

Ana Težak Damijanić, B. S.

Junior Researcher

Institute of Agriculture and Tourism, Department of Tourism, Poreč

E-mail: tezak@iptpo.hr

Zdravko Šergo, Ph. D.

Research advisor

Institute of Agriculture and Tourism, Department of Tourism, Poreč

E-mail: zdravko@iptpo.hr

DETERMINING TRAVEL MOTIVATIONS OF WELLNESS TOURISM

UDK / UDC: 338.48-6:615.8

JEL klasifikacija / JEL classification: I10, L83

Prethodno priopćenje / Preliminary communication

Primljeno / Received: 29. ožujka 2013. / March 29, 2013

Prihvaćeno za tisak / Accepted for publishing: 10. lipnja 2013. / June 10, 2013

Abstract

Wellness tourism is a relatively new form of tourism based on special interest of consumers. In order to create appropriate marketing strategy it is necessary to better understand travel motivation for this segment. The purpose of this paper is to explore travel motives in the context of wellness tourism. The aim of this paper is twofold: 1) to determine how well the general proposed structure of push and pull motivating factors applies to tourists who consider wellness services an important pull factor and 2) to examine the relation among travel motives and various sociodemographic and travel characteristics of tourists who consider wellness services an important pull factor.

Keywords: travel motives, wellness tourism, wellness services

1. INTRODUCTION

Many tourist destinations offer similar features which makes them more easily substitutable on tourist market (Pike, 2009), so, as an attempt to overcome this problem, tourist destinations are developing new marketing strategies in order to identify and exploit new opportunities that are attractive, economically rewarding and sustainable (Ibrahim and Gill, 2005). Appropriate strategy must be formulated based on stressing a set of competitive advantages, which will serve as a basis for forming the positioning strategy. Understanding consumer motivation is one of the most effective ways of gaining competitive differential advantage (Hudson, 2008). Focus on certain forms of a special interest tourism may prove to be an excellent way of achieving competitive advantage and formulate the appropriate marketing strategy, because Special interest tourism is a form of tourism which involves consumers whose holiday choice is inspired by specific motivations (Novelli, 2005).

Wellness tourism is a form of tourism based on special interest of tourists. It is regarded as a subcategory of health tourism (Kim and Batra, 2009; Mueller and Lanz Kaufmann, 2001) because it is pursued solely by "healthy" people, whose prime aim is preserving or promoting their health (Mueller and Lanz Kaufmann, 2001). Since it is a relatively new form of tourism, a better understanding of tourists' wellness characteristics and their travel motives is needed.

The purpose of this paper is to explore travel motives from the aspect of wellness tourism. The aim of this paper is twofold: 1) to determine how well the general proposed structure of push and pull factors applies to tourists who consider wellness services an important pull factor and 2) to examine relation among travel motives and various sociodemographic and travel-related characteristics of tourists who consider wellness services an important pull factor.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Motivations are inner drives that cause people to take action to satisfy their needs (Hudson, 2008). In order to explain travel motivations it is possible to use Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (Chon, 1989 in Awaritefe, 2004; Hudson, 2008), according to which a person first tries to satisfy his/her primary needs like food and safety and then higher needs like the need for love, esteem and self-actualization (Maslow, 1943). Although this theory has been accepted and used to explain travel behavior, there are some researchers who consider this theory to be inapplicable to tourist motivation (Witt and Wright, 1992 in Chang, 2007).

Other theories have been proposed in order to better explain factors that influence travel (Awaritefe, 2004; Hudson, 2008) and some of them are: 1) behavioral theory of travel motivation which includes two theories i.e. "sunlust" and "wanderlust" (Gray, 1970 in Awaritefe, 2004) and fourfold classification of tourists based on traveler's role in terms of institutionalized/non-institutionalized behaviors and the mass organized/individual organized types of travel (Cohen,

1984 in Awaritefe, 2004); 2) classified purpose (Dann, 1981 in Awaritefe, 2004); 3) personal and/or interpersonal experiences in destination settings (Iso-Ahola, 1982 in Awaritefe, 2004); 4) auto-definitions and meanings (McIntosh and Geoldner, 1986 in Awaritefe, 2004) and 5) static factors, dynamic factors and current decision factors (Witt and Mountinho, 1989 in Awaritefe, 2004).

The most widely applied theory is the one of push and pull motivations (Awaritefe, 2004; Crompton, 1979; Dunne et al, 2007; Hallab et al., 2003; Heung et al., 2001; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Kozak, 2002; Lubbe, 2003; McGehee, et al.1996; Uysal and Jurowski, 1993; Yoon and Uysal, 2005). The concept of this theory distinguishes two important factors: push factors, which refer to internal forces that motivate or create a desire to satisfy a need to travel, and pull factors, which are recognized as destination attributes and can be divided into three groups (Lubbe, 2003): 1) primary pull factors e.g. scenery, cities, climate, wildlife, historical and local cultural attractions; 2) secondary pull factor e.g. accommodation, catering, entertainment, sports and 3) tertiary pull factors e.g. marketing, prices. Pull motivation factors respond to and reinforce inherent push motivation factors (Heug et al., 2001; Sangpikul, 2008). Push and pull factors describe how individuals are pushed by motivation variables into making travel decisions and how they are pulled or attracted by destination attributes (Uysal and Hagan 1993, in Yoon and Uysal, 2005: 46).

