The relationship between motive and in-destination behaviour

Abstract

While a great deal of research has examined the relationship between motive and behaviour, virtually none has explored the relationship between travel motives and in-destination behavior. Motive research focuses on such issues as destination choice and loyalty, while in-destination behavior tends to track visitor movements without sufficient investigation into motives. This study examined the link between motive and behaviour in Bali. It is framed within Pearce's Travel Career Pattern motive model. Eight motive based segments were identified. Differences were noted in intensity of behaviour in the vast majority of the most popular activities undertaken or attractions visited. Management implications are identified.

Keywords: Travel career pattern; Motive; in-destination behaviour

Introduction

A vast array of research has been undertaken examining the impact of motives on tourist behaviour, framed largely within Dann's (1977) push-pull paradigm. Most of this research, though, has tended to focus on macro issues such as how motive influences destination choice (Dolnicar and Fluker 2003; Heitman 2011; Hsu, Cai, Li 2010; Josiam, Smeaton and Clements 1999). Other studies have examined the link between motive and loyalty (Antón, Camarero and Laguna-García 2017; Devesa, Laguna, Palacios 2010), experience (Apostolopoulou and Papadimitriou 2015; Kong and Chang 2016) or the link with pursuing similar behaviours at home as in the destination (Lee, Scott and Packer 2015, Smith Pitts and Litvin 2012).

Somewhat ironically, little or no research has examined the relationship between motive and in-destination behaviour. Instead, most in-destination behaviour studies have involved tracking tourist movements (Khairi et al., 2019; McKercher et al., 2012; Zoltan & Masiero, 2012), with only a select few attempting to differentiate movements by segment (McKercher et al., 2019). Indeed, more empirical and conceptual work has been developed modelling tourist movements within a destination than understanding the drivers behind such

behaviours (Lew & McKercher, 2006). In addition, the implied link through the flawed method (McKercher & Chan, 2005) of documenting behaviour and then making the false assumption that participation in specific activities is a valid proxy to identify motive based special interest market segments. Not only does this method over-estimate the size of the special interest market, it also produces dangerous result.

Yet, understanding such a link is vital to understanding tourist behaviour for what motivates travel should influence what people do in a destination. A more sophisticated approach to analysing the link between motive and behaviour is needed for it may be able to unpack subtle differences in behaviour patterns, and in doing so enable destination management organisations to better target their markets. Ryan (2003) argues for such a link, although it is not always possible to discern one from the other, for the same behaviour may be attributed to different motives. This issue is especially prescient in multi-product destinations where the market is heterogeneous. Here it is possible to segment the market by motive. While some tourists may participate in similar activities regardless of their underlying motives for no other reason than tourists are very active when they travel (Kantanen & Tikkanen, 2006), differences should be observed in intensity of participation, especially among the most popular attractions or activities that may reflect best different motives.

This paper presents the findings of a study of the activities pursed by tourists to Bali, Indonesia. The objectives of the study are manifold. First, it seeks to determine whether different motive based segments are drawn to this destination. Second, it seeks to determine if identifiable differences are noted in the behaviour patterns of each segment and if these patterns can be related to the motives identified. Finally, it seeks to draw primarily practical based implications, while adding to the theory of travel careers. The study is framed conceptually within Pearce and Lee's (2005, 2011) Travel Career Pattern (TCP) model that appreciates travel is influenced by a multitude of motives and that the balance between the se motives will.

Literature review - travel career pattern

Over the years, a number of increasingly sophisticated models has been developed to understand why people travel. As Pearce (2005) mentioned, the task is difficult for the underlying reasons to travel are often covert in that they reflect individual's private needs and wants. An additional challenge in developing motivation theory was highlighted by Pearce (201) who stated “good motivation theory [thus] needs to be multi-motive, dynamic, measurable and relatively easy to communicate” (pg. 43).

Much of the early work conflated motives with activities pursued and trip purpose (see Lundberg, 1972), or by arguing that a person's underlying psychological profile influenced their entire travel careers (Plog, 1974). It was not until the late 1970s and early 1980s that a significant breakthrough in motive research occurred by such scholars as Dann (1977), Crompton (1979) & Iso-Ahola (1982). In many ways Dann's (1977) push-pull model is the grandfather of most motivational research (Prayag & Ryan, 2011; Uysal et al., 2008). Essentially, he argued that people are pushed to travel for one of two reasons, anomie or ego enhancement and that various destination attributes, or pull factors can satisfy these needs. Crompton's (1979) model built on this idea by identifying seven different push factors, even though disequilibrium represents the initial impetus to travel. Importantly, he realised that the motives are not exclusive and instead, operate in tandem or in combination with other motives. Iso-Ahola (1982) argued people pursue leisure and by extension travel as a potential satisfaction-producer for two main reasons: to provide certain intrinsic rewards such as feelings of mastery and competence and to leave the routine environment behind (pg. 258).

