Domestic tourism in practice: an investigation of Vhembe District Municipality residents' travel motivations

Mr. Munei Nengovhela
Department of Tourism Management, University of Venda, South Africa

Dr. Ndivhuwo Tshipala
Department of Tourism Management, Tshwane University of Technology
South Africa

Mr. Siyabulela Nyikana*
Department of Tourism, Nelson Mandela University, South Africa
siyabulela.nyikana@mandela.ac.za

Corresponding Author*

Abstract

Travel motivation studies have always played a pivotal role in tourism development which is aligned to the travel needs of any given market. Knowledge about a tourist's travel motivations can assist destination managers, tourism planners and tourism marketers in meeting the tourist's needs. This holds true especially in countries such as South Africa, where recent emphasis has been placed on promoting domestic tourism. The purpose of this study was to understand the travel motives of residents at Vhembe District Municipality, Limpopo, South Africa. The study was quantitative in nature with data analyzed using the SPSS version 23 software. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was used to identify the motivating factors and thus identified five motivating factors. Following PCA was a Cluster analysis which classified the residents into two segments, namely Self-Enrichers and Purposive travelers. The findings are fundamental in identifying and developing appropriate marketing strategies that would entice greater VDM travel demand, especially linked to domestic tourism promotion in the region.

Keywords: Push and Pull factors, residents, travel motivations, tourism development, Vhembe District Municipality.

Introduction

There has been growing consensus amongst tourism researchers that understanding travel motivation and tourists' behavior is an important aspect in tourism. This is based on the fact that information on motivation to travel leads to better informed decisions regarding destination management, planning and marketing (Crompton, 1979; Dan, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Fodness, 1994; Veal, 1997). Moreover, information about travel motivation is seen as being particularly useful for tourism product development, creating and improving destination image and for destination positioning purposes. Travel behavior analysis *inter alia*, reflects travel motivations and serves as a fundamental marketing and management practice, which is associated with the creation of sustainable tourism growth and competitiveness. According to Van Vuuren and Slabbert (2011) travel motivational studies assist in the development of tourism products and services that are aligned to tourist's needs and wants, development of effective marketing strategies and development of conducive tourism policies. Tourism literature has widely shown that various factors such as culture, finances, travel motivations, leisure time and destination attributes affects tourist's travel behavior (Crompton and Baker, 1996; Cooper and Hall, 2008; Van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011). Travel motivations and pull factors plays an integral role in explaining tourist/traveler behaviour. Dan (1981) defined travel motivation as 'a meaningful state

of mind which adequately disposes an actor or group of actors to travel, and which is subsequently interpretable by others as a valid explanation for such a decision'. It can therefore be deduced that the decision to visit a particular destination depends on the motivation to travel. Motivations are the needs or wants of a person which forces them to act in a specific manner and make relational decisions (March and Woodside, 2005; Van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011), as such travel motivation plays the most pivotal role in influencing tourist behavior.

In developing countries like South Africa, there has been a growing trend of prioritizing domestic tourism on the basis of its huge potential in sustainable tourism development. The South African tourism growth strategy of 2012-2020 has set its mission to offering tour packages that meets the needs of the market in order to create positive experiences (Domestic Tourism Growth Strategy, 2012). In this regard, it is crucial to understand the motivations of the domestic markets so as to align tourism offerings with the identified needs (Van Vurren and Slabbert, 2011). However, due to human nature, as mentioned above, measuring the motives can be problematic because the travel motivation can embrace more than one motive at a time, which ultimately makes it difficult to investigate.

It has been widely documented in travel motivations literature that investigating such a phenomena is an extensive task which is generally not easy due to the nature of human complexity and the fact that travel motivations are not globally uniform as substantiated by the fact that motivations depend on factors such as culture, finances, and time availability (Pearce and Lee, 2005; Van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011; Jiang, Scott and Ding, 2015). Such a complexity of the human nature may be the underlying factor to the development of various models and theories explaining tourist motivation such as the Travel Career Ladder of which Pearce and Lee (2005) acknowledged its lack of uniform applicability across all tourists of all cultures. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, developed by Maslow in 1970 has been both well accepted and criticized in literature, with its criticism stemming from the idea that tourist motivations are not hierarchical in nature (Huang and Hsu, 2009). The Push and Pull theory (1977), Plog's Allocentrism (1974) and the Travel Career Ladder (1988) are some of the the travel motivation theories that can be found in literature for describing and measuring travel motivations. In this study the Push and Pull theory developed by Dann in 1977 is adopted as the main theory, it was then used in ascertaining the travel motivations of residents as well as the destination attributes that attract or influence their travel decisions

