



Motivation and Involvement in Camping – a Gender Perspective

Van Heerden, C.H.
Faculty of Management Sciences
Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa
E-mail: vanheerdench@tut.ac.za
ORCID: 0000-0002-2950-6051

Abstract

Camping tourism is a popular recreational activity, where participants travel in order to spend time living in tents or caravans. Yet, this form of tourism has so far been neglected in tourism and hospitality research. This article focuses on factors that could motivate a camper (create a motivational state) to visit a campsite and to participate (a level of involvement) to participate in certain camping activities. It is postulated that there is a limited understanding in general on the psychological (motivation) and behavioural aspects (involvement) in terms of camping as a recreational activity. This study therefore investigates these two constructs among campers in South Africa. The sample was drawn from six campsites within 100km from Pretoria. The inclusion criteria of the campsites were as follows: they are located in a natural environment, campers have set up their tents and caravans; permission had been received to collect data from campers at the campsite, the campsites were easily accessible by road, and data collection could be managed during a day visit without having to stay overnight at the campsites. The realised sample consisted of 218 males and females aged 18 years and older, with a fairly equal distribution between male (n=49.1%) and female (n=50.9%) respondents. The results indicated that there is a statistically significant difference between males and females in terms of their involvement but not in terms of motivation. This study was a South African replication based on a study conducted by Kyle, Absher, Hammit and Cavin (2006) in the United States of America.

Keywords: Involvement, motivation, gender, South Africa, camping.

Introduction

Camping tourism is a popular (MacLeod, 2017) and attractive (Poldrugovac, Janković, & Peršić, 2019) recreational activity, where participants travel in order to spend time living in tents, caravans, motor homes or other types of informal, rural accommodation. They label the camping industry as a very important and growing segment in tourist destinations. Despite its popularity, this form of tourism has so far been neglected in tourism and hospitality research (Mikulić, Prebežac, Šerić, & Krešić, D, 2017; Lopes & Brandão, 2018).

Initial research output (models and theories generated by Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Maslow, 1943; Mannel & Iso-Ahola, 1987; & Mill & Morrison, 1985) established that motivation was a psychological process but did not acknowledge involvement as a behavioural outcome of motivation.

A seminal study by Kyle Absher, Hammit and Cavin (2006) investigated the relationship between motivation and involvement relating to campers in United States of America context. They concluded that motivation could be regarded as an antecedent of involvement. Subsequent research to test the relationship between motivational influences and the state of involvement to engage in an activity such as camping is scarce and more so in a South African context. It could therefore be postulated that there is a limited understanding in general on the psychological (motivation) and behavioural aspects (involvement) and the relationship between these two constructs in terms of camping as a recreational activity.



Whether males and females have the same psychological mindset in terms of camping motivation and involvement is unknown. Two decades ago a pioneer in South African tourism research (Saayman, 2000:33) identified these two forces (psychological as well as behavioural) that may attract or repel a tourist to a specific tourism site. He acknowledged the expectancy-value model of Lawler (1973), as an overall framework to understand the basic motivational and involvement elements in any recreational activity such as visiting a tourism site.

Culture and gender may create distinct recreational behavioural patterns and measuring motivation-involvement relationship within a South African camping context could therefore be different from the findings of Kyle *et al.* (2006) in their study conducted in the United States of America.

Literature review

A succinct review of appropriate literature on the constructs of motivation and involvement is discussed in this section. Gender as a moderating variable is also briefly covered.

Motivation in camping

Motivation is an important dimension in tourism research (Seabra, *et al.*, 2014). As a scientific construct it consists of socio-psychological motives (Crompton, 1979 - (escape, self-exploratory, relaxation, prestige, regression, kinship-enhancement, and social interaction; psychological processes (Pizam & Mansfeld, 1999:58; Witt & Wright, 1992:24) and include personal characteristics (Packer & Ballantyne, 2002:189). A tourist (camper) “brings” these motives with them to the destination (previous experiences, personal goals and beliefs and opportunities to participate or experience activities). These motives create a desire (Park, Yang, & Wang, 2019) to visit a destination (campsite).

