



# An analytical scale for domestic tourism motivation and constraints at multi-attraction destinations: The case study of Serbia's Lower and Middle Danube region



Sanja Božić\*, Tamara Jovanović, Nemanja Tomić, Djordjije A. Vasiljević

University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Geography, Tourism and Hotel Management, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 3, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 12 October 2016

Received in revised form 4 May 2017

Accepted 13 May 2017

Available online xxxx

### Keywords:

Travel motivation

Travel constraints

Multi-attraction sites

Serbia

## ABSTRACT

The principal aim of this study was to develop an analytical scale for domestic tourism motivations and constraints for visiting complex destinations with multiple offerings, containing both cultural and natural assets. A survey was conducted among 454 respondents from Serbia who have experienced multi-attraction destinations in the Lower and Middle Danube region. In part, motives were derived from the studies of Beard and Ragheb (1983), Fodness (1994) and Ryan and Glendon (1998), while the scale of constraints was based on the study of Dong and Chick (2012). Some new motives and constraints were also introduced. The results of exploratory factor analysis (the first phase), indicate four motivating factors (Knowledge and experience, Visiting attractions, Rest and relaxation, Research and prestige) as well as four constraints factors (Structural, Inter/Intrapersonal, Lack of information and recommendation, Lack of time). Finally, while some items were excluded from the scales during the confirmatory factor analysis (the second phase), the analysis confirmed the four-dimensional structure of Multi-attraction travel motivation and constraints scales.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

What drives people to travel and visit new destinations, and what are the barriers which hinder them to travel, are among the most important questions in tourism research. There are numerous reasons why people travel. Some travel to gain new knowledge (Chiang, Wang, Lee, & Chen, 2015), some are on a quest for a new, authentic experience (Jovičić, 2016); some crave escape, rest and relaxation far away from home (Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015) and for some of them, travel is just in their job description (Tsui & Fung, 2016). Understanding what motivates, but also what hinders people from travelling has important practical implications, as it helps better understand and predict travel decisions and consumption behavior of tourists.

Previous research on this topic indicates that tourist motivation is “multi-faceted” i.e. tourists have multiple motives for travelling, even within a single journey (Bowen & Clarke, 2009; Lu, Hung, Wang, Schuett, & Hu, 2016; Pearce, 1993; Ryan, 2002; Uriely, Yonay, & Simchai, 2002). In the extensive body of literature, there are many theories of tourist motivation. One of the most frequently mentioned theories within the realm of tourism research is the push and pull motivation theory, which modern application specifically to tourism and leisure has been attributed to Crompton (1979). The push and

pull theory was afterwards widely accepted in tourism literature (Dann, 1981; Jamrozy & Uysal, 1994; Pesonen, 2012; Prayag & Ryan, 2011; Smith, Costello, & Muenchen, 2010; Uysal & Hagan, 1993; Uysal, Li, & Sirakaya-Turk, 2008). This theory is based on the assumption that there are two groups of motives: push motives as inner forces within travelers that encourage them to travel, and pull motives as external attributes of the destination that attract the traveler. That would mean that people travel either depending on their needs and preferences or due to the type of destination, its offering and characteristics.

On the other hand, our desire to visit one destination can be hindered by wide array of barriers which can arise in our everyday life. Sometimes a lack of time or money, family obligations, poor health, lack of appropriate company can hinder us from travelling and visiting our desirable destination. These barriers are defined as constraints which limit our participation in desired leisure activities such as travelling (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford, Jackson, & Godbey, 1991). The most widely accepted theoretical framework of leisure constraints is a three-dimensional hierarchical model of intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural constraints proposed by Crawford and Godbey (1987). Intrapersonal constraints include the individual psychological states such as stress, depression, anxiety, religiosity, reference group attitudes, prior socialization into specific activities, perceived self-skill, and subjective evaluation of the appropriateness and availability of various leisure activities. On the other hand, interpersonal constraints refer to constraints such as lack of friends and family members to participate in a leisure activity, while structural

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [sanja.bozic@dgt.uns.ac.rs](mailto:sanja.bozic@dgt.uns.ac.rs) (S. Božić).

constraints include stage in family-cycle, financial resources of the household, season, climate, the work schedule, and availability of opportunities (Crawford & Godbey, 1987; Crawford et al., 1991). It is also important to note that constraints not always result in not travelling to the desired destination. Studies by Crawford et al. (1991) and Um and Crompton (1999) claim that the final decision about whether to choose a certain travel destination might not be based on the absence of constraints, but rather on the successful negotiation of those constraints. So, this study focuses on those who have successfully overcome their preliminary constraints and visited the analyzed study area.

Current literature suggests that there are ample scales for measuring motivation and constraints in the field of leisure and tourism. However, the existing motivation scales in the tourism field are rather general, lacking some specific indicators connected with different attractions (natural, cultural, historical) that can be found at one destination, and that are certainly important travel motivators (pull factors). Thus, there is a need for constructing such scale for motivation containing more attraction-based pull factors, that can be applied to complex destinations with multiple offerings. When considering travel constraints scales that can be found in literature, they are mostly specific and applicable to a particular type of tourism (for instance cruise tourism, event tourism). Although there is a study aiming to apply and extend leisure constraints in a global tourism context (Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008), it focuses on extending only structural constraints. Also, several studies on travel constraints (Handy & Srinivasan, 2005; Otoo, 2014) have included the organizational constraints referring to pre-travel education, poor information/ advertising etc. This constraints were found as very important, however, the authors of the current study believe that tourism constraints scale should contain more specific organizational constraints related to the lack of travel recommendation (both by travel agency and friends and family) as well as lack of information that tourists have about destination before they visit it.