Although the concept of push and pull motives distinguishes between two factors i.e. push and pull factors, both constructs are delineated by various dimensions. Crompton (1979) determined nine push and pull motive i.e. 1) escape from a perceived mundane environment, 2) exploration and evaluation of self, 3) relaxation, 4) prestige, 5) enhancement of kinship relationship, 6) regression, 7) facilitation of social interaction, 8) novelty and 9) education. McGehee, et al. (1996) revealed five push motive i.e. 1) sports and adventure, 2) cultural experience, 3) family and kinship, 4) prestige and 5) escape and six pull motives i.e. 1) heritage and culture, 2) recreational activities, 3) comfort and relaxation, 4) outdoor resources, 5) resort enclave and 6) budgetary environs. Uysal and Jurowski (1993) established four push travel motives: 1) cultural experience, 2) re-experiencing family togetherness, 3) escape and 4) sports and four pull travel motives: 1) entertainment/resort, 2) outdoor/nature, 3) heritage/culture and 4) rural/inexpensive areas. Heung (2001) determined five push and pull motives: 1) exploration, 2) dream fulfillment, 3) benefits sought, 4) cosmopolitan city and 5) attractions and climate. Kozak (2002) and Jönsson and Devonish (2008) found four travel motives: 1) culture, 2) pleasure-seeking/fantasy, 3) relaxation and 4) physical.

Awaritefe, (2004) found three push motive: 1) physiological-tension-reducing, 2) self-actualization-cultural/education and 3) belonging and love; and five pull motives: 1) dynamic factor, 2) current decision, 3) static factor, 4) commercial and 5) information/advertisement on destination. Later Yoon and Uysal, 2005 determined eight push motives: 1) exciting, 2) knowledge/education, 3) relaxation, 4) achievement, 5) family togetherness, 6) escape, 7) safety/fun and 8) away from home and seeing and nine pull motives: 1) modern atmospheres and

activities, 2) wide space and activities, 3) small size and reliable heather, 4) natural scenery, 5) different culture, 6) cleanness and shopping, 7) night life and local cuisine, 8) interesting town and village and 9) water activities.

In analysis of travel motives in wellness tourism, certain scholars have adopted the push and pull motives (Azman and Chan, 2010; Hallab, 2006) while others are more interested in analyzing only push motives (Konu and Laukkanen, 2009; Mak et al., 2009). Certain scholars focus on benefits for wellness tourists (Voigt et al., 2011) which may serve for gaining better insights in potential wellness travel motives. Hallab (2006) found five push motives i.e. healthy-living, excitement, education, indulging and escape and five pull motives i.e. health and fitness, hygiene and the environment, history and nature, vigilance and health and arts and urban luxury. Mak et al. (2009) found five push motives: friendship and kinship, health and beauty, self-reward and indulgence, relaxation and relief, escape. Konu and Laukkanen (2009) determined seven motivational factors: self-development, healthy and physical activity, relation and escape, isolation and nostalgia, nature, autonomy and stimulation and social status. Azman and Chan (2010) determined three push motives i.e. escape – relay and pamper, distress/time out and unwind / regeneration and two pull motives i.e. tangible resources and marketing image.

In order to better understand the travel motives, certain scholars tried to determine the relation between them and personal characteristics of tourists (Boksberger and Laesser, 2008; Heung et al., 2001; Kozak, 2002; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Mak et al., 2009; Sangikul, 2008). In analyzing tourist market in general, statistically significant relation between travel motives and gender (Heung et al., 2001; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Sangikul, 2008), age (Boksberger and Laesser, 2008; Heung et al., 2001; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Sangikul, 2008), country of origin/nationality (Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Kozak, 2002), education (Boksberger and Laesser, 2008), occupation (Sangikul, 2008), professional position (Boksberger and Laesser, 2008) and annual income (Sangikul, 2008). From the aspect of wellness tourists, statistically significant relationship was determined between the travel motives and income, gender, and education level (Mak et al., 2009).

3. METHODOLOGY

A study focusing on tourists' attitudes related to the importance of environmental preservation and travel motives was conducted from July through September 2010. In this study the target population included those tourists who visited seven seaside tourist resorts in Istria County: Medulin, Pula, Rovinj, Poreč, Vrsar, Funtana and Umag. These sites were selected because they were visited by more than 50% of tourists visiting Istria County in 2009 (Istria Tourists Board, 2009). Survey was carried out in 20 hotels through a self-complete questionnaire. Tourists were approached by trained researcher and asked to participate in the survey. Researcher explained the purpose of the survey, said that the survey was anonymous and handed out a questionnaire in appropriate

language. In that process of onsite data collection researchers were stationary while respondents were mobile (Veal, 2006) and convenient sample was used. Hotels were preselected based on location i.e. they were located in seaside tourists resorts and capacity (from 200 to 500 rooms).

