BioOne COMPLETE

Travel Motivation of Tourists to Krugerand Tsitsikamma National Parks:A Comparative Study

Authors: Kruger, Martinette, and Saayman, Melville

Source: South African Journal of Wildlife Research, 40(1) : 93-102

Published By: Southern African Wildlife Management Association

URL: https://doi.org/10.3957/056.040.0106

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Travel motivation of tourists to Kruger and Tsitsikamma National Parks: a comparative study

Martinette Kruger* & Melville Saayman

Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies, North-West University, Potchefstroom, 2520 South Africa

Received 28 October 2008. Accepted 20 April 2009

As countries and destinations try to increase their share of the international and national tourism market, it is important to understand why people travel and why they choose a specific destination. We here determine and compare travel motives of visitors to Kruger and Tsitsikamma National Parks. We administered 2899 questionnaires in the Kruger National Park and 829 in the Tsitsikamma National Park. A factor analysis was used to determine the travel motives and six factors were identified respectively for both parks. Results showed that tourists have common as well as unique motives in the two parks. Common motives in both parks include escape from city life and relaxation as well as knowledge seeking, nostalgia and park attributes. Unique to the Kruger National Park are activities and novelty compared to nature experience and photography for the Tsitsikamma National Park. This research therefore confirmed that different attractions and destinations feed different travel motives even when classified as similar types of products. Marketers can use this information to position these parks and to focus their marketing communication more effectively.

Key words: factor analysis, Kruger National Park, travel motives, South Africa, Tsitsikamma National Park.

INTRODUCTION

National parks and natural areas are powerful attractions for tourists, are major foreign currency earners and constitute an important part of the tourism industry (Uysal *et al.* 1994). South Africa is aware of these benefits and two of the most popular and oldest national parks in the country are the Kruger National Park and Tsitsikamma National Park (SANParks 2008). Both these parks are established brands and tourism products generating millions of Rands in revenue each year (SANParks 2008). Together with these two parks, South Africa has 22 national parks. In addition to this there are also local and provincial parks and a further 9000 privately owned game reserves competing for eco-tourists (Saayman & Van der Merwe 2004). Neighbouring countries such as Namibia, Zimbabwe and Botswana are also becoming competitive and according to Saayman (2003) it has become imperative for national parks to keep up with trends and the needs of tourists since this will streamline future marketing strategies.

As countries and destinations strive to increase their share of the international and national tourism market, it becomes important to understand why people travel and why they choose a specific destination (Oh *et al.* 1995). In order to launch effective marketing campaigns that are developed based on tourists' motivations, national parks should understand and be aware of the underlying reasons why tourists travel (Pan & Ryan 2007). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to determine and compare the reasons (travel motives) why tourists visit these two parks. By determining the motives, marketing can be undertaken more effectively and specific factors can be taken into account when marketing strategies are being planned (Saayman 2006). This could further lead to a competitive advantage, vital in South Africa's very competitive market.

Effective tourism marketing is impossible without understanding the consumers' (tourists') motivations (Fodness 1994). Pan & Ryan (2007) agree and add that in order to develop an effective marketing strategy and sustainable management plan for any destination, it is important to identify and explore the motivating factors that lead to the decision to visit. Understanding the tourist motivations for visiting a particular area (in this case a national park) can ultimately help entice more tourists to visit the area (Fodness 1994). Further insights into tourists' travel motivation can benefit tourism marketers specifically with regard to market segmentation, product development, service quality

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.
E-mail: 13018493@nwu.ac.za

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

evaluation, image development, and promotional activities (Fodness 1994; Kozak 2002; Yoon & Uysal 2005).

