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Abstract

Textile tourism is a tourism product that presents attractions in the form of textile products. The tourism industry is regarded as one of the world’s most important industries that have emerged in worldwide economy including Indonesia. The textile industry is a multi-million dollar industry globally. Textile tourism is peripheral to other forms of tourism, for example ethnic tourism and cultural tourism. Generally, textile tourism can also be related to fashion tourism and shopping tourism because (of course), it is expected that customers will spend money to rent and buy textile and other products made from traditional textiles. Textiles can and should be linked to tourism as a strategy for tourist development, it is recommended for the tourism sector in Indonesia to create a policy framework to control and build a more powerful ‘textile tourist’. To do this one needs to ascertain what supports or hinders textile tourists. This study aims to explore the motivations and constraints of potential tourists with regard to visiting a textile-based tourism destination (one mainly featuring traditional textiles and clothing). Data were collected using an open-ended online questionnaire involving 638 participants who had recently experienced visiting a destination related to traditional textiles. The data were analysed using content analysis. The authors found various dimensions of motivations and constraints. Recommendations for practitioners and future studies are discussed.
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Introduction

So far, the term of ‘textile tourism’ has not been widely used by researchers in the field of tourism. Practically, many managers of tourism sites offer tour packages with textile products and textile-making processes as a tourist attraction (such as those in India, Peru, Spain, and Indonesia). Textiles or textile-making processes offered are, in general are traditional textiles. People use traditional textiles for daily life and even for rituals (Murwanti, 2013). For instance, Lurik is a traditional cloth that is always included in various traditional ceremonies that are related to the life phase of Javanese people in Indonesia, starting from the fetus in the womb, born, married, to death. This fabric is rectangular shaped striped pattern. Each line has meaning and philosophy. Traditional textile is a foundation of today’s global fashion system. Nations across the globe have a history of textile development. Yet surprisingly, only a few researchers, such as, Coit (2001), Heckman (1998) and Richards (2005), among a few others have examined textile tourism or tourism related to textiles. Because of the focus on traditional textiles, there is the potential that textile tourism is tangential to other forms of tourism, such as ethnic tourism and cultural tourism. In general, textile tourism can also be related to fashion tourism and shopping tourism because (of course), it is expected that customers will spend money to rent and buy textile and other products made from traditional textiles.

This study aims to explore the potential tourists’ motivations and constraints with regard to visiting a tourism destination related to textile tourism. The motivation of tourists has been widely explored by prior studies which have used different frameworks. For example, Kay (2003) and Tikkanen (2007) use Maslow’s theory of the hierarchical of needs and apply it to
food tourism. Further, Suhud (2014) uses Maslow’s theory in the setting of volunteer tourism. Further, Anders et al. (1999), Bristow and Yang (2015), and Jacobsen, Skogheim, and Dann (2015) employ the ‘sea, sun, sand, and sexual motivation’ approach. Other scholars employ intrinsic-extrinsic motivation theory (Chung, Koo, & Kim, 2014; Correia & Kozak, 2017). Some others apply push-pull motivation theory (Khuong & Ha, 2014; Wang, Luo, & Tang, 2015). In terms of constraints, everyone has a specific interest in terms of the types of attractions and tourist destinations they like best. If tourists’ interests differ from those which the attraction and the destination cater to, it will be difficult for such persons to set foot anywhere near those locations. For the managers of tourism sites, facing the interest of different potential tourists can be a challenge. Therefore, some researchers assume that tourist segmentation can be seen from the types of constraints tourists are under, regarding their vacation (Cho, Bonn, & Brymer, 2017). In addition to the issue of taste, other limitations faced by tourists should also be considered.

**Literature Review**

**Tourist motivation**

Previous studies have addressed motivation in various tourism-product settings – for example, ecotourism (Hultman, Kazemina, & Ghasemi, 2015), volunteer tourism (Suhud, 2015), sex tourism (Suhud & Sya’bani, 2014), food tourism (Tikkansen, 2007), sport tourism (Robinson & Gammon, 2004), and geo-tourism (Allan, 2011). However, there are a limited number of studies discussing motivation in textile-based tourism. A study conducted by Onderwater, Richards, and Stam (2000) looked at motivation and other determinant factors influencing the purchase of textile souvenirs. Considering the limitations, the authors borrow the literature of tourists’ motivations in different settings of other tourism products.

