), and logically T3 search more in bars and restaurants, those who contact home when they have a moment or Internet connection, and T5, those who share their experiences the most, since they take advantage of those moments to share them. Thus, with respect to where they perform their searches, there are also differences in behaviour between the different groups of tourists.

### 5.2. Search results for tourist attractions at destinations

A total of 371 respondents (92.2% of the sample) searched for tourist attractions at the destination. This shows that trips are being planned less and less in advance and people are looking for and deciding what to visit once they are actually at the destination. In fact, tourist attractions are what tourists look for the most when at the destination, even more than transport and restaurants.

The majority looked for everything that can be visited, followed by heritage buildings and urban spaces. While T6, social media 'addicts', were the ones who most searched for everything that can be visited (76.7%), they were also the least interested in looking for heritage buildings. On the other hand, T5, who share most on the networks, were the ones that searched most for both heritage buildings and natural spaces. And T1, searched most for museums (60.9%) and least for natural spaces.

**Table 3.** Search on tourist attractions by type of tourist (N = 371)

<b>Search</b>	<b>T1 (%)</b>	<b>T2 (%)</b>	<b>T3 (%)</b>	<b>T4 (%)</b>	<b>T5 (%)</b>	<b>T6 (%)</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Tourist attractions</b>							
Everything for visiting	11 (47.8)	34 (50)	66 (53.7)	13 (43.3)	58 (59.8)	23 (76.7)	205
Heritage spaces	11 (47.8)	33 (48.5)	56 (45.5)	13 (43.4)	65 (67)	13 (43.3)	191
Urban spaces	10 (43.5)	34 (50)	60 (48.8)	11 (36.7)	58 (59.8)	14 (46.7)	187
Museums	14 (60.9)	33 (48.5)	52 (42.3)	13 (43.3)	46 (47.4)	12 (40)	170
Natural spaces	5 (21.7)	29 (42.6)	52 (42.3)	10 (33.3)	44 (45.4)	11 (36.7)	151
<b>Searched aspects</b>							
Location	17 (73.9)	53 (76.8)	101 (82.8)	21 (70.0)	72 (74.2)	19 (63.3)	283
How to get there	14 (60.9)	47 (68.1)	98 (80.3)	19 (63.3)	73 (75.3)	23 (76.7)	274
Schedule	18 (78.3)	44 (63.8)	84 (68.9)	15 (50.0)	77 (79.4)	19 (63.3)	257
Prices	12 (52.2)	48 (69.6)	77 (63.1)	13 (43.3)	63 (64.9)	20 (66.7)	233
Inf. what attraction is	6 (26.1)	28 (40.6)	59 (48.4)	13 (43.3)	51 (52.6)	15 (50)	172
Reviews by other users	5 (21.7)	24 (34.8)	46 (37.7)	9 (30)	38 (39.2)	14 (46.7)	136
<b>At what moment</b>							
When required	11 (47.8)	33 (50)	77 (65.3)	19 (67.9)	58 (63)	21 (72.4)	219
On reaching destination	11 (47.8)	27 (40.9)	43 (36.4)	13 (46.4)	33 (35.9)	4 (13.8)	131
During the day	4 (17.4)	17 (25.8)	30 (25.4)	10 (35.7)	31 (33.7)	7 (24.1)	99
At breakfast	4 (17.4)	15 (22.7)	19 (16.1)	7 (25)	22 (23.9)	6 (20.7)	73
Leaving the hotel	5 (21.7)	12 (18.2)	20 (16.9)	6 (21.4)	19 (20.7)	6 (20.7)	68
<b>Digital channels</b>							
Google	9 (42.9)	20 (41.7)	33 (37.9)	14 (58.3)	35(45.5)	7 (41.2)	118
Tourist web pages	8 (38.1)	14 (29.2)	35 (40.2)	4 (16.7)	19(24.7)	9 (52.9)	89
Google Maps	2 (9.5)	11 (22.9)	21 (24.1)	4 (16.7)	24(31.2)	4 (23.5)	66
TripAdvisor	4 (19)	7 (14.6)	12 (13.8)	4 (16.7)	15(19.5)	2 (11.8)	44
Social media	1 (4.8)	6 (12.5)	7 (8)	2 (8.3)	15(19.5)	3 (17.6)	34
Apps	2 (9.5)	2 (4.2)	13 (14.9)	3 (12.5)	4 (5.2)	1 (5.9)	25
Blogs	1 (4.8)	3 (6.3)	7 (8.)	-	4 (5.2)	2 (11.8)	17
Booking	-	1 (2.1)	2 (2.3)	-	-	1 (5.9)	4
<b>Where</b>							
At the accommodation	17 (73.9)	51 (76.1)	100 (85.5)	20 (71.4)	67 (72)	20 (71.4)	275
In the street	10 (43.5)	29 (43.3)	56 (47.9)	16 (57.1)	60 (64.5)	13 (46.4)	184
In a bar/restaurant	5 (21.7)	23 (34.3)	56 (47.9)	15 (53.6)	43 (46.2)	14 (50)	156
In public transport	3 (13)	13 (19.4)	25 (21.4)	7 (25)	28 (30.1)	7 (25)	83
In an attraction queue	2 (8.7)	3 (4.5)	12 (10.3)	6 (21.4)	8 (8.6)	4 (14.3)	35
At a tourist attraction	1 (4.3)	4 (6.0)	8 (6.8)	3 (10.7)	9 (9.7)	4 (14.3)	29

Source: authors' own

They mainly looked for the location on the map and how to get there, followed by schedules and prices. But the most interesting differences are shown in the search for information about what the tourist attraction is. Group T1 (26.1%) searches the least for this, which shows that they are tourists who have already searched for information about the attractions in a previous stage to the trip and already know them; while T5 (52.6%) and T6 (50%), the ones that connect the most, are the ones with highest number of searches, meaning that they plan their trips less and are even unaware of the tourist attractions at the place when they arrive at the destination. Another interesting difference is observed with the

searches of other users' reviews. While T<sub>1</sub> (26.1%) searches this least, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> are the ones who most seek reviews that other users have made of tourist attractions. So, logically, and in line with what Pirolli (2016) showed previously, those who share opinions and evaluations are also the ones who trust and seek them the most.