Literature review

Travel Motivations
Motivation has been an important topic of research to tourism academics, practitioners and researchers (Crompton, 1979; Dan, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Fodness, 1994; Veal, 1997). A plethora of work has been done, some in all specs of tourism and others in niche tourism (Van der Merwe, Slabbert and Saayman, 2011; Schneider and Vogt, 2012). The emergence of motivational theory in literature, has been widely criticized as Jiang, Scott and Ding (2015) recommended that a good motivation theory should be multi-motive by looking at both motives and pull factors, dynamic, easy to measure and easy to communicate.

Consumers are drivers of demand, understand motives (push factors) to purchase and dimensions (pull factors) of choosing a product amongst its direct competitors, and may provide the tourism industry with insight into how to meet consumer's changing needs in a memorable manner (Schneider and Vogt, 2012). To view tourism demand from a social perspective, Dan (1981) proposed the usage of distinctions between push (i.e. internal motives to travel) and pull (i.e. dimensions affecting destination choice) factors which have been extensively accepted in

literature. Tourism marketers can therefore develop tourism products and services that aim to align travel motives and pull factors to tourism products (Van Vurren and Slabbert, 2011). Reason could substantiate that an assumption is made that tourist are attracted by the features of a destination which may mean that destinations exist in the tourist's mind, however there are physical manifestations of destination features, some tangible e.g. beaches, and others intangible e.g. climate, that play a pivotal role in touristic experiences. Travel behaviour analysis can therefore assist tourism marketers and managers in developing tourism products and services which are not just of high quality but aligned to the needs and wants of travelers as reflected in their motivations (Jiang et al., 2015). Analyzing travel motivation of residents within a specific geographic region can assist potential tourism marketers and managers in developing products and marketing strategies which are aligned to the most prevalent travel motivations of residents within the analyzed region.

It has been well conceived in tourism literature that travel motivation studies face the limitation of adopting motivational items that were developed from past studies as such motivational items may not fit in the scope of current research subjects. Respondents of the study are therefore, forced to make choices on the listed motivational items which may not be suitable for them (Pearce and Lee, 2005; Kim and Prideaux, 2005; Jiang, Scott and Ding, 2015). Although such a limitation threatens the validity of travel motivational studies, past literature has relatively produced similar findings of motives over the years (Dan, 1981; Crompton 1979; Galloway 1998; Veal 1997). However, it can still be argued through reason, that such a consistency in travel motivational research findings may be due to the usage of uniform motivational scale items. The consistency in travel motivation research findings still however strengthens the fact that generally tourists travel to fulfil master needs and wants that can be fulfilled through travelling and experience. For instance, a trip to the moon can satisfy a need to learn and a trip to the museum can satisfy the basic same need to learn but factors that affect travel behaviour (finance, situational factors, environment, and education) may influence the selection of specific destination for fulfilling such a basic need. As such the current study maintained the adoption of motivational items from past literature (Crompton, 1979; Dan, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Fodness, 1994; Veal, 1997). The current study was therefore designed to investigate and analyze the factors which motivate and attract Vhembe District Municipality residents to certain destinations when they travel. A sociological approach which investigates and analyzes travel motivation items and destination features was adopted for the study. Distinctively, travel motivation and destination features that motivate and attract residents when they partake in consumption of tourism products and services and were used in the study.

According to Van der Merwe, Slabbert and Saayman (2011) travel motivation as a set of needs causes a person to participate in tourist activity. The needs of a tourist are essentially psychological and stimulate tourist's behavior (Yoon and Uysal, 2005), and they can only arise when humans' innate needs face disequilibrium (Li, Zhang and Cai, 2016). Exploring the reasons why people travel has been a difficult task as noted by Crompton (1979). Such difficulty does not only rest on human complexity, as Li, Zhang and Cai (2016) argue that the difficulty may be caused by the unwillingness of potential tourists/tourists to reflect on real motives.