Among other approaches, ‘push-pull’ is one of the most approaches most used by scholars. Caber and Albayrak (2016) investigate the motivations of rock climbing tourists (in the Geyikbayiri region of Turkey) by employing the push and pull approach. According to these authors, push motivation dimensions involve risk-taking, challenge, catharsis, recognition, creativity, and physical setting. Pull motivation dimensions include climbing novelty seeking, destination novelty seeking, climbing tourism infrastructure, non-climbing sport and leisure activities, and reclusiveness. Whyte (2017) studies tourists’ pull-push motivations related to a cruise vacation. They found that tourists’ motivations are linked to their travel-related decisions. Fieger, Prayag, and Bruwer (2017) use the data from foreign tourists who visited New Zealand and make nine typologies of them based on a pull-push approach. Further, taking place in Hong Kong, Xu and Chan (2016) look at the motivations of the nature-based tourists in Hong Kong. They find that push motivation includes self-enhancement, relaxation and knowledge, and escapism from routine life. Pull motivation includes Hong Kong scenery, information and convenience, and various fun activities. They document a relationship between pull motivation and recommendation that others to be involved in nature-based tourism while also documenting that push motivation moderates on the relationship. Looking at the motivations of international tourists who visited Penang, Malaysia, researchers Yousefi and Marzuki (2015) discuss three dimension of push motivation and three dimensions of pull motivation. According to them, the dimensions of push motivation include novelty and knowledge-seeking, ego enhancement, and rest and relaxation. Further, the dimensions of pull motivation include factors related to interest in environment and safety, cultural and historical attractions, and tourism and facilities.

A Chinese study related to consumer motivations to visit boutique hotels was conducted by Wang et al. (2015). The scholars documented push motivation dimensions consisting of uniqueness seeking, interpersonal experience, and social networking, whereas pull motivation dimensions consist of site value, and of decoration and theme. Another study looking at push-pull motivation of tourists was conducted by Jang and Wu (2006). They found that push motivation includes ego-enhancement, self-esteem, knowledge-seeking, relaxation, and
socialisation. In contrast, pull motivation includes cleanliness and safety; facilities, event, and cost; and natural and historical sightseeing. In general, travel motivation would seem to affect other factors, such as travel satisfaction, destination image, and intention to return (Chetthamrongchai, 2017; Dayour & Adongo, 2015; Leong, Yeh, Hsiao, & Huan, 2015). Additionally, in developing segmentation of tourism destinations, scholars have studied the important role of tourists’ motivation in developing a segmentation. They have split tourists into different categories based on demographic, psychographic (Galloway, 2002), geographic, behaviour, and motivational factors. Other scholars (Alexandris, Koutris, Konioros, & Giannopoulos, 2015; Beh & Bruyere, 2007; Bieger & Laesser, 2002) have classified tourist segmentation according to motivation.

**Constraints against visiting**

Prior studies have explored constraint in tourism as a predictor variable. For example, Tan (2017) and Chen, Chen, and Okumus (2013) adopt restraint to predict destination image and revisit intention. Similar with the case of motivation above, there is also a lack of study exploring constraints to visit a destination relating to textile products.

Cho et al. (2017) studied wine tourism constraints in the south-eastern United States and see it as being a way to subdivide the market into groups for market segmentation. According to them, dimensions of constraints include a lack of interest, a lack of information, lack of money and time, inconvenient wheelchair accessibility, and a lack of family-oriented programs. Further, a study by Priorpas, Vassiliadis, Bellou, and Andronikidis (2015) involved winter sports tourists in Greece. The researchers adopted constraints to develop a tourist segmentation to subdivide tourists into groups based on the various constraints tourists are under. The constraint dimensions consisted of intrapersonal, financial, social, and athletic constraints. Suhud (2014: 57) documents constraints on tourism as seen in Table 1. He argues that constraints can be grouped into intrinsic and extrinsic, or factual and perception. Intrinsic constraints include a lack of interest, time, finance, health, and skills. Besides, extrinsic constraints consist of factors related to a lack of information, safety and security, distance, family, work, facilities, travel companion/s, social interaction and/or isolation, and transportation.