It was observed that the main search time for all tourist groups was when they needed it, which also confirms the change in search behaviour at the destination (Kang *et al.*, 2020; Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020).

They searched mainly on Google, followed at a distance by tourism websites and Google Maps. To a lesser extent, they searched in social networks, apps, blogs and other platforms. It is observed that the groups with greater connectivity (T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>) searched in many different channels and generally record high percentages in the different platforms. It is also observed that these groups performed the most searches both on Google Maps. However, it is surprising that searches in both social media and apps are low and remain higher in search engines. This contradicts the results of Pirolli (2016), who showed tourists that use and rely more on word of mouth sources, tend to look for information from that non-professional sources.

They searched mostly at their accommodation, followed by in the street and in bars and restaurants. It should be noted that all tourist groups look for and decide which tourist attractions to visit mainly at their accommodation, before setting out for the day. All in all, those who searched the most in the street, in bars and restaurants, on public transport or even at another attraction are the groups with the greatest connectivity (T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>), which shows that they are looking more at any time and during the tourist experience of the visit.

### 5.3. Search results for restaurants at destinations

Of the sample, 82% (330 respondents) looked for information about where to eat at the destination. Thus, it is the second topic most sought, after what to visit.

It is observed that all tourist groups searched for more restaurants than bars, but curiously they looked for other establishments even more, such as: fast food outlets, markets, etc. Those who most searched for restaurants are groups T<sub>4</sub> (55.6%), who are connected out of responsibility (parents or businesspeople), and T<sub>1</sub> (47.4%), the most inactive, who could be identified as being older tourists with higher purchasing power. On the other hand, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>, who would be younger tourists and with greater online search resources, as Fan *et al.* (2019) previously show, searched more for other types of establishments. This corroborates the results of Fodness and Murray (1999), which showed that tourists with different incomes had different information search strategies and relied on different sources.

Restaurants were searched for firstly by their location, followed by type of food and price. While price ranked last in the search for transport and came in fourth position with respect to tourist attractions, it is the third aspect sought when it comes to restaurants. Thus, it is an important aspect when looking for where to eat. Table 5 shows that all groups except T<sub>1</sub>, the most inactive on the Internet, have high percentages of searching for a place to eat by location, that is, due to proximity at the time of the search. In contrast, group T<sub>1</sub> sought more by type of food (78.9%). On the other hand, it should be noted that except for group T<sub>1</sub>, all the others show high search percentages for reviews, much more than for searches for tourist attractions. Thus, when looking for where to eat, the opinions of others are sought and taken into account much more.

**Table 4.** Search on food/restaurants by type of tourist (N = 330)

Search	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)	T6 (%)	Total
<b>Establishment</b>							
Restaurants	9 (47.4)	26 (45.6)	50 (44.6)	15 (55.6)	29 (34.1)	10 (37)	139
Bars	2 (10.5)	18 (31.6)	23 (20.5)	7 (25.9)	25 (29.4)	7 (25.9)	82
Other establishments	12 (63.2)	29 (50.9)	63 (56.3)	14 (51.9)	66 (77.6)	23 (85.2)	207
<b>Searched aspects</b>							
By location	6 (31.6)	38 (65.5)	74 (66.1)	14 (51.9)	64 (75.3)	17 (63)	213
By type of food	15 (78.9)	36 (62.1)	66 (58.9)	17 (63)	54 (63.5)	17 (63)	205
By price	9 (47.4)	29 (50)	65 (58)	14 (51.9)	54 (63.5)	17 (63)	188
By others' reviews	4 (21.1)	22 (37.9)	50 (44.6)	12 (44.4)	34 (40)	13 (48.1)	135
By type of restaurant	3 (15.8)	17 (29.3)	36 (32.1)	8 (29.6)	34 (40)	12 (44.4)	110
By photographs	1 (5.3)	8 (13.8)	17 (15.2)	6 (22.2)	17 (20)	7 (25.9)	56
<b>At what moment</b>							
When required	14 (63.6)	34 (58.6)	74 (67.3)	14 (51.9)	46 (54.8)	17 (65.4)	199
At breakfast	4 (18.2)	17 (29.3)	27 (24.5)	6 (22.2)	26 (31)	7 (26.9)	87
During the day	3 (13.6)	12 (20.7)	22 (20)	7 (25.9)	33 (39.3)	5 (19.2)	82
On reaching destination	4 (18.2)	18 (31)	24 (21.8)	7 (25.9)	21 (25)	4 (15.4)	78
Leaving the hotel	2 (9.1)	10 (17.2)	17 (15.5)	2 (7.4)	17 (20.2)	1 (3.8)	49
<b>Digital channels</b>							
TripAdvisor	6 (31.6)	10 (27)	28 (34.6)	11(47.8)	26 (38.2)	10 (50)	91
Google	5 (26.3)	12 (32.4)	31 (38.3)	6 (26.1)	24 (35.3)	5 (25)	83
Google Maps	6 (31.6)	6 (16.2)	16 (19.8)	5 (21.7)	17 (25)	5 (25)	55
Tourist web pages	2 (10.5)	10 (27)	19 (23.5)	4 (17.4)	10 (14.7)	5 (25)	50
Social media	1 (5.3)	4 (10.8)	6 (7.4)	1 (4.3)	8 (11.8)	1 (5)	21
Apps	-	2 (5.4)	4 (4.9)	2 (8.7)	4 (5.9)	-	12
Blogs	-	1 (2.7)	2 (2.5)	1(4.3)	3 (4.4)	1 (5)	8
Booking	1 (5.3)	-	-	-	1 (1.5)	-	2
<b>Where</b>							
At the accommodation	13 (59.1)	41 (71.9)	66 (60)	16 (59.3)	51 (61.4)	18 (69.2)	205
In the street	12 (54.5)	32 (56.1)	75 (68.2)	18(66.7)	64 (77.1)	20 (76.9)	221
In a bar/restaurant	3 (13.6)	10 (17.5)	28 (25.5)	9 (33.3)	18 (21.7)	8 (30.8)	76
In public transport	3 (13.6)	7 (12.3)	24 (21.8)	4 (14.8)	20 (24.1)	5 (19.2)	63
In an attraction queue	1 (4.5)	10 (17.5)	7 (6.4)	5 (18.5)	6 (7.2)	6 (23.1)	35
At a tourist attraction	1 (4.5)	5 (8.8)	6 (5.5)	3 (11.1)	7 (8.4)	2 (7.7)	24