A decision to visit a destination (national park) is a directed action, which is triggered by a desire to meet a need (Crompton & McKay 1997; Lohmann 2004). Motivation comes into play when a person wants to satisfy a need and must take action to do so (Goossens 2000). A visitor may have several needs, which he/she desires to satisfy through a (park) visit. The relationship between travel needs, motives and the decision to visit a national park is complex. A tourist's motivation to travel begins when he/she becomes aware of a need to visit a national park. In order to take the final decision, the motives for visiting comes into play and these motives will eventually lead to satisfaction of needs. Qu & Ping (1999) add that different visitors may engage in the same (park) element and derive different benefits from the experience. Measuring the main desires visitors are seeking to satisfy at the national park and which motivational factors lead to the preference of the particular park, can give a more detailed profile of the visitors and enable marketers/organizers to better address their needs with a tailor-made marketing programme (Crompton & McKay 1997). In an increasingly saturated marketplace, the success of marketing destinations/national parks should be guided by a thorough analysis of tourist motivation and its interplay with tourist satisfaction and loyalty (Kozak 2001; Yoon & Uysal 2005).) Therefore, in order to adequately provide a tourism experience for visitors, it is important to identify their motivations for travel (Beh & Bruyere 2007).

The behaviour of tourists is influenced by a small number of factors, and a person can be motivated by more than one motive at a time (Mill & Morrison 1985). Motivations that influence tourists' travel decisions include such things as escape (Crompton 1977); adrenalin/excitement seeking (Loker & Perdue 1992); self-enhancement (Fodness 1994); socializing (Backman *et al.* 1995); safety/comfort (Oh *et al.* 1995); family togetherness (Schneider & Backman 1996), culture exploration (Lee *et al.* 2004); education (Bansal & Eislet 2004), health and fitness (Swanson & Horridge 2006), facilities, events and cost (Jang & Wu 2006) and nature (Molera & Albaladejo 2007).

Limited research has been done on travel motives to national parks. Some results were produced by Uysal *et al.* (1994) who determined the travel motives of Australian tourists to US national parks and nature areas; Tao *et al.* (2004) who analysed motivations of Asian tourists travelling to Tiawan's Taroko National Park; Kerstetter *et al.* (2004) who profiled Taiwanese eco-tourists using a behavioural approach; Awaritefe (2004) who researched the travel motives of tourists to Nigeria; Beh & Bruyere (2007) who analysed visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves; Mehmetoglu (2007) who typologized nature-based tourists by activity in Northern Norway; Pan & Ryan (2007) who identified the motivations and determinants of satisfaction of visitors to Pirongia Forest Park in New Zealand and Saayman & Saayman (2009) who determined the travel motivations and socio-demographics of visitors to the Addo Elephant National Park in South Africa. The results from the respective studies are summarized in Table 1.

Based on the above and the results depicted in Table 1, four conclusions can be drawn. Firstly, comparing the studies conducted on visitors to national parks/nature areas, reoccurring motives can be identified. The most consistent motives across the board were: (1) education/learning about nature, (2) self-actualization, (3) participating in recreation activities and, (4) social contact/ enhancement of kinship. Therefore these can be regarded as the most common motives for travelling to a national park or nature area. Secondly, escape, relaxation and nature were seldom considered as a motive for travelling to a national park/nature area. This is surprising since national parks/nature areas are nature bound and escape and relaxation are regarded as the most important motives for travel in general (*see* Crompton (1979); Uysal *et al.* (1994), Beh & Bruyere (2007) and Saayman & Saayman (2009)). Thirdly, the results are further not comparable and this emphasizes the fact that different visitors to different parks have quite different motives (Pan & Ryan 2007). This could be because of (1) what these parks offer, (2) where they are located, (3) the type of market and (4), the type of activities, to name but a few. Finally, only one previous study by Saayman & Saayman (2009) was done on travel motives to a national park in South Africa.

The lack of research done at national parks in South Africa and in general as well as the fact that different parks revealed different results was the motivation underlying this research. Uysal *et al.* (1994) add to this understanding that, in order to market effectively, it is essential to generate more specific knowledge about visitors to parks and natural areas. More importantly, national parks

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Table 1. Analysis of research on travel motives to national parks/nature areas.