Table 1. Grouping constraints in tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraints/Authors</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Travel companion/s</th>
<th>Social &amp; isolation</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson and Henderson (1995)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott and Munson (1994)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyaupane and Andereck (2008)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Brown, Miller, and Hansen (2001)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior studies have explored constraint in tourism as a predictor variable. For example, Tan (2017) and Chen, Chen, and Okumus (2013) adopt restraint to predict destination image and revisit intention. Similar with the case of motivation above, there is also a lack of study exploring constraints to visit a destination relating to textile products. Cho et al. (2017) studied wine tourism constraints in the south-eastern United States and see it as being a way to subdivide the market into groups for market segmentation. According to them, dimensions of constraints include a lack of interest, a lack of information, lack of money and time, inconvenient wheelchair accessibility, and a lack of family-oriented programs. Further, a study by Priorpas, Vassiliadis, Bellou, and Andronikidis (2015) involved winter sports tourists in Greece. The researchers adopted constraints to develop a tourist segmentation to subdivide tourists into groups based on the various constraints tourists are under. The constraint dimensions consisted of intrapersonal, financial, social, and athletic constraints. Suhud (2014: 57) documents constraints on tourism as seen in Table 1. He argues that constraints can be grouped into intrinsic and extrinsic, or factual and perception. Intrinsic constraints include a lack of interest, time, finance, health, and skills. Besides, extrinsic constraints consist of factors related to a lack of information, safety and security, distance, family, work, facilities, travel companion/s, social interaction and/or isolation, and transportation.
Methodology

Sample

Participants of this current study were those who had had been on an experience as a tourist within the last six months. They were approached conveniently using an online personal communication channel. They were asked to fill in an online questionnaire with open-ended questions in order to obtain qualitative data. These data were then coded and presented in frequencies and percentages. The survey consisted of two main questions including (a) motivations for visiting a tourism destination with a traditional clothing available to buy, rent, or borrow during the visit of tourists; and (b) constraints against attending a tourism destination with a traditional clothing available to buy, rent, or borrow during the tourists’ stay.

Table 2 presents the profile of the participants. This current study attracted 638 participants. The group comprised 248 males (38.9%) and 390 females (61.1%). Most of the participants were unmarried (92.5%) university students (82.1%). A predominant number of participants (79%) having not yet earned an undergraduate degree. Further, 59.2% of them were between 17-20 years old.

Table 2. Participants profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow/widower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level has been completed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-graduate</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and older</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, more than 60% of participants claimed they experienced visiting a destination where traditional dresses were available to rent, borrow, or purchase.

In term of the stage of experience related to textile tourism, almost 40% of participants mentioned that “I did not know that in the tourism destinations I’ve visited, there were traditional clothes that visitors could buy, rent, or borrow”. Furthermore, almost 30% claimed that “I know in one of the tourist destinations I’ve visited, there were traditional clothes that visitors could buy, rent, or borrow […] and I have bought, rented, or borrowed”. Also, more than 25% of participants indicated “I know [that] in one of the tourist destinations I’ve visited, there
were traditional clothes that visitors could buy/rent/borrow [such clothes]." Less than 10% of participants said that "I knew [that] in one of the tourist destinations I've visited, there were traditional clothes that visitors can buy, rent, or borrow, but [I] had not been interested”.

**Data analysis**

The authors analysed the data using content analysis techniques (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992; White & Marsh, 2006). As the data were being collected using the Microsoft Office Form, the authors had an opportunity to also download the results in an Excel format. Furthermore, the data points were transformed into an SPSS format and coded each into themes. Further, the data were analysed descriptively. The interviews were conducted in the Bahasa (language) of Indonesia and all the data were translated into English by the authors.

**Results and discussion**

**Motivation for visiting**

Table 3 shows the motivation of potential tourists for visiting a tourism destination relating to traditional textiles and clothes. The authors group the answer into categories related to whether the respondents’ motivations were either push-related or pull-related in nature.