Motivational models such as Plog’s psychographic or Iso Ahola’s model of social psychology attempted to explain tourism behaviour (Šimková & Holzner, 2014). Maslow’s 5-stage motivational hierarchy, that explains five basic human needs, is well-known in academic literature. Mill and Morrison (1985:19) regard travel as a human need and they firmly believe that Maslow’s hierarchy connects well with travel motivation. Similarly, Dann’s (1977:186; & 1981) seven travel motivators can also be connected to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. Manfredo, Driver, Tarrant (1996) state that one approach to studying the motivations for leisure is to focus on the desired goal states that are attained through participation in leisure. Kyle *et al.* (2006:468) identified motivational forces as “escape”, “nature”, “bonding”, “learning” and “social”.

Involvement in camping

Research on involvement has been neglected in services contexts, especially in tourism (Seabra, *et al.*, 2014). One reason is perhaps because researchers have focussed more on motivational factors that determine tourist behaviour. The study of the involvement construct in consumer behaviour and its connection to motivation can be traced back to Sherif and colleagues’ early work on ego-involved attitudes and processes related to attitude change (Sherif & Cantril, 1947; Sherif & Hovland, 1961; Sherif, Taub, & Hovland, 1958). Many researchers (Bloch, Black & Lichtenstein, 1989; Kyle, Kerstetter & Guadagnolo, 2002; Schuett, 1993) investigated the effect involvement has on leisure-related behavioural and psychological processes. Enduring involvement relates to the occurrence of personal



relevance when an individual relates the product (recreational activity such as camping) to his/her self-image (Jun, et al., 2012).

Individuals' needs, goals, values and the attitudes of an activity (motivational state) influence the desire to pursue (involvement in) a recreational activity. Individual differences and situational factors jointly determine the level of involvement experienced by consumers (Celsi & Olsen, 1988:210). According to Dimanche and Samdahl (1994) "identity affirmation" and "identity expression" dimensions of involvement indicate that campers affirm their identities to themselves and others by their participation in specific leisure activities. Kyle *et al.* (2006:470) combined five dimensions of enduring involvement consisting of "attraction", "centrality", "social bonding", "identity affirmation" and "identity expression" in a study among inter alia campers visiting a south-eastern National Forest. Their Modified Involvement Scale (MIS) has been replicated in this study.

Researchers such as Caber and Albrayak (2016; Chen & Chen (2015), Hani (2016), and Lee, Quintal & Phau (2017) refer to the use of a push and pull approach to study travel motivations. Travel motivators identified by Dann (1977:186; & 1981) relate to push and pull forces that drive a tourist to visit a specific place (campsite) or practice a particular activity while pull forces make a facility or activity attractive to the tourist. Motivation consists of a set of internal (psychological) forces that push people to undertake certain actions to achieve an end (recreation), by pursuing a recreational activity such as camping (Crompton, 1979; Mannel & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Seabra, et al., 2014). They state that people travel because they are "pushed" (a desire to travel is created by psychological forces), and "pulled" (by the subsequent state of psychological motivation, arousal and interest) to pursue a recreational activity and visit a tourist destination (involvement). The push forces that Dann (1977:186) identified refer to the physical activities that campers can participate in (involvement). As cited in Kyle *et al.* (2006:471), the overall experiences that combine motivation and involvement will be captured in campers' long-term memories.

In a South African context Saayman (2000:33) acknowledged that push and pull factors are linked to the scales of Kyle *et al.* (2006:474). The scales that Kyle *et al.* (2006) developed for motivation and involvement were therefore deemed to be appropriate to replicate in a South African context.

Gender

Figuroa-Domecq, Pritchard, Segovia-Pérez, Morgan and Villacé-Molinero (2015) conducted a gender-aware bibliometric analysis of 466 journal papers published during 1985–2012 on gender applications in tourism. They concluded that tourism gender research remains marginal in tourism enquiry. Pritchard (2018) stated that despite a maturing of the field, research utilising qualitative and feminist methods of inquiry continues to struggle for legitimacy. More recently Morris, van Riper, Kyle, Wallen and Absher (2018) concluded that evidence is mounting that interactions between people and places may likely vary for men and women.