Philip Pearce began exploring the idea of travel motives more than 30 years ago. After many iterations, the current Travel Career Pattern (TCP) model was developed. As Pearce (2005) states “that travel career pattern approach can be conceptually illustrated as having three layers of travel motivation consisting of 14 motives in total where each layer consists of different travel motives” (pg. 79). The most recent version reduced the number of metrics to two per factor (Oktadiana et al., 2017). The core layer shows the most important common motives of novelty, escape/relaxation, and enhancing relationships. These central motivation factors can be understood as the “backbone” or “skeleton” of all travel motivation and travel career patterns (Pearce & Lee, 2005). The middle layer includes moderately important motives that change from inner directed motives to externally oriented ones as one's travel career expands (Pearce, 2005, p. 79). These motives include security and relationships, host site involvement, nature, self or personal development and self actualisation. The outer layer consists of common and stable motives and includes autonomy, isolation, nostalgia seeking, stimulation and recognition.

The key feature of the model is that all motives potentially play a role in the travel decision making process, but the weight placed on each motive or each motive tier varies by both trip and level of travel experience. Empirical testing has validated the model revealing various levels of motives within each segment (Song & Bae, 2018). Ward (2014), for example found different segments of the seniors market had multiple motives and interests which influenced their destination choice as well as frequency of travel. Chen et al. (2014) identified four backpacker segments again using different weightings of the motives, while Zhang and Peng (2014) concluded that using the TCP model could aid in the design of packages for Chinese tourists visiting Cairns in far north Queensland, Australia.

In addition, it has been suggested that the Travel Career Pattern framework can be an effective means to segment tourists (Song and Bae (2018) although it has been tested rarely. Intuitively, though, such a suggestion makes sense for understanding motives can explain consumption patterns better and help understand satisfaction (Frochot & Morrison, 2000; Moscardo et al., 2001). This framework offers the most comprehensive understanding of motives developed to date by identifying 14 major motive categories and grouping them into core, middle and outer tiers. In doing so, it is possible to segment the market precisely.

Bali

Bali is Indonesia is the locus for this study. It is Indonesia's premier tourism destination, with an estimated six million foreign tourists a year visit who travel primarily for pleasure (BHA, 2020; Subadra 2019). The major foreign markets in 2018 were Europe (23% share), China (22% share) Australia/New Zealand (21% share), followed by the Americas (6% share), India (6% share) and Japan (4% share) (BHA 2020). Most Chinese tourists come as part of an organised package, while most others travel independently. This arrival figure is augmented by almost 10 million domestic tourists, bringing total visitation levels of 15.8 million in 2018 (Subadra, Sytapa, Artana, Yuni, and Sudiarta 2019). It is a well developed destination with more than 50,000 rooms of all star ratings available for the consumer (Yonasari 2018).

It was positioned as a typical sun, sand and sea resort, but has worked hard to broaden its market base. Today, the Bali Tourism Board promotes a number of experiences, including resort and beach activities, land and water-based adventure, wellness tourism, cultural tourism, nature-based tourism and events.

Method

The study sought to identify the relationship between motives and behaviours among free and independent, English speaking foreign tourists in Bali. Please note, most tourists to Bali are Westerners and most Europeans who visit have some English language skills. Moreover, the students who were hired to conduct the research had English language skills but not other non-Indonesian language skills. Thus, the decision to interview in English was based on pragmatic reasons. In addition, Chinese tourists which constitute a large market, generally come in packaged group tours where they are escorted around the island. Thus, they do not have freedom of choice to select where they go. Instead their movements are tightly controlled by the tour guide. Since we wanted to look at the relationship between motive and (free) movement, the FIT market was targeted, which excluded most Chinese tourists.

To this end, a survey was developed by the study team and administered by senior year students from the Sekola Tinggi Pariwisata Bali (hereinafter called the STP Bali).

Interviewers were trained by staff from STP Bali who also supervised the data collection activities. The surveys were administered between September and November 2019. A convenience sampling approach was adopted with data collected at various locales throughout Bali, including the international airport and major touristic areas. Convenience sampling was deemed most appropriate given that the population of tourists was unknown and that, therefore, it would have been impossible to adopt a random or quasi-random sampling process.

The survey instrument was initially tested, developed, validated and administered in Hong Kong for a study examining whether attractions attract tourists to this destination. It was modified for the unique features of Bali by changing the list of attractions to reflect Bali's attractions' mix. The instrument itself was divided into four parts. The first part documented basic trip information, including length of stay, past visits, whether Bali was the main or only destination, trip purpose and the like. The last section gathered respondents' demographic information.

