

## PART B



## **PART B: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS**

### **5. Summary and Discussion of Findings**

This section summarises the main findings of the studies. Next, the contribution of the findings from the studies will be presented and discussed, followed by implications for research and management. Finally, the limitations of the studies will be delineated, followed by suggestions for future research.

The papers combined have resulted in several important findings regarding antecedents and consequences of tourist motivation. In the following, the main findings in the six studies are presented in line with the three Study Objectives.

#### ***5.1 Study Objective 1. How are tourist motivation and tourist choice of destination and activities related? (H1-H9)***

The relationships amongst motivation and choice of destination and choice of activities have been explored and examined empirically in Papers 1, 2 and 4. First, tourist motivation within a certain tourist setting – “outbound charter tourists from Norway” – is outlined. Charter tourists seem to group into separate motivation segments. The results from Study 1 reveal four distinct motivation factors for Norwegian outbound tourists: “Relax/Sun”, “Learning/Culture”, “Lifestyle/Social” and “Fitness”. The findings show significantly different results regarding tourist motivation in terms of what place they visited, and as such, H1, which is in line with other empirical studies (e.g. Milman and Pizam, (1995). In addition to examining relationships between motivation and choice of destination (H1), Study 1 addresses the theoretical debate concerning how to classify destinations (RQ1) (e.g. Laws, 1995). The factor analysis of the motivational items yielded almost identical results as in the well-known article by Beard and Ragheb (1983), which are “intellectual, social, mastery/competence, and stimulus avoidance” and upon which many other researchers base their articles, e.g. Kleiven (1998; 1999). As in Yuan and McDonald’s (1990) and Cha et al.’s (1995) studies, charter tourists from Norway placed a high emphasis on learning and experiencing culture (knowledge and adventure). The Relax/Sun factor was also important for the Norwegian tourists travelling on pre-arranged tours. The fact that many of the Norwegian tourists are motivated by warmer weather is not a new phenomenon (Denstadli, 2002; Kleiven, Holmengen and Jacobsen, 1991; Jacobsen, 2002). For these Norwegian tourists

living in the northern part of Europe, the need for sun and bathing were quite important, even though some disagreed. These results were further tested in Study 2, where the results reveal two groups of tourists: “Sun/Beach” and “Other types of tourists” (H2, H3). The H2 hypothesis is clearly confirmed. Sun/Warmth is indeed a major travel motive for Norwegian package tourists, and a clear majority view themselves as a “Sun/Beach tourist”. Covering 80 % of our sample, the group represents an obviously heavy trend in their national holiday market. The Sun/Beach-seekers constitute a major segment in the travel industry, and package tour companies are dependent on selling their services to this large group. The results also reveal that within this apparently homogenous segment, “Sun/Warmth” is not the only important motive. About one-fifth of the respondents claimed to have been on some “other” type of trip, (i.e. city tour, a round trip, Alpine holiday, or cruise) and as such this second group is large enough to confirm H3. There are definitely people amongst charter tourists who are less interested in sun and warmth than in culture and in developing personal skills. The results from Study 2 reveal that a set of five of the motive measures predicts travellers’ holiday types rather well. While the “Sun/Beach” travellers tend to have high scores on the “Family”, “Sun/Warmth” and “Peace/Quiet” motive scales, the “Other” group tends to score highly on the “Accomplishment” and “Culture” factors. Hence, Hypothesis 4 stands confirmed: the two groups have different motives for travel and the motive measurements predict the holiday type. Family considerations and hopes for a peaceful stay are also central characteristics of the Norwegian Sun/Beach tourist. As several authors have pointed out, holiday motives may best be considered a multidimensional phenomenon. Thus, a segmentation study was implemented (Study 4: H5), and four different segments amongst Norwegian outbound charter tourists were chosen and named: “Active Sun and Family”, “Culture Patron”, “Experiencing” and “Family Sun and Comfort (H5). Similar segmentation studies in other empirical settings are supported in the tourism literature (e.g. Ahmed et al., 1998; Cha, McCleary and Uysal, 1995; Jang, Morrison and O’Leary, 2002; Johns and Gyimóthy, 2002). Interestingly, although the type of product bought (charter-trip), the “Experiencing” segment seems to enjoy a more adventuresome and personal experience compared to the other group tourists, which deviates from earlier suggestions of this type of tourist. The “Experiencing” segment appears to correspond to results in comparable studies, e.g. novelty seekers (Cha, McCleary and Uysal, 1995) and Novelty/Nature seekers (Jang, Morrison and O’Leary, 2002). Further, it could be speculated that the “Family Sun and Comfort” segment in the present study correspond to Iso-Ahola’s (1982) “escapers”, particularly in view of their need for reducing stress. The “Family Sun and Comfort” segment in the present study appears to

correspond to Cha et al.'s (1995) "family/relaxation seekers" and Jang et al.'s (2002) "escape/relaxation seekers", and the "sun and comfort" segment in the Ahmed et al.'s (1998) study. The "Active Sun and Family" segment in the present study seems to correspond, to a certain degree, to Jang et al.'s (2002) "family/outdoor activity seekers" and Ahmed et al.'s (1998) "active sun and fun" segment. Finally, the "Culture Patron" segment in the present study corresponds somewhat to Bieger and Laesser's (2002) cultural hedonism segment as well as the "Culture Patron" segment revealed in the Ahmed et al. (1998) study.

In Paper 5, the assumption regarding motive as a stable construct is tested. The paper contributes to the methodology part of the study, which demonstrates that the tourists' pre-purchase motives are consistent in pre- and post-purchase situations. This implies that pre-purchase motives can be measured in post-purchase situations as well, which is a necessary condition for making adequate travel behaviour models (Lounsbury and Hoopes, 1988).

## ***5.2 Study Objective 2. How do tourist motivation and different choices of destinations and activities relate to tourist satisfaction and, accordingly, to tourist intentions to repurchase and recommend the trip? (H10- H26)***

The consequences of motivation in terms of choice of activities, satisfaction and subsequent intentions to re-purchase and recommend the trip have been tested in Papers 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The results show strong relationships between motivation and choice of activities (H10, H11, H12, H14, H15, H16). Charter tourists with different motives choose different destinations (H1 – see discussion above), confirming H16 and H17 in line with other tourism studies (e.g. Pizam and Milman 1995). The tourists also choose activities in line with their motivations, indicating rational choice behaviour. The two motivation-based groups of tourists, "Sun/Beach" and "Others", are clearly different in terms of *some* of the activities at the destinations. The "Sun/Beach" tourists naturally participate more in "Traditional charter-sun" activities, while the activities labelled "Learning about the destination" are more frequent with the "Other" group. As such, H10 is confirmed. Further, the results reveal that motivation *directly* influences tourists' participation in activities, not only *indirectly*, through its influence on the holiday type, and as such, H11 and H12 are supported. Notably strong associations were found between the "Sun/Warmth" motive and "Traditional charter sun" activities, and between the "Culture" motive and "Learning about the destination". Such relationships amongst the constructs are based on general theories within consumer behaviour literature regarding motivated behaviour (e.g. Carroll and Johnson, 1990; Engel, Blackwell

and Miniard, 1986; Engel, Kollat and Blackwell, 1968; Howard, 1994; Howard and Shet, 1969; Nicosia, 1966; Runyon, 1980), which are tested empirically in tourism studies as well (e.g. Chhetri, Arrowsmith and Jackson, 2003; Gitelson and Kerstetter, 1990; Lee et al., 2002; Moscardo, Pearce, Lang, O’Leary, 1995; Wong and Lau, 2001).