Based on all above mentioned, the principal purpose of this study was to develop an analytical scale for domestic tourism motivations and constraints for visiting complex destinations with diverse tourist attractions. The goal was to create scales for travel motivation and constraints that could be applied to destinations with multiple offerings such as different kinds of tourist routes and other multi-attraction sites, containing both cultural and natural assets (e.g. museums, archeological sites, national parks). Current scales of motives or constraints are mainly focused on natural or cultural attractions which would mean that in order to evaluate the motives for visit of certain destination, these two types of attractions have to be regarded separately. This makes the process of destination evaluation needlessly complicated. Developing one, unique scale for the evaluation of motives for visit of both natural and cultural attractions, simplifies this process. Also, this study puts an emphasis on pull motives as specific destination attributes. These motives are of paramount importance for making decision to visit certain destination, but are often neglected in travel motivation studies. This study also aims to contribute to the scarce literature on travel motivation and constraints in Serbian domain. Based on the fact that limited studies on this topic have been conducted in this region, the paper intends to contribute to both academic knowledge and managerial implications. Thus, both scales were tested on the example of the Middle and Lower Danube region in Serbia (Viminacium, Djerdap, Vinča, Fruska Gora, Stari Slankamen and Titelski breg). These sites contain multiple offerings in form of valuable historical, religious, archeological, industrial, natural and geological heritage attracting a lot of scientific and public attention.

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. Travel motivation

Travel motivation is a set of needs that predisposes a person towards a certain tourist activity (Pizam, Neumann, & Reichel, 1979). It is the key

factor underlying all tourist behavior, fundamental to tourism development and has therefore been a significant subject of many tourism studies in the past (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981; Huang & Hsu, 2009; Jang, Bai, Hu, & Wu, 2009; Li & Cai, 2012; Murphy, Benckendorff, & Moscardo, 2007; Pearce, 1995; Pearce, 2005). Efforts to understand the factors motivating tourists to visit a particular destination and how they differ among different tourists, could help destination planners to set marketing strategies. It could also help destinations to build a positive image on travel market and differentiate its own products and services from competition.

Many travel motivation theories have been developed throughout the decades by various authors. Some of those theories include the push and pull theory (Crompton, 1979), the optimal arousal theory by Iso-Ahola (1982) and the travel career ladder (TCL) approach (Pearce, 1988). In tourism literature, push and pull factors have been most widely discussed (Baloglu and Uysal, 1996; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Kao, Patterson, Scott, and Li, 2008; Pizam et al., 1979; Uysal and Jurowski, 1994; Seebaluck, Munhurrin, Naidoo, & Rughoonauth, 2015; Caber & Albayrak, 2016; Kim, Lee and Klenosky, 2016; Xu & Chan, 2016). According to Dann (1977) the push dimensions are related to internal forces, such as the social-psychological motivators that drive an individual to travel. On the other hand, the pull dimensions are related to external forces, otherwise known as a destination's outward features, specific attractions or unique attributes that entice one to visit. Both of these factors are believed to be in effect at the same time (Crompton, 1979; Uysal and Jurowski, 1994).

It seems that current literature puts an emphasis on push factors, while pull factors (as destination specific factors) are often neglected. Crompton (1979) through interviews identifies nine motivational factors, seven of which are socio-psychological (push) factors (escape from a perceived usual environment, self-exploration and evaluation, relaxation, prestige, regression, enhancement of kinship relationships and social interaction) and only two pull factors - cultural and novelty and education). The push motivations have been thought useful for explaining the desire for travel, while the pull motivations have been thought useful for explaining the actual choice of destination. In his study, he also states that these factors are not mutually exclusive. His study was among the first to assume that general, push motives, non-related to the specific destination, are often the major factors influencing traveler's choice of where and when to travel, and many authors agreed with this claim.

An important contribution to the explanation of leisure motivation gives the development of the leisure motivation scale by Beard and Ragheb (1983). This study identifies four dimensions which correspond closely to Kozak's (2002) four dimensions (culture, pleasure seeking, relaxation and physical). Beard and Ragheb's Leisure Motivation Scale was derived from the work of Maslow (1970) who focused only on push factors. According to Beard and Ragheb (1983), it is argued that four motives can be satisfied through leisure travel: an intellectual motive (learning, exploring, discovering, reflecting or imagining), a social motive (the need for friendship and interpersonal relationships, the esteem of others) a competence-mastery motive (achieving, mastering, challenging, and competing) and a stimulus avoidance motive (the need to escape and get away) (Beard & Ragheb, 1983). In 1998, Ryan and Glendon adapted the Beard and Ragheb's Leisure motivation scale for tourism purposes and extracted also four motives: social, relaxation, intellectual and competence-mastery dimension. Beside these two scales, Fodness's Tourist Motivational Scale (1994) is frequently cited in tourism literature. It measures five functions that travelling serves for a tourist: Knowledge, Utilitarian (Punishment Minimization), Social Adjustive, Value-Expressive, Utilitarian (Reward Maximization). The Knowledge function can be related to an intellectual motive, while the Social Adjustive and Value-Expressive component are connected with the need for the esteem of others (the need which is a part of social dimension in the study of Beard and Ragheb (1983)).

Crompton's study of push and pull factors indicates that tourism-related businesses may wish to pay greater attention to socio-psychological motivations when they develop product and promotion

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5108768>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5108768>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)