The second section measured motives using a modified version of Pearce's Travel Career Pattern validated in Indonesia (Oktadiana et al., 2017). The TCP model tests core, middle and outer layer motives. This section began with an introduction stating “people travel for a variety of reasons. Sometimes they travel for one specific reason, other times it is for a combination of reasons.” Respondents were then asked to rate 19 motive statements on a five point Likert scale from not being important to being extremely important. A follow-up laddering question than asked “from the above list of motives, can you identify up to three that played the most important role in your decision to visit Bali? If no motives dominate, then please tick the box for no specific reason." This question was asked in order to determine which motive, and ultimately which tier or combination of the TCP tiers of motives played the most influential role in the visit decision. Responses to this question were used as the basis for two-step cluster analysis to divide the sample into motive-based segments.

The third section provided a list of the 36 most common attractions and activities available in Bali and asked respondents to select those they participated in during their visit. ‘Other’ categories were also added in case people participated in activities not on the list. Where generic attractions were identified identified (for example beaches, or temples), respondents

were asked to name specific places if they could remember them. Few did. This list was developed in consultation with the study team and also by reviewing a large number of brochures, tourist maps and other promotional collateral. As with the questions on motives, respondents were asked to name up to four attractions or activities that played a role in whole or in part in their decision to visit Bali.

Over 800 fully and partially completed surveys were returned. Post survey quality checks and data cleaning yielded a valid sample of 659 useable questionnaires. Data were coded and entered onto an SPSS spreadsheet. Cluster analysis was used to segment the sample, while descriptive analyses were undertaken to compare and contrast the activities undertaken by each segment. How the sample was segmented is discussed in greater detail in the next section of the paper.

As with all studies, the limitations of this study must be recognised. To begin, the use of a convenience sample is not ideal but represented the most practical method to gather a sufficiently large sample to facilitate analysis. As such, the segments identified are valid, but it is not possible to discuss if they are representative of the entire population of tourists to Bali. Second, the use of an English only survey was sufficient to capture respondents from Australia and New Zealand, throughout Europe, the Americas and English speaking Asian source markets. But, tourists from significant non-English speaking Asian markets of Japan and Mainland China were largely excluded. Finally, the use of a large number of data collectors meant that some inconsistencies in recording of data were noted, resulting in the exclusion of a large number of questionnaires in the quality checking process. While the final sample is large, data cleaning excluded more than 150 problematic surveys where either incomplete data were recorded or data were recorded in an inconsistent manner as to raise questions about the reliability of the reporting.

Findings

The findings section is divided into two parts. The first part describes the eight segments that emerged from cluster analysis, while the second section compares and contrasts behaviour among the segments.

Identifying Motive based segments

Two step cluster analysis was undertaken to identify motive based segments. Respondents were asked to identify which motives, if any, played a key role in their decision to visit Bali. These responses were then coded according to the TCP motive categories and entered onto the spreadsheet using a binary code (played a role/did not play a role). For example, 297 respondents identified having fun or experiencing something different as one or more key motives in their decision to visit. Both these statements reflect the TCP core motive of 'Novelty'. In total, eight different TCP motive categories were identified by cluster analysis. These segments reflected either a single dominant tier of the TCP or clusters of tiers. The segments include: core grouping of Novelty Escape/Relaxation (resting and relaxing or being away from routine) and Strengthening relationships (doing things with family and friends); a mix of core and middle tier motives of Nature escape and Cultural novelty (experiencing different culture or meeting new and different people); middle level motives as reflected in Self development; and two groups influenced strongly by outer layer motives, including Stimulation (feeling excitement or having daring/adventuresome experiences), and Isolation (experiencing peace and calm or being away from crowds of people). In addition, 158 people said no specific motive influenced their decision to visit.

The third and fourth groups identified a mix of core and middle tier motives. Both are about the same size, accounting for about a nine percent share of visitors. The Cultural novelty group identified a desire to experience different cultures also with having fun or experiencing something different as the factors that influenced their visit decision. They were most likely to be first time visitors and came predominantly from Europe. The Nature escape group came looking for a chance to view scenery and gain a greater appreciation of nature while having an escapist holiday. They identified Bali as their main destination. As with the Cultural Novelty group, Asian tourists were underrepresented in this cohort.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Three other groups identified middle or outer layer motives as playing a key role in their visit decision. The smallest cohort, consisting of only 31 respondents identified the opportunity for Personal development as influencing their visit. This group comprised the largest share of

first time visitors, but was least likely to identify Bali as their main or only destination. A majority came from Europe, with North Americans also being proportionately overrepresented. The Isolation group consisted of people who were searching for peace and calm. They were experienced visitors who identified Bali as their only destination. Asians and North Americans are over-represented, while Europeans were under represented. The last group, the Stimulation group, was also small. Members were more likely to be first time visitors than others, but on multi-destination trips. Asian and European tourists were over-represented in this cohort.

Few if any differences were noted in trip profile. Typically, the median length of stay in Bali was one week, with the total trip duration lasting slightly longer, to take into consideration overnight flights and some visits elsewhere. No differences were noted in mean travel party size, which averaged around three people per group.