A broader explanation of travel motivation was proposed by Jian, Scott and Ding (2015:88) who cited (Pearce 2011a) and proposed that "travel motivation is a special subset of the wider interest area of human motivation and is the total network of biological and cultural forces, which give value and direction to travel choice, behavior and experience". It can therefore be deduced that travel motivation attempt to embrace all the factors affecting the behavior of tourists, with emphasis on why people travel. The Push and Pull theory was developed by Dan in 1977, and has been widely used due to its ability of considering the role played by destination features in

motivating travelers. According to Slabbert and Viviers (2012), push and pull theory as a sociological approach to travel motivation investigation does not only attempt to answer why tourists travel but also examines the role of destination features when choosing a suitable destination. Past literature review found the following travel motives to the most prevalent: escape, novelty, relaxation, prestige, enhancement of kingship relationships and relaxation (Dan, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Dan, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Fodness, 1994; Veal, 1997; Fodness, 1994; Yuan and McDonald, 1990), however travel motives are not only limited to the above mentioned but studies have found all motives to be similar and related. Common push factors or travel motives found in most travel motivation studies include relaxation, knowledge seeking and family togetherness whereas most found pull factors include natural and historic environments, safety and cost, ease of access and facilities (Crompton, 1979; Dan, 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Fodness, 1994; Veal, 1997; Jang and Wu, 2006).

Push factors

Push factors are motivational factors that arise due to a disequilibrium or tension in the motivational system (Slabbert and Viviers, 2011). It can therefore be deduced that push factors reflect traveler's needs and wants. Dan (1977) suggested that the classification of motivations to participate in leisure tourism falls into anomie or ego-enhancement, this is followed by Iso-ahola (1982) who identified two basic dimensions of touristic behavior: escaping and seeking. Push factors are intrinsic needs which are very difficult to measure. Different niches of the tourism sector has led to travel motivation research of different niches.

A study by Bogari, Crowther and Marr (2004) of tourists visiting Saudi Arabia found cultural value, utilitarian value, knowledge, social, economic, family togetherness, interest, relaxation and convenience of facilities to be the push factors. Van Der Merwe, Slabbert and Saayman (2010) conducted a study to determine the travel motives or push factors of tourists to marine areas, the study resulted in a four factor solution with: destination attractiveness, escape and relaxation, time utilization and personal attachment as the four travel motive factors. Van Vuuren and Slabbert (2011) conducted a study of tourist's motivations to a South African resort and the results indicated that resting and relaxation, enriching and learning experiences, participation in recreational activities, personal values and social experiences, enriching and learning was also found to be a push or motivational factor in the current study. Wang (2004) axamined the push factors of visitors to the Huangshan World Heritage Park in China, the study revealed four domains of push factors which includes: appreciating natural beauty and acquiring knowledge, enhancement of human relationship, prestige and adventure novelty.

Similarly Ward (2014) segmented the senior tourism market in Ireland based on travel motivations and their study revealed five factors: escaping, exploring, spiritual and social, physical and excitement and family focused. Even though the current study identified purposive motivation to be a push factor, it is still similar to other findings such as ego-enhancement, prestige and novelty. Slabbert and Viviers (2011) conducted a study to determine the push and pull factors of national parks in South Africa and found personal gain and relaxation to be the push factors. Personal gain is similar to the current study's finding of self-enriching and learning. The plethora of travel motivation literature with specific reference to push and pull factors clearly demonstrates a range of push factors exist and they are similar in the sense that they all aim to fulfil inner needs.

Pull factors

Pull factors are external factors consisting of destination features, attractions or attributes of the destination and destination endowed resources (Slabbert and Viviers, 2011:67; Keyser, 2009). Pesonen, Komppula, Kronenberg and Peters (2011) advocated that pull motivational factors attract people to destination once they have felt and recognized the need to travel. Thus, pull

motives influence the selection of a destination that can satisfy the traveler's intrinsic needs which are within the travel motives. Destinations compete for tourist arrivals. Pesonen et al., (2011) critically stressed the fact that once a decision to travel has been made by tourism consumers, destination features that can best fulfil the travel needs is selected and the selection the destination is based on pull factors of the destination or destination endowed resources and its amplifying and qualifying determinants. Destination attractiveness and pull factors are mutually inclusive concepts, Mayo and Jarvis (1981) referred to destination attractiveness as the relative importance of destination benefits and its ability to deliver these benefits, and hence tourists select benefits that addresses their innate needs. The differentiating line between destination attractiveness features and pull factors is blurry. Herington, Merrilees and Wilkins (2013) recounts that the following are the most apparent destination attractiveness features in literature: (a) natural factors, (b) social factors, (c) historical factors, (d) recreational and shopping facilities, (e) infrastructure, (f) food and shelter. Keyser (2009) advocated the recent addition and importance of events as an important pull factor and destination attractiveness amplifier.