Travel motive	Uysal *et al.* (1994)	Tao et al. (2004)	Kerstetter *et al.* (2004)	Awaritefe (2004)[a]	Bey & Bruyere (2007)	Metmetoglu (2007)[b]	Pan & Ryan (2007)	Saayman & Saayman (2009)
Relaxation (2)	X						X	
Novelty (2)	X					X		
Escape (3)	X				X			X
Prestige (1)	X							
Education/Learning about nature (6)		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Participating in recreation activities/Recreation or leisure pursuits (4)		X		X		X		X
Adventure (2)			X		X			
Holistic (1)			X					
Self actualization (4)				X	X	X	X	
Culture (2)				X	X			
Nature (3)					X	X		X
Game viewing (1)					X			
Mundane everyday (1)						X		
Social contact / Enhancement of kinship relations (4)	X					X	X	X
Attractions (1)								X
Photography (1)								X

[a]In this study Education and Culture were combined into a single dimension.
[b]In this study, Novelty and Education were combined into a single dimension.

can make better use of the information to successfully promote their packages and gain competitiveness in the market. Hence the question that this research wants to address, is: is there is a difference in travel motives of visitors to two major national parks in the same country?

METHODS

Structured questionnaire surveys were conducted at the Kruger National Park (22°19′–25°32′S, 30°52′–32°03′E) and the Tsitsikamma National Park (on the southern coast of the Eastern Cape Province between 23°30′E and 24°15′E). The data used in the analysis were gathered over a period of eight years (2001–2008), using consumer-based questionnaires.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire used to survey visitors to both the Kruger National Park and the Tsitsikamma National Park remained similar throughout the period (2001–2008) of data collection and consisted of three sections. In Section A, demographic details (marital status, age, and province of origin) were surveyed while section B focused on spending behaviour (number of persons paid for, frequency of visits, length of stay and amount spent) and travel motivational factors. Since visitors to national parks are motivated by different elements, the travel motivational factors were based on the work of Crompton (1979) and adapted for national parks. Crompton's (1979) conceptual framework embraces seven socio-psychological motivational domains and was considered to be the most appropriate for representing the different motives in this study. Twenty items were measured in the motivation section for Kruger National Park and 18 items for Tsitsikamma National Park on a five-point Likert scale and respondents were asked to indicate how important they considered each item on the scale (1 = not at all important; 2 = less important; 3 = important; 4 = very important and 5 = extremely important). Section C of the questionnaire consisted of more detailed informa-

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Table 2. Total number of questionnaires completed.

Year: Survey month:	2001 May	2002 July	2003 December	2004 November/ December	2005 November/ December	2006 July	2006 November	2007 June/July	2007 December	2008 March
Kruger National Park (2001–2007)										
Number of questionnaires	220	323	246	400	450	476	171	613	–	–
Tsitsikamma National Park (2001–2008)										
Number of questionnaires	73	48	122	91	83	64	–	41	151	156

tion about the consumer's general behaviour (type of magazines/newspapers they read and their catering preferences, for example). For the purposes of this article, the information obtained from sections A and B was predominantly used.

The samples

Surveys in the Kruger National Park were conducted annually between 2001 and 2005. Since 2006, two surveys were conducted annually, in winter and in summer. In Table 2, the sample sizes are given, and it is evident that the sample size has grown significantly in recent years. Since 2001, surveys were conducted annually at the Tsitsikamma National Park and in 2007 a winter and a summer survey were conducted. All visitors that formed part of the surveys at the parks received a questionnaire that they completed in their own time. Field workers collected the questionnaires again during the evenings and early mornings.

Here we consider a tourist to be a person who voluntarily visits a place, away from his normal abode, for a period of at least 24 hours (Saayman 2007). Therefore only overnighting visitors are considered in the analyses. A total of 2899 questionnaires was administrated in the Kruger National Park and 829 in the Tsitsikamma National Park. According to Saayman *et al.* (2008), the profile of visitors has remained similar since 2001 for both parks. Hence it is believed that that the sampling is adequate.