Relationship between motive segment and behaviour

Respondents were generally quite active during their stay, participating in or visiting 12 activities and/or attractions during their visits. No differences were noted across the various motivation cohorts. However, as Table 2 illustrates, the intensity of participation varied significantly across the sample. in fact, statistically significant intensity levels were noted in eight of the 10 most popular activities/attractions pursued, 10 of the 15 most and 13 of the 20 most popular activities/attractions. No differences were noted in the likelihood of participating in beach activities which was the most common activity pursued by a vast majority of all participants regardless of their underlying motive.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Stark differences were noted among the two cohorts who identified core tier motives for visiting Bali. Few features stood out among the large cohort of people looking for Novelty and Escape, for their participation patterns more or less mirrored the overall participation rates demonstrated by the entire population. The only exceptions were a lower propensity to visit temples or to engage in spa/massage activities. By contrast, those who travelled primarily to Do Things with Family and Friends tended to participate in resort-based leisure

activities at a much higher level than members of other cohorts. General sightseeing, shopping, visiting a spa or having a massage and, especially staying in the resort and using its facilities were very popular.

Differences were also noted in behaviour between the two groups that identified both core and middle tier motives, with the Cultural Novelty group being the most active and the Nature Escape group least active. Unsurprisingly, members of the Cultural Novelty group chose to visit places that reflected Bali's diverse tangible and intangible cultural heritage, including its natural heritage. They were more likely than others, for example, to visit temples and palaces, rice terraces, the Sacred Monkey Forest Reserve and to attend dance performances. While not tested, these activities are common items on most day tour itineraries, and this fact coupled with their high likelihood of identifying general sightseeing as a popular activities suggests they are the largest consumers of day tours. Two other features of this group are worth noting. The first is the popularity of beach activities - higher than any other group. The second is their disdain for built cultural attractions, for they were less likely than others to visit the Garuda Wisnu Kancana Cultural Park and the Bali Cultural Park.

The most popular activities pursued by members of the Nature Escape cohort again were largely similar to that of the overall population. They tended to get out of the resort and engage in hiking or cycling. But other than that, few activities stand out. However, like their Cultural Novelty counterparts, they eschewed built attractions, being less likely than others to visit zoos, waterparks, cultural theme parks and activities generally associated with participation in day tours, such as visits to a coffee plantation and the Scared Monkey Forest Sanctuary.

The small group who travelled for Self Development arguably demonstrated the most diverse behaviours, being equally more or less likely to participate in the most popular activities than members of other cohorts. For example, they were less likely than others to stay in the resort, sample different foods or participate in general sightseeing activities. But, they were more likely than others to go shopping, participate in scuba diving or snorkeling, visit the art colony at Ubud and visit palaces or the Sacred Money Forest Reserve. Wellness tourism in general (one in three) and in particular, yoga (one in four) and traditional healing (one in five) were popular among a minority of members of this cohort.

Members of the two cohorts who identified outer tier motives as drivers of their visits also tended to be somewhat less active than others. In particular, those who travelled Looking for Excitement seemed to be rather disappointed by Bali's offerings. They participated far less than others in sampling different cuisines, general sightseeing, shopping, staying in the resort, visiting cultural sites and going to bars and nightclubs. Instead, a minority participated in active recreation, such as scuba diving or snorkeling or hiking and cycling or took a sunrise tour to Mt Batur. Those looking for Peace and Calm eschewed adventure sports like diving or hiking and cycling and also appeared to have not participated in day tours to the same extent as others. Instead, they were somewhat more likely to attend a festival and surprisingly, a small minority also chose to go whitewater rafting.

Few features stand out among those respondents who did not identify a dominant motive for their visit. They were as likely as others to participate in the 15 most popular activities, with the exception of a lower intensity of visiting rice terraces. They did participate in surfing more than others and were also more likely than others to visit built cultural attractions.

Discussion

This study examined the relationship between dominant motive(s) and behaviour within a destination. It sought to determine whether different motive based segments are drawn to this destination and if so if identifiable differences were noted in the behaviour patterns of each segment and if these patterns can be related to the motives identified. The first objective was verified as eight different motive based segments were identified using Pearce's Travel Career Patten model, including two segments dominated by core tier motives, two with a mixture of core and middle tier motives, one dominated by middle tier motives and two influenced most strongly by outer tier motives. An eighth segment did not identify any dominant motive factor. Statistically significant differences were noted in intensity of participation in the eight of the ten most popular activities undertaken or attractions visited. Moreover, the study also identified statistically significant differences in participation rates across a range of primary, secondary and tertiary activities pursued by each segment. The study, therefore, has a number of conceptual and management implications.