Source: authors' own

If we look at when tourists look for information about where to eat, we see that all groups do so when they need it, even group T1. This means that the search for a place to eat is the least planned and is done from where they are at the time they need it.

The digital channels where this information is most sought are: firstly, TripAdvisor, followed by Google, and thirdly, but at a distance, Google Maps. Thus, TripAdvisor is the preferred search platform for places to eat, even more than search engines. And Google Maps, which was the main platform where tourists searched for transportation and how to get to a place, comes in third position here. The group that searches the most on Google is T3 (38.3%). And those who search most on TripAdvisor: T4, T5 and T6

and on Google Maps: T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>. Thus, here it is also observed that, with the exception of group T<sub>1</sub> on Google Maps, the tourist groups with the highest connectivity are those who search on the most specific digital platforms.

While transportation and tourist attractions were mostly searched for at their place of accommodation, where to eat was mostly searched for in the street, except for groups T<sub>1</sub> and T<sub>2</sub>, who did so at their place of accommodation. Thus, the search for information on where to eat is the most improvised.

#### 5.4. Search results for leisure at destinations

The topic least searched for at destinations is leisure. Only 260 tourists (64.6% of the sample) performed a search about leisure activities.

Most tourists searched for festivals and exhibitions, and to a lesser extent for concerts, theatres, folklore and cinema. Although no great differences were observed between groups, the one that most searched for festivals is T<sub>5</sub> (68.6%), who most share on social media; and those that most searched for exhibitions are T<sub>3</sub>, tourists who connect to home when they have access to Internet, and T<sub>1</sub>, the most inactive.

The aspects most sought concerning leisure were by type of activity, schedules and prices. They were followed, at a distance, by location and how to get there. Therefore, price is also an important aspect to take into account when looking for leisure activities at the destination. Those who most searched for leisure by type of activity are T<sub>4</sub> (66.7%), those who connect out of responsibility and also, although to a lesser extent, T<sub>2</sub> (63.3%), who are inactive when they travel to disconnect, and T<sub>3</sub> (63.2%), who connect to home only when they have access to Internet. It seems that these groups, which may be tourists with work or family responsibilities, are the ones who mainly seek to disconnect when they travel and, therefore, are the ones who most seek leisure activities at the destination.

The moment of the search is mainly when they require it, confirming that leisure activities are increasingly less planned in advance and information is sought during the trip. All groups except T<sub>4</sub> searched when they so required. It is surprising that even T<sub>1</sub>, who searched for other topics in advance, also mostly sought leisure when they needed it.

The main digital channel where they performed most searches about leisure is Google, followed by destination websites. It is surprising that very few searched on social media, Google Maps, TripAdvisor or an app. There are no major differences between the groups. However, most of them searched on Google, except for T<sub>4</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>, which mostly searched on the official tourism websites of the destination. These results contradict those of Fernández-Cavia et al. (2020) that reveal that at destinations tourists search mainly on social networks and Facebook, but corroborate their results for the few searches in apps. Our study shows that tourists practically do not search on social media and apps for leisure information although these digital sources are more used to search for other topics.

Finally, the main search place is at the place of accommodation, before leaving, followed by in the street, though at some distance. This coincides with the searches for transport and tourist attractions, which are also mostly carried out at the accommodation, unlike the search for restaurants, which is mainly carried out in the street. Those who connect the most in the street are T<sub>5</sub> (61.5%), who share the most. And those that connect the most in bars or restaurants, as in previous searches, are T<sub>3</sub>, who connect to home when they have a moment or access to Internet, and T<sub>4</sub>, who connect out of responsibility.