The questionnaire was constructed for the purpose of gathering data. It consisted of 22 questions which were divided into five sections. The first section of questions was designed to gather respondents' sociodemographic characteristics (country of origin, age, gender, income level, occupation, size of settlement, travelling party) and trip characteristics (number of visits, length of stay and sources of information). The second section of questions focused on determining extends of current crises on tourists' behaviour. The questions in the third section were based on New Environmental Paradigm scale and served to determine tourist's attitudes about the environment. In the fourth section travel motives were examined (Awaritefe, 2004; Crompton, 1979; Dunne et al, 2007; Heung et al., 2001; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Kozak, 2002; McGehee, et al.1996; Uysal and Jurowski, 1993; Yoon and Uysal, 2005). The last section focused on determining tourist's satisfaction and intention to revisit Istria County. Questionnaire was originally designed in Croatian and then translated into the following languages: English, German, Italian, Russian and Slovenian.

The respondents were *a priori* grouped based on the importance of wellness services in general. For the purpose of this analysis, a group of respondents, that said that wellness services were important pull factor, was extracted and analysed.

Data were processed using statistical methods available in R statistical software i.e. univariate and multivariate statistics. Univariate statistics was used for general description of the sample while multivariate statistics was used to examine multidimensionality and internal reliability of the push and pull factors. In order to examine multidimensionality of the push and pull factors exploratory factor analysis was conducted using principal axis factor analysis and direct oblimin rotation while internal reliability was determined by computing Cronbach's alpha (Field, 2005; Hinkin et al., 1997). For measuring push and pull factors a five-point Likert scale (one = "strongly disagree" to five = "strongly agree") was used.

After determining the latent variables, regression factor scores were calculated and included into further analysis (DiStefano et al., 2009). These five factors were used as the dependent variables in a series of linear multiple regressions. The aim of these multiple regression analyses was to examine the relative contribution of individual respondent characteristics on travel motives. Because the objective of the study was to gain greater understanding of the various drivers of travel motives within push and pull paradigm, a series of econometric analyses was conducted to identify determinants associated with these factors. Regression diagnostics included checking the residuals to detect whether the outliers and evidence of model fit.

The explanatory variables included into the analysis were:

- Respondents' sociodemographic characteristics i.e. Age (AGEn), gender (GENDER), education level (EDLEV), profession (PROFES), total net monthly income (TOTNMI) and country of origin (COUNOR) (Table 1).
- Travel party (1 if yes, 0 if no): children (CHILD), partner (PARTN), other members of the family (OTFAM), friends (FRIEN);
- Respondents' satisfaction with various aspects related to their travel was measured using a five point Likert scale and encompassed: service quality (SATIS1), price (SATIS2), vacation (SATIS6) and destination choice (SATIS7)
- Possibility of recommending tourist destination to friends and family member (RECOM) was measured using a five point Likert scale
- Perception of tourist destination (PERTD) and comparison of tourist destination with other destinations (COMTD) were measured using a five point Likert scale.
- Length of stay (LENST)
- Number of previous visits (NOPV) and
- Revisiting intention (REVINT) 1 if yes, 0 if no.

In order to achieve stronger models, two linear regressions were done for every travel motive (unrestricted and restricted models). In the context of a model that controls for independent set of variables, the models are expressed as following regression equations:

$$\text{PULL_CULTURE}_i = \beta_2 \text{NOPV}_i + \beta_3 \text{LENST}_i + \beta_4 \text{CHILD}_i + \beta_5 \text{PARTN}_i + \beta_6 \text{OTFAM}_i + \beta_7 \text{FRIEN}_i + \beta_8 \text{SATIS1}_i + \beta_9 \text{SATIS2}_i + \beta_{10} \text{RECOM}_i + \beta_{11} \text{SATIS6}_i + \beta_{12} \text{SATIS7}_i + \beta_{13} \text{PERTD}_i + \beta_{14} \text{COMTD}_i + \beta_{15} \text{REVINT}_i + \beta_{16} \text{AGE}_i + \beta_{17} \text{GENDER}_i + \beta_{18} \text{EDLEV}_i + \beta_{19} \text{PROFES}_i + \beta_{20} \text{TOTNMI}_i + \beta_{21} \text{COUNOR}_i + e_i,$$

$$\text{PULL_NATURE}_i = \beta_2 \text{NOPV}_i + \beta_3 \text{LENST}_i + \beta_4 \text{CHILD}_i + \beta_5 \text{PARTN}_i + \beta_6 \text{OTFAM}_i + \beta_7 \text{FRIEN}_i + \beta_8 \text{SATIS1}_i + \beta_9 \text{SATIS2}_i + \beta_{10} \text{RECOM}_i + \beta_{11} \text{SATIS6}_i + \beta_{12} \text{SATIS7}_i + \beta_{13} \text{PERTD}_i + \beta_{14} \text{COMTD}_i + \beta_{15} \text{REVINT}_i + \beta_{16} \text{AGE}_i + \beta_{17} \text{GENDER}_i + \beta_{18} \text{EDLEV}_i + \beta_{19} \text{PROFES}_i + \beta_{20} \text{TOTNMI}_i + \beta_{21} \text{COUNOR}_i + e_i$$