Table 1 indicates studies that have been conducted within the domain of push and pull factors, escaping, exploring, spiritual and social, physical and excitement and family focused, Personal gain and relaxation are some of the most prevalent push factors. The table further indicates that Budget, culture and history, wilderness, ease of travel, cosmopolitan environment and facilities, Easy access to educational and natural resources, destination information and facilities and relaxation and nature appreciation are some of the most prevalent pull factors within literature. To make the differentiating line between destination attractiveness and pull factors more clear Keyser (2009) argued that destination attractiveness is the management, packaging and branding of destination pull factors in an appealing manner and the ability to ensure of the destination to deliver satisfying experiences. Which then means that destination resources or attractions need to be well management in order to pull tourists and provide perceived benefits.

Destination marketers endeavor on various activities to craft a place image or brand which reflects the core attributes of the destination (Stylidis, Sit and Biran, 2016) and there by gaining a competitive edge, consumers then link their needs with destination image. For instance, a tourist who experiences a need to relax may decide to visit Durban beaches because of their relaxation facilities, or Cape Town due to its finer facilities. Jan and Wu (2006) identified three pull factors (cleanliness and safety, facilities and events and cost), Yousefi and Marzuki (2012) identified cultural and historical attractions, tourism facilities, environment and safety as the pull factors of visitors to Penang Malaysia. Knowing tourists motivations and their needs is fundamental in tourism product development and marketing.

Table 1: push and pull factors motivation

Researcher(s)	Push factors identified	Pull factors identified
Iso-ahola (1982)	Escape, seeking	
Phau, Lee and Quintal (2013)	Escape and health, appreciating cultural and natural resources and curiosity	Easy access to educational and natural resources, destination information and facilities and relaxation and nature appreciation
Dan (1977)	Anomie, ego-enhancement	
Crompton (1979)	Escape, self-exploration, relaxation, prestige, enhancement of kinship relationships, social interaction	Novelty, education
Yuan and McDonald (1990)	Escape, novelty, prestige enhancement of kinship, relaxation	Budget, culture and history, wilderness, ease of travel, cosmopolitan environment and facilities

Kim, Oh and Jogaratnam (2006)	Knowledge, Sports, Adventure, Relax, Lifestyle, Travel bragging, family	
Ward (2014)	escaping, exploring, spiritual and social, physical and excitement and family focused	Pre-arranged tour, quality, culture/history, climate/food, sports, no kids
Slabbert and Viviers (2011)	Personal gain, relaxation	Park activities, park attributes and educational value

Methodology

A self-administered survey questionnaire was developed to measure travel motivations of Vhembe District Municipality (VDM) residents, South Africa. The questionnaire aimed to identify the underlying dimensions of push/travel motives and pull travel motivations associated with residents of VDM. A cluster sampling approach was employed wherein VDM was broken into 5 cluster municipalities, data was collected at mall intercepts, taxi ranks and door-to-door entry to households. The questionnaire had Likert scale questions that related to travel motivations and pull factors. There were 11 statements which relate to travel motivations and 15 statements which relates to pull travel motives; the statements were developed with reference to past literature (Jang and Wu, 2006; Fodness, 1994; Jang and Cai, 2002; and Lang, O'Leary and Morrison, 1997; Dan, 1981; Crompton 1979; Galloway 1998; Veal 1997; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011; Jiang, Scott and Ding, 2015; Li, Zhang and Cai, 2016). Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement per each travel motive statement. Four point Likert scale items were used wherein respondents had to select whether they agree, strongly agree, disagree and strongly disagree with the given statements.

Out of the 450 questionnaires distributed, a total of 404 usable questionnaires were obtained representing a 90% response rate. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section posed questions on respondents' background and their travel experience. In the second section, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with statements describing their reasons for travelling (push factors) and their agreement with statements about destination attributes that draws them when they travel. Data was analysed using the SPSS version 23 software in three steps. Firstly, the findings were profiled by socio-demographic and travel experience. Secondly, a factor analysis using a principal component method with Varimax rotation was carried out to identify the underlying dimension of each set of 11 travel motive items and 15 pull motivational items, making a total of 26 motivational items and directed marketing method as the last step created a two cluster solution.