Based on this review of literature the following two null hypotheses have been formulated:

H₀₁: Motivational aspects related to camping are not moderated by gender.

H₀₂: Involvement aspects related to camping are not moderated by gender.



Methodology

Population, sampling and data collection

The target population for this study consisted of campers at selected campsites within 100 kilometres from Pretoria. Inclusion criteria of the campsites were as follows: they are located in a natural environment, campers have set up their tents and caravans; permission was received to collect data from campers at the campsite, the campsites were easily accessible by road, and data collection could be managed during a day visit without having to stay overnight at the campsites. The eventual sample was fairly equally distributed between male and female respondents with a slight domination by female (n = 111 - 50.9%) and male 107 (n = 107 - 49.1%) respondents.

Self-completion questionnaires were handed out at the various camping sites to respondents who were willing to participate, Voluntary participation was emphasised and no incentives were used to encourage participation. Respondents were able to complete the questionnaire at their own time (taking in mind that these campers are in holiday mode). Campsite manager's permission was obtained beforehand. No incentives were used to encourage respondent participation.

Measuring instrument

All five sub-dimensions (escape, nature, social, bonding and learning) from Kyle *et al.*'s (2006:474) motivation scale was replicated to assess the respondent's motivation to engage in camping. Every one of these five sub-dimensions consisted of 3 items each (see left-hand column in Table 1). All five sub-dimensions (attraction, centrality, social bonding, identity affirmation and identity expression) from Kyle *et al.*'s (2006:474) involvement scale was replicated to assess the respondent's involvement in camping. Every one of these five sub-dimensions consisted of 3 items each (see left-hand column in Table 2). Motivation and Involvement were tested at an interval level of measurement ranging from ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree").

Results

Overall motivation

The mean (*M*) scores and standard deviation (*SD*) scores of the overall motivation-construct with its five sub-dimension and fifteen items are presented in Table 1. The highest ranked motivation sub-dimension is associated with "escape" ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.61$), which lies between "agree" and "totally agree" and the lowest ranked motivation sub-dimension is associated with "social" ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.67$), which lies between "neither agree nor disagree" and "agree".

The Cronbach's Alpha (α) coefficient was used to calculate the internal consistency coefficients of the 15 items included in this section of the questionnaire. An Alpha α of 0.87 on the overall motivation scale indicates highly acceptable internal consistency reliability. The Alpha α scores of this study are also compared to those from the Kyle *et al.*-study (2006).



Table 1. The internal consistency reliability of the overall motivation as well as the sub-dimensions of motivation (n=218)

	M (mean)	SD (Standard Deviation)	Cronbach's α This study	Cronbach's α Kyle et al. 2006
Overall Motivation	4.13	.43	.87	
Escape	4.17	.61	.64	.74
Like to be away from the everyday routine of home	4.39	.69		
Like to get away from crowded areas	4.16	.85		
Like to experience the solitude/privacy of camping	3.99	.87		
Nature	4.45	.52	.85	.88
Like to be in a natural setting	4.43	.61		
Enjoy the natural scenery	4.54	.58		
Enjoy the tranquillity of the area	4.39	.62		
Bonding	4.53	.47	.88	.84
Like to share quality time with family/friends	4.66	.53		
Enjoy doing things with family/friends	4.50	.54		
Like that family/friends are close together	4.42	.60		
Learning	3.72	.77	.85	.82
Like to develop knowledge of the area	3.71	.83		
Like to learn more about nature	3.90	.89		
Like to learn more about natural history and the ecosystems of the area	3.55	.93		
Social	3.78	.67	.77	.91
Like to be around people with similar interests	4.02	.74		
Like to talk to new people	3.71	.82		
Like to meet new campers	3.61	.85		

Note: Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree").
 The standard deviation is a valid measure of variability (BMJ, 2005, 331:903).