Data analysis

Microsoft© Excel© was used for data capturing and basic data analysis. All the years' data were pooled and only the respondents who answered at least two-thirds of the motivational questions were included. The analysis of data in this study consisted of two stages. Firstly, a general profile of visitors to the Kruger National Park and Tsitsikamma National Park were compiled with the help of SPSS (SPSS Inc. 2007). Secondly, to explain the variance-covariance structure of a set of variables through a few linear combinations of these variables, a principal component analysis was applied. A principal component factor analysis with Oblimin with Kaiser normalization was preformed on the 20 motivation items for Kruger National Park and on the 18 motivation items for Tsitsikamma National Park by means of SPSS (SPSS Inc. 2007). Rotation implies an orthogonal transformation of factor loadings and is used in practice to obtain a more interpretable and 'simpler' structure. Oblique rotations are often used in social sciences and entail a non-rigid rotation of the coordinate axes. While orthogonal rotations assume the factors to be independent, this is not assumed with oblique rotations. Oblique rotations also seek to minimize the number of factors extracted (Johnson & Wichern 2007). Oblique rotation split the factor matrix into two matrixes – a pattern matrix and a structure matrix. These two matrixes are the same when orthogonal rotation is used. Yet, with oblique rotation, the pattern matrix contains the factor loadings while the structure matrix takes the relationship between the factors into account (Field 2005). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was also used to determine if the covariance matrix is suitable for factor analysis. Kaiser's criterion for the extraction of all factors with eigenvalues larger than one, were used because they were considered significant. In addition, all items with a factor loading above 0.4 were included in a factor, whereas all items with factor loadings lower than 0.4 were considered as not correlating significantly with this factor. Also, any item which cross-loaded on two factors with factor loadings greater than 0.4 was categorized in the factor where interpretability was best. A reliability coefficient

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Table 3. Visitors profile: Kruger National Park 2001–2007 and Tsitsikamma National Park 2001–2008.

Category	Kruger National Park	Tsitsikamma National Park
Home language	Afrikaans-speaking (70%)	Afrikaans-speaking (55%) and English-speaking (35%)
Age	Average age: 44.5	Average age: 45.4
Marital status	Married (84%)	Married (83%)
Province of residence	Gauteng and Western Cape predominantly in winter	Gauteng and Western Cape predominantly during the winter and summer months
	Mpumalanga and Gauteng provinces during the summer months	
Level of education	Diploma/Degree (80%)	Diploma/Degree (37%) or Post-graduate (27%)
Mode of transport	Sedan and 4×4 vehicle	Sedan and 4×4 vehicle
Average spending	R6209.95	R3290.78
Number of visits to national parks over three years	Six times (two per year)	Four times
Length of stay	4–14 days during winter and 2–7 days in summer	2–5 days during winter and 2–7 days in summer
Preference of the Park	Wildlife	Scenic nature
Reasons for visiting the Park	To relax (87%)	To relax (84%)
Preferred accommodation	Chalets	Camping

(Cronbach's alpha) was computed for each factor to estimate the internal consistency of each factor. All factors with a reliability coefficient >0.4 for Kruger National Park and above >0.5 for Tsitsikamma National Park were considered to be acceptable in this study.

RESULTS

Demographic profile and travel characteristics of tourists

Four surveys were conducted at the Kruger National Park during the summer season (November/December) and four during the winter season (May/July) (see Table 2). Five summer surveys and four winter surveys were carried out at the Tsitsikamma National Park. Due to this, there were minor differences between the summer and winter profile of visitors such as province of origin (see Table 3), length of stay (tourists tend to stay longer at Kruger National Park during the winter season compared to visitors at Tsitsikamma National Park) and the average spending (an increased spending during the winter seasons at the Kruger National Park).

The profiles of visitors to the two parks are similar (Table 3). However, visitors tend to stay longer and spend more on average in the Kruger National Park compared to Tsitsikamma National Park. The preference by visitors for these parks differs because of what the two parks have to offer. The Kruger National Park offers a wide variety of wildlife compared to the Tsitsikamma National Park that mainly offers scenic beauty. The accommodation preference for visitors to the respective parks also differs; chalets at the Kruger National Park and camping at the Tsitsikamma National Park.