**Table 5.** Search on leisure activities by type of tourist (N = 260)

Search	T1 (%)	T2 (%)	T3 (%)	T4 (%)	T5 (%)	T6 (%)	Total
<b>Leisure activities</b>							
Festivals	7 (50)	22 (45.8)	46 (55.4)	12 (57.1)	48 (68.6)	12 (54.5)	147
Exhibitions	7 (50)	21 (43.8)	49 (59)	7 (33.3)	23 (32.9)	7 (31.8)	114
Concerts	2 (14.3)	16 (33.3)	29 (34.9)	3 (14.3)	23 (32.9)	3 (13.6)	76
Theatres	1 (7.1)	12 (25)	22 (26.5)	9 (42.9)	22 (31.4)	9 (40.9)	75
Folklore	2 (14.3)	15 (31.3)	25 (30.1)	9 (42.9)	15 (21.4)	8 (36.4)	74
Cinema	3 (21.4)	16 (33.3)	23 (27.7)	3 (14.3)	17 (24.3)	3 (13.6)	65
<b>Searched aspects</b>							
Type of activity	4 (28.6)	31 (63.3)	55 (63.2)	14 (66.7)	40 (58.8)	11 (45.8)	155
Schedule	4 (28.6)	32 (65.3)	53 (60.9)	11 (52.4)	42 (61.8)	12 (50)	154
Prices	4 (28.6)	31 (63.3)	47 (54)	10 (47.6)	35 (51.5)	13 (54.2)	140
Location	2 (14.3)	21 (42.9)	44 (50.6)	6 (28.6)	39 (57.4)	12 (50)	124
How to get there	7 (50)	22 (44.9)	43 (49.4)	7 (33.3)	35 (51.5)	8 (33.3)	122
Information about what is	3 (21.4)	14 (28.6)	41 (47.1)	5 (23.8)	22 (32.4)	9 (37.5)	94
Photographs	7 (50)	7 (14.3)	20 (23)	6 (28.6)	10 (14.7)	5 (20.8)	55
Reviews	4 (28.6)	5 (10.2)	17 (19.5)	5 (23.8)	14 (20.6)	8 (33.3)	53
<b>At what moment</b>							
When required	9 (64.3)	19 (40.4)	43 (53.1)	8 (38.1)	27 (41.5)	13 (56.5)	119
On reaching the destination	2 (14.3)	18 (38.3)	23 (28.4)	12 (57.1)	22 (33.8)	7 (30.4)	84
At breakfast	4 (28.6)	12 (25.5)	30 (37)	5 (23.8)	18 (27.7)	8 (34.8)	77
During the day	2 (14.3)	9 (19.1)	11 (13.6)	2 (9.5)	13 (20)	1 (4.3)	38
Leaving the hotel	1 (7.1)	9 (19.1)	6 (7.4)	3 (14.3)	12 (18.5)	3 (13)	34
<b>Digital channels</b>							
Google	4 (50)	19 (61.3)	30(54.5)	7 (46.7)	28(59.6)	5 (41.7)	93
Tourist web page	3 (37.5)	13 (41.9)	22 (40)	8 (53.3)	12(25.5)	8 (66.7)	66
Google Maps	2 (25)	1 (3.2)	4 (7.3)	-	7 (14.9)	1(8.3)	15
Apps	-	-	3 (5.5)	1 (6.7)	4 (8.5)	-	8
Social media	1 (12.5)	-	3 (5.5)	-	1 (2.1)	1(8.3)	6
TripAdvisor	-	-	3 (5.5)	1 (6.7)	2 (4.3)	-	6
<b>Where</b>							
At the accommodation	6 (42.9)	34 (70.8)	70(84.3)	15(71.4)	46(70.8)	18(78.3)	189
In the street	7 (50)	20 (41.7)	32(38.6)	8 (38.1)	40(61.5)	8 (34.8)	115
In a bar/restaurant	1 (7.1)	7 (14.6)	33(39.8)	7 (33.3)	21(32.3)	6 (26.1)	75
In public transport	2(14.3)	7 (14.6)	11(13.3)	4 (19)	15(23.1)	5 (21.7)	44
In an attraction queue	1 (7.1)	4 (8.3)	8 (9.6)	5 (23.8)	4 (6.2)	4 (17.4)	26
At a tourist attraction	-	4 (8.3)	9 (10.8)	2 (9.5)	3 (4.6)	1 (4.3)	19

Source: authors' own

## 6. Conclusion

Firstly, the study shows that there are differences in searches for tourist information at the destination by topic searched. Virtually all tourists look for what to visit (92.2%) and where to eat (82%), and to a lesser extent, how to get there (75%) or leisure activities (64.6%) at the destination. These high search rates corroborate previous studies (Kang *et al.*, 2020; Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020) and show that there really is a change in the behaviour of tourists, who increasingly plan trips less and seek more

tourist information once at the destination. Furthermore, the study shows that all topics are searched mainly when needed, and this further corroborates these results.

Previous studies have shown that social networks and Facebook were the principal digital sources searched by tourists at destinations (Fernández-Cavia *et al.*, 2020). However, this study has also shown that each topic is mainly searched in different digital channels, places and at different times. Therefore, it corroborates the importance of studies on tourist information search that take into account various topics, channels, situations and contexts (Xiang & Fesenmaier, 2020). It has been shown that while transport is searched mainly on Google Maps, restaurants are searched mostly on TripAdvisor, and attractions and leisure on Google. To a lesser extent, transport and leisure are searched more in apps than in social media, while tourist attractions and restaurants are searched more in social media than in apps.