The "escape" sub-dimension scored the lowest internal consistency reliability of the five sub-dimensions; however, if the "escape" dimension were to be removed from the scale, it would decrease the internal consistency reliability of the overall motivation scale. At face value α -values of three sub-dimensions (learning, bonding and nature) were very similar to those α -values reported by Kyle *et al.* (2006); while the α -value for the social and escape sub-dimensions were higher in the Kyle *et al.* (2006) study.

Overall involvement

The Cronbach's Alpha α was used to calculate the internal consistency coefficients of the 15 items included in this section of the questionnaire. An Alpha α of 0.91 on the overall involvement construct indicates highly acceptable internal consistency reliability. The mean (M) scores and standard deviation (SD) scores of the overall involvement scale with its sub-dimension and items are presented in Table 2. The Alpha α scores of this study are also compared to those from the Kyle *et al.*-study (2006).



Table 2. Descriptive statistics for the involvement-construct and its five sub-dimensions (n=218)

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cronbach's <i>α</i> This study	Cronbach's <i>α</i> Kyle et al. 2006
Overall Involvement	3.58	.65	.91	
Attraction	3.84	.81	.91	.86
Camping is one of the most enjoyable thing to do	3.98	.93		
Camping is personally important	3.75	.84		
Camping is one of the most satisfying activities	3.77	.89		
Centrality	3.20	.95	.87	.83
Life is organized around camping	3.22	1.09		
Camping occupies a central role	3.06	1.05		
To change preference of camping to another recreation activity would require major rethinking	3.30	1.08		
Social Bonding	3.65	.74	.69	.71
Enjoy discussing camping with friends	3.68	.94		
Friends are in some way connected to camping	3.41	1.06		
Participation in camping provides opportunity to be with friends	3.84	.80		
Identity Affirmation	3.60	.75	.61	.73
Camping allows one to be themselves	3.80	.99		
Camping allows one to identify and associate with their image	3.60	.99		
One is not concerned about how one looks while camping	3.47	1.01		
Identity Expression	3.63	.85	.81	.74
Camping can tell a lot about a person	4.02	.74		
Participating in camping says a lot about a person	3.71	.82		
Camping allows others to see one as they would want to be seen	3.61	.85		

Note 1: Items were measured on a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("Strongly disagree") to 5 ("Strongly agree").
 The standard deviation is a valid measure of variability (BMJ, 2005, 331:903).

The "Identity Affirmation" sub-dimension scored the lowest internal consistency reliability of the five sub-dimensions; however, if this sub-dimension were to be removed from the scale, it would decrease the internal consistency reliability of the overall involvement scale. At face value α -value of one sub-dimension (social bonding) were very similar to the α -value reported by Kyle *et al.* (2006); while the α -value for the identity affirmation sub-dimension was lower in the Kyle *et al.* (2006) study; whereas the α -values for the centrality, attraction and identity expression sub-dimensions from this study indicated a higher internal consistency reliability than in the study of Kyle *et al.* (2006).

Involvement was tested at an interval level of measurement. The highest ranked involvement sub-dimension is associated with "attraction" ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.81$), which lies between "neither agree nor disagree" and "agree" and the lowest ranked involvement sub-dimension is associated with "centrality" ($M=3.20$, $SD=0.95$), which also lies between "neither agree nor disagree" and "agree".

Comparing the motivation-construct measures between gender sub-samples

The realised sample consisted of males and females aged 18 years and older, with a fairly equal distribution between male ($n=107 - 49.1\%$) and female ($n=111 - 50.9\%$) respondents. Table 3 presents descriptive statistics on overall motivation mean scores by gender. Mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for the sub-dimensions of motivation is shown and as results

indicate, “bonding” is the strongest motivational factor for both males and females ($M=4.5$, $SD=0.47$ and $M=4.55$, $SD=0.48$ respectively) whereas “learning” is the weakest motivational factor to participate in camping for both males and females ($M=3.70$, $SD=0.78$ and $M=3.74$, $SD=0.77$ respectively). Interestingly, the mean scores for the “social” motivational sub-dimension showed the biggest difference between males and females indicating that males have a stronger motivational need to socialise with other campers when motivated to go camping than females ($M=3.83$ and $M=3.74$ respectively).