Table 2: demographic profile of VDM residents

Demographics	Frequency **N**	Percentage **%**
Age range		
15-20	36	8.9
21-30	160	39.6
31-40	157	38.9
41-50	49	12.1
50+	2	.5
TOTAL	**404**	**100**
Gender		
Male	160	39.6
Female	244	60.4
TOTAL	**404**	**100**
Municipality of residence in VDM		
Thulamela	64	15.8

Mutale	66	16.3
Makhado	86	21.3
Musina	98	24.3
Malamulele	90	22.3
TOTAL		
	404	**100**
Employment status		
Employed	179	44.3
Unemployed		
Student/learner	123	30.4
TOTAL	102	25.2
	404	**100**
Marital status		
Married	130	32.2
Single		
Divorced	236	58.4
Widowed	24	5.9
TOTAL	14	3.5
	404	**100**
Monthly income range		
R1000	230	56.9
R1 100-R5 000	92	22.8
R6 000-R10 000	59	14.6
R11 000-R20 000	11	2.7
R30 000+	12	3.0
TOTAL	**404**	**100**

Descriptive analysis of the demographical data of the respondents indicates that the sample had more female respondents than males with females constituting 60.4% of the respondents. Table 2 indicates that 58.4% of the respondents were single, 32.2% of the respondents were married. Table 2 indicates that, 39.6% of the respondents were between the ages of 21-30, which then means that majority of the respondents where the youth. As indicated on Table 2, 24.3% of the respondents were from Musina municipality, followed by Malamulele municipality with 22.4% and Thulamela municipality accounted with 15.8% of the respondents residing at the municipality.

Findings

Travel motivation factors (Push factors): The 11 travel motivation Likert items were subjected to Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation using SPSS version 23. Prior to performing PCA, the reliability of the data was first assessed through Cronbach Alpha's reliability analysis in SPSS. The inspection of the corrected Item-Total Correlation revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above, however two items (exploration and escape daily life) had a coefficient of less than .3 and as such were dropped off from further analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin (KMO) value was .799, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970) and Bartlett's Test of sphericity reached statistical significance of .000

PCA revealed the presence of two components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 37.27% and 13.69% of the variance respectively which explains a total variance of 50.97%. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the second component. Using Catell's (1996) scree test, it was decided to retain two components for further analysis. The two component solution explained a total of 50.97% of the variance, with component 1 contributing 37.27% and

component 2 contributed 13.69%. To aid in the interpretation of these three components varimax

Travel motivation	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Cronbach Alpha
Factor 1: **PURPOSIVE MOTIVATION**		3.354	37.27%	.758
I travel to visit friends and relatives	.726			
I travel for business related reasons	.752			
Travelling for religious purpose is important	.667			
Traveling to natural environments is important	.612			
Traveling for adventure is important	.571			
Factor 2: **SELF ENRICHING AND LEARNING MOTIVATION**		1.233	13.69%	.664
Travelling for new experiences is important	.368			
I travel to meet new people and socialize	.772			
I travel to recharge	.704			
I travel for education	.710			
TOTAL			50.97%	

rotation was performed due to little correlations existing between the factors. The rotated solution revealed the presence of a simple structure, with the components showing a number of strong loadings of above .6.

Table 3: Travel motivational factors of VDM residents/push factors

Table 3 indicates the two factors that were revealed by PCA with Varimax rotated solution. The two factors were then labelled as, Purposive motivation and Self-enrichment motivation. Visiting Friends and Relatives, Business travel, Religious travel, travelling to Natural Environment and traveling for Adventure were items that composed factor 1. The labeling was based on items that are similar in the sense that the motive items were aimed at fulfilling a specific aspect/activity such as to attend business, religious events or to visit friends and relatives. Such a finding may be due to the fact that Vhembe District Municipality is a rural setting and traveling is mostly carried out in order to fulfil a specific activity, and tourism demand is still in its early stages of development.

Meeting new people and socializing, traveling to recharge, traveling for education and traveling for new experiences are included in factor 2 labeled as Self-enriching and Learning. The labeling was also based on that the travel items are similar with respect to that they enrich the traveler through the nature of activities undertaken which are related to traveling for education, traveling for new experiences, socializing and recharge, such enrichments also fulfils learning of new perspectives of life.