In addition, the study shows that there are different searches depending on the type of tourist, corroborating previous studies (Fodness & Murray, 1999; Ho *et al.*, 2012; Jani *et al.*, 2014) and even the tourist typology of Fan *et al.* (2019). While the groups with greater connectivity look for more public transport and everything that can be visited at the destination, the most inactive group looks mainly for trains and buses and also for more about museums. The groups with greater connectivity also look more for basic information about tourist attractions once at the destination, showing that they plan their trips less and less and even do not know what they are going to visit when they arrive at the destination. The groups with the greatest connectivity are also the ones that most seek reviews by others about tourist attractions, and the most inactive group on the Internet the least. Regarding places to eat, the most Internet-inactive tourists and those who connected out of responsibility were the ones who most search for restaurants, while the groups with the greatest connectivity search more for other types of establishment. For this search, all groups seek the reviews of others except the most Internet-inactive group of tourists, who search more by type of food. Finally, with respect to leisure, while the groups with the greatest connectivity search more for festivals and festivities, the most inactive group on the Internet and those that connect when they have access to the Internet search more about exhibitions. In addition, those who connect out of responsibility, when they have access to Internet, and those who travel to disconnect, are the ones who most seek leisure activities at the destination.

The results of the study show that different types of tourists also search in different digital channels, also corroborating previous studies (Jani *et al.*, 2014; Luo *et al.*, 2005). We observed that for transport and restaurants, the tourist groups with the greatest connectivity search on more specific and specialized platforms, such as Google Maps and TripAdvisor, corroborating the results of Xiang, Magnini and Fesenmaier (2015). Regarding the search for tourist attractions, the groups with the greatest connectivity are the ones that search in a greater number of different channels. When it comes to entertainment, there are practically no differences, as most of them use Google.

Differences are also appreciated with respect to the places where searches take place according to type of tourist. Although previous studies had stated that tourist information search was influenced by situational aspects and travel scenarios (Wang *et al.*, 2014), no previous study had shown this in this way according to the type of tourist. For transportation, attractions and leisure, the groups that perform most searches in the street are the groups with the greatest connectivity, and for bars and restaurants, both those that share the most on the networks and those that connect with home when they have a moment or access to Internet, or that connect out of responsibility. For restoration, not so many differences are observed: all groups searched the in the street, even the most inactive.

In contrast, there are no differences between groups regarding the time at which they perform the search. All tourists, even the most inactive, seek tourist information at the destination when they require it, although this is especially the case for groups with greater connectivity. However, where to eat and leisure activities are the most sought by all groups at the time they is needed.

The main contributions of the study have been: to confirm that there are different searches for information by type of tourist (Adhikary & Adhikari, 2019; Fan *et al.*, 2019; Llodrà-Riera *et al.*, 2015) and corroborate the validity of the typology created by Fan *et al.* (2019) demonstrating its usefulness in analysing the behaviour of tourists. Similarly, the study has shown a change in the behaviour of tourists, that they increasingly seek more tourist information once at the destination (Kang *et al.*, 2020; Liebana-Cabanillas *et al.*, 2020) and that there are different searches for information at the destination, depending on the topic, in the different digital channels, contexts and situations.

The knowledge of these different search behaviours provided by this study is very useful for DMO communication managers who will know where and when the different tourist typologies look for information when they are at the destination; and thus they will be able to offer each type of tourist the suitable information, at the time and place they require it, and through their digital channels of preference (Kotoua & Ilkan, 2017; Xiang & Pan, 2011), to generate more satisfying tourist experiences (Femenia-Serra *et al.*, 2019).

One limitation of the study is that, as it was based on the tourist typology of Fan *et al.* (2019), their connectivity preferences and other contextual and situational aspects, such as type of trip and type of destination, the study is less based on tourists' sociodemographic characteristics. In addition, due to the large amount of data obtained, this article only analyses the relationship of the different types of tourists with tourists' information searches. Further research will need to take into account the type of trip and destination and analyse their relationship with the tourists' searches. In addition, new topics searched by tourists will also be added, such as accommodation or shopping, among others.

## Appendix 1. Survey Form

Dear Participant,

The survey was designed to measure how you searched for information on the internet during your last tourism trip. The data to be obtained will only be used for scientific purposes. Thank you for your cooperation and contribution. Best regards

- 1.- Gender:     Man       Women
- 2.- Age:     < 30 years     31-65 years     > 65 years
- 3.- Type of Trip you did:
  - Sun and beach
  - Culture
  - Active (Nature)
  - Work/Business
- 4.- Type of Destination:
  - Coast
  - Heritage city
  - Inland
  - High mountain
- 5.- What kind of tourist do you consider yourself:

**T1** □ *Disconnected Immersive Traveller*: Tourist inactive on the Internet and social media, both regularly and when travelling.

**T2** □ *Digital Detox Traveller*: Tourist active on the Internet during their daily life, but inactive when travelling, for the purpose of disconnecting

**T3** □ *Diversivary Traveller*: Tourist who connects with family, only when a moment arises during the trip or when there is access to Internet.

**T4** □ *Dual Zone Traveller*: Tourist who remains connected to family even when travelling and sacrifices travel time out of responsibility (parents, businesspeople).

**T5** □ *Daily Life Controller*: Tourist with a high presence in social media when travelling. Shares photos and experiences on the Internet.