**Push motivation**

Push motivation is a motivation driven by aspects from within the tourist, in that they constitute a desired to be released.

a. Knowledge-seeking (24.8%). Some participants said: "[I] want to [get to] know the place of tourism", "To see the object of tourism in that place", "[I have a] curiosity [with regard to] the place", "So we know that our culture is diverse", "To know the traditional custom", "Because [I] want to see the beauty of the place", "I want to see how the resort's way or method introduces or promotes … traditional clothing", and "[To] learn about the culture in that place."

b. Experience-seeking (23.5%). For example: "$[I]$ want to try on that custom and post it to [people on] social media to see our culture" and "[My] motivation is to rent and wear it to [I] introduce to the outside that the sights are interesting". Also, "$[I]$ will take the opportunity to visit and borrow/rent traditional clothes that exist in the place" and "Because [in wearing such clothes] I can feel a part of the local community". Further, "[To] feel the culture that exists in the place", "[To have a] new experience", "Trying to feel to be the original person of the place", and "I want to feel [a connection] to the tourist attractions that provide custom clothing, so that we do not forget our culture."

c. For taking and posting photos (9.4%). Responses include: "In addition to the place of interest, we can [take a] selfie while wearing the typical clothes of the area", "Creating Instagram-able photos", "One of the things to do when travelling is to take pictures [as] keepsakes, and the traditional dress adds power pull to come adds power [and an attractive force], and I can take pictures that are with more interesting", "[I] am interested in capturing the moment", "To take pictures", "To post photos on Instagram", and "[To] take pictures with family or people closest [to you]."

d. For holidaying and leisure (8.9%): "For recreation", "To travel naturally [and to] introduce the culture to the wider community", "[I] want a vacation, and [I] want to] see [the place] directly [to see the place for myself]", "For a vacation", and "My main motivation is to take a vacation or to enjoy the sights are".

e. For marketing purposes (2.5%). For instance, "To introduce the place to the future children of the nation", "[To] make a business, [To] attract tourists to come and visit", "To introduce culture and traditional dress on a much deeper [level]", "[to] in the presence of traditional clothing", "Especially for parents who bring children can introduce the culture, not just the usual walks, and can also take pictures by wearing regional clothes [to introduce the culture to children]", "To help promote tourism and culture", and "[to] introduce the culture [to others]".
f. For preservation (1.4%). Responses include: "To preserve the culture", "[To] preserve Indonesian culture", and "[To] preserve traditional dress".

g. Nationalistic (1.1%). For instance: "To love the culture of this nation", "[To] love the culture", "I am proud to be Indonesian child, and I love Indonesian culture", "[To] appreciate the existing culture", "So as [for memories] to not fade", and "[To] remind us that our country has a diverse culture".

**Pull motivations**

Pull motivation is the motivation formed by aspects that come from outside the tourist. These aspects attract the tourist to visit a tourism destination, which these aspects may relate to things that are related to the tourism destination.

a. The place (17.2%). Responses included: "Because the place is so interesting that [I] wanted to visit and try the traditional clothes", "History of the sights", "The tourism is interesting", "Because of the attraction of the destination", "Because the place is good", "(The place has) tourist attractions and facilities", "The unique and interesting place", "The uniqueness of the place", "The beautiful scenery and the interesting custom", "The place is nice, beautiful, nice looking, cool, [and] not a slum", "Cultural history [from that place]", and "Because the tourist attractions are very easy for tourists".

b. The clothes (4.4%). Participants were motivated to visit a textile tourism destination as it had a "traditional dress", "ethnic garments", "the beauty and uniqueness of the dress", "the hallmark of the culture", and "innovation in dress".

Up to 6.7% of participants had an unidentified answer. The rest of the answers indicated other forms of response and are not presented here due to their being in the minority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Dimensions of motivation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Knowledge-seeking</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Experience-seeking</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The place</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To take and post photos</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>For holidaying and recreation</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The clothes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>For marketing purposes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>For conservation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nationalistic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Constraints against visiting**

Table 4 shows constraints as perceived by the participants. The authors identified ten types of constraints against visiting a tourism destination related to textile tourism as seen by participants. These types are divided into intrinsic and extrinsic constraints.