$$\text{PUSH_DESTINATION}_i = \beta_2 \text{NOPV}_i + \beta_3 \text{LENST}_i + \beta_4 \text{CHILD}_i + \beta_5 \text{PARTN}_i + \beta_6 \text{OTFAM}_i + \beta_7 \text{FRIEN}_i + \beta_8 \text{SATIS1}_i + \beta_9 \text{SATIS2}_i + \beta_{10} \text{RECOM}_i + \beta_{11} \text{SATIS6}_i + \beta_{12} \text{SATIS7}_i + \beta_{13} \text{PERTD}_i + \beta_{14} \text{COMTD}_i + \beta_{15} \text{REVINT}_i + \beta_{16} \text{AGE}_i + \beta_{17} \text{GENDER}_i + \beta_{18} \text{EDLEV}_i + \beta_{19} \text{PROFES}_i + \beta_{20} \text{TOTNMI}_i + \beta_{21} \text{COUNOR}_i + e_i,$$

$$\text{PUSH_RELAXATION}_i = \beta_2 \text{NOPV}_i + \beta_3 \text{LENST}_i + \beta_4 \text{CHILD}_i + \beta_5 \text{PARTN}_i + \beta_6 \text{OTFAM}_i + \beta_7 \text{FRIEN}_i + \beta_8 \text{SATIS1}_i + \beta_9 \text{SATIS2}_i + \beta_{10} \text{RECOM}_i + \beta_{11} \text{SATIS6}_i + \beta_{12} \text{SATIS7}_i + \beta_{13} \text{PERTD}_i + \beta_{14} \text{COMTD}_i + \beta_{15} \text{REVINT}_i + \beta_{16} \text{AGE}_i + \beta_{17} \text{GENDER}_i + \beta_{18} \text{EDLEV}_i + \beta_{19} \text{PROFES}_i + \beta_{20} \text{TOTNMI}_i + \beta_{21} \text{COUNOR}_i + e_i,$$

$$\text{PUSH_LOCAL_PEOPLE}_i = \beta_2 \text{NOPV}_i + \beta_3 \text{LENST}_i + \beta_4 \text{CHILD}_i + \beta_5 \text{PARTN}_i + \beta_6 \text{OTFAM}_i + \beta_7 \text{FRIEN}_i + \beta_8 \text{SATIS1}_i + \beta_9 \text{SATIS2}_i + \beta_{10} \text{RECOM}_i + \beta_{11} \text{SATIS}$$

$$6i + \beta_{12} \text{SATIS}7i + \beta_{13} \text{PERTD}i + \beta_{14} \text{COMTD}i + \beta_{15} \text{REVINT}i + \beta_{16} \text{AGE}i + \beta_{17} \text{GENDER}i + \beta_{18} \text{EDLEV}i + \beta_{19} \text{PROFESI}i + \beta_{20} \text{TOTNMI}i + \beta_{21} \text{COUNORI}i + e_i.$$

The β 's represent unknown parameters that measure the impact of their respective variables on Y_i . The random error term, e_i , represents unmeasured factors that affect the dependent variable. It is assumed to possess a normal distribution across the population of respondents, with a mean equal to zero and a constant variance.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 751 respondents were taken into analysis. Prior to the data analysis, multiple imputation was done on a set of data related to push and pull factors.

The proportion of female respondents (51%) was slightly higher than that of male (49%) (Table 1). Most of the respondents were between 35 and 54 years of age. The majority of respondents obtained some kind of higher education level. The respondents had different background and occupation, most of the respondents stated that they were employees, while 17% were managers and about 16% were entrepreneurs/owners. Most of the respondents were from Austria (25%), about 18% were from Italy, about 14% from Germany and almost 12% from Russia.

Table 1

Sample characteristics

Characteristics	Percent (%)	Characteristics	Percent (%)
Age		Gender	
16-24	8.4	Female	51.0
25-34	19.8	Male	49.0
35-44	37.3	Land of arrival	
45-54	22.8	Austria	25.4
55+	11.7	Germany	13.5
Education		Italy	18.1
Basic education	12.7	UK	5.7
Secondary education	31.4	Russia	11.8
College	20.0	Slovenia	4.9
University	25.2	The Netherlands	3.1
Masters	6.5	Other	17.5

Ph.D.	4.2	Personal net monthly income	
Profession		Up to 500 €	3.1
Owner/Entrepreneur	16.5	500 – 1,000 €	8.9
Manager	17.0	1,000 – 2,000 €	23.0
Employee	45.6	2,000 – 3,000 €	18.5
Student	5.0	3,000 – 4,000 €	8.5
Retired	3.2	4,000 – 5,000 €	5.8
Other		Over 5,000 €	9.3
	12.7	Private (n/a)	22.9

Source: Data processed by authors

To examine multidimensionality and internal reliability of the push and pull motivational factors, respondents were asked to state the importance for 16 push and 24 pull factors (Awaritefe, 2004; Crompton, 1979; Dunne et al, 2007; Heung et al., 2001; Jönsson and Devonish, 2008; Kozak, 2002; Lubbe, 2003; McGehee, et al.1996; Uysal and Jurowski, 1993; Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Using eigenvalues greater than 1.0, as criteria, three factor groupings of push factors (Table 2) and two factor grouping of pull factors (Table 3) formed clear factors structures.

Three factors representing push motives (Table 2) jointly accounted for 47.89% of accumulated variance and most of the factor loading were greater than .60. The factors were labelled as: 1) Experience related to tourism destination, 2) Relaxation and escape and 3) Experience related to local people while Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .715, .738 and .743 respectively.