The four motive-based segments presented in Study 4 – Relax/Sun, Learning/Culture, Lifestyle/Social, and Fitness, are mainly named based on the significant differences between the segments and choices of activities. The results show that three of the segments, which count for almost 75 % of the respondent group, seem more active than the Family Sun and Comfort segment, and as such, H14 and H16 are confirmed. The relatively high activity level found for three out of four clusters seems to relate to the findings in the Bornholm study by Johns and Gyimòthy (2002), where two distinct clusters were found called the “active” and “less active” holiday seekers. Hypothesis 15 holds that motivation and activities will divide the tourists into effective market segments, which the above discussion indicates. However, the challenge for the marketing researchers as well as the industry is to be aware of the differences concerning this often stereotyped category of tourists (charter tourists), and respond adequately. For the industry, it might provide new opportunities concerning effective marketing as well as product development, and as such, H15 is confirmed. It is fascinating that the Norwegian charter tourists could largely fit into Cohen’s (1972) organised and individual mass tourists based on the way they travel. Still, the four clusters indicate that the classical mass tourist might be more differentiated than initially pictured. An example is the tendency that people in the Experiencing segment have to travel on their own and order sightseeing trips before leaving home. It could be speculated that organising the trip (buying a pre-arranged tour and ordering sightseeing before leaving home) might be a matter of making the journey easier or more pleasurable than of making sure that the need for security is met (as suggested by Cohen, 1972). Currently, the transportation side of a journey may not be as difficult or frightening to most people as it was three or four decades ago. The results indicate that some of the classical “organised” and “individual” group tourists may be very individualistically oriented and, as such, match the “drifters” or “explorers” on some issues (e.g. searching for novel experiences) to a greater extent. The choice of charter as a holiday type for Norwegians, to a greater extent than before, might be a matter of lowering transportation costs or a desire to spend the time during the holiday on something other than looking for accommodation.

Paper 2 (H19) addresses the central premises within buying behaviour literature regarding involvement in the buying process (Svenson, 1992). A few studies of involvement

in terms of decision-makers within tourism exist (e.g. Dellaert, Prodralidad and Louviere, 1991; Lawson, 1991; Thornton, Shaw and Williams, 1997; Wang, Hsieh, Yeh and Tsai, 2003; Zalatan, 1998). Paper 2 adds new knowledge to the marketing literature by empirically testing relationships amongst tourist motivation, type of trip and choice of activities on two groups of respondents: those involved in the buying decision, and those not. The results reveal slightly stronger relationships amongst those involved in the buying process than those not involved. It could be speculated that one reason for the limited difference may be that the decision-makers are familiar with their companions' motives and consider them when making the decisions (e.g. Myers and Moncrief, 1978; Ritchie and Filiatrault, 1980; Svenson, 2005). It is also likely that travel companions will have similar social backgrounds, thus also similar travel motives (Fodness, 1994).

Consequences in terms of tourist satisfaction and subsequent intention to re-buy and recommend the trip have been tested empirically in Papers 3 and 4. The findings in the studies reveal satisfied tourists and that they intend to purchase the products again and make positive recommendations to others. This reaction is analogous to the behavioural consequences found in most satisfaction studies, such as the research of Fornell et al. (1996). The fact that tourists make positive judgments (they claim to be satisfied) is in line with results with other studies showing a positively skewed evaluation of satisfaction (Fornell et al., 1996). Even though the present work supports the dominant marketing theories regarding the foundation of motivated behaviour, the present study has not found a strong relationship between motivation and satisfaction (H13), or between choice of activities and satisfaction (H20), even though tourists do choose destinations and activities based on their motivations for travelling and are subsequently satisfied with the trip. In tourist contexts, the assumption within general marketing theories that individual choices of products or experiences function as a means to satisfy initial needs seems to be weak. The relative weak relationship between pre-purchase motivation and tourist satisfaction found in this study might reflect the influence of external stimuli during the process of "producing" a holiday. By this, we mean that the consumer is often an active part of producing his or her own well-being, e.g. communicating with the waiter, finding new attractions to visit that were not planned, etc., and that the learning experience of the given journey provides new competence and new drives for satisfaction. Novelty, discovery and surprise are often appreciated by tourists and thus become important and determining elements of the consumer's evaluation of the experience. Additionally, the possible difference between the two sets of criteria amongst tourists could reflect that, on tour, things happen that were not possible to plan for and that people on holiday try to avoid being

dissatisfied (the opposite of what attracted them in the first place). There might also be speculation that the lack of relationships between motivation and satisfaction and between activities and satisfaction can be explained as part of a measurement problem (validity of measurements). Another explanation may be possible differences between choice drivers and satisfaction drivers (Gardial et al., 1994; Henke, 1995 in Oliver, 1997). The lack of relationship between pre-purchase motivation and tourist satisfaction might reflect the influence of external stimuli during the process of “producing” a holiday.

Charter tourist satisfaction with the various aspects of the trip effects on their overall satisfaction dependent on their motive-activity structure, and as such, H22 and H23 are confirmed. It was observed that the more satisfied the tourists were with the “service/organising” side of the journey and with activities in general, the more satisfied they were with the destination visited. The total variance explained was 50.3 % in the model. Tourist satisfaction with the trip (overall) was not shown to effect on the intention to re-purchase the trip, and as such, H24 were not confirmed. Even though the results show that the “service/organising” factor mediated a positive intention to repurchase a charter tour, the explained variance was low. This is an interesting result, since most tourism studies show a positive relationship between satisfaction and intentions to re-purchase (e.g. Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Pizam, 1994; Ross, 1993). The results from the study, however, showed a somewhat positive relationship between tourist satisfaction with the trip (overall) and the intention to recommend the trip to friends and relatives, and as such, H25 was partly confirmed. This is in line with previous tourism studies (e.g. Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Pizam, 1994; Ross, 1993). In addition, in Study 4 (H26), the same tests were performed on the four motive-based segments. This study clearly shows significant differences when it comes to tourists’ satisfaction and intentions to re-purchase and recommend the trip, and as such, H26 is confirmed. These results provide interesting information for the tourism industry and as such, further confirm H15.

### ***5.3 Study Objective 3. Important antecedents of travel motivation: Travel experience and tourists’ self-perceptions (H27-H30)***

As outlined in the introductory chapter and as the above discussion somewhat indicates, trip experience and self-perception are considered important antecedents of tourist motivation. The following findings are based on this premise.



### **5.3.1** *Travel Experience*

In Study 1, travel experience and search for novelty were found to be important variables when examining how tourists categorise the destination they have been visiting, indicating that H27 is confirmed. This is also in line with previous tourism research (e.g. Dann, 1995; Embacher and Buttle, 1989; Gotlieb, 1982; Jacobsen and Dann, 2003). It was found that tourists travel to different countries and different destinations within a country depending on their amount of previous trip experience and degree of searching for novel experiences. Other researchers points to the same conclusion (e.g. Chon, 1992; Gartner and Hunt, 1987; Milman and Pizam, 1995). Significant differences were found amongst the countries visited as well as the destinations visited within a country as regards previous travel experience and the degree to which tourists search for novel experiences.

### **5.3.2** *Tourists' Self-Perceptions*

Findings in Study 6 reveal that most German tourists visiting Norway seem to perceive themselves as non-typical tourists, which confirms H28. This result is in line with Jacobsen (2000). The major finding was also that there were no significant differences amongst German tourists visiting Norway perceiving themselves as typical or non-typical tourists as regards their trip motivation or activities performed during the trip, confirming H29 and H30, respectively. These results are in line with the theory of self-serving bias presented by Koenig (1997). Further, no significant differences were found between the two groups regarding how the typical German tourist was conceptualised, supporting the findings in the three hypotheses (H28, H29, H30). Both groups expected more or less the same as the typical tourist with respect to modes of travel, motives for coming, typical activities and family income. No difference was observed between the groups with respect to the number of activities or motives for travelling. It should be mentioned that the number of activities performed was rather low (a mean of 4.41 out of 15 options), implying that the respondents viewed themselves as being more non-typical than they probably are, indicating that being a non-typical tourist might be a matter of self-perception more than a matter of actual behaviour. The data further indicated that tourists tend to perceive themselves as different from the average stereotyped tourist, maybe because being typical on a negative attribute is judged as undesirable. It could be argued that the typical respondent (a German tourist in Norway) in our material views him- or herself more positively or more favourably than he or she views "the typical German tourist". Another explanation might be that the German

tourists perceive travelling to Norway as non-typical compared to other German tourists travelling to other destinations.

Regarding the outbound charter tourist groups from Norway, most of them strongly claim cultural motives but actually perform cultural activities to a lesser degree than other activities. As previously discussed, this could reflect a lack of cultural activities available at the destination. However, together with the results from the study of German tourists in Norway, it probably reflects the effect of “the self-serving bias”.