Conceptual implications

To begin, it extends the work of Pearce's TCP model. The initial premise behind the model was that a relationship existed between travel experience and the emergence of middle and outer tier motives as influencers in the travel decision process (Pearce, 2005; Pearce & Lee, 2005). A number of other studies confirmed the validity of this assertion (Paris & Teye, 2010; Song & Bae, 2018; Ward, 2014; Zhang & Peng, 2014). However, few works, other than by Pearce and his colleagues sought to extend the work (Oktadiana et al., 2017; Panchal & Pearce, 2011).

This study makes two major contributions to the development of the TCP. First, it demonstrates how it can be used as an effective psychographic segmentation tool. Essentially, market segmentation seeks to identify homogeneous groups of people from among the heterogeneous population of tourists (Andereck & Caldwell, 1994). In doing so, researchers look for shared characteristics, such as common goals, interests, similar lifestyles, demographic profiles or other features that link groups of people (Camilleri, 2018). Different segments are assumed to require different marketing programmes, respond to different calls to action and behave differently. This study indicates that segmenting using the TCP approach satisfies the core conditions of homogeneity, identifiability, measurability and accessibility (Dolnicar, 2008; Fyall, Legoherel, Frochot & Wang 2019). Moreover, using this model allows researchers to identify segments that are both compatible with existing markets and with the destination's image, strength and product offerings.

Second, it demonstrates how motive is related to behaviour. In particular, those who travel for the core motive of doing things with friends and family or for a combination of the core and middle motives of novelty and host site involvement tend to be less active than other tourists, while those who travel to have outer motives satisfied tend to be more active and participate in popular activities or visit major attractions more intensely. People who travel to have middle tier motives satisfied represent somewhat of an anomaly as they are simultaneously heavy consumers of leisure oriented attractions/activities but light consumers of cultural, active and wellness activities/attractions.

Moreover, the application of the TCP model also illustrates how destinations with a dominant image can attract multiple market segments. Utama (2017) and Rahmawati (2008), for example, determined that Europeans' and Australians' image of Bali involved its cultural diversity, displayed through its tangible culture, nature and built attractions. Of course, secondary images relate to beach and resort activities as well as water based tourism. However, this study identified seven discrete segments, plus one with no dominant motive, that each held a slightly different image of Bali as reflected by their behaviours.

The most significant conceptual implication of this study is the link between travel motive and in-destination behaviour. It is surprising that this link does not appear to have been explored much in the tourism literature, for it should be self-evident that people who are drawn to a destination for different reasons should behave differently in a destination. This study adds empirical substance to that assumption. Moreover, the finding adds support to Leiper's (1990) argument that each tourist operates within his or her own tourism system, that may overlap at certain activities, but otherwise is unique. Here, we see a lot of overlap in the major attractions/activities, but within this apparent homogeneous pattern, clearly defined heterogeneous activities are pursued.

Management implications

The study also has a number of management implications. The market for most destinations is heterogeneous, to a greater or lesser extent. As a result, in-destination behaviours will vary significantly. This study offers insights into better bundling of attractions/activities to satisfy diverse needs of tourists. In particular, it illustrated the risks of trying to make attraction recommendations based on assumed special interested desires. This study suggests that a much more realistic approach is to consider motives in a much broader sense and in doing so to look at clusters of different attractions/activities that might appeal to different segments.

It also highlighted some unexpected findings. In particular, the cultural segment prefers to discover the destination on its own merits and eschews visiting built cultural attractions. It supports the idea that tourists interested in culture seek in-depth authentic experiences rather than cultural representations packaged for tourists. Built cultural attractions appeal more to the type of tourist who has no dominant interest in visiting Bali who instead is looking for

something to do. Likewise, some ecotour activities seem to hold little appeal for those looking for a nature escape and instead are more appealing for those travelling to seek excitement.

The results also support use of market segmentation based on psychographic variables, such as visitors' interests and opinions, rather than purely relying on demographics (Srihadi et al., 2016). Departing visitor surveys tend to omit motive-based questions. Yet this study suggests that some minor revisions to the visitor survey to focus on Pearce's motive pattern could offer valuable insights into tourist behaviour.

Conclusion

Motive not only affects destination choice, but this study also indicates it affects the tourist's behaviour once in the destination. While this statement seems apparent and logical, the results suggest that assumptions regarding activities that attract visitors with certain motives may be incorrect. For example, those visitors interested in cultural or natural resources are not necessarily attracted by commercial purpose-built cultural attractions, nor by highly commoditized ecotours. Instead, they are likely to explore the area by themselves in search of authentic encounters with culture of local people and natural wonders. Thus, there is scope for further research into motives and in-destination behaviours that addresses the knowledge gap in what tourists really want, how they consume destination and most importantly why.

References

Andereck, K. L., & Caldwell, L. L. (1994). Variable selection in tourism market segmentation models. Journal of Travel Research, 33(2), 40-46.

Antón, C., Camarero, C. and Laguna-García, M. (2017) Towards a new approach of destination loyalty drivers: satisfaction, visit intensity and tourist motivations, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 20:3, 238-260.