Factors representing pull motivations (Table 3) jointly accounted for 48.88% of accumulated variance and most of the factor loading were greater than .60. The two factors were labelled as: 1) Culture and 2) Nature. The reliability coefficients of pull factors were .815 for first and .773 for second factor.

Table 2

Exploratory factor analysis results for push motivations

Variable	1	2	3
Interest in visiting various sights	.797		
Interest in visiting cultural and historical sites	.655		
Visiting destinations which my friends did not visited	.520		
Interest in experiencing something new and exciting	.431		

Escape from everyday environment		.750	
Escape from daily stress		.706	
Physical rest and relaxation		.659	
Interest in meeting various people			-.793
Interest in experiencing how other people live			-.776
Interest in local cuisine			-.403
Cronbach's alpha	.715	.738	.743
% accumulated variance	30.287	42.731	47.894

Source: Data processed by author

Table 3

Exploratory factor analysis results for pull motivations

Variable	1	2
Museums and exhibitions	.775	
Variety of architectural styles	.720	
Variety of cultural heritage different from mine	.713	
Variety of cultural events	.664	
Local entertainment events	.558	
Scenic and natural beauty		.850
Environmental preservation		.749
Suitable climate		.566
Picturesqueness and tidiness of a resort		.526
Cronbach's alpha	.815	.773
% accumulated variance	34.891	48.882

Source: Data processed by authors

Five push and pull motivation factors were taken into further analysis which resulted in five models (Tables 4 and 5). A total of ten regression analyses, two for each motivation factor, were done in order to determine the relation between an individual travel motive and various sociodemographic and travel characteristics of tourists who stated that wellness services are an important pull motive. Unrestricted models include all variables, while restricted models include only those explanatory variables that proved to be significant in unrestricted model on 5% level or less. The results of the restricted and unrestricted regression coefficient, their t- values and adjusted R², obtained from multiple regression analysis for push and pull factors are presented in Tables 4 and 5. The homoscedasticity testing shows that the nonconstant error variance or heteroscedasticity is statistically absent in all of the models. Bonferroni test was used to determine if the largest studentized residual is an outlier. In most of the

regressions only one to two observations among the 751 could be the problem according to the outlier tests, so they were removed.

Table 4

Determinants of Pull Factors, COEFFICIENT ESTIMATES by OLS

Explanatory variable	PULL_CULTURE		PULL_NATURE	
	Unrestricted model	Restricted model	Unrestricted model	Restricted model
(Intercept)	-2.186 ^a (-6.784)	-2.105 ^a (-7.939)	-1.663 ^a (-5.183)	-1.7 ^a (-7.21)
NOPV	-0.019 (-1.047)		-0.037^d (-2.041)	-0.034^d (-1.89)
LENST	0.02^c (2.371)	0.02^c (-2.529)	0.018^c (2.054)	0.02^c (2.391)
CHILD	-0.161^c (-2.553)	-0.158^c (-2.517)	-0.117^d (-1.869)	-0.098 (-1.585)
PARTN	-0.205^b (-2.809)	-0.167^c (-2.239)	-0.134^d (-1.843)	-0.095 (-1.449)
OTFAM	-0.126 (-1.5)		-0.086 (-1.030)	
FRIEN	-0.200^c (-2.124)	-0.176^d (-1.912)	-0.13 (-1.390)	
SATIS1	0.0178 (0.333)		0.180^a (3.384)	0.171^b (3.237)
SATIS2	-0.018 (-0.415)		-0.08^d (-1.786)	-0.081^d (-1.806)
RECOM	0.184^b (3.16)	0.174^a (3.621)	0.158^b (2.721)	0.141^c (2.487)
SATIS6	0.161^a (3.312)	0.163^a (3.728)	0.096^c (1.993)	0.102^c (2.128)
SATIS7	-0.022 (-0.348)		0.121^d (1.867)	0.112^d (1.755)
PERTD	0.001 (0.042)		-0.049 (-1.068)	
COMTD	0.055 (1.127)		-0.014 (-0.288)	
REVINT	-0.298^c (-2.062)	-0.272 (-1.932)	-0.08 (-0.558)	
AGE	0.028^c (2.519)	0.011^a (3.516)	0.002 (0.237)	
GENDER	0.101 (1.593)		0.033 (0.530)	
EDLEV	0.080^b	0.074^b	0.081^b	0.075

	(2.875)	(2.721)	(2.917)	(2.743)
PROFES	0.051 ^c (2.263)	0.062 ^b (2.85)	0.006 (0.293)	
TOTNMI	-0.032 (-1.370)		-0.039 (-1.676)	
COUNOR	0.037^b (2.742)	0.038^b (2.8)	-0.064^a (-4.733)	-0.063^a (-4.673)
Regression Diagnostics				
Non-constant	1.78	1.43	1.88	1.13
error variance	[0.182]	[0.23]	[0.139]	[0.32]
test				
RESET test	0.311 [0.732]	0.595 [0.55]	8.327 [0.0002]	9.315 [0.0001]
Adjusted R-squared	0.25	0.20	0.24	0.17

Note: (t-value in parentheses); “d” significant at 5% level of significance; “c” significant at 1% level of significance; “b” significant at 0.1% level of significance, “a” 0% level of significance; [p-value in parentheses].