Table 3. Gender and motivation

	Gender					
	Male (n = 107)		Female (n = 111)		Total (n = 218)	
Motivational sub-dimensions	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Escape	4.17	.58	4.19	.64	4.18	.61
Nature	4.44	.51	4.47	.54	4.45	.52
Bonding	4.50	.47	4.55	.48	4.53	.47
Learning	3.70	.78	3.74	.77	3.72	.77
Social	3.83	.61	3.74	.71	3.78	.67
Overall Motivation	4.13	.41	4.14	.45	4.13	.43

Comparing the involvement-construct measures between gender sub-samples

Table 4 displays the differences between males and females on the sub-dimensions of involvement. Mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) for the sub-dimensions of involvement is shown and as results indicate, “attraction” is the strongest involvement mechanism for both males and females ($M=4.03$, $SD=0.68$ and $M=3.66$, $SD=0.88$ respectively) whereas “centrality” is the weakest involvement mechanism to participate in camping for both males and females ($M=3.38$, $SD=0.82$ and $M=3.03$, $SD=1.04$ respectively). Interestingly, the mean scores for the involvement sub-dimensions differed dramatically between males and females resulting in a bigger difference between the gender groups than the comparison between genders on motivation.

Table 4. Gender and involvement

	Gender					
	Male (n=107)		Female (n=111)		Total (n=218)	
Involvement sub-dimensions	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Attraction	4.03	.68	3.66	.88	3.84	.81
Centrality	3.38	.82	3.03	1.04	3.20	.96
Social Bonding	3.82	.69	3.48	.74	3.65	.74
Identity Affirmation	3.74	.73	3.46	.74	3.60	.75
Identity Expression	3.68	.88	3.58	.83	3.63	.85
Overall Involvement	3.73	.63	3.44	.65	3.58	.66

Hypothesis testing

The data from Table 3 and Table 4 was utilised to test the two hypotheses.

Hypothesis 1

The first null hypothesis (H_{01}) focused on the differences in motivation between the two gender sub-samples and is stated below:

H_{01} : Motivational aspects related to camping are not moderated by gender.



This two-tailed hypothesis was tested at a 5% level of significance (i.e., $\alpha=0.05$).

The descriptive statistics in Table 5 indicate a small difference ($4.14 - 4.13=0.01$) in the mean motivational scores of the male ($M=4.13$, $SD=0.41$) and female ($M=4.14$, $SD=0.45$) sub-samples.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for the male and female sub-samples on the overall motivational scale

Gender	N	M	Median	SD
Male	107	4.13	4.20	0.41
Female	111	4.14	4.13	0.45

A comparison **between mean and median** generally reveals information about the shape of the data distribution. For a set of data – the following applies: **mean = median indicates a symmetric distribution** / **mean > median indicates a positively skewed distribution** / **mean < median**, indicates a negatively skewed distribution. Table 5 indicates slight departures from normality in both sub-samples when the means and medians are compared.

Overall motivation was measured at an interval level of measurement. Therefore the appropriate parametric significance test is the independent sample t-test because. This test has two assumptions, namely it assumes that the variable on which the two groups were compared had a normal distribution in both sub-samples and, secondly, it assumes that the variable on which the two groups are being compared has an equal variance in both sub-samples (Pallant, 2001:260). If its assumptions could not be satisfied the Mann-Whitney U-test should be used as a non-parametrical test (Pallant, 2001:260).

The assumption of normality was assessed through the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality as well as through the visual inspection of histograms and normal probability plots (Pallant, 2001:261). These tests indicate slight departures from normality in both sub-samples. Since the independent samples t-test is robust for mild (slight) departures from normality with large samples (Pallant, 2005:198), it was used to test H_{01} . The results of the t-test are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of an independent samples t-test for differences in the mean scores of the male and female sub-samples on the overall motivation scale

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	0.57	0.45*	-0.2	216	.842	-.012	.058	-.13	.10
Equal variances not assumed			-0.2	215.31	.841	-.012	.058	-.13	.10

The results of Levene's test for equality of variances ($p=0.45$)* indicate that the t-test assuming equal variances should be interpreted. These results appear in the first row of Table 6, labelled "equal variances assumed".