“The self-serving bias” is well established in psychological research (e.g. Koenig, 1997). Our study could be perceived as documenting the self-serving bias phenomenon within a tourism setting. Thus, to the extent that being a typical tourist is a negative attribute, one could expect other tourists from other countries to respond in a similar way. Another justification of the results might be made by employing Festinger’s (1956) cognitive dissonance theory, which holds that when individuals are uncertain about the result of a choice, the dissonance arising will motivate the individual to change either the behaviour or the belief in an effort to avoid a distressing feeling.

## **6. Theoretical and Methodological Implications**

The present work has theoretical and methodological implications for research. As a part of important contributions to the present body of knowledge, this study has undertaken an examination of the relationships amongst important constructs in the process of consumers’ buying behaviour, i.e. trip motivation, choice of destination, choice of activities, satisfaction, trip-relevant intentions to repurchase and recommend, trip experience and tourist self-perception.

The current study comprises several more or less unexplored areas related to the interactions amongst several important steps in the psychological process from need recognition to the evaluation of experienced products (e.g. Johnson, 1998; Peter and Olson, 1996) in a tourist context. In his intriguing book dedicated to the satisfaction construct, Oliver (1997) claimed that little research exists that actually supports the relationships amongst customer needs and satisfaction and the subsequent role of individual behaviour in that relationship, and that only a few works address its nature (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Oliver, 1997; Svenson, 2005). The present work addresses the link between tourist motivation and satisfaction, and found that the explained variance between motivation and satisfaction is low, questioning traditional theoretical thinking within consumer behaviour of meeting customers’ needs with products and services. These results show that even though the present work

supports dominant marketing theories regarding the foundation of motivated behaviour, it is extremely important to acknowledge the lack of findings concerning the relationship towards satisfaction. This study thus indicates that one central assumption for the marketing theory “that the consumer buys a product to fulfil a need satisfactorily” might not be fully comprehended, and/or that the constructs should be further explored in terms of measurement and, as such, more research on the topic is required.

Based on traditional marketing approaches regarding motivated behaviour, it is expected that if people diverge in their degree of participation in the decision-making process, those who are more engaged will show a stronger motive-activity relationship. The results from one of the studies (Study 2) show a somewhat stronger relationship between motivation and activities for the decision-makers than those not deciding. Since most consumer behaviour literature is based on the approach of motivated behaviour which holds that if people diverge in their degrees of participation in the decision-making process, those who are more involved should show a stronger motive-activity relationship, more research on the topic is vital and the study indicates involvement as a construct should be framed in buying behaviour models (Svenson, 2005).

Consumers’ (i.e. charter tourists’) participation in activities during a journey was measured on a six-point scale. The purpose of this scale was to separate the tourists based on the average amount of engagement in the activity during the holiday. The present study thus divides the respondents by their activities and subsequently their activity levels. Previous tourist studies have primarily asked what types of activities the tourists have joined (e.g. Kelly, 1990), and often fail to take into account the fact that the tourists’ preferences might be reflected through the frequency of participation in the various activities.

One of the studies (Study 1) analysed how people categorise the term “destination”. By applying open-ended questions to 1154 respondents, a variety of answers regarding what destinations they had visited occurred. The respondents replied by using names of a country, a region, an island, a city or a combination of names. These constructs were tested towards tourists’ motives and trip experiences. The data showed no significant differences amongst categories, but revealed differences amongst countries and further regions within countries regarding motivation and experience. The results thus show that the categories employed in these types of studies are of great importance in terms of construct validity, which is in line with Law’s (1995) suggestions.

Tourist motivation can be seen as a relatively lasting and stable phenomenon. A previous study has tested a five-year interval of motivation (Loundsbury and Hoopes, 1988)

amongst people in the same regions. The present work shows that motivation is relatively stable immediately after a trip and two months after a trip has been undertaken. The present study (Study 5) tested the same respondents before and after a trip in two different time modes (within a week and within two months) after the trip. The results reveal that people's sets of travel motives change very little from before to after a holiday trip abroad. This is encouraging to both researchers and practitioners, since stable travel motives are a *necessary* condition for the use of motives in travel behaviour prediction models.

## **7. Empirical and Managerial Implications**

The present work has implications for further empirical research as well as for tourism industry practitioners.

New knowledge regarding the relationship between motivation and choice in a tourist context will help tourist marketers and management streamline products and services to meet customer expectations and enhance consumer loyalty, which is identified in previous tourism work (e.g. Pearce, 1993; 1995).

Norwegian charter tourists travel to different countries as well as different places within one country because of various motivations and experiences. Tourists choose activities in line with their motives for travelling on holiday. This is in line with other tourism studies (e.g. Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Fodness, 1994; Moscardo et al., 1995). However, some discrepancy seems to occur regarding motivation and number of activities pursued, which will be discussed below. Norwegian charter tourists seem to group into two major types of tourists referred to in the present work as "Sun/Beach" and "Others", and into four motivationally-based segments, i.e. "Active Sun and Family", "Culture Patron", "Experiencing" and "Family Sun and Comfort". The challenge for the marketing researchers as well as the industry is to be aware of the differences concerning this often-stereotyped category of tourists (e.g. Cohen, 1972), and to respond accordingly. For the industry, it might provide new opportunities concerning effective marketing as well as product development (e.g. Peter and Olson, 1996). An example might be selling charter tours including rental cars and recommendations to those heading for rural trips, special types of events and less-known attractions (in line with the need for learning and experience).

In attracting new customers, many countries develop a branding strategy where the goal is often to achieve one strong unique image (e.g. Buhalis, 2000). The fact that Norwegian charter tourists travel to different destinations within a country (e.g. Spain and Greece) with motivational differences demonstrates the importance of motivation on the choice of

destination to visit for holiday purposes. Based on these findings, it could further be speculated that these countries do not necessarily have one single image, a distinct challenge for marketing and branding expenses. The findings further indicate that branding nations for tourism purposes should be done with care, depending on the market they want to attract and what motivations these tourists have.

Tourists seem to vary somewhat as concerns the tendency to participate in the decision-making process when planning and buying a trip (Dellaert, Prodigalidad and Louviere, 1991; Lawson, 1991; Thornton, Shaw and Williams, 1997; Wang, Hsieh, Yeh and Tsai, 2003; Zalatan, 1998). However, since the results from the study revealed that the expected differences between the decision-makers and the non-decision-makers were not as strong as expected, we conclude that the decision-makers are familiar with their companions' motives and consider them when making decisions. It also seems that travel companions will have similar social backgrounds and thus similar travel motives. Another explanation might be that family members or friends perform compensating behaviour in terms of the logic that "If I go with you on a sun/swim/relaxing trip to Cyprus this summer, you will come with me to see the geysir in Iceland next summer".

Norwegian charter tourists are satisfied with their travel destinations in Southern European countries and their activities pursued there. Consequently, they intend to re-purchase the products and make positive recommendations to others. This reaction is analogous to the behaviour consequences (intentions) found in most satisfaction studies, such as the research of Fornell et al. (1996). Regarding the predictive models derived from the study, there is speculation that the low explained variance tied to activities and tourist satisfaction is attributed to the fact that the provision of leisure activities familiar to Norwegians is totally insufficient amongst those European destinations. An improvement in tourists' satisfaction with the activities of interest would help augment tourists' overall satisfaction and their intentions to communicate via positive word-of-mouth. Repeat purchases and/or recommendations of destinations benefit marketing organisations as well as other businesses in their efforts to attract the attention of customers in the future, and are thus expected to improve the economy (e.g. Anderson, Fornell and Lehmann, 1994). As indicated above, the tourists are skilful in producing their own holidays, regardless of the reason (lack of available product or that he or she likes producing the holiday), which is in line with existing research (e.g. Bianchi, 1998). By recognising this tendency, businesses can plan and offer more individualistically based products, allowing the tourists to participate more actively in choosing and producing their holidays. The results should be interesting for

Norwegian tour operators from the aspects of product development and marketing communication. For product development, popular activities should be identified (e.g. visiting quality restaurants), while the supporting services to tourists (e.g. pre-trip planning) could be delivered via the Internet, which ensures timely assistance (before and during the trip). As for marketing communication, the travel industry might concentrate on the development of persuasive communication strategies addressing the needs (e.g. relaxation/sun) of travel consumers at an individual level and on a group basis.