Source: Data processed by authors

Culture as a pull travel motive was a principal factor in model PULL_CULTURE (Table 4). Ten variables were statistically significant at the 0.05 level or higher, and six of them have positive sign: length of stay, possibility of recommending tourist destination to friends and family member, satisfaction with destination choice, age, education level and country of origin. Four variables were significant with negative sign: travelling with children, partner, friends and revisiting intention. PULL_NATURE model examines influence of independent variables on nature as a pull motivational factor. Set of variables related to various aspects of satisfaction had a significant and positive effect on nature as a pull motivational factor. The exemption is satisfaction with the price which has a negative effect on nature as a pull travel motive. Length of stay and education level have positive sign, while travelling with children and/or partner have negative signs.

Compared to the pull travel motives, there are fewer variables which are statistically significant in determining push travel motives. The relationship between tourist destination as a pull motivational factor and exploratory variables was analysed in PUSH_DESTINATION model (Table 5). Possibility of recommending tourist destination to friends and family member is a variable that has the highest influence on tourist destination as a pull motivational factor, and, along with respondents' age, has positive effect on this factor. Travelling with children and/or partner, revisiting intention and total net monthly income have negative signs. PUSH_RELAXATION model was determined by only three explanatory variables. Revisiting intention, satisfaction with service quality and possibility of recommending tourist destination to friends and family member had positive effect on this travel motive. Model PUSH_LOCALPEOPLE presents the effect of independent variables on the experience related to local people as a

travel motivational factor. Number of previous visits and possibility of recommending tourist destination to friends and family member had positive effect on this travel motive, while travelling with children and/or partner and education level had negative effect.

Table 5

Determinants of Push Factors, COEFFICIENT ESTIMATES by OLS

Explanator y variable	PUSH_ DESTINATION		PUSH_ RELAXATION		PUSH_ LOCALPEOPLE	
	Unrestricted model	Restricted model	Unrestricted model	Restricted model	Unrestricted model	Restricted model
(Intercept)	-1.525 ^a (-4.830)	-1.094 ^a (-4.734)	-9.767e- 01 ^b (-3.012)	-1.439 ^a (-7.657)	-1.553 ^a (-4.708)	-1.053 ^a (-5.165)
NOPV	0.014 (0.799)		1.151e-02 (0.615)		0.042^c (2.249)	0.044^c (2.37)
LENST	0.006 (0.745)		2.357e-04 (0.027)		0.008 (0.887)	
CHILD	-0.256^a (-4.04)	-0.263^a (-4.166)	-7.872e-02 (-1.238)		-0.209^b (-3.231)	-0.211^a (-3.336)
PARTN	-0.189^b (-2.637)	-0.161^c (-2.505)	-2.948e-02 (-0.400)		-0.207^b (-2.762)	-0.178^b (-2.66)
OTFAM	-0.099 (-1.212)		-8.927e-02 (-1.055)		-0.077 (-0.9)	
FRIEN	0.029 (0.317)		-3.059e-02 (-0.322)		0.025 (-0.259)	
SATIS1	0.028 (0.548)		9.308e-02^d (1.728)	0.107^c (2.369)	0.013 (0.243)	
SATIS2	-0.018 (-0.419)		-2.903e-02 (-0.635)		0.020 (0.439)	
RECOM	0.225^a (3.86)	0.277^a (7.048)	1.622e-01^b (2.762)	0.177^a (3.646)	0.272^a (4.21)	0.305^a (7.733)
SATIS6	0.031 (0.653)		1.678e-02 (0.342)		0.033 (0.673)	
SATIS7	0.025 (0.404)		8.784e-02 (1.337)		-0.011 (0.178)	
PERTD	0.06 (1.313)		-3.617e-02 (-0.769)		0.066 (1.367)	
COMTD	-0.004 (-0.095)		-5.087e-02 (-1.023)		-0.040 (-0.88)	
REVINT	-0.328^c (-2.32)	-0.308^c (-2.287)	2.775e-01^d (1.908)	0.279^c (2.008)	-0.146 (-0.98)	
AGE	0.019^d (1.713)	0.011^a (3.523)	-1.706e-02 (-1.487)		-0.119 (0.163)	
GENDER	0.036		-8.986e-02		0.036	

	(0.592)		(-1.405)		(0.530)	
EDLEV	0.024		7.215e-05		-0.052^d	-0.048^d
	(0.898)		(0.003)		(-1.84)	(-1.91)
PROFES	0.011		3.359e-03		0.03	
	(0.484)		(-0.146)		(1.193)	
TOTNMI	-0.066^b	-0.065^b	2.885e-03		-0.024	
	(-2.831)	(-2.967)	(0.120)		(-0.99)	
COUNOR	0.061^a	0.068^a	-1.691e-02		0.009	
	(4.614)	(5.564)	(-1.227)		(0.645)	
Regression Diagnostics						
Non-constant	6.321	0.412	4.18	0.254	5.123	0.361
error variance	[0.018]	[0.682]	[0.032]	[0.743]	[0.023]	[0.547]
test						
RESET test	0.424	0.506	0.434	0.234	1.492	1.784
	[0.65]	[0.602]	[0.62]	[0.79]	[1.225]	[0.168]
Adjusted R-squared	0.22	0.18	0.15	0.12	0.20	0.17

Note: (t-value in parentheses); "d" significant at 5% level of significance; "c" significant at 1% level of significance; "b" significant at 0.1% level of significance, "a" 0% level of significance; [p-value in parentheses].