Factor analysis of trip motivation

The factor analysis (Pattern Matrix) identified six factors (labelled according to similar characteristics) for both the Kruger National Park (see Table 4) and Tsitsikamma National Park (see Table 6). The six factors for the Kruger National Park accounted for 63.5% of the total variance and the six factors for the Tsitsikamma National Park accounted for 69.01% of the total variance. The mean value of each factor was calculated as the average of all items contributing to a specific factor so that means scores can be interpreted on the original 5-point Likert scale of measurement. Eigenvalues for these factors ranged from 1.01 to 4.04. Cronbach's coefficients were also examined for each factor to check the reliability of the data and to serve as a measure of internal consistency among the items. The Alpha values should be interpreted with caution due to the limited number of items (statements) that loaded successfully

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Table 4. Pattern matrix for Kruger National Park.

Factor labels;	Factor 1: Knowledge seeking	Factor 2: Activities	Factor 3: Park attributes	Factor 4: Nostalgia	Factor 5: Novelty	Factor 6: Escape and relaxation
Mean values	3.006	1.539	2.807	3.435	2.772	4.213
To learn about endangered species	0.854					
To learn about animals	0.809					
To learn about plants	0.741					
For educational reasons	0.671					
To take photographs of animals	0.560					
To take photographs of plants	0.498					
To attend conferences		0.856				
To attend events		0.780				
Hiking		0.763				
Accommodation and facilities			0.805			
Brand of the Park			0.637			
Climate of location			0.629			
Grew up with park				–0.780		
To experience wildlife				–0.695		
Family time				–0.653		
To experience different species				–0.624		
Explore new destinations					0.794	
Socializing with friends					0.555	
Routine vacation						0.825
Relaxation						0.787
Cronbach's Alpha	0.860	0.798	0.576	0.795	0.462	0.731

onto the same factors. Relatively high factor loadings indicate a reasonably high correlation between the delineated factors and their individual items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (Field 2005) of 0.753 for Kruger National Park and 0.833 for Tsitsikamma National Park also indicated that patterns of correlations are relatively compact and should yield distinct and reliable factors.

Motives for visiting the Kruger National Park

As shown in Table 4, the results indicate six factors (motives for visiting Kruger National Park), knowledge seeking, activities, park attributes, nostalgia, novelty, escape and relaxation. The data also show that, with regard to the mean values, escape and relaxation has the highest value followed by nostalgia, knowledge seeking and park attributes. The table also indicates that Cronbach's coefficients are consistent with the exception of factor 5 that had a loading of <0.5 hence more items should be included in future surveys to address the low value.

Based on the results of the component correlation matrix as captured in Tables 5 & 7, the low correlation between the different factors shows

Table 5. Component correlation matrix for Kruger National Park.

Component	Knowledge seeking	Activities	Park attributes	Nostalgia	Novelty	Escape and relaxation
Knowledge seeking	1.000					
Activities	0.206	1.000				
Park attributes	0.228	0.227	1.000			
Nostalgia	–0.219	–0.013	–0.194	1.000		
Novelty	0.115	0.072	0.048	–0.141	1.000	
Escape and relaxation	0.110	–0.096	0.171	–0.094	–0.030	1.000

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Table 6. Pattern matrix for Tsitsikamma National Park.

Factor label	Factor 1: Knowledge seeking	Factor 2: Nature experience	Factor 3: Photography	Factor 4: Escape and relaxation	Factor 5: Park attributes	Factor 6: Nostalgia
Mean values	2.642	2.974	2.493	4.125	2.943	1.964
Education reasons	0.688					
To learn about animals in general	0.913					
To learn about endangered species	1.00					
To learn about plants	0.901					
To learn about animals	0.754					
Benefits of children		0.469				
Family recreation		0.374				
Learn about nature		0.927				
Appreciation for endangered species		0.843				
Photograph animals			1.023			
Photograph plants			0.677			
Get away				0.718		
Relax				0.781		
Accommodation and facilities					0.546	
Climate					0.723	
Hiking trails					0.464	
Grew up with park						0.947
Brand						0.313
Cronbach's Alpha	0.933	0.814	0.853	0.649	0.572	0.523

that the factors can be clearly distinguished. The motives why tourists visit the Kruger National Park and the Tsitsikamma National Park are thus very specific and well defined, stating that tourists visiting the parks for knowledge seeking are not the same as those visiting the parks for activities or to escape and relaxation, for example.