Pull motivational factors: It is important to consider the motivational patterns/constructs when understanding the forces that drive people to travel, rather than only looking at motivation items individually. Motivational constructs explain why people travel, by not only looking at individual items but also by assessing the grouping of such correlated items. Pull constructs on the other hand; explain why people travel to specific destinations. Factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis) is a common technique used to uncover such constructs or patterns within a grouping of items (Field, 2009). The questionnaire had 15 pull factor statements. Respondents were asked

to state their level of agreement per each pull factor statement. The identified 15 pull statements were subject to Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation. Prior to performing PCA, the reliability of the data was first inspected using reliability analysis test which revealed four items; destination image, climate and weather of the destination, infrastructure of the destination and culture of destination, having a coefficient of less than .3 which were then dropped due to their little correlation. Inspection of the corrected Item-Total Correlation revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The KMO value was .726 before dropping off the four unreliable items. The 11 pull items remaining were subjected to PCA and revealed a KMO value of .800 exceeding the recommended value of .6 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance of .000 supporting the reliability of correlational findings. PCA revealed the presence of three components with Eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 32.193%, 11.893% and 10.193% of the variance respectively with a total cumulative variance of 54.27%. An inspection of the scree plot revealed a clear break after the third component; as such it was decided to retain only three components.

The three component solution explained a total of 54.27% of total variance. Varimax rotation was applied in order to make interpretation of the results easier. The rotated solution showed that all components had strong loadings of above.6.

Table 3: Pull factors of VDM residents

Pull factors	Factor loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained	Cronbach Alpha
Factor 1: **DESTINATION AUGMENTS**		3.541	32.193%	.640
Shopping facilities at the destination	.755			
Beauty and scenery of destination	.745			
Outdoor activities at the destination	.639			
Special events and activities at the destination	.334			
Factor 2: **DESTINATION TOURISTIC FEATURES**		1.308	11.893%	.685
Social of host destination	.740			
Entertainment and relaxation at the destination	.738			
Special animals and plants at the destination	.318			
Price of the destination	.648			
Factor 3:**ENABLING FEATURES**		1.121	10.193%	.508
Safety at the destination	.681			
facilities of destination	.638			
Accessibility of the destination	.596			
TOTAL			54.27%	

As indicated in Table 4, three pull factors were identified. The factors were labeled as, Destination augments, Destination touristic features and Enabling features. The identified factors are further described below:

Factor 1: Destination Augments
Destination Augments is comprised of destination shopping facilities, beauty and scenery of the destination, outdoor activities at the destination and special events and activities at the destination, all these pull items has a similar character of being able to add more for the visitor. The pull items in factor 1 are not core offerings of the destination but rather they are offerings that ensure that there is satisfactory consumption of the core offerings.

Factor 2: Destination Touristic Features
Destination touristic features include entertainment and relaxation at the destination, social host, special animals and plants at the destination and price of the destination. The pull items in this factor share the similarity of existing in order to cater for the core needs of the tourists. The provision of destination touristic features is central to the success of destination tourism industry.

Factor 3: Enabling features
Enabling features incorporates safety at the destination, accessibility of the destination and destination facilities as its pull motive items. These items are similar in the sense that they enable the consumption of tourism at the destination.

Cluster analysis of VDM

The five identified factors from factor analysis were used as variables in cluster analysis. The direct marketing technique resulted in a two cluster solution with cluster one accounting for 164 (40.6%) respondents and cluster 2 accounting for 240 (59.4%) respondents. The mean values for the five factors were used to interpret and assign cluster labels. The first cluster was labeled self-enrichers because this cluster had the highest mean value on the travel motive factor self-enrichment. The second cluster was labeled purposive travelers because the cluster had high mean score on the factor purposive motivation.

Cluster 1: self-enrichers. This cluster is characterized by residents who likes to travel in order to enrich their selves through travelling for new experiences, education and meeting new people to socialize

Cluster 2: purposive travelers. This cluster is characterized by residents who would like travel or travel in order to fulfil a specific purpose. Such purposes may include religious purposes, business purposes, or for visiting friends and relatives. These residents are unique in that their demand for travelling is derivative i.e. caused by the purpose at hand.

Profile of the clusters

Self-enrichers
Sixty-four of the respondents were males as indicated in table 5. Self-enrichers are learners/students who are mostly single, aged from 21-30 and living towards enriching their life experiences. They prefer to use hotels when travelling and use the internet when sourcing information about the place to visit. Since most of them are student/learners their monthly income ranges from R0-R1000. These young self-enrichers prefer to travel with private motor vehicles.