Source: Data processed by authors

Travelling with other family members, perception of tourist destination, comparison of tourist destination with other destinations had no effect on either motivational factor. Although Heung et al. (2001), Jönsson and Devonish (2008), Sangikul (2008) and, in the case of wellness tourists, Mak et al. (2009) determined statistically significant relationship between travel motives and gender, in this research gender had no effect on either motivational factor. Boksberger and Laesser (2008) determined statistically significant relationship between travel motives and profession, but their findings are not supported in this research.

Certain implications can be drawn based on the results. Based on the theory of push and pull travel motivation, three push (tourist destination, relaxation and local people) and two pull (culture and nature) travel motives were determined in the case of tourists who place high importance on wellness services. Tourists who find culture as a pull motivational factor very important tend to stay longer in a tourist destination and are more likely to recommend visit to tourist destination to friends and family. This factor is more important to respondents who are older and have obtained higher level of education. Offering certain cultural attributes may result in a higher level of satisfaction with vacation, but it is not a determinant of repeat visit. Nature as a pull motive stimulates longer stay in tourist destination and respondents' tend to be more satisfied with service quality, vacation and destination choice, but it is more important for first time visitors, more educated and older tourists. Tourists interested in nature tend to be less satisfied with price. Experience related to tourist destination as a push motivational factor increases possibility of giving

recommendation to visit tourist destination, but it does not encourage repeat visitation. It is more important to elderly tourists. Tourists who find desire for relaxation and escape very important push motive are more likely to experience satisfaction with service quality, to recommend the visit to friends and family members and to repeat their visit. Interaction with local people is of interest to tourist who obtained lower formal education suggesting that they are more prone to interact with local people. Importance of experiencing interaction with local people may increase number of visits and increase the possibility of recommending visiting tourist destination. Travelling with children and partner in general have negative effect on most travel motives which may suggest that tourists, who find wellness services important pull factor, may prefer to travel alone or with friends. Age and education level seem to be very important variables in relation to travel motives. These findings are supported by Boksberger and Laesser (2008), Heung et al. (2001), Jönsson and Devonish (2008), Sangikul (2008) and, in the case of wellness tourists by Mak et al. (2009).

There are some limitations of this study. This analysis took into account only those tourists who stated that wellness services were an important pull factor, so it cannot be applied to overall tourist market. The overall regression models had low adjusted R square which is often the case when analysing cross-sectional data. RESET test, as a general mis-specification test, implies the rejection of the null hypothesis in the case of Pull_Nature model, suggesting that in Pull_Nature model certain important variables are omitted.

Future research may focus on importance of first/repeat visit to tourist destination. Influence of travel party, mostly children and partner may also prove interesting for further research. Since certain important variables were omitted in analysing nature as a pull travel motive, future research may focus on importance of nature as a pull travel motive.

5. CONCLUSION

Previous research on travel motives from the aspect of wellness tourists, within the context of push and pull motivational theory, was mostly focused on push motivational factors. Although push motivational factors induce travel, pull motivational factors should also be taken into account.

In this paper three push and two pull motivational factors were determined. Tourists, who stated that wellness services were important pull factor, were pushed by desire to experience attributes of tourist destination, to interact with local people and to relax and escape everyday life, while they were pulled by culture and nature as attributes of a tourist destination. Pull motivational factors stimulated longer stay in tourist destination and in general had positive effect on satisfaction, while travelling with children and/or partner showed negative effect on travel motives. The latter suggests that tourists interested in wellness services are less likely to be travelling with children and/or partner.