The results of the t-test assuming equal variances ($t(216) = -0.2$, and $p=0.842$) indicate that there is no significant two-tailed difference between the mean scores of the male and female sub-samples on the overall motivation scale. H_{01} can, therefore, not be rejected. These findings, therefore, indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female sub-samples in this study in terms of motivation to engage in camping.



Hypothesis 2

The second null hypothesis (H_{02}) focused on the differences in involvement between the gender groups and is stated below:

H_{02} : *Involvement aspects related to camping are not moderated by gender.*

This two-tailed hypothesis was tested at a 5% level of significance (i.e., $\alpha=0.05$).

The descriptive statistics in Table 7 indicate a small difference ($3.73 - 3.44=0.29$) in the mean involvement scores of the male ($M=3.73$ $SD=0.63$) and female ($M=3.44$, $SD=0.65$) sub-samples. Since a higher score on the involvement scale indicates a stronger tendency to participate in camping activities, these descriptive statistics suggest that males seem to have a slightly stronger tendency to participate in camping activities than females.

Table 7. Descriptive statistics for the male and female sub-samples on the overall involvement scale

Gender	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Median</i>
Male	107	3.73	0.63	3.8
Female	111	3.44	0.65	3.53

A comparison **between mean and median** generally reveals information about the shape of the data distribution. For a set of data – the following applies: **mean = median indicates a symmetric distribution / mean > median indicates a positively skewed distribution / mean < median**, indicates a negatively skewed distribution. Table 7 indicates slight departures from normality in both sub-samples when the means and medians are compared.

Overall involvement was measured at an interval level of measurement therefore the suitable parametric significance test is the independent sample t-test. If its assumptions could not be satisfied the Mann-Whitney U-test should be used as a non-parametrical test (Pallant, 2001:260). The independent sample t-test has two assumptions:

First, it assumes that the variable on which the two sub-samples are compared has a normal distribution in both populations.

Second, it assumes that the variable on which the two groups are being compared has an equal variance in both sub-samples (Pallant, 2001:260). The assumption of normality was assessed through Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality as well as through the visual inspection of histograms and normal probability plots (Pallant, 2001:261). These tests indicate slight departures from normality in both sub-samples.

The independent samples t-test is robust for mild (slight) departures from normality with large samples (Pallant, 2005:198) and it was therefore used to test H_{02} . The results of this test are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Results of an independent samples t-test for differences in the mean scores of the male and female sub-samples on the overall Involvement scale

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of means / medians						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						r		Upper	Lower
Equal variances assumed	.031	.86**	3.33	216	.001	.29	.087	.12	.46
Equal variances not assumed			3.34	216	.001	.29	.087	.12	.46

*The results of Levene's test for equality of variances (p=0.86**) (column 3 of Table 8), indicate that the t-test assuming equal variances should be interpreted. These results appear in the first row of Table 8, labelled "equal variances assumed".*

The results of the *t*-test assuming equal variances ($t(216) = 3.33, p=0.001$) indicate that there is a significant two-tailed difference in the means scores of the male and female sub-samples on the overall involvement scale. The two-tailed *p*-value of 0.001 is smaller than the significance level of 0.05. H_{02} can, therefore rejected and the alternative hypothesis H_{A2} can be accepted that involvement aspects related to camping are moderated by gender in this study. These findings, therefore, indicate that there is a significant difference between males and females on involvement to participate in camping activities. However, van Heerden (2008) found that a statistically significant difference may not be practically significant and therefore, the practical significance could also be calculated.

$$D = \frac{[X1 - X2]}{SD_{max}}$$

$$= \frac{3.73-3.44}{0.65}$$

$$= 0.446$$

(0.466 indicates a medium effect size – Ellis & Steyn, 2003: 51-53)

Summary of Findings

To my knowledge, this is the first study that investigated the difference between gender on motivational and involvement constructs amongst campers in a South African context as well the first to examine whether gender has a moderating influence on overall motivation and/or overall involvement. The main limitation of this study is linked to the characteristics of the sample and the location where data was collected (only those camp sites that gave permission within a radius of 100km from Pretoria), which may restrict the generalisation of the results.