Purposive travelers

Twenty-four percent of the respondents were males and thirty-six percentage were females. They were aged between 31-40 years. The majority of them were married (127) and employed wherein 38.4% of the respondents were actually employed. Most of them (24.0%) prefer to use a Lodge for accommodation and most of them also used the internet to search for information about the destinations they intended to visit.

Table 4: Tripo-graphics of two Clusters

Factor	Clusters	
	Self-enrichers	Purposive travelers
(a) Tripographic profile of clusters		
Mode of transport		
bus	62	53
air	14	13
Private motor vehicle	82	139
Train	6	35
Accommodation		
Hotel	66	42
Backpackers	16	44
Camping	16	41
Lodge	59	97
Friend/relatives home	7	16
Source of destination information		
Internet	68	53
Travel guide	17	26
Friends and relatives	48	81
Magazine and newspaper	21	47
Television	5	22
Radio	5	7
Email	0	2
publications	0	2
Trip expenditure		
R0-R500	35	18
R600-R110	86	147
R2000+	43	75
(b) demographics		
Age range		
15-20	33	3
21-30	98	62
31-40	23	134
41-50	10	39
50+	0	2
Gender		
Male	64	96
Female	100	144
Employment status		
Employed	24	155
Unemployed	46	77
Student/learner	94	8
Marital status		
Single	160	76
Married	3	127
Divorced	1	23
Widowed	0	14
Monthly income range		
R0-R1000	164	66
R1100-R5000	0	92
R6000-R10000	0	59
R11000-R20000	0	11

| R30000+ | 0 | 12 |

Discussion and contributions

Principal Component Analysis revealed two travel motivational factors and three pull motivational factors which motivate VDM residents to travel to specific destinations. Purposive and Self Enrichment were the two motivational factors that motivate VDM residents to travel. Purposive motivation was the strongest from travel motivation factors which then means VDM residents mostly travel to achieve a specific purpose which may be to visit friends and relatives or to attend religious events. It was also found that VDM residents travel to enrich themselves through travelling for education, for new experiences and to meet new people and socialize. PCA revealed three pull factors that were labeled as Destination augments, Destination touristic features and Enabling features with Destination augments being the most potent factor which pulled the residents to specific destinations. It therefore becomes clear that when VDM residents choose destinations to visit, they base their choices on the three identified factors.

Unlike previous studies which either considered push and pull factors, this study looked at motivational items and pull items in order to paint a picture that can demonstrate the factors which motivate VDM residents to travel and the pull factors which attract the travelers to specific destinations. The findings of the study had significant practical implications for understanding travel motivations and pull dimensions of VDM residents. The findings are fundamental in developing appropriate marketing strategies that would affect VDM travel demand. It must be well acknowledged that the current paper was diametric from many within the literature of travel motives in the sense that most of the studies (Crompton 1979; Jang and Wu, 2006; Van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011; Slabbert and Viviers, 2011; Yousefi and Marzuki, 2012; Li, Zhang and Cai, 2016) that investigated and measured the travel motives of 'visitors' with reference to specific tourist destinations. The current study however investigated the travel motives of a segment of residents within a district municipality. It explored their perceived travel motives and pull factors without reference to a specific destination but with reference to their personal motives. The motivation labeled as Self-Enriching is similar to that of Jang and Wu (2006) and Yoursefi and Marzuki (2012) which was labeled as being 'knowledge seeking'. It was not surprising to find a factor labeled as 'purposive motivation' to emerge as Crompton (1979) argued that in the early stages of tourism growth within a region, most travelers will be influenced by visiting friends and relatives and traveling for fulfilling a specific activity.

Conclusions and implications of the study

The primary objective of the study was to investigate the travel motives of VDM residents and give shape to the travel behavior of the residents. The study found two motivational factors which are, purpose fulfilment and destination touristic features. Based on the findings of the study, tourism marketers who intend to sell tourism products to VDM residents should package tours aimed to be purposive in their nature and should add more touristic features within such packaged products. Segmenting the residents into clusters was part of the objectives of the study. A cluster analysis revealed a two cluster solution through a direct marketing technique in SPSS version 24, the clusters created a segment which embodies residents who are purposive travelers and self-enrichers. It can be noted that VDM residents are purposive travelers and self-enhancers who prefer to use private motor vehicles and sleep at lodges. This bodes well for the potential of domestic tourism in the country, especially for those regions where tourism has not fared well in recent times. Knowing what motivates residents to travel will allow the relevant authorities to custom-make domestic tour packages which will appeal to residents like those of VDM.