BHA (2020) Visitor Statistics. Bali Hotels Association. https://www.balihotelsassociation.com/media-centre/stats/ <downloaded Jan 31, 2020>.

Chen, G., Bao, J. and Huang, S.(. (2014), Segmenting Chinese Backpackers by Travel Motivations. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 16: 355-367.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 164-182.

Dann, G. (1977) Anomie, Ego Enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4(4): 184 – 194.

Devesa, M., Laguna, M. and Palacios, A (2010) The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism. *Tourism Management* 31(4): 547 – 552

Dolnicar, S. and Fluker, M. (2003) Behavioural market segments among surf tourists: investigating past destination choice, *Journal of Sport Tourism*, 8(3) 186-196.

Heitman, S. (2011) Tourist behaviour and tourism motivation, in Robinson, P., Heitmann, S. and Dieke, P (Eds) *Research Themes for Tourism* Wallingford: CABI 31-44.

Hsu, C. H. C., Cai, L. A., & Li, M. (2010). Expectation, Motivation, and Attitude: A Tourist Behavioral Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, *49*(3), 282–296.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1982). Toward a Social Psychological Theory of Tourism Motivation: A Rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9(2): 256–262.

Josiam, B. M., Smeaton, G., & Clements, C. J. (1999). Involvement: Travel motivation and destination selection. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *5*(2), 167–175.

Khairi, N., Ismail, H. and Jaafar, S (2019) Tourist behaviour through consumption in Melaka World Heritage Site, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22:5, 582-600.

Kantanen, T., and Tikkanen, I. (2006). Advertising in Low and High Involvement Cultural Tourism Attractions: Four cases. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 6(2), 99–110.

Kong, W & Chang, T (2016) Souvenir Shopping, Tourist Motivation, and Travel Experience, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 17(2) 163-177.

Lee, K., Scott, N., and Packer, J. (2015) Habitus and food lifestyle: In-destination activity participation of Slow Food members. *Annals of Tourism Research* 48:207-220.

Leiper, N, (1990) *Tourism Systems; An Interdisciplinary perspective.* Department of Management Systems (Occasional Paper # 1). Palmerston North: Massey University

Lew A. and B. McKercher (2006) Modeling tourist movement: a local destination analysis *Annals of Tourism Research* 33(2): 403 – 423.

McKercher, B., Hardy, A. & Aryal, J. (2019): Using Tracking Technology to Improve Marketing: Insights from a historic town in Tasmania, Australia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(7) 823-834. DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2019.1580243.

McKercher, B., Shoval, N., Ng, E. & A. Birenboim (2012) First-Time and Repeat Visitor Behaviour: GIS Tracking and Digital Analysis. *Tourism Geographies.* 14(1): 147 – 161.

Oktadiana, H., Pearce, P., Purisan, A., Agarwal, M. (2017) Travel Career Patterns: the motivations of Indonesian and Malaysian Muslim tourists. *Tourism, Culture and Communication.* 17: 231-248.

Panchal J., and P. Pearce (2011) Health Motives and the Travel Career Pattern (TCP) Model. *Asian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism.* 5(1): 32-44.

Paris, C., and Teye, V (2010) Backpacker Motivations: A travel career approach. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management.* 19(3): 244 – 259.

Pearce, P. L. and Lee, U-I. (2005) Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research* 43, 226-237.

Pearce, P. L. (2005). *Tourist behaviour: Themes and conceptual schemes.* Clevedon: Channel View

Prayag, G. and Ryan, C. (2011) The relationship between the 'push' and 'pull' factors of a tourist destination: the role of nationality – an analytical qualitative research approach, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2):121-143, DOI: 10.1080/13683501003623802

Rahmawati (2008) Bali's image as a tourist destination- a perspective of Australian tourists after bomb Bali**.** *Telah di publikasikan dalam Jurnal Pariwisata*, 13(2): 106-116. https://sustainabletourismforbali.wordpress.com/2012/04/26/hello-world/ <downloaded Feb 4, 2019>.

Smith, W., Pitts, S and Litvin, S. (2012) Travel and leisure Activity Participation. *Annals of Tourism Research.* 39(4): 2207 – 2210.

Song, H., and Bae, S. (2018) Understanding Travel Motivation and Patterns of international Students in Korea: using the theory of travel career pattern. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* 23(2): 133 – 145.

Subadra, N. (2019) International tourist visit to Bali. *Bali Tourism Directory* http://www.balitourismdirectory.com/tourism-studies/bali-tourism-statistics.html <downloaded Jan 31, 2020>

Subadra, N., Sytapa, K., Artana, W., Yuni, H., and Sudiarta, M. (2019) Investigating Push and Pull Factors of Tourists Visiting Bali as a World Tourism Destination. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research* 8(7): 253 – 269.