REFERENCES

- Awaritefe, O. D. (2004), Motivations and Other Considerations in Tourism Destination Choice: A Case Study of Nigeria, *Tourism Geographies*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 303-330.
- Azman, I., Chan, K. L. J. (2010), Health and Spa Tourism Business: Tourists' Profiles and Motivational Factors, in Health, Wellness and Tourism: healthy tourists, healthy business? *Proceedings of the Travel and Tourism Research Association Europe 2010*, Budapest, pp. 9-24.
- Boksberger, P., Laesser, C. (2008), Segmenting the Senior Travel Market by Means of Travel Motivation – Insights from a Mature Market – Switzerland, in *CAUTHE 2008 Conference proceedings*, available at: http://www.griffith.edu.au/conference/cauthe2008/content_refereed-papers.html
- Chang, J. C. (2007), Travel motivation of package tour travellers, *Tourism*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 159-176.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979), Motivations for Pleasure Vacations, *Annals of Tourism Research*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 408-424.
- DiStefano, C., Zhu, M., Mîndrilă, D. (2009), Understanding and Using Factor Scores: Considerations for the Applied Research, *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, vol. 14, no. 20, pp. 1-11.
- Dunn, G., Buckley, J., Flanagan, S. (2007), City Breat Travel Motivation – The Case of Dublin, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Research*, vol. 22, no. 3&4, pp. 95-107.
- Field, A. (2005), *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS, 2nd edition*, Sage Publication Ltd., London
- Hallab, Z. A. A., Yoon Y., Uysal, M. (2003), An Identification of Market Segments Based on Healthy-Living Attitude, *Journal of Hospitality and Leisure Marketing*, vol. 10, no. 3/4, pp. 185-198.
- Hallab, Z. (2006), Catering to the healthy-living vacationer, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 71-91.
- Heung, V. C. S., Qu, H., Chu, R. (2001), The relationship between vacation factors and socio-demographic and travelling characteristics: the case of Japanese leisure travellers, *Tourism Management*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 259-269.
- Hinkin, T. R., Tracey, J. B.,ENZ, C. A. (1997), Scale Construction: Developing Reliable and Valid Measurement Instruments, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 100-120.
- Hudson, S. (2008), *Tourism and Hospitality Marketing: A Global Perspective*, Sage Publications Ltd., London
- Ibrahim, E. E., Gill, J. (2005), A positioning strategy for a tourism destination, based on analysis of consumers' perceptions and satisfactions, *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 172-188.
- Jönsson, C., Devonish, D. (2008), Does nationality, gender, and age affect travel motivations? A Case of Visitors to the Caribbean Island of Barbados, *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, vol. 25, no. 3-4, pp. 398-408.
- Kim, B. H., Batra, A. (2009), Healthy-living Behavior Status and Motivational Characteristics of Foreign Tourists to Visit Wellness Facilities in

Bangkok, in *The 2nd Annual PSU Phuket Research Conference Proceedings*, Phuket, Prince of Songkla University, pp.1-8.

Konu, H., Laukkanen, T. (2009), Roles of Motivation Factors in Predicting Tourists' Intentions to Make Wellbeing Holidays – A Finnish Case, in ANZMAC 2009, available at: <http://www.duplication.net.au/ANZMAC09/papers/ANZMAC2009-376.pdf>

Kozak, M. (2002), Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destination, *Tourism Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 221-232.

Lubbe, B. A. (2003), *Tourism Management in Southern Africa*, Pearson Education South Africa, Cape Town

Mak A. H. N., Wong K. K. F., Chang R. C. Y. (2009), Health or Self-indulgence? The Motivations and Characteristics of Spa-goers, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 185-199.

Maslow, A. H. (1943), A theory of human motivation, *Psychological Review*, vol. 50, pp. 370-396.

McGehee, N. G., Loker-Murphy, L., Uysal, M. (1996), The Australian International Pleasure Travel Market: Motivations from a Gendered Perspective, *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 45-57.

Mueller, H., Lanz Kaufmann, E. (2001), Wellness Tourism: Market analysis of a special health tourism segment and implications for the hotel industry, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 5-17.

Novelli, M. (2005), *Special Interest Tourism, in Niche Tourism: Contemporary issues, trends and cases*, ed. Novelli, M., Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.

Pike, S. (2009), Destination brand positions of a competitive set of near-home destinations, *Tourism Management*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 857-866.

Sangpikul, A. (2008), A factor-cluster analysis of tourist motivations: A case of U.S. senior travellers, *Tourism*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 23-40.

TZ Istra (2009), Tourist arrivals and nights by tourist offices 2009, available at: <http://www.istra.hr/hr/pr/statistika>

Uysal, M., Jurovski, C. (1993), An Empirical Testing of the Push and Pull factors of Tourist Motivations, in *Proceedings of 1993 CHRIE Conference*, Chicago, pp. 162-63.

Veal, A. J. (2006), *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*, Pearson Education Limited, Essex.

Voigt, C., Brown, G., Howat, G., (2011), Wellness tourists: in search of transformation, *Tourism Review*, vol. 66, no. 1/2, pp.16 – 30.

Yoon, Y., Uysal, M. (2005), An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model, *Tourism Management*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 45-56.

Ana Težak Damijanić, dipl. oec.

Asistent

Institut za poljoprivredu i turizam, Zavod za turizam, Poreč

E-mail: tezak@iptpo.hr

Dr. sc. Zdravko Šergo

Viši znanstveni suradnik

Institut za poljoprivredu i turizam, Zavod za turizam, Poreč

E-mail: zdravko@iptpo.hr

**ODREĐIVANJE MOTIVA PUTOVANJA U KONTEKSTU
WELNESS TURIZMA*****Sažetak***

Wellness turizam je relativno novi oblik turizma koji se temelji na posebnim interesima potrošača. S ciljem stvaranja odgovarajuće marketinške strategije potrebno je bolje upoznati motive putovanja ovoga segmenta. Svrha rada je istražiti motive putovanja u kontekstu wellness turizma. Ciljevi rada su dvostruki: 1) utvrditi u kojoj je mjeri općenita struktura unutarnjih i vanjskih motiva putovanja primjenjiva u slučaju turista koji smatraju wellness usluge važnim vanjskim motivom putovanja i 2) utvrditi vezu između motiva putovanja i različitih sociodemografskih karakteristika te karakteristika turista vezanih uz putovanje.

Ključne riječi: motivi putovanja, wellness turizam, wellness usluge

JEL klasifikacija: I10, L83