Marketers should comprehend that even when tourist embark on VFR or religious tours they may still visit resorts and museums and such products that can satisfy such needs should be further developed. The contributions of this study will hopefully help tourism marketers to understand the current travel needs and pull factors of Vhembe District Municipality residents. Such an understanding could be fundamental in developing marketing strategies which will induce the demand for tourism products that are aligned to the resident's travel motivations.

References

Bogari, N., Crowther, B. & Marr, G, N. (2004). Motivation of domestic tourism: The case of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Tourism Analysis,* 8, 131–141.

Cooper, C. & Hall, M. (2008). Contemporary Tourism: an international approach. London, Butterworth-Heinemann.

Crompton, J. (1979). Motivations for pleasure tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408–424.

Crompton, J. L. (1977). Motives for Pleasure Vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1(4), 408-424.

Dann, G. (1981). Tourist motivation: an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2),187-219

Dann, G.M.S. (1977). Anomie, Ego-Enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4 (4), 184-94.

Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 555-581

Galloway, G. (1998). Motivations for leisure Travel: a critical examination. International conference on tourism and hospitality research. Australia: Bureau of tourism Research, 99-108

Huang, S. & Hsu, H. C. (2009). Travel motivation: linking theory to practice. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality*, 3(4), 287-295

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Towards a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: a rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9 (2), 256-262.

Jang, S. & Wu, C. E. (2006). Seniors' travel motivation and the influential factors: An examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Management*, 27, 306-316

Jang, S. & Cai, L. (2002). Travel motivations and destination choice: a study of British outbound market. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 13(3), 111-133

Jiang, S., Scott, N. & Ding, P. (2015). Using means-end chain theory to explore travel motivation: An examination of Chinese Outbound tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 12(1), 87-100.

Keyser, H. (2009). Developing Tourism in South Africa. Oxford press. Cape Town

Kim, K., Oh, I. & Jogoratnam, G. (2007). College student travel: a revised model of push motives. *Journal of Vacation Marketing.* 13, 1, 73-85

Kim, S. & Prideaux, B. (2005). Marketing implications arising from a comparative study of international pleasure tourist motivations and other travel-related characteristics of visitors to Korea. *Tourism Management*, 26, 347-357

Lang, C.T., O'Leary, J.T. & Morrison, A.M. (1997). Distinguishing the destination choices of pleasure travellers from Taiwan. *Journal of travel and tourism marketing*, 6(1), 21-40

Li, M., Zhang, H. & Cai, L. A. (2016). A subcultural analysis of tourism motivations. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research,* 40(1), 85-113

March, R. G. & Woodside, A. G. (2005). Tourism behaviour: Travelers decisions and Actions. Cabi Publishing. Cambridge.

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

Pesonen, J., Kompula, R., Kronenberg, C. & Peters, M. (2011). Understanding the relationship between push and pull motivational factors in rural tourism. *Tourism Review*, 66(3), 32-49

Pine, B. J. & Gilmore H. J. (1999). The experience economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business a stage. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Prayag, G. & 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.

Schneider, P. P. & Vogt, A., A. (2012). Applying a 3M model of personality and Motivation to Adventure Travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(6), 704-716

Slabbert, E. & Viviers, P. (2011/12). Push and Pull factors of national parks in South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 9, 66-88

Stlidis, D., Sit, J. & Biran A. (2016). An exploratory study of residents' perception of place image: the case of Kavala. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(5), 659-674

Van Der Merwe, P., Slabbert, E. & Saayman, M. (2011).Travel motivations of tourists to selected marine destinations. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* 30, 457–467.

Van Vuuren, C. & Slabbert, E. (2011). Travel Motivations of tourists to a South African resort. International conference on tourism and Management studies. Book of proceedings. Vol. 1. Algarve, 2011.

Veal, A. J. (1997). Research methods for leisure and tourism studies. 2nd ed. London: financial times. Prentice Hall.

Wang D, G. (2004). Push–pull factors in mountain resorts: A case study of Huangshan Mountain as world heritage. *Chinese Geographical Science*, 14(4), 368–376.

Wong, M. & Cheung, R. (2013). A study on traveller expectation, motivation and attitude. *Contemporary management research.* 9(2),169-186

Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism management*, 26(1), 45-56

Yousefi, M. & Marzuki, A. (2012). Travel motivations and the influential factors: the case of Penang, Malaysia. *An international journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 23(2), 169-176

Yuan, S. & McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinates of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29, (1), 42–54.