Motives for visiting the Tsitsikamma National Park

The data for the Tsitsikamma National Park (Table 6) also identified six factors (motives), knowledge seeking, nature experience, photography, escape and relaxation, park attributes and nostalgia. Based on the mean values, escape and relaxation had the highest mean value followed by nature experience and park attributes. All Cronbach Alpha's were >0.5 which shows internal consistencies among items measured.

DISCUSSION

Our data show the main motives in both national parks are knowledge seeking, nostalgia, park attributes as well as escape and relaxation, with the visitors to the two parks having some motives in common. The Kruger National Park differs in terms of activities and novelty, compared to nature experience and photography in the case of the

Table 7. Component correlation matrix for Tsitsikamma National Park

Factor	Knowledge seeking	Nature experience	Photography	Escape and relaxation	Park attributes	Nostalgia
Knowledge seeking	1.000					
Nature experience	0.608	1.000				
Photography	0.562	0.295	1.000			
Escape and relaxation	0.038	0.259	–0.002	1.000		
Park attributes	0.217	0.324	0.222	0.413	1.000	
Nostalgia	0.258	0.343	0.205	0.106	0.246	1.000

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

Tsitsikamma National Park. Our data confirm the findings of Saayman & Saayman (2009) that visitors to different destinations, in this case national parks, have different motives. Therefore, this research confirms that, even where the markets (tourist profiles) and the type of attraction are similar, their travel motives differ.

When comparing our data to other data published on travel motives to national parks/nature areas, the following can be concluded: Firstly, escape and relaxation as a main motive got the highest mean values of the six factors for both national parks (see Tables 4 & 6). Similar motive have been found elsewhere (Tao *et al.* 2004; Beh & Bruyere 2007; Mehmetoglu 2007; Saayman & Saayman 2009). Hence, tourists who travel to national parks want to 'escape' from their daily routine to relax and enjoy the scenic beauty as well as the wildlife at the park. From a marketing point of view, SANParks could successfully use 'escape and relaxation' in promoting both parks. Secondly, our data show, for both parks, knowledge seeking as a motive, which comprises aspects such as 'to learn about endangered species', 'to learn about animals' and 'to learn about plants'. For the Kruger National Park, this factor has a mean value of 3.01, which is the third highest of the six, whilst it was the fourth highest for the Tsitsikamma National Park with a mean value of 2.64. This factor is the reoccurring motive in almost all the research conducted on national parks/nature areas (Tao *et al.* 2004; Beh & Bruyere 2007; Mehmetoglu 2007; Pan & Ryan 2007; Saayman & Saayman 2009). Visitors therefore consider learning and knowledge as important aspects when travelling to national parks which are also a determinant for being an eco-tourist (Kerstetter *et al.* 2004). Hence, national parks need to continuously improve on 'educating' tourists about plants and animals by means of, for example, information boards, talks, videos and photographic displays. Thirdly, results of both parks support nostalgia and park attributes as motives to travel. Nostalgia achieved the second highest mean value of 3.44 for the Kruger National Park but was the lowest factor for the Tsitsikamma National park with a mean value of 1.96. Nostalgia has not been found in similar research as an important motive for travelling and can therefore be seen as a unique motive here. Possible reasons for this could be that both parks are well-known and established where loyal visitors visit regularly. Although data are still limited it could be the older and more established a park, the more important nostalgia becomes. Nostalgia could also be used in the marketing communication in order to promote these two parks. Added to this is that 80% of visitors to national parks are domestic, hence they are familiar (grew up) with these products and they can visit them regularly. With regard to park attributes, it received the fourth highest mean value (2.81) for the Kruger National Park and the third highest mean value (2.94) for the Tsitsikamma National Park. The only study that indicated a similar motive labelled 'attractions' was done by Saayman & Saayman (2009) on the Addo Elephant National Park. Fourthly, the Kruger National Park differs from the Tsitsikamma National Park in terms of activities and novelty. Activities (Saayman & Saayman 2009) and novelty (Uysal *et al.* 1994; Tao *et al.* 2004; Pan & Ryan 2007) have been identified as motives elsewhere. Fifthly, motives for the Tsitsikamma National Park differed in terms of nature experience and photography compared to the Kruger National Park. Nature experience had the second highest mean value of 2.97 and was found elsewhere (*e.g.* Tao *et al.* 2004; Beh & Bruyere 2007; Mehmetoglu 2007; Saayman & Saayman 2009). Nature experience can therefore also be seen as an important motive for visitors who travel to the Tsitsikamma National Park (which is known for its scenic beauty). Although the Tsitsikamma National Park is an excellent destination for photography, it only had the fifth highest mean value (2.49) of the six factors. A possible reason for this could be that the value of photography is not fully comprehended and exploited by park management.