**Intrinsic constraints:**

a. Finance: Regarding the constraints against visiting a textile-based tourism destination, 160 participants (39.7%) perceived the tariff of renting of the clothes as being expensive.

b. Lack of interest: 99 of participants (15.2%) were not interested in wearing a traditional cloth. Reasons included: "I just like to see it (traditional clothes)", "It doesn't suit (with) my taste", "Not interested in being too old-fashioned", "Custom clothing doesn't interest me", "[I] don't want", " Maybe it isn't appealing enough to me ", "I'm not willing (wearing traditional clothes ")", "(I'm) not used to wearing traditional clothes ", "(I'm) not interested ", "(I'm) not ready ", "(I ) not interested ", " [I feel unnecessary ", " I will not borrow if there is
no need ", "Not (my) priority ", [I] do not need", "[I] lazy [To] queue up ", "(I'm) lazy to wear it ", and" (I'm) lazy to change [into the traditional] clothes [provided] ".

c. Limited time to visit: Time became a factor attended to by 18 participants (2.8%). Time constraints were related to the limited time the potential could be spent at a destination. In support of this constraint, here are the participants' comments: "Maybe it's not the right time", "The tour is only for a short time, and has no time to rent the clothes", "A little travel time", "[It's] wasting of time", "There are other interests", "Next time [I] may". "Limitations of time and process are difficult when having to change clothes ", and" Because the weather does not support [it]".

d. Discomfort: 16 participants (2.5%) perceived that it could be uncomfortable to wear clothing that has been worn by others. Comments included: "[I] am not confident in wearing the (traditional) clothes", "[I] embarrassed", "Not comfortable. I'm not the type to take photos – especially when wearing traditional clothes", and "Maybe it looks strange or uncomfortable when in use".

Extrinsic constraints:

a. The attraction: The traditional clothes in the setting of textile-based tourism were considered as an attraction. Participants perceived the clothes as being dirty and of the wrong size and perceived the wearing of such clothes as being impractical and improper.

- Impractical. Up to 95 participants (14.9%) mentioned that traditional clothes could be impractical to wear. They said, "It takes a long time to wear it", "[It's] complicated to wear it", "Too difficult [to] be changed", "[It's] too complicated to use [when] traveling", "Maybe [it's] because of laziness [that I do not want] to change [into traditional] clothes", "It's too time consuming to wear it", "It's hard to wear regional clothes", "Usually traditional clothes are difficult to wear", "Traditional clothing that is worn is inconvenient, so it cannot enjoy the tourist spot because of [wearing such] its clothes", "[I] want to dress [in a] more relaxed [way]", "Maybe because the clothes aren't simple [to put on]", "It's complicated because you have to change clothes".

- Cleanliness: To borrow, 41 participants (6.4%) considered that the clothes could be dirty, unhygienic, and have a bad smell. For this type of constraints, they said: "[I] fear (the clothes) are not hygienic", "[I] do not want to (wear them), because usually (the clothes) are not guaranteed to be clean", "It's better to buy because if we rent or borrow we don't know the character of the skin [of people] who have rented or borrowed (the clothes) ", "The clothes are dirty or smelly ", "Maybe because [the clothes] are not treated ", and " [I] doubt the cleanliness of the clothes ".

- The clothes. Twenty-one participants (4.7%) thought that size, design, and fabric could be a problem for them. Responses included: "The clothes are not suitable," "The clothes are not good because they are damaged", "The clothes are not the right size," and "The material is hot [if worn]".

- Improprate: 14 participants (2.2%) considered that the traditional clothes would be improper for them to wear. These participants associated the clothes with their religion. "[The design of the] clothes is too open", "[I am visiting] a tourism place that is not in harmony with traditional clothing", "Because traditional clothing is a symbol of religion embraced by a region; so if I go to a place that may not be in accordance with religion [which I follow] I will not rent or borrow ", "Maybe it is not in accordance with the principles I have "; and" Wearing (traditional clothes) at the wrong time ".

b. Long queues: Participants predicted that a long queue could result from the crowd who visited the destination having wanted to borrow or rent the clothes. Up to 30 participants (4.7%) showed their concern for it. For example, "There are many who are borrowed so that it causes a queue, especially if the clothes provided (in number) are limited".