Utama, I. (2017) Tourism Destination Image of Bali According to European Tourist. 2nd International Conference on Innovative Research Across Disciplines (ICIRAD 2017). *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 134* pp 27 – 31.

Uysal, M., Li, X., and Sirakaya-Turk, E. (2008) Push–pull Dynamics in Travel Decisions. In Oh, H. (Ed) *Handbook of Hospitality Marketing Management.* London: Routledge. Pp 412 – 440.

Ward, A. (2014). Segmenting the senior tourism market in Ireland based on travel motivations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *20*(3), 267–277.

Yonasari, N (2018) *Bali Hotel Market.* Colliers Quarterly. https://www.colliers.com/-/media/files/marketresearch/apac/indonesia/q3-2018-colliersquarterly-bali.pdf?la=en-GB <downloaded Jan 31, 2020>.

Zhang, Y., and Peng, Y. (2014) Understanding travel motivations of Chinese tourists visiting Cairns, Australia. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management.* 21: 44 – 53.

Zoltan, J., and Masiero, L. (2012) The relation between push motivation and activity consumption at the destination within the framework of a destination card. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 1 (1 / 2) 84-93.

Table 1

Motive-Based Segments

Segment name (dominant TCP tier(s))	Novelty and escape (Core)	Doing things with family and friends (Core)	Cultural novelty (Core and middle)	Nature escape (Core and middle)	Self development (Middle)	Searching for peace and calm (Outer)	Looking for excitement (Outer)	No dominant motive identified (None)	All	Test score
n	121	80	59	61	31	73	59	158	659	
First time visitor (%)	51.7%	62.5%	76.3%	68.1%	77.4%	52.8%	73.7%	63.7%	63.1	X = 20.728, p = .004
Bali as main destination (%)	90.8%	91.0%	82.8%	88.9%	76.7%	94.5%	79.7%	88.0%	87.9	X = 13.513, p = .061
Bali as only destination (%)	70.6%	59.5%	65.5%	75.0%	51.6%	79.5%	53.4%	69.4%	67.3	X = 18.594, p = .010
Respondents - % female	50.4%	66.3%	59.3%	59.2%	35.5%	54.8%	47.5%	53.2%	54.5	X = 12.239, p = .098
Home region										X = 56.719, p = .002
Asia	17.5%	6.3%	5.3%	5.8%	6.7%	21.1%	24.6%	20.1%	14.8	
Australia / NZ	33.3%	41.8%	26.3%	34.8%	20.0%	29.6%	17.5%	24.0%	29.1	
Europe	40.0%	43.0%	63.2%	43.5%	53.3%	36.6%	50.9%	43.5%	45.1	
Latin America	5.8%	1.3%	1.8%	4.3%	6.7%	1.4%	3.5%	1.9%	3.1	
North America	3.3%	7.6%	3.5%	11.6%	13.3%	11.3%	3.5%	10.4%	7.9	
Mean travel party size	3.0	3.5	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.4	3.1	2.9	F = .940, p = .475

Table 2

Activities Pursued by Motive Cluster

	Novelty and escape (Core)	Doing things with family and friends (Core)	Cultural novelty (Core and middle)	Nature escape (Core and middle)	Self development (Middle)	Searching for peace and calm (Outer)	Looking for excitement (Outer)	No dominant motive identified (None)	All	Test score	Popularity
n	121	80	59	61	31	73	59	158	653		
Mean number of activities pursued	11.9	12.6	13.4	11.5	12.6	11.6	11.0	12.6	12.2	F = 1/353, p = .223	
Beach activities	89.3%	81.3%	94.9%	84.7%	93.5%	80.8%	83.1%	83.5%	85.6%	X = 10.536, p = .160	1
Eating different food	76.0%	81.3%	81.4%	79.2%	67.7%	89.0%	67.8%	70.9%	76.6%	X = 15.072, p = .035 **	2
general sightseeing	67.8%	82.5%	78.0%	77.8%	51.6%	74.0%	59.3%	69.6%	71.2%	X = 18.842, p = .009 ***	3
Visit temples	60.3%	62.5%	84.7%	65.3%	77.4%	64.4%	72.9%	68.4%	67.7%	X = 14.486, p = .045 **	4
Shopping	60.3%	80.0%	59.3%	63.9%	83.9%	58.9%	57.6%	60.1%	63.7%	X = 18.272, p = .011 **	5
Stay in resort and use facilities	62.8%	71.3%	64.4%	51.4%	48.4%	60.3%	42.4%	61.4%	59.6%	X = 16.721, p = .019 **	6
rice terraces	57.0%	60.0%	79.7%	62.5%	58.1%	58.9%	50.8%	53.2%	58.8%	X = 14.830, p = .048 **	7
Spa or massage	50.4%	72.5%	57.6%	56.9%	51.6%	57.5%	44.1%	61.4%	57.4%	X = 15.629, p = .029 **	8