The discrepancies amongst tourist motivation and the actual activities carried out, found particularly in Study 6, are discussed in terms of the phenomenon of tourists' "self-serving biases". The theory of "self-serving bias" (e.g. Koenig, 1997) holds that individuals need to feel different and better than the group to which they actually belong, indicating that the tourism industry should follow a strategy of training their workers to avoid generalising, and practice behaviour that communicates to the tourists that they are accepted as individuals. This result is important to the industry, since it indicates that an individual approach to each and every visitor is preferable. If, however, the discrepancy between motivation and behaviour arises from lack of cultural activities offered at the destination, this is a problem of making new activities available for visitors and developing new products. It should be mentioned, however, that the theory of self-perception was proposed as an alternative to dissonance theory (Bem, 1967). As implied above, dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) could be an alternative reference to the findings presented. Sabini (1995) presents a model of magnitude of dissonance and self-perception effects, based on Fazio, Zanna and Cooper (1977). The model indicates that dissonance effects grow and self-perception effects shrink as the discrepancy between attitude and behaviour increases. If the German tourists meet too many other German tourists in Norway, they may choose not to visit Norway again, or they could perform different activities while staying in Norway, or even just change their attitudes about being typical tourists to being not as negative as first thought. However, the discrepancies between attitudes and behaviours amongst tourists should be recognised to better meet customers' needs and secure customer satisfaction.

## **8. Limitations**

There are theoretical limitations with the present research. First, the present work employs choice of travel experience and self-perception as antecedents for tourist motivation. Other important antecedent of motivation could be addressed, e.g. cultural background, values, market communication (e.g. Bandura, 1986; Belk, 1988; Fodness, 1994; Fyans et al., 1981;

Solomon, 1999). However, the present work employs Bandura's (1977; 1986) social cognitive theory as foundation, where the reciprocal relationships amongst behavioural, personal, and environmental determinants are in focus. This theory explicitly posits that prior behaviours can serve as powerful sources of personal and environmental factors, and that these relationships are reciprocal in nature.

Further, the present work pays little attention to tourists' expectations, which are reported in research as important for the evaluation of a tourist trip (e.g. Gnoth 1997). Bowen (2001: 51) claims that expectations are influenced by: "1) the product itself including one's prior experience, brand connotations and symbolic elements, 2) the context including the content of communications from salespeople and social referents, 3) individual characteristics, including persuasiveness and perceptual distortions." Following the general principle of expectancy-value theories (e.g. Feather, 1982), attitude towards the behaviour is itself a function of the value one assigns to the perceived consequences of behaviour and the subjective probabilities one attaches to these consequences. Researchers address the importance of emotions as well as cognitive dimensions of consumer satisfaction (e.g. Mittal, 1988; Pratkanis, Breckler and Greenwald, 1989; Zajonc, 1980), and tourist satisfaction in particular (e.g. Bigné, Andreu and Gnoth, 2005). As such, the relatively low relationship between motivation and satisfaction found in the present study might result from the fact that the study does not take into account individual expectation per se. In addition, in models where attitude effects on behaviour, the anticipated outcome of the behaviour might be divided into three classes: "utilitarian outcomes (i.e. rewards and punishments), normative outcomes (i.e. others' social approval) and self-identity outcomes (i.e. affirmations and repudiations of the self concept) (Eagly and Chaiken, 1998: 397). The satisfaction construct might insufficiently represent the three classes of outcome, or adequately include emotional dimensions of satisfaction. It should be mentioned, however that, researchers (Cronin and Taylor, 1992; Brady, Cronin and Brand, 2002) claim that "performance-only measures" exceed "expectation-performance measures" in service quality measurements.

The major limitations within the present thesis, however, are related to the methodology adopted. Three different surveys are employed, and surveys help strengthen the external validity. The internal validity, however, might be reduced as a result of less of a chance to manipulate the variables (Malhotra, 1999; Ringdal, 2001). Another limitation of the methodology relates to the measurements of the variables (operationalising) (Malhotra, 1999; Ringdal, 2001). Travel motivation still needs to be explored and tested, which provides explicit challenges regarding the scales and operationalisation. In the present thesis, the

destination variable was open-ended to explore how the tourists categorise and define the places visited, increasing the internal validity of the study. In the following, the three surveys are discussed in terms of methodology and theoretical limitations.

### ***8.1 Design: Survey of outbound charter tourists from Norway***

The study explores and tests relationships amongst some important theoretical constructs regarding a tourist trip. The fact that empirical testing is primarily based on outbound Norwegian tourists implies that there are limitations regarding the possibilities of generalisation. The generalisation is therefore relevant for these types of tourists only. However, many countries organise and sell packages to warmer countries, e.g. Canada, the northern part of the USA, other Scandinavian countries, Northern Russia and Great Britain, where the latter countries also contribute to the stream of visits to Southern Europe, indicating a vast market (e.g. Ahmed, Barber and d'Astous, 1998).

Since tourist evaluations in the present study have been measured only after the trips, this could affect the evaluation of the tourists' relative importance of trip-specific elements since they might have a problem recalling those specific experiences in detail (Gardial, et al., 1994).

Norwegian outbound charter tourists seem to be generally satisfied with the destinations (overall satisfaction), as well as with more specific satisfaction factors. The fact that tourists make positive judgments (they claim to be satisfied) is in line with results with other studies showing a positively skewed evaluation of satisfaction (Fornell et al., 1996). However, the variables measuring tourist satisfaction were measured on a five-point Likert Scale from "Not important" (1) to "Very important" (5). The scale should probably be expanded to a nine-point scale to divide the differences amongst the positive evaluations more successfully. Further, the intentions to repurchase and recommend variables were measured on a three-point scale from 1 ("Quite sure I will") to 3 ("Quite sure I will not"), which might also be considered a somewhat narrow scale for the gauging of intentions to repurchase and recommend amongst tourists. Another possible limitation could be the use of tourists' intentions to re-buy the trips and recommend the trips as a measure of tourists' future intentions. Oliver (1997) claims that these constructs could be seen as measures of satisfaction, which indicate some possible weakness with the tests.

The respondents visited 37 countries (n=1154). For simplicity, the analysis only considered the six most visited countries (n=862), indicating that some important differences regarding tourist motivation and experience will be lost, since 25,3% of the respondents are



excluded from the tests. The main goal of this study, however, was to analyse the way people define and categorise the destinations they had visited. The results also provide examples of differences regarding motivations and experiences of countries visited, as well as regions within the same country.

Only limited differences were found amongst the decision-makers and the non-decision-makers in terms of relationships amongst motives, types of trips and choices. A reason for the small difference found might be that the study's operational definition of "non-decision-makers" is not very clear. It could also be speculated that the decision-makers are familiar with their companions' motives, considering them when making the decisions. It is also likely that travel companions will have similar social backgrounds, thus also having similar travel motives, which is in accordance with other research (e.g. Fodness, 1994).

The study is exploratory and descriptive due to a lack of a priori knowledge regarding relationships amongst the constructs (Malhotra, 1999). A cross-sectional study was found to be appropriate for the present purpose (Aaker and Day, 1986). There are several reasons for this choice: first, one of the purposes is to examine the relationships amongst important concepts in buying behaviour in a new context: a tourist setting. Second, the dimensionality of the motivation, activity and satisfaction constructs is also to be explored in a new context compared with prior research. Third, earlier research has been based on cross-sectional studies. Thus, to get comparable results, the same approach should be followed.

A segmentation study is performed. Segmentation studies are often used to divide tourists into groups with the goal of supporting marketers in their communication strategies and product developments. The present study supports the industry with this type of information and further discusses the results towards classical typology within tourism literature.

Factor analyses are performed. Since the three psychological constructs including motivation, activities and satisfaction are relatively new specifically to assessing the opinions of Norwegian outbound travellers, it is practical to further evaluate the underlying dimensions explaining the proposed scales. Exploratory factor analysis was chosen, as the basic objective was to identify latent dimensions. (Hair, Andersen, Tatham and Black, 1998). First, unrotated factor analysis was performed for all constructs in order to decide the number of factors. For most scales, except the motivation scale employed in Studies 1 and 3, the principle of keeping factors with an eigenvalue above 1 are employed (Kaiser, 1960). Then, Varimax rotations were conducted for all scales that resulted in four satisfaction factors (Studies 3, 4), six activity factors (Studies 2, 3, 4), eight motivation factors (Studies 2, 4, 5) and four motivation factors (Studies 1, 3). In two of the studies (i.e. Studies 1 and 3), a four-factor solution was

employed on the motivation scale, mainly for simplicity. The factors employed in the studies are the mean scores of the items for the detached factors (i.e. summated scales). Oblique rotation tests were also performed to compare the results. These tests performed the same results concerning the items loading on the various factors, but with different factor loadings. To assess the reliability of the scales, Cronbach's alpha tests (Cronbach, 1951) were computed for each component of the scales. Carmines and Zeller (1979) suggest that Cronbach's alpha should not be lower than 0.80 for widely used scales. The alpha values were somewhat low in some of these studies, indicating that these scales should be treated with caution. For exploratory research, however, alpha values above 0.6 are acceptable even though above 0.7 is desirable (Bagozzi, 1994; Nunally, 1978).