The remaining answers were considered as being unidentified; and therefore, the authors put them in the category of 'other'.
cultural places are undoubtedly part of a nation's culture. For example, traditional hats are a part of Ecuadorian culture. Studies on cultural tourism motivation have been conducted by previous scholars. For example, Yolal and Negruşa (2012) stated tourists were visiting the cultural tourism destinations because they thought them to be important. Besides, because there are usually cultural objects or cultural events, tourists also want to learn about the culture and at the same time want to contribute to cultural preservation. Also, cultural places are considered to have a historical background that makes tourists want to learn. Further, Negruşa and Yolal (2012) indicated that cultural events and cultural place could motivate tourists to visit an event. Similarly, Prada-Primm, and Lafe (2017) observed that, in general, the attraction of a destination would attract tourists to come.

Other research that explores the motivations of cultural tourism does not explicitly look at motives related to culture. These motivations of tourists with regard to cultural tourism are, in general, almost the same as for other tourism products. For example, Chiang, Wang,
Lee, and Chen (2015) investigated the motivation of cultural tourists. The motivation included skill learning, escaping, networking, and sightseeing. Yusof, Harun, Wafa, Kler, and Majidab (2017) revealed that cultural motivation included novelty seeking, social interaction, mastery or competence, and intellectual interest.

d. Taking and posting a selfie: In a tourism destination characterised by traditional clothing and tourists wearing said clothing, what they must do is take pictures (whether selfie or groupie). Wearing a traditional dress in a tourism destination is not necessarily something all that usual. Therefore, documenting those moments can be socially mandatory. After all the efforts and many sacrifices, they have invested in producing attractive photos, tourists will feel they are dear to the hearts of their friend if the pictures are shared on their social media accounts are shared. So, once they say ‘cheese’ and click the camera or smart phone button, in a matter of minutes the photos have been spread through cyberspace (Axelsson, 2018; Flaherty & Choi, 2016). Within minutes, socially networked tourists will obtain some likes, comments and questions from their followers.

e. For holidaying and recreation: Whatever the destination, some tourists sometimes just want a vacation where they can party and enjoy the holidays. In their study, Dodds, Graci, and Holmes (2010) compared tourists visiting Koh Phi Phi, Thailand, and Gili Trawangan, Indonesia. Phi Phi and Gili Trawangan are two islands which are popular among international tourists. They said that tourists are motivated for reasons related to relaxation, holidaying, and the beach.

f. For marketing purposes: Generally, the marketing activities of a tourism destination are always part of the work of the managers. In this study, these participants stated their views that the supply of textiles and traditional clothing at tourist attractions to be lent, rented, or sold, were tricks and gimmicks created to entertain tourists.

g. For preservation. Textile and traditional clothing need to be preserved. Tourists realize that developing traditional textile-based tourism products means preserving traditional textiles and clothing. In relation to island tourism, tourists paid attention to preservation and conservation (Dodds et al., 2010). Some authors drew a connection between motivational preservation and rural tourism (Farmaki, 2012), heritage tourism (De-qian, 2005; Halsall, 2001), and ethnic tourism (Esman, 1984).

h. Nationalistic. Tourists very rarely travel to a destination due to nationalistic motivation. In the current research, nationalistic motivation refers to the feelings or perceptions that participants have in expressing their love and pride in traditional textiles and clothing. However, nationalistic has been identified as being related to an entrepreneurial motivation of Muslim students in Indonesia (Purwana, Suhud, & Arafat, 2015).

Constraints

a. Finance: Financial factors can, of course. affect someone’s intention to take a vacation – not only to visit a textile-based tourism destination, but also to visit other destinations as well. Constraints can indeed factually mean that the person does not have a certain amount of money, however, it could also be because vacation is not a priority for them, or because they perceive vacationing in a textile-based tourism destination to be expensive. Prior studies have documented that personal finance was indeed one of the constraints governing the travel of tourists (Beh & Bruyere, 2007; Brown, Brown, Miller, & Hansen, 2001; Kim & Chalip, 2004; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008; Priporas et al., 2015; Scott & Munson, 1994; Suhud, 2014).