CONCLUSION

Clear differences between the motives for visiting the two parks were identified as indicated. We suggest that the marketers of these national parks should consider the practical implications of the motives identified in this article, since they can be fundamental in increasing satisfaction with destination (park) services and products as well as enhancing destination (park) loyalty. Our results suggest that national park managers should give attention to tourists' relaxation and need for knowledge in order to appeal to tourists' internal motives to travel. The marketers of both national parks need to use these motives to focus their marketing efforts to attract tourists with similar needs. The concept of a place to escape and relax can be used successfully in marketing as this is a major travel motive for tourists in general. Coupled to this

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

are the aspects of park attributes and nostalgia. These motives could be combined to add value in the marketing campaigns of the parks. Current marketing efforts focus strongly on the nature motive, especially the scenic beauty in the case of Tsitsikamma and wildlife and the 'Big 5' in the case of the Kruger National Park, whilst the research indicated that experiencing nature as a motive is only important for the Tsitsikamma National Park. The motives identified here can also be used in the branding and positioning of these two national parks. In the case of the Kruger National Park, it should be based on a relaxing family holiday destination with a wide variety of wildlife and learning opportunities that has served the needs of tourists for more than a century. For the Tsitsikamma National Park it should be based on the unique attributes of the park such as the relaxing atmosphere, the nature and wildlife experience, photographic opportunities and nostalgia. This approach will further distinguish these parks from one another, thereby increasing their competitiveness and resulting in more brand-loyal visitors. Escape and relaxation was confirmed as being the main motive to travel to these national parks. This research therefore confirms existing research but also identifies unique motives. These include motives such as photography and nature experience in the case of the Tsitsikamma National Park and nostalgia in the case of both parks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank SANParks, in particular Glenn Phillips, for support and financial assistance.

REFERENCES

AWARITEFE, O.D. 2004. Motivation and other considerations in tourist destination choice: a case study of Nigeria. *Tourism Geogr.* 6(3): 303–330.

BACKMAN, K.F., BACKMAN, S.J., UYSAL, M. & SUNSHINE, K.M. 1995. Event tourism: an examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Manage. & Event Tourism* 3(1): 15–24.

BANSAL, H. & EISLET, H.A. 2004. Exploratory research of tourists' motivations and planning. *Tourism Manage.* 25: 387–396.

BEH, A. & BRUYERE, B.L. 2007. Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Manage.* 28: 1464–1471.

CROMPTON, J.L. 1979. Motives for pleasure vacation. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 1(4): 408–424.

CROMPTON, J.L. & McKAY, S.L. 1997. Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 24(2): 425–439.

FIELD, A. 2005. Discovering statistics using SPSS. SAGE publications, London.

FODNESS, D. 1994. Measuring tourist motivation. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 21(3):555–581.

GOOSSENS, C. 2000. Tourism motivation and pleasure motivation. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 7(2): 301–321.

JANG, S. & WU, C.E. 2006. Seniors' travel motivations and the influential factors: an examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Manage.* 27: 306–316.

JOHNSON, R.A. & WICHERN, D.W. 2007. Applied multivariate statistical analysis. Pearson Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

KERSTETTER, D.L., HOU, J. & LIN, C. 2004. Profiling Taiwanese ecotourists using a behavioural approach. *Tourism Manage.* 25:491–498.