### ***8.2 Design: Quasi experiment***

The study focuses on stability in tourist motives and does not control for other variables, e.g. tourist satisfaction, which might affect the results. However, the study tests motives in two different post-situations (Cook and Campbell, 1979): immediately after the trip and after two months, which, to a limited extent, might be viewed as a control.

It should be equally clear, however, that stable motives are by no means a *sufficient* condition for adequate travel behaviour models (e.g. Loundsbury and Hoopes, 1988). Other factors (e.g. money, health, competence, practical opportunities) undoubtedly also play a part here, perhaps exerting even more influence on actual travel behaviour (e.g. Turnball and Uysal, 1995). To properly assess the role of travel motives, therefore, further research, including additional central influences, e.g. trip satisfaction (Oliver 1997), is needed.

### ***8.3 Design: Survey: Germans in Norway***

The study has some limitations. First, the cross-sectional study is performed at two different destinations in Norway: on ferries from Germany to the Southern part of Norway (Oslo and Kristiansand), and on different ferries to the Lofoten Islands, which might give limitations in terms of generalisations (e.g. Aaker and Day, 1986; Malhotra, 1999). The sample size in the group of tourists, who considered themselves typical German tourists to Norway, is quite small. Small does not necessarily mean non-representative, but it does mean that there is a wide margin for statistical error and thus makes it less likely that it is representative of the population under study (e.g. Hair et. al., 1998). This small size of the "typical" sub-sample of the study limits confidence in the conclusions drawn, and calls for further research to support or refute them. Further, it should be mentioned that self-perception

(Neisser, 1997) as an untypical versus typical tourist is only one of many ways to measure self-perception regarding being a tourist (e.g. Jacobsen 2000).

## **9. Future Research**

Tourism researchers have focused on the difficulties in finding unique scales for measuring tourist motivation. In one of the present studies (Study 2), eight motive scales were tested. Amongst these scales, seven had a satisfactory internal consistency, measured according to Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951). One of the scales, hedonism, was dropped from further analysis because of its low alpha levels. The fact that the hedonism scale was found to correlate with all the other scales was taken to indicate that hedonism is probably on another level than the other motive scales. Since, along with one or several other purposes, people travel to enjoy themselves and to have a good time, the hedonistic aspects of travelling should be further explored (Arnold and Reynolds, 2003).

An interesting result from one article (Paper 3) is that Charter/Sun activities had a negative effect on satisfaction with specific activities and culture experiences. The result implies that the tourists who engaged in Charter/Sun activities did not heavily participate in other types of activities. The findings seem to suggest a viable research topic for future study, i.e. to further investigate the characteristics of underlying travel segments that could be distinguished by the activity taken (e.g. Chhetri, Arrowsmith and Jackson, 2003).

However, in addition to the above-suggested method, post-hoc segmentation approaches could also be an alternative method for segmentation evaluation.

In one paper (Paper 2), the results show that tourists' participation in the decision-making process does not influence the motive-holiday type-activity relationships very much more than those not participating. Although some explanations can be offered, further research is needed to understand the complexities involved. In line with recommendations from other tourism researchers (e.g. Fodness, 1994; Gitelson Kerstetter, 1990; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Moscardo et al., 1995; Oh, Uysal and Weaver, 1995), an adequate understanding of charter tourists' motives, choices and behaviours is necessary, not only for the teaching of travel and tourism, but for professional marketing in the travel business as well.

Segmentation studies regarding all types of outbound tourists from Norway ought to be performed, as well as comparative studies for different outbound tourists from other countries. In accordance with Kozak and Rimmington (2000), national differences concerning motivation, choices and satisfaction should be further investigated. Additionally, following

tourism researchers' (e.g. Ahmed, Barber, and d'Astous, 1998; Cohen, 1972) suggestions, tourist needs and wants regarding "packaged" or "organised" products available at the destination should be performed.

Concerning charter trips from Norway, further research should be conducted on how previous trip experiences and the need for novelty affects tourists' choices of where to travel and how they categorise the destinations visited. The desire to experience novel destinations and cultures has repeatedly emerged as a key motive of travel behaviour (Cohen, 1972; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; 1981; Oh, Uysal and Weaver, 1995; Yuan and McDonald, 1990). On the one hand, tourists travel to learn and undergo new experiences (e.g. Beard and Ragheb, 1983; Fodness, 1994; Turnball and Uysal, 1995); on the other hand, there are those who prefer to visit the same destination time and again (Basala and Klenosky, 2001). Shoemaker (1994), for instance, reveals that travel motivations can be inferred from consumers' past travel experiences. Regarding the importance of personal experience on destination image formation as well as the tendency of the need to visit novel places, an individual's travel history (the frequency of a particular type of trip taken together with the need for novelty) is of interest when addressing the categorisation of a destination.

The present research supports earlier tenets and hypotheses concerning possible differences amongst choice drivers and satisfaction drivers (Henke, 1995; Oliver 1997). However, more knowledge is needed to understand the processes of consuming and producing a product (e.g. a tourist journey). In this sense, Holt's (1995) idea that consumption practice is part and parcel of the purpose and structure of action might be helpful in exploring the consumer's production of a holiday. In addition, a greater effort should be put into obtaining knowledge about the ways in which earlier experiences shape consumer behaviour, with a greater focus on the productive as well as the emotional side of the consumer's behaviour.

In line with the above argument, the influence of previous experience, word-of-mouth and marketing communication upon tourists' expectations (e.g. Parasuraman, Zeithaml and Berry, 1994) should be further explored and tested. This is also relevant in analysing the influence on and the relationship between expectations and evaluations of actual experiences (Milman and Pizam, 1995).

This study has tested the consistency in expressing pre-purchase motives in different purchase situations. Even though stable motives are a necessary condition for the profitable use of motives in models for travel behaviour, they alone are not a sufficient condition for elaborating adequate models: other elements involved in the validity and reliability of tourist

motives need to be further tested (Crawford, Godbey and Crouter, 1988; Loundsbury and Hoopes, 1988; Nunnally, 1978).

To strengthen the internal validity of the findings, experiments where variables might be manipulated should be performed (Cook and Campbell, 1979).

## REFERENCES

- Aaker, D.A. and G.S. Day (1986) *Marketing Research*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ahmed, S.A., M. Barber and A. d'Astous (1998). Segmentation of the Nordic Winter Sun Seekers Market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 7(1): 39-63.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), December: 179-211.
- Ajzen, I. and M. Fishbein. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Anderson, E., C. Fornell and D. Lehmann (1994). Customer Satisfaction, Market Share and Profitability: Findings from Sweden. *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 53-66.
- Argyle, M. (1996). *The Social Psychology of Leisure*. London: Penguin Group.
- Arkes, H.R. and K.R. Hammond (1986). *Judgement and Decision Making: An Interdisciplinary Reader*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnolds, M.J. and K.E. Reynolds (2003) Hedonic Shopping Motivations. *Journal of Retailing*, 79: 77-95.
- Assael, H. (1984). *Consumer Behaviour and Marketing Action*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Boston, Mass.: Kent Publishing Company.
- Baloglu, S. (1997). The Relationship between Destination Images and Sociodemographic and Trip Characteristics of International Travelers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 3(3): 221-233.
- Baloglu, S. and K. McCleary (1999). A Model of Destination Image Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26, 868-897.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioural Change. *Psychological Review*. 84: 191-215.
- Bandura, Albert (1986). The self and mechanisms of agency. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self*. Vol. 1. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1994). *Measuring in Marketing Research: Basic Principles of Questionnaire Design, in Principles of Marketing*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bagozzi, R.P. (1989). An Investigation of the Role of Affective and Moral Evaluations in the Purposive Behaviour Model of Attitude; *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 28: 97-113.