**T6** □ *Social Media Addict*: Tourist who is totally connected to family and social media and also with the trip and the people at the destination

**6.- What search did you perform (where, when and through what channels) about the following topics: transport/ tourist attractions/restaurants/ leisure activities, in your last trip**

<b>Transport</b>	<b>Tourist attractions</b>	<b>Restaurants</b>	<b>Leisure activities</b>
<b>Type of Transport</b>	<b>Tourist attractions</b>	<b>Establishment</b>	<b>Leisure activities</b>
Public Transport	Everything for visiting	Restaurants	Festivals
Buses	Heritage spaces	Bars	Exhibitions
Trains	Urban spaces	Other establishments	Concerts
Underground	Museums	<b>Searched aspects</b>	Theatres
Car hire	Natural spaces	By location	Folklore
Boats	<b>Searched aspects</b>	By type of food	Cinema
Taxis	Location	By price	<b>Searched aspects</b>
Flights	How to get there	By others' reviews	Type of activity
<b>Searched aspects</b>	Schedule	By type of restaurant	Schedule
How to get to	Prices	By photographs	Prices
Schedule	Inf. what attraction is	<b>At what moment</b>	Location
Location	Reviews by other users	When required	How to get there
Routes	<b>At what moment</b>	At breakfast	Information about what is
Prices	When required	During the day	Photographs
<b>At what moment</b>	On reaching destination	On reaching destination	Reviews
When required	During the day	Leaving the hotel	<b>At what moment</b>
During the day	At breakfast	<b>Digital channels</b>	When required
On reaching destination	Leaving the hotel	TripAdvisor	On reaching the destination
Leaving the hotel	<b>Digital channels</b>	Google	At breakfast
At breakfast	Google	Google Maps	During the day
Before travelling	Tourist web pages	Tourist web pages	Leaving the hotel
<b>Digital channels</b>	Google Maps	Social media	<b>Digital channels</b>
Google Maps	TripAdvisor	Apps	Google
Tourist web pages	Social media	Blogs	Tourist web page
Google	Apps	Booking	Google Maps
Apps	Blogs	<b>Where</b>	Apps

Social media	Booking	At the accommodation	Social media
TripAdvisor	<b>Where</b>	In the street	TripAdvisor
Booking	At the accommodation	In a bar/restaurant	<b>Where</b>
Blogs	In the street	In public transport	At the accommodation
<b>Where</b>	In a bar/restaurant	In an attraction queue	In the street
At the accommodation	In public transport	At a tourist attraction	In a bar/restaurant
In the street	In an attraction queue		In public transport
In a bar/restaurant	At a tourist attraction		In an attraction queue
In an attraction queue			At a tourist attraction
At a tourist attraction			

## References

- Adhikary, M., & Adhikari, A. (2019). Micro-modelling of individual tourist's information-seeking behaviour: A heterogeneity-specific study. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(6), 705–728.
- Almeida-Santana, A., & Moreno-Gil, S. (2017). New trends in information search and their influence on destination loyalty: Digital destinations and relationship marketing. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(2), 150–161.
- Amaro, S., Duarte, P., & Henriques, C. (2016). Travelers' use of social media: A clustering approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 59, 1–15.
- Ayeh, J. K. (2018). Distracted gaze: Problematic use of mobile technologies in vacation contexts. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 26, 31–38.
- Bao, J. (2007). Exploring Gender Differences in Information Search Among Domestic Visitors To Yellow Mountain and Guilin. *Proceedings of the 2006 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium: April 9-11*, 120.
- Benckendorff, P. J., Sheldon, P. J., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2014). *Tourism Information Technology*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Benckendorff, P. J., Xiang, Z., & Sheldon, P. J. (2019). *Tourism information technology*. Boston: Cabi.
- Buhalis, D., & Amaranggana, A. (2014). Smart Tourism Destinations. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2014*. (pp. 553–564).
- Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and 10 years after the internet: The state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 609–623.
- Buhalis, D., & Michopoulou, E. (2011). Information-enabled tourism destination marketing: addressing the accessibility market. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2), 145–168.
- Buhalis, D., & Sinarta, Y. (2019). Real-time co-creation and nowness service: lessons from tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(5), 563–582.
- Chadwick, R. A., Ritchie, J., & Goeldner, C. (1987). Concepts, definitions and measures used in travel and tourism research. In J. R. B Ritchie & C. R. Goeldner (Ed.), *Travel, Tourism, and Hospitality Research. A Handbook for Managers and Researchers* (pp. 47–61). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cho MH, J. S. (2008). Information value structure for vacation travel. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(1), 72–83.
- Choe, Y., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2017). The quantified traveler: Implications for smart tourism development. In *Analytics in smart tourism design* (pp. 65–77). Springer, Cham.
- Choi, Y., Hickerson, B., & Kerstetter, D. (2018). Understanding the sources of online travel information. *Journal of Travel Research*, 57(1), 116–128.
- Cohen, S. A., Prayag, G., & Moital, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 872–909.

- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*, 164–182.
- Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 18–35.
- Del Chiappa, G., & Baggio, R. (2015). Knowledge transfer in smart tourism destinations: Analyzing the effects of a network structure. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 4(3), 145–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2015.02.001>
- Dellaert BGC, Ettema DF, L. C. (1998). Multi-faceted tourist travel decisions: a constraint based conceptual framework to describe sequential choices of travel components. *Tourism Management*, 19(4), 313–320.
- Dickinson, J. E., Hibbert, J. F., & Filimonau, V. (2016). Mobile technology and the tourist experience:(Dis) connection at the campsite. *Tourism Management*, 57, 193–201.
- Egger, I., Lei, S. I., & Wassler, P. (2020). Digital free tourism—An exploratory study of tourist motivations. *Tourism Management*, 79, 104098.
- Fan, D. X., Buhalis, D., & Lin, B. (2019). A tourist typology of online and face-to-face social contact: Destination immersion and tourism encapsulation/decapsulation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 78, 102757.
- Fan, D. X., Zhang, H. Q., Jenkins, C. L., & Tavitiyaman, P. (2017). Tourist typology in social contact: An addition to existing theories. *Tourism Management*, 60, 357–366.
- Femenia-Serra, F., Neuhofer, B., & Ivars-Baidal, J. A. (2019). Towards a conceptualisation of smart tourists and their role within the smart destination scenario. *The Service Industries Journal*, 39(2), 109–133. Retrieved from file:///D:/RST-destination/Femenia-Serra\_et\_al.\_2018\_authors\_version.pdf
- Fernández-Cavia, J., Vinyals-Mirabent, S., Fernández-Planells, A., Weber, W., & Pedraza-Jiménez, R. (2020). Fuentes de información para los turistas en las distintas etapas del viaje. *El Profesional de La Información*, 29(2), e290219.
- Fesenmaier, D. R., Xiang, Z., Pan, B., & Law, R. (2011). A framework of search engine use for travel planning. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(6), 587–601.
- Filieri, R., & McLeay, F. (2014). E-WOM and accommodation: An analysis of the factors that influence travelers' adoption of information from online reviews. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(1), 44–57.
- Fodness, D., & Murray, B. (1999). A model of tourist information search behavior. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(3), 220–230.
- Fodness D, M. B. (1998). A typology of tourist information search strategies. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 108–119.
- Ford, N., Miller, D., & Moss, N. (2001). The role of individual differences in internet searching: An empirical study. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 52(12), 1049–1066.
- Foster, A. (2004). A non-linear model of information-seeking behavior. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 55(3), 228–237.
- García-Milon, A., Juaneda-Ayensa, E., Olarte-Pascual, C., & Pelegrín-Borondo, J. (2020). Towards the smart tourism destination: Key factors in information source use on the tourist shopping journey. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 36, 100730.
- García-Milon, A., Olarte-Pascual, C., & Juaneda-Ayensa, E. (2021). Assessing the moderating effect of COVID-19 on intention to use smartphones on the tourist shopping journey. *Tourism Management*, 87, 104361.
- Grønflaten, Ø. (2009). Predicting travelers' choice of information sources and information channels. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(2), 230–244.
- Ho, C. I., & Liu, Y. P. (2005). An exploratory investigation of web-based tourist information search behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 10(4), 351–360.
- Ho, C. I., Lin, M. H., & Chen, H. M. (2012). Web users' behavioural patterns of tourism information search: From online to offline. *Tourism Management*, 33(6), 1468–1482.

- Hyun, M. Y., Lee, S., & Hu, C. (2009). Mobile-mediated virtual experience in tourism: Concept, typology and applications. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(2), 149–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766708100904>
- Jani, D., Jang, J. H., & Hwang, Y. H. (2014). Big five factors of personality and tourists' Internet search behavior. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(5), 600–615.
- Jeng J, F. D. (2002). Conceptualizing the travel decision-making hierarchy: a review of recent developments. *Tourism Analysis*, 7(1), 15–32.
- Jeong, M., & Shin, H. H. (2020). Tourists' experiences with smart tourism technology at smart destinations and their behavior intentions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(8), 1464–1477.
- Kang, S., Jodice, L. W., & Norman, W. C. (2020). How do tourists search for tourism information via smartphone before and during their trip?. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 45(1), 57–68.
- Kang, S., Kim, W. G., & Park, D. (2021). Understanding tourist information search behaviour: the power and insight of social network analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1–21.
- Kim, D. Y., Lehto, X. Y., & Morrison, A. M. (2007). Gender differences in online travel information search: Implications for marketing communications on the internet. *Tourism Management*, 28(2), 423–433.
- Kirillova, K., & Wang, D. (2016). Smartphone (dis) connectedness and vacation recovery. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 61, 157–169.
- Kotoua, S., & Ilkan, M. (2017). Tourism destination marketing and information technology in Ghana. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 6(2), 127–135.
- Lamsfus, C., Martin, D., Alzua-Sorzabal, A., Torres-Manzanera, E. (2015). Smart Tourism Destinations: An Extended Conception of Smart Cities Focusing on Human Mobility. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism 2015*.
- Law, R., Buhalis, D., & Cobanoglu, C. (2014). Progress on information and communication technologies in hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(5), 727–750.
- Lengieza, M. L., Hunt, C. A., & Swim, J. K. (2019). Measuring eudaimonic travel experiences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 74(C), 195–197.
- Li, J., Pearce, P. L., & Low, D. (2018). Media representation of digital-free tourism: A critical discourse analysis. *Tourism Management*, 69, 317–329.
- Lian, T., & Yu, C. (2019). Impacts of online images of a tourist destination on tourist travel decision. *Tourism Geographies*, 21(4), 635–664.
- Liebana-Cabanillas, F., Carvajal-Trujillo, E., Villarejo-Ramos, Á. F., & Higuera-Castillo, E. (2020). Antecedents of the intention to use NFC mobile applications in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Technology*.
- Liu, P., Zhang, H., Zhang, J., Sun, Y., & Qiu, M. (2019). Spatial-temporal response patterns of tourist flow under impulse pre-trip information search: From online to arrival. *Tourism Management*, 73, 105–114.
- Llodrà-Riera, I., Martínez-Ruiz, M. P., Jiménez-Zarco, A. I., & Izquierdo-Yusta, A. (2015). A multidimensional analysis of the information sources construct and its relevance for destination image formation. *Tourism Management*, 48, 319–328.
- Lu, A. C. C., & Gursoy, D. (2015). A conceptual model of consumers' online tourism confusion. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality*, 27(6), 1320–1342.
- Lu, Q. S., Yang, Y., & Yuksel, U. (2015). The impact of a new online channel: An empirical study. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54, 136–155.
- Luo, M., Feng, R., & Cai, L. A. (2005). Information search behavior and tourist characteristics: The internet vis-à-vis other information sources. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 17(2–3), 15–25.