b. Lack of interest: Textile-based tourism may only attract tourists who have an interest in traditional textiles and clothing. For this reason, this type of tourism product will be categorized as being an alternative or niche tourism. Previous studies (Brown et al., 2001; Cho et al., 2017; Kim & Chalip, 2004; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008; Scott & Munson, 1994; Suhud, 2014) raised the possibility that a lack of interest may be one of the constraints that must be watched for by managers of tourism destinations.
c. The attraction: The attraction includes the clothes, impracticality, cleanliness, impropriate, and discomfort. Participants considered that a textile-based tourism destination would be less attractive if the clothes provided were impractical. Besides, they might be dirty. In the study of Jang and Wu (2006), the cleanliness of the destination was one of the motivation factors in visiting that destination. By contrast, in the current study, cleanliness was found to be one of the constraint factors. Further, participants also paid attention on the clothes itself. What happens if tourists who are interested in borrowing, renting, or buying traditional clothes find that such clothes are not available in the desired size? Or, what if the fabric used to make traditional clothing is not in accordance with weather conditions back home?

d. Long queues: There is a perception among tourists that if a destination lends out traditional clothing to wear, renting such clothing at destination will require facing a long queue. This is an understandable fear, especially if their visit is scheduled to occur during the holiday season. This perception can be an obstacle, so it will be difficult for them to be involved in this type of tourism product. Prior studies had not previously revealed any such constraint.

e. Limited time to visit: In previous studies, being busy was a reason for potential tourists to not travel (Brown et al., 2001; Lu, Lin, & Tseng, 2011; Nyaupane & Andereck, 2008; Scott & Munson, 1994; Suhud, 2014). In the current study, tourists travelled, but their time was short, so they did not have time to borrow or rent traditional clothing during their stay at the destination.

f. Less information: Only two participants (0.5%) said that a lack of information could potentially constrain them from becoming involved with a textile-based tourism product. However, providing a sufficient amount of quality information still could be an important key to running an attraction and coordinating activities related to traditional textiles. According to Cho et al. (2017), Nyaupane and Andereck (2008), and Scott and Munson (1994), having access to less information is one of the most important constraints which stop potential tourists from visiting a destination.

Conclusions

This study aimed to explore motivations and constraints related to textile-based tourism destinations. Previous studies have not appropriately developed the literature on this area of study. In this current study, the authors focus on authentic traditional textiles of Indonesia. In general, the motivation for visiting a textile-based tourism-related destination consists of two dimensions: push and pull motivation. The push motivation includes the desire to enhance understanding (experience-seeking), to create experiences (experience-seeking), to take and post photos, to engage in holidaying and recreation, visit for marketing purposes, visit for conservation, and for nationalistic reasons. Additionally, the pull motivation includes an interest in the place itself and the textile/clothes on offer there.

Further, the travel constraints consisted of intrinsic and extrinsic constraints. The intrinsic constraints consist of financial factors, a lack of interest, limited time, discomfort, and concerns over perceived impropriety, whereas, the extrinsic constraints include impracticability, the clothes (size, design, and fabric), the desire to avoid waiting in a long queue, scepticism as to the cleanliness of the clothing, and a lack of relevant information. Some answers were indicated as ‘others’ due to such responses’ having been in the minority, and some other answers were simply irrelevant.

Here are some recommendations concerning the future development of textile-based tourism destinations in Indonesia:

a. Integrate textile-based tourism products with other tourism products so that the appeal of one product with another product can complement each other. At the very least, if textile-based tourism products are not attractive to some tourists, tourists will see additional products as alternatives.
b. Create an integrated set of information, which combines materially informative content media promotion that can be used to create awareness and (especially) to generate interest.

c. Choose the right information, the right time, the right target audience, sharing the right reasons for visiting sites related to textiles to have a positive impact on the communication which has been done.

d. Pay attention on motivations and tourist obstacles because they can be used as a basis for the kind of segmentation that has been previously carried out by previous researchers. However, it can also be directed towards the development of tourism products.

Further study may consider other tourism products that are suspected of having an intersection with textile-based tourism. Such products include agritourism, cultural tourism, ethnic tourism, fashion tourism, shopping tourism, creative tourism, and educational tourism. Also, the next study could be conducted according to a quantitative approach. By conducting quantitative research, the data can hopefully become an even more valid way to measure motivations and constraints. Future studies can also consider selecting potential textile tourism tourists at a destination related to the textiles. This approach could be an ideal way to compose a sample of people who are in an environment supportive of traditional textile or who have chosen to support the manufacture of traditional textile.
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