- Bagozzi, R.P. and U.M. Dholakia (1999). Antecedents and Purchase Consequences of Customer Participation in Small Group Brand Communities. *Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23(1): 45-61.
- Barsky, J.D. (1992). Customer satisfaction in the hotel industry: Meaning and measurement. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 16(1), 51-73.
- Basala, S.L. and D.B. Klenosky (2001) Travel-Style Preferences for Visiting a Novel Destination: A Conjoint Investigation across the Novelty-Familiarity Continuum. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40 (November): 172-182.
- Beard J.G. and M.G. Ragheb (1983). Measuring Leisure Motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Quarter: 219-228.
- Beeho, A.J. and R.C. Prentice (1997). Conceptualizing the Experiences of Heritage Tourists: A Case Study of New Lanark World Heritage Village. *Tourism Management*, 18(2), 75-87.
- Berli, A. and J.D. Martin (2004). Tourists' Characteristics and the Perceived Image of Tourist Destinations: A Quantitative Analysis – A Case Study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management*, 25: 623-636.
- Belk R. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 5. September: 139-168.
- Bem, D.J. (1976). Self-perception: An Alternative Interpretation of Cognitive Dissonance Phenomena. *Psychological Review*, 74: 183-200.
- Bem, D.J. (1972). *Self-Perception Theory*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Bettman, J.R., E.J. Johnson and J.W. Payne (1990). A Componential Analysis of Cognitive Effort in Choice. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 45: 111-139.
- Bianchi, M. (1998) *The Active Consumer. Novelty and Surprise in Consumer Choice*. London: Routledge.
- Bieger, T. and C. Laesser (2002). Market Segmentation by Motivation: The Case of Switzerland, *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1): 68 – 76.
- Brady, M.K., J.J. Croning and R.R. Brand (2002). Performance-Only Measurement of Service Quality: A Replication and Extension, *Journal of Business Research*, 55: 17-31.
- Buhalis, D. (2000) Marketing the Competitive Destination of the Future, *Tourism Management*, 21: 97-116.

- Burke, K. (1969). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Campbell, J.P. and R.D. Pritchard (1976). Motivation Theory in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook for Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Pp. 60-130. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Carmines, E.G. and R.A. Zeller (1979). *Reliability and Validity Assessments*. Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
- Carroll, J.S. and E.J. Johnson (1990). *Decision Research: A Field Guide*. Newbury Park: Saga Publications.
- Cha, S., K. McCleary and M. Uysal (1995). Travel Motivation of Japanese Overseas Travellers. A Factor-Cluster Approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(3), 33-39.
- Chen, J.S. (2003). Market Segmentation by Travelers' Sentiments. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 178-193.
- Chen, J.S. and D. Gursoy (2001). An Investigation of Tourists' Destination Loyalty and Preferences. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(2), 79-85.
- Chhetri, P., A. Arrowsmith and M. Jackson (2003). Determining Hiking Experience in Nature Based Tourist Destinations. *Tourism Management*. 25(1), 31-43.
- Chon, K.S. (1992). The Role of Destination Image in Tourism: An Extension. *The Tourist Review*, 2, 2-7.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a Sociology of International Tourism. *Social Research*, 39: 164-182.
- Cook, T.D. and D.T. Campbell (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation. Design & Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Crandall, R. (1980). Motivation for Leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, First Quarter.
- Crawford, D.E., G. Godbey and A.C. Crouter (1986). The Stability of Leisure Preferences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 18(2), 96-115.
- Crompton, J.L. (1979). Motivation for Pleasure Vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6: 408-424.
- Crompton, J.L. and P.K. Ankomah (1993). Choice Set Propositions in Destination Decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20: 461-476.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297-334.



- Cronin, J.J. and S.A. Taylor (1992). Measuring Service Quality: A Reexamination and Extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56: 55-68.
- Culler, J. (1981). Semiotics of Tourism. *American Journal of Semiotics* 1&2: 127-140. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(3): 461-476.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, Ego-Enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4: 184-194.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourist Motivation: An Appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8 (2): 187-194.
- Dann, G. (1995). A Socio-Linguistic Approach Towards Changing Tourist Imagery. In *Change in Tourism. People, Places, Processes*. R. Butler and D. Pearce, Eds., pp. 114-136. London: Routledge.
- Dellaert, B., M. Prodigalidad and J. Louviere (1991). Using Conjoint Analysis to Study Family Travel Preference Structures: A Comparison of Day Trips and One-Week Holidays. *Tourism Analysis*, 2, 67-75.
- Denstadli, J.M. (2002). *Den Nasjonale Reisevaneundersøkelsen. Ferie- og Fritidsreiser*. [The National Survey amongst Norwegian Tourists]. TØI Report No. 614/2002.
- Deci, E.L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*, New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E.L. and R.M. Ryan (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- Dunn-Ross, E.I. and S.E. Iso-Ahola (1991). Sightseeing Tourists' Motivation and Satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18, 430-448.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eagly, A.H. and S. Chaiken (1998). Attitude Structure and Function. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske and G. Lindzey, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. Vol. 1. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Embacher E. and F. Buttle (1989). A Repertory Grid Analysis of Austria's Image as a Summer Vacation Destination. *Journal of Travel Research* (Winter): 3-7.
- Engel, J.F., R.D. Blackwell and P. Miniard (1986). *Consumer Behaviour*. 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. Chicago: The Dryden Press.
- Engel, J.F., D.J. Kollat and R.D. Blackwell (1968). *Consumer Behaviour*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

- Fazio, R.H., M.P. Zanna and J.C. Cooper (1977). Dissonance and Self-Perception: An Integrative View of Each Theory's Proper Domain of Application. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 13 (5): 464-479.
- Feather, N.T. (1982). Attitudes and Selective Recall. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12: 310-319.
- Fesenmaier, D.R. and J.M. Jeng (2000). Assessing Structure in the Pleasure Trip Planning Process. *Tourism Analysis*, 5: 13-27.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance Processes*. Standford, CA: Standford University Press.
- Fishbein, M. and I. Ajzen (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behaviour: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring Tourist Motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3): 555-581.
- Fornell, C. (1992). A National Customer Satisfaction Barometer: The Swedish Experience. *Journal of Marketing*, 56: 6-21.
- Fornell, C., M.D. Johnson, E.W. Anderson, J. Cha and B.E. Bryant (1996). The American Customer Satisfaction Index. Nature, Purpose and Findings. *Journal of Marketing*, 60: 7-18.
- Fyans, L.J., B.K. Farideh, S. Martin and L. Maehr (1981). The Effects of Evaluation Conditions on "Continuing Motivation" Study of the Cultural, Personological and Situational Antecedents of a Motivational Pattern. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 5(1): 1-22
- Flynn, L.R. and R.E. Goldsmith (1999). A Short, Reliable Measure of Subjective Knowledge. *Journal of Business Research*, 46(1): 57-66.
- Gardial, S.F., D.S. Clemonts, R.B. Woodroff, D.W. Shumann and M.J. Burns (1994). Comparing Consumers' Recall of Prepurchase and Postpurchase Evaluation Experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24 (March): 109-121.
- Gartner, W. (1993). Image Formation Process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 2(2/3), 191-215.
- Gartner, W. and J. Hunt (1987). An Analysis of State Image Change over a Twelve-Year Period. *Journal of Travel Research*, 26 (2): 15-19.
- Geen, R.G., W.W. Beatty and R.M. Arkin (1984). *Human Motivation. Physiological, Behavioural, and Social Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

- Gilovich, T., D. Griffin and D. Kahneman (2002). *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive Judgement*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gitelson, R.J. and Kerstetter, D.L. (1990). The Relationship Between Sociodemographic Variables, Benefits Sought and Subsequent Vacation Behaviour: A Case Study. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(Winter): 24-29.
- Gotlieb, A. (1982). Americans' Vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9 (1): 165-187.
- Gould, G. (1995). Why is Customer Loyalty that Counts (and how to measure it). *Managing Service Quality*, 5(1): 15-19.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism Motivation and Expectation Formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2): 283-304.
- Gray, J.P. (1970). *International Travel – International Trade*. Lexington Heath: Lexington Books.
- Gunn, C.A. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Environments*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas.
- Gunn, C.A. (1989). *Tourism Planning*. 2<sup>nd</sup>.Ed. New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Hair, J.F., R.E. Anderson, R.L. Tatham and W.C. Black (1998). 5<sup>th</sup> Ed. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hallowell, R. (1996). The Relationship of Customer Satisfaction. Customer Loyalty, Profitability: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Service Industry*.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Longman Press.
- Haukeland, J.V. (1993). *Den Norske Feriedrømmen* [The Norwegian Holiday Dream]. (TØI Report No. 194). Oslo: The Institute of Transport Economics.
- Heckhausen, H (1989). *Motivation und Handeln [Motivation and Behaviour]*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Berlin: Springer.
- Henke, L.L. (1995). A Longitudinal Analysis of the Ad Agency-Client Relationship Predictors of an Agency Switch. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 35(March/April): 24-30. In R.L. Oliver (1997), *Satisfaction. A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. and M.H. Bond (1984). Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions. An Independent Validation Using Rokeach's Value Survey. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 15 (4): 417-433.