- Mitsche, N. (2005). Understanding the information search process within a tourism domain-specific search engine. In *Information and Communication Technologies in Tourism* (pp. 183–193).
- Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer behaviour in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), 5–44.
- Munar, A. M., & Jacobsen, J. K. S. (2014). Motivations for sharing tourism experiences through social media. *Tourism Management*, 43, 46–54.
- Murphy, H. C., Chen, M. M., & Cossutta, M. (2016). An investigation of multiple devices and information sources used in the hotel booking process. *Tourism Management*, 52, 44–51.
- Murphy, P. E., & Rosenblood, L. (1974). Tourism: An exercise in spatial search. *The Canadian Geographer*, 18(3), 201–210.
- Navío-Marco, J., Ruiz-Gómez, L. M., & Sevilla-Sevilla, C. (2018). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 30 years on and 20 years after the internet-Revisiting Buhalis & Law's landmark study about eTourism. *Tourism Management*, 69, 460–470.
- Neuhof, B., Buhalis, D., & Ladkin, A. (2012). Conceptualising technology enhanced destination experiences. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 1(1–2), 36–46.
- Nolan Jr, S. D. (1976). Tourists' use and evaluation of travel information sources: Summary and conclusions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 14(3), 6–8.
- Okazaki, S., & Hirose, M. (2009). Does gender affect media choice in travel information search? On the use of mobile Internet. *Tourism Management*, 30(6), 794–804.
- Pan, B., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2006). Online information search: vacation planning process. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 809–832.
- Park, S., Woo, M., & Nicolau, J. L. (2020). Determinant factors of tourist expenses. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(2), 267–280.
- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. I. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 226–237.
- Pearce, D. G. (2008). A needs-functions model of tourism distribution. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(1), 148–168.
- Pencarelli, T. (2019). The digital revolution in the travel and tourism industry. *Information Technology and Tourism*, (0123456789). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40558-019-00160-3>
- Pirolli, B. (2016). Travel information online: Navigating correspondents, consensus, and conversation. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(12), 1337–1343.
- Pirolli, B. (2018). Travel information online: navigating correspondents, consensus, and conversation. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(12), 1337–1343.
- Ramkissoon, H., & Uysal, M. S. (2011). The effects of perceived authenticity, information search behaviour, motivation and destination imagery on cultural behavioural intentions of tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(6), 537–562.
- Sotiriadis, M. D. (2017). Sharing tourism experiences in social media. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 179–225.
- Tussyadiah I, Park S, F. D. (2011). Assessing the effectiveness of consumer narratives for destination marketing. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 35(1), 64–78.
- Tussyadiah, I. P. (2014). Toward a theoretical foundation for experience design in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53(5), 543–564.
- Tussyadiah, I. P. (2016). Factors of satisfaction and intention to use peer-to-peer accommodation. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 70–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.03.005>
- Tussyadiah, I. P. (2016). The influence of innovativeness on on-site smartphone use among American travelers: Implications for context-based push marketing. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 33(6), 806–823.

- Um, T., & Chung, N. (2021). Does smart tourism technology matter? Lessons from three smart tourism cities in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 396–414.
- Um S, C. J. (1992). The roles of perceived inhibitors and facilitators in pleasure travel destination decisions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(3), 18–25.
- Vecchio, P. Del, Mele, G., Ndou, V., & Secundo, G. (2018). Creating value from Social Big Data: Implications for Smart Tourism Destinations. *Information Processing and Management*, 54(5), 847–860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2017.10.006>
- Wang, D., Li, X. R., & Li, Y. M. (2013). China's "smart tourism destination" initiative: A taste of the service-dominant logic. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 2(2), 59–61.
- Wang, D., Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2014). Adapting to the mobile world: A model of smartphone use. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 11–26.
- Wang, D., Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2016). Smartphone use in everyday life and travel. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(1), 52–63.
- Woodside AG, L. S. (1989). A general model of traveler destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(4), 8–14.
- Xiang, Z., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2020). Travel Information Search. In *Handbook of e-Tourism* (pp. 1–20).
- Xiang, Z., & Gretzel, U. (2010). Role of social media in online travel information search. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 179–188.
- Xiang, Z., & Pan, B. (2011). Travel queries on cities in the United States: Implications for search engine marketing for tourist destinations. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 88–97.
- Xiang, Z., Magnini, V. P., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2015). Information technology and consumer behavior in travel and tourism: Insights from travel planning using the internet. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 22, 244–249.
- Xiang, Z., Wang, D., O'Leary, J. T., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2015). Adapting to the internet: trends in travelers' use of the web for trip planning. *Journal of Travel Research*, 54(4), 511–527.
- Xiang, Z., Wöber, K., & Fesenmaier, D. R. (2008). Representation of the online tourism domain in search engines. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(2), 137–150.
- Xiang, Z. (2018). From digitization to the age of acceleration: On information technology and tourism. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 25, 147–150.
- Yuan, Y., Tseng, Y. H., & Ho, C. I. (2019). Tourism information technology research trends: 1990-2016. *Tourism Review*, 74(1), 5–19.
- Zarezadeh, Z., Benckendorff, P., & Gretzel, U. (2019). Lack of progress in tourist information search research: a critique of citation behaviour and knowledge development. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(19), 2415–2429.
- Zillinger, M. (2020). The curious case of online information search. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(3), 276–279.

Received: 27/07/2021

Accepted: 07/03/2022

Coordinating editor: Berta Ferrer-Rosell