Waterfalls	52.9%	52.5%	62.7%	55.6%	35.5%	42.5%	52.5%	46.2%	50.4%	X = 10.604, p = .157	9
Sacred Monkey Forest Sanctuary	52.9%	48.8%	64.4%	41.7%	67.7%	37.0%	49.2%	46.2%	49.2%	X = 16.950, p = .018 **	10
visit Ubud	44.6%	43.8%	50.8%	31.9%	51.6%	37.0%	42.4%	43.0%	42.6%	X = 7.217, p = .407	11
Bars and nightclubs	48.8%	48.8%	44.1%	34.7%	41.9%	41.1%	32.2%	41.8%	42.4%	X = 7.720, p = .358	12
visit palaces	36.4%	37.5%	49.2%	44.4%	58.1%	38.4%	23.7%	43.7%	40.4%	X = 15.117, p = .035 **	13
scuba or snorkeling	39.7%	40.0%	40.7%	37.5%	48.4%	17.8%	42.4%	32.3%	36.0%	X = 16.436, p = .021 **	14
Attend a dance performance	28.1%	30.0%	42.4%	29.2%	35.5%	27.4%	23.7%	39.2%	32.3%	X = 10.638, p = .155	15
Bali coffee plantation	31.4%	42.5%	47.5%	25.0%	29.0%	20.5%	30.5%	25.9%	30.8%	X = 19.375, p = .007 ***	16
Visit Bali Cultural Park	25.6%	27.5%	23.7%	30.6%	29.0%	32.9%	28.8%	34.8%	29.7%	X = 4.540, p = .718	17
Hiking and/or cycling	24.8%	26.3%	35.6%	33.3%	25.8%	19.2%	32.2%	22.2%	26.3%	X = 8.976, p = .254	18
Surfing	28.9%	21.3%	28.8%	23.6%	32.3%	11.0%	22.0%	32.3%	25.7%	X = 14.944, p = .037 **	19
Garuda Wisnu Kancana cultural park	24.8%	17.5%	16.9%	19.4%	29.0%	24.7%	15.3%	36.7%	24.8%	X = 20.535, p = .005 ***	20

Mt Batur for sunrise	18.2%	21.3%	22.0%	22.2%	12.9%	24.7%	30.5%	27.2%	23.1%	X = 7.109, p = .418	21
Photo tours	19.8%	20.0%	20.3%	19.4%	19.4%	17.8%	20.3%	24.7%	20.8%	X = 2.075, p = .956	22
Yoga	16.5%	17.5%	20.3%	18.1%	25.8%	21.9%	11.9%	24.7%	19.8%	X = 6.865, p = .443	23
Hot springs	19.8%	17.5%	13.6%	12.5%	16.1%	17.8%	22.0%	27.2%	19.8%	X = 10.248, p = .175	24
Attend a festival	19.8%	16.3%	13.6%	18.1%	16.1%	26.0%	15.3%	19.6%	18.7%	X = 4.728, p = .693	25
Agung River / Volcanos	16.5%	17.5%	13.6%	13.9%	12.9%	21.9%	22.0%	17.1%	17.2%	X = 3.666, p = .817	26
wellness tourism in general	15.7%	10.0%	20.3%	16.7%	29.0%	26.0%	11.9%	16.5%	17.2%	X = 11.833, p = .108	27
Bali zoo	15.7%	23.8%	11.9%	6.9%	19.4%	19.2%	13.6%	19.6%	16.7%	X = 10.733, x= .151	28
Waterparks	11.6%	23.8%	15.3%	11.1%	16.1%	17.8%	16.9%	15.8%	15.8%	X = 6.923, p = .437	29
Tattoo or henna	14.9%	15.0%	22.0%	9.7%	12.9%	9.6%	3.4%	13.9%	13.0%	X = 11.277, p = .127	30
Whitewater rafting	12.4%	10.0%	11.9%	4.2%	9.7%	15.1%	11.9%	18.4%	12.7%	X = 10.513, p = .061 *	31
Elephant park	10.7%	11.3%	8.5%	12.5%	16.1%	12.3%	6.8%	13.3%	11.5%	X = 3.169, p = .869	32
Traditional healing	8.3%	3.8%	10.2%	9.7%	19.4%	13.7%	10.2%	16.5%	11.3%	X = 12.575, p = .083 *	33

ATV or quad bike	9.1%	13.8%	6.8%	12.5%	6.5%	6.8%	10.2%	10.1%	9.8%	X = 3.824, p = .800	34
Visit Turtle island	14.0%	10.0%	10.2%	5.6%	6.5%	2.7%	10.2%	8.9%	9.0%	X = 8.816, p = .266	35
Attend cooking class	6.6%	7.5%	10.2%	8.3%	6.5%	13.7%	6.8%	10.1%	8.9%	X = 4.051, p = .774	36

* p <.1

** p <.05

*** p < .01