- Holt, D.B. (1995). How Consumers Consume: A Typology of Consumption Practices. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 22. (June): 1-16.
- Houston, M.J. and M.L. Rothschild (1978). Conceptual and Methodological Perspectives in Involvement. In S. Jain, Ed., *Research Frontiers in Marketing: Dialogs and Directions*. American Marketing Associations, Chicago.
- Howard, J.A. (1994). *Buyer Behaviour in Marketing Strategy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Howard, J.A. and J.N. Shet (1969). *The Theory of Buyer Behaviour*. New York: John Wiley.
- Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1980). *The Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation*. William. Dubuque: C. Brown Company.
- Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1983). Towards a Social Psychology of Recreational Travel. *Leisure Studies*, 2: 45-56.
- Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1989). Motivation for Leisure. In E.L. Jackson and T.L. Burton (Eds.), *Understanding Leisure and Recreation: Mapping the Past, Charting the Future*. USA: Venture Publishing. Pp. 247-279.
- Jacobsen, J.K.S. (2000). Anti-Tourist Attitudes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27 (2): 284-300.
- Jacobsen, J.K.S. and G. Dann (2003). Images of the Lofoten Islands. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 3 (1): 24-47.
- Jafari, J. and J.R.B. Ritchie (1981). Towards a Framework for Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4): 390 -407.
- Jacoby, J. and R.W. Chestnut (1978). *Brand Loyalty: Measurement and Management*. Wiley, New York.
- Jacoby, J. and D.B. Kyner (1973). Brand Loyalty vs. repeat Purchasing Behaviour. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 10(1); 1-9.
- Jamrozy, U. and M. Uysal (1994). Travel Motivation Variation of Overseas German Visitors. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 6(3/4): 135-160
- Jang, S.C., A.M. Morrison and J.T. O'Leary (2002). Benefit Segmentation of Japanese Pleasure Travelers to the USA and Canada Selecting Target Markets Based on the Profitability and Risk of Individual Market Segments. *Tourism Management*, 23, 367-378.
- Johns, N. and S. Gyimòthy (2002). Market Segmentation and the Prediction of Tourist Behaviour: The Case of Bornholm, Denmark. *Journal of Travel research*, 40(February): 316-327.

- Johnson, B.T. and A.H. Eagly (1989). The Effects of Involvement on Persuasion: A Meta Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106: 290-314.
- Johnson, M.D. (1998). *Customer Orientation and Market Action*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Johnson, M.D. and C. Fornell (1991). A Framework for Comparing Customer Satisfaction across Individuals and Product Categories. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 128-140.
- Johnson, M.D., E.W. Anderson and C. Fornell (1995). Rational and Adaptive Performance Expectations in a Customer Satisfaction Framework. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21, 267-286.
- Johnson, M.D., A. Gustavson, T.W. Andreassen, L. Lervik and J. Cha (2001). The Evolution of and Future of National Customer Satisfaction Index Models. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 22(2): 217-245.
- Jones, E.E. and T.S. Pittman (1982). Toward a General Theory of Strategic Self Presentation. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological Perspectives on the Self*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation Theory in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In M.D. Multivariate Software Inc.
- Kantona, G. (1960). *Psychological Studies of the American Economy*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Kelly J.R. (1990). *Leisure*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Kim, C. (1999). Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1): 201-204.
- Kleiven, J. (1998a). *En Vanskelig Forenkling - Den Komplekse Norske Feriedrømmen* [A Difficult Simplification: The Complex Norwegian Holiday Dream]. (Research Report No. 34/1998). Lillehammer: Lillehammer College.
- Kleiven, J. (1998b). *Skalaer for Måling av Aktivitets- og Motivmønstre i en Norsk Lokalbefolknings Ferie og Fritid*. [Scales for Measuring Activity and Motive Patterns in the Holiday and Leisure time of a Norwegian Local Population] Working Paper No. 77/1988. Lillehammer: Lillehammer College.
- Kleiven, J. (1999). *Leisure Motives as Predictors of Activities: The Lillehammer Scales in a National Survey*. Hil Report No. 49/1999. Lillehammer: Lillehammer College.
- Kleiven, J. (2006). Measuring Leisure and Travel Motives in Norway – Replicating and Supplementing the Leisure Motivation Scales. *Tourism Analysis*, 2(10): 109-122.

- Kleiven, J., H. Holmengen and J.K.S. Jacobsen (1991). *Solturisten V: En sammenligning av vinterturisme til fire sydlige reisemål* [The Sun Tourist V: A Comparison of Winter Tourism in Four Southern Destinations]. (Research Report No. 73/1991). Lillehammer: Lillehammer College.
- Koenig, L.J. (1997). Depression and the Cultural Context of the Self-Serving Bias. In U. Neisser and D.A. Jopling (Eds.), *The Conceptual Self in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kozak, M. and M. Rimmington (2000). Tourist Satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an Off-Season Holiday Destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38 (February), 260-269.
- Krippendorf, J. (1987). *The Holiday Makers*. London: Heinemann.
- Lachman, R., J.L. Lachman and E.C. Butterfield (1979). *Cognitive Psychology and Information Processing*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum. Management, 23, 367-378
- Lam, T. and C.H.C. Hsu (2006). Predicting Behavioural Intention of Choosing a Travel Destination. *Tourism Management*, 27: 589-599.
- Lawrence, P.R. and N. Nohria (2002). *Driven: How Human Nature Shapes our Choices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Laws, E. (1995). *Tourist Destination Management. Issues, Analysis and Policies*, London: Routledge.
- Lawson, R. (1991). Patterns of Tourist Expenditure and Types of Vacation across the Family Life Cycle. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29, 12-18.
- Leary, M.R. and J.P. Tangney (2003). *Handbook of Self and Identity*. (Eds). New York: Guildford Press.
- Lee, G., J.T. O'Leary, S.H. Lee and A. Morrison (2002). Comparison and Contrast of Push and Pull Motivational Effects on Trip Behaviour: An Application of a Multinomial Logistic Regression Model. *Tourism Analysis*, 7, 89-104
- Leiper, N. (1990). Tourist Attraction Systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17: 367-384.
- Lin, Y., H.-Y. Su and S. Chien (2005). A Knowledge-Enabled Procedure for Customer Relationship Management. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29 (June).
- Locke, E.A. and G.P. Latham (1984). The Determinants of Goal Commitment. *Academy of Management Review*, 14: 23-29.
- Loundsbury, J.W. and L.L. Hoopes (1988). Five-Year Stability of Leisure Activity and Motivation Factors. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(2), 118-134.