KOZAK, M. 2001. Repeaters' behaviour at two distinct destinations. *Ann. Tourism Res.* 28(3): 784–807.

KOZAK, M. 2002. Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Manage.* 23:221: 232.

LEE, C.K., LEE, Y.K. & WICKS, B.E. 2004. Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Manage.* 25: 61–70.

LOHMANN, M. 2004. New demand factors in tourism. Institut für Tourismus- und Bderforschung, Nordeuropa.

LOKER, L. & PERDUE, R. 1992. A benefit segmentation of a non-resident summer travel market. *J. Travel Res.* 31(1): 31–35.

MEHMETOGLU, M. 2007. Typologising nature-based tourists by activity – theoretical and practical implications. *Tourism Manage.* 28: 651–660.

MILL, R.C. & MORRISON, A.M. 1985. The tourism system: an introductory text. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.

MOLERA, L. & ALBALADEJO, I.P. 2007. Profiling segments of tourists in rural areas of South-Eastern Spain. *Tourism Manage.* 28: 757–767.

OH, H.C., UYSAL, M. & WEAVER, P.A. 1995. Product bundles and market segmentation based on travel motivations: a canonical correlation approach. *Hospitality Manage.* 14(2): 123–137.

PAN, S. & RYAN, C. 2007. Mountain areas and visitor usage – motivations and determinants of satisfaction: The case of Pirongia Forest Park, New Zealand. *J. Sustain. Tourism* 15(3): 288–308.

QU, H. & PING, E.W.Y. 1999. A service performance model of Hong Kong cruise travellers' motivation factors and satisfaction. *Tourism Manage.* 20(1999): 237–244.

SAAYMAN, M. 2003. A marketing analysis of tourist visiting Kgalagadi Transfrontier and Augrabies Falls National Parks in South Africa. Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies, Unpublished report delivered for the South African National Parks by Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies, Potchefstroom.

SAAYMAN, M. 2006. Marketing tourism: products & destinations: getting back to basics, 2nd edn. Leisure Consultants and Publications, Potchefstroom.

SAAYMAN, M. 2007. En route with tourism: an introduction. Leisure Consultants and Publications, Potchefstroom.

SAAYMAN, M., FOUCHE, M. & KRUGER, M. 2008. Executive summary of research profiles of selected national parks in South Africa. Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies, Potchefstroom.

SAAYMAN, M. & SAAYMAN, A. 2009. Why travel motiva-

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University

tions and socio-demographics matter in managing a national park. *Koedoe* 51(1): 381.
SAAYMAN, M. & VAN DER MERWE, P. 2004. Managing game farms form a tourism perspective. Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies, Potchefstroom.
SANPARKS. 2008. Tsitsikamma National Park map. Online at: http://www.saparks.com/images/maps/kruger-map.gif (accessed 22 September 2008).
SCHNEIDER, I.E. & BACKMAN, S.J. 1996. Cross-cultural equivalence of festival motivations: a study in Jordan. *Festival Manage. & Event Tourism* 4: 139–144.
SPSS Inc. 2007. SPSS® 16.0 for Windows, Release 16.0.0. SPSS Inc., Chicago.
SWANSON, K.K. & HORRIDGE, P.E. 2006. Travel motivations as souvenir purchase indicators. *Tourism Manage.* 27: 671–683.
TOA, C.H, EAGLES, P.F.J. & SMITH, S.L.J. 2004. Profiling Taiwanese ecotourists using a self-definition approach. *J. Sustain. Tourism* 12(2): 149–168.
UYSAL, M., McDONALD, C.D. & MARTIN, B.S. 1994. Australian visitors to U.S. national parks and natural areas. *Int. J. Contemp. Hospitality Manage.* 6(3): 18–24.
YOON, Y. & UYSAL, M. 2005. An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Manage.* 26: 45–56.

Corresponding Editor: M.J. Somers

Downloaded From: https://bioone.org/journals/South-African-Journal-of-Wildlife-Research on 10 Sep 2021
Terms of Use: https://bioone.org/terms-of-use Access provided by Virginia Tech University