- MacKay, K. and J. Crompton (1990). Measuring the Quality of Recreation Services. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 8(3), 47-56.
- Malhotra, N.K. (1999). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. 3ed. London: Prentice Hall.
- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). From Motivation to Actual Travel. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(3): 399-419.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50: 370-396.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper.
- Mathieson A. and G. Wall (1982). *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. London: Longman.
- Mayo, E. and L. Jarvis (1981). *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling of Travel Services*. Boston: Cobe Publishing.
- McClelland, D. (1965). Achievement and Entrepreneurship: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. April: 389-392. In John C. Mowen (Ed.), *Consumer Behaviour*. USA: Prentice-Hall.
- McGehee, N.G., L. Loker-Murphy, M. Uysal and L.L. Murphy (1996). The Australian International Pleasure Travel Market: Motivations from a Gendered Perspective. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 7 (1): 33- 45.
- McIntosh, R.W. and C.R. Goeldner (1990). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. Wiley: New York.
- Milman, A. and A. Pizam (1989). The Role of Awareness and Familiarity with a Destination: The Central Florida Case. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33 (3): 21-27.
- Mittal, B. (1988). The Role of Affective Choice Mode in the Consumer Purchase of Expressive Products. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 9: 499-524.
- Mowen, J.C. (1995). *Consumer Behaviour*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Moscardo, G., A.M. Morrison, P.L. Pearce, C. Lang and J.T. O'Leary (1995). Understanding Vacation Destination Choice through Travel Motivation and Activities. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*. Vol. 2(2): 109-122.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers, P.B. and L.W. Moncrief (1978). Differential Leisure Travel Decision-Making between Spouses. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 2-6.
- Neisser, U. (1997). Concepts and Self-Concepts. In U. Neisser and D.A. Jopling. Eds., *The Conceptual Self in Context*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Nicosia, F.M. (1966). *Consumer Decision Process: Marketing and Advertising Implications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oh, H., M. Uysal and P. Weaver (1995). Product Bundles and Market Segments Based on Travel Motivations: A Canonical Correlation Approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14(2): 123-137.
- Oliver R.L. (1997). *Satisfaction. A Behavioural Perspective on the Consumer*. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Oliver, R.L. and J.E. Swan (1989). Consumer Perception of Interpersonal Equity and Satisfaction in Transactions: A Field Survey Approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 53: 21-35.
- Ottesen, O. (2001). *Marketing Communication Management*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Parasuraman, A., V.A. Zeithaml and L.L. Berry (1994) Alternative Scales for Measuring Service Quality: A Comparative Assessment Based on Psychometric and Diagnostic Criteria, 70(3): 201-230.
- Pearce, P.L. (1988). *The Ulysses Factor: Evaluating Visitors in Tourist Settings*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Pearce, P.L. (1993). Introduction. In D.G. Pearce and R.W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*, Routledge, London, pp. 1-8.
- Pearce, P.L. (1995). Pleasure Travel Motivation. In R.W. McIntosh, C.R. Goeldner and J.R.B. Ritchie (Eds.), *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*. Pp. 167-190. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Peter, P. J. and J. C. Olson (1996). *Consumer Behaviour*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Chicago: Irwin.
- Petrick, J.F. (2004). Are Loyal Visitors Desired Visitors? *Tourism Management*, 25(4): 463-470.
- Pittman, T.S. (1998). Motivation. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske and G. Lindzey, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., Vol. 1. *The Handbook of Social Psychology*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Pizam, A. (1994). Monitoring Customer Satisfaction. In B. David and A. Lockwood. (Eds.), *Food and Beverage Management: A Selection of Readings*. Pp. 231-247). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Pizam, A., Y. Neuman and A. Reichel (1979). Tourist Satisfaction: Uses and Misuses. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6: 96-107.
- Plog, S.C. (1974). Why Destination Areas Rise and Fall in Popularity. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 14(4): 55-58.



- Pratkanis, A., S.J. Breckler and A.G. Greenwald (1989). *Attitude Structure and Function*. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.
- Quellette, J.A. and W. Wood (1998). Habit and Intention in Everyday Life: The Multiple Processes by which Past Behaviour Predicts Future Behaviour. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(1): 54-74.
- Rapoport, R. and R.N. Rapoport (1975). *Leisure and the Family Life Cycle*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Reicced, F.F. (1996). *The Loyalty Effect: The Hidden Force Behind Growth, Profits, and Lasting Value*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Ringdal, K. (2001). *Enhet og Mangfold*. [Unit and Diversity]. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Ritchie, J.R. and P. Filiatrault (1980). Family Decision-Making. A Replication and Extension. *Journal of Travel Research*, 18(4), 3-4.
- Roch, E., C.B. Mervis, W.D. Gray, D.M. Johnson and P. Boyes-Braem (1976). *Cognitive Psychology*, July, Pp. 382-439.
- Rosenthal, R. (1994). Interpersonal Expectancy Effects: A 30-year Perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 3: 176-179.
- Ross, G. (1993). Destination Evaluation and Vacation Preferences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 477-489.
- Ross, M. and M. Conway (1986). Remembering one's Own Past: The Construction of Personal Histories. In R.M. Sorrentino & E.T. Higgins (Eds.), *The Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behaviour*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Runyon, K.E. (1980). *Consumer Behaviour and the Practice of Marketing*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Ryan, C. (1993). Correlation between Clusters based on the Ragheb and Beard Leisure Motivation Scale and the Attributes of Desired Holiday Locations. In *Proceedings of Third International Conference of the Leisure Studies Associations*. UK. Loughborough University.
- Ryan, C. (1994). *Reaching Tourist Satisfaction*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ryan, C. and I. Glendon (1998). Application of Leisure Motivation Scale to Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1): 169-184.
- Sabini, J. (1995). *Social Psychology*. New York: Norton. Prentice Hall.
- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-Behavioural Relations: A Conceptual and Empirical Review. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 12: 1-36.

- Shoemaker, S. (1994). Segmenting the U.S. Travel Market According to Benefits Realized. *Journal of Travel Research*, Winter: 8-21.
- Solomon, M.R. (1999). *Consumer Behaviour*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Svenson, O. (2005). Motivation, Decision Theory and Human Decision Making. In S. Kreitler & A. Renninger (Eds.), *Cognition and Motivation: Forging an Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. and J.C. Turner (1986). Social Identity of Group Behaviour. In S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., pp. 7-24) Chicago: NelsonHall.
- Tinsley, H.E.A. (1984). The Psychological Benefits of Leisure Counselling. *Society and Leisure*, 7: 125-140.
- Thornton, P.R., G. Shaw and A.M. Williams (1997). Tourist Group Holiday Decision-making and Behaviour: The Influence of Children. *Tourism Management*, 18(5), 287-297.
- Turnball, D.R. and M.S. Uysal (1995). An Exploratory Study of German Visitors to the Caribbean: Push and Pull Motivation. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 4(2), 85-92.
- UNSTAT and WTO (1994). *United Nations and World Tourism Organization, Recommendations on Tourism Statistics*, United Nations Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis, New York, 1994: 7.
- Uysal, M. and C. Juowski (1993). An Empirical Testing of the Push and Pull Factors of Tourist Motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4): 844-846.
- Wang, K.C., A.T. Hsieh, Y.C. Yeh and Y.C. Tsai (2004). Who is the decision-maker: the Parents or the Child in Group Package Tours? *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 183-194.
- Wigfield, A. and J. Eccles (2000). Expectancy-Value Theory of Achievement Motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25: 68-81.
- Wong, S. and E. Lau (2001). Understanding the Behaviour of Hong Kong Chinese Tourists on Group Tour Packages. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1): 57-67.
- World Tourism Organisation (WTO) (1997). *Compendium and Tourism Statistics 1991 - 1995*. 17<sup>th</sup> Ed., Madrid.
- World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2006). <http://www.wttc.org>.
- Yuan, S. and C. McDonald (1990). Motivational Determinants of International Pleasure Time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(Fall): 42-44.

- Zajonc, R.B. (1980). Feeling and Thinking, Preferences Needs no Inferences. *American Psychologist*, 35: 151-175.
- Zalatan, A. (1998). Wives' Involvement in Tourism Decision Processes. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25 (4): 890-903.



## **LIST OF TABLES**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Table 1: Definitions of motivation and tourist motivation.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table 2: Approaches to study Tourist Motivation.</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 3: Examples of Motivation Construction applied in tourist research.</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Table 4: A formalised organisation of the hypotheses based on the three research objectives.</b>	<b>29</b>

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

- 1. Overview of the Designs and Research Questions/  
Hypotheses of the Thesis**
- 2. Questionnaire 1: Besucherumfrage 1998 – German Tourists  
in Norway 1998**
- 3. Questionnaire 2: Test-Retest 2002 and 2003 –  
Norwegian Outbound Tourists**
- 4. Questionnaire 3: Outbound charter tourists from Norway 2002**