The results indicate that there is no significant statistical difference between males and females on an overall motivational level for this sample. The highest mean score for both gender sub-samples on the overall motivational scale was "bonding" ($M=4.53$). This indicates that male and female respondents are intrinsically motivated to participate in camping by the



notion of “bonding” with family and friends. “Learning” was the lowest ranked motivation sub-dimension. Motivational pull forces (Dann, 1977:186) such as the opportunity to bond, will attract campers to a campsite that creates an environment conducive to bonding with family and friends.

The results further indicate a significant statistical (but on a medium practical significance level) difference between males and females on an overall involvement level in terms of camping. Male respondents scored higher on all five sub-dimensions of involvement, namely attraction, centrality, social bonding, identity affirmation, and identity expression. This would indicate that males are more inclined to participate in certain activities than females because camping is a highly physical recreational activity that generates self-development in terms of identity. This could also mean that males can express themselves in their true nature while socialising with family, friends or other campers. From these findings, it would be statistically and practically (medium effect) relevant for campsite managers to create special activities for males and females, to maximise their satisfaction levels.

Managers as well as academics must realise the importance of the motivation and involvement constructs in any recreational activity and specifically for camping. To meet the expectations and satisfy the needs of campers, managers need to know how to attract (pull) campers to their campsites as well as what camping activities campers want to engage in (push factors). Managers can affectively motivate campers to visit their camping sites by addressing the needs and wants in terms of camping activities. The findings suggest that male and female campers are intrinsically equally motivated by “bonding” and male campers are more extrinsically motivated by “learning” and “social” aspects.

Males and females seems to differ on involvement due to two reasons; firstly, camping is a leisure activity that requires more physical involvement and secondly, because males take up the responsibility in organising all the intensive labour activities such as pitching the tents. Males therefore display their self identity through camping. This is emphasised by Jun, Kyle, Vlachopoulos, Theodorakis, Absher and Hammitt (2012:13) who state “while individuals’ identity-affirmation is internal, their desire to express identity to an external audience also drives leisure behaviour. This might explain why there is a difference between males and females in terms of overall involvement consisting of “attraction”, “centrality”, “social bonding”, “identity affirmation” and “identity expression”. Females, on average, see camping as relaxation whereas males regard camping as an opportunity to do all the things they cannot do in their everyday routines.

Future research may also focus on the relationship between “expression of self (identity)” and “enduring involvement” (Higie & Feick, 1989) in the pursuit of all forms of recreational activities (not only camping but for example birding and tree-spotting).

References

- Bloch, P.H., Black, W.C. & Lichtenstein, D. (1989). Involvement with the equipment component of sport: Links to recreational commitment. *Leisure Sciences*, 11, 187-200.
- Caber, M. & Albrayak, T. (2016). Push or pull? Identifying rock climbing tourists’ motivation. *Tourism Management*, 55, 74-84.
- Chan, J. K. L. & Baum, T. (2007). Motivation factors of ecotourists in ecolodge accommodation: the push and pull factors. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(4), 349-364



- Chen, L.J. & Chen, W.P. (2015). Push-pull factors in international birders' travel. *Tourism Management*, 48, 416-425.
- Celsi, R.K. & Olson, J.C. (1988). The role of involvement in attention and comprehension processes. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 210-224.
- Crompton, J.L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, Ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4, 184-194.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourist Motivation: An Appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-194.
- Diamantopoulos, A. & Schlegelmilch, B.B. (2000). *Taking the fear out of data analysis: a step-by-step approach*. London, UK: Business Press/Thompson Learning.
- Dimanche, F. & Samdahl, D. (1994). Leisure as symbolic consumption: A conceptualization and prospectus for future research. *Leisure Sciences*, 16, 119-129.
- Ellis, S.M. & Steyn, H.S. (2003). Practical Significance (Effect Sizes) Versus or in Combination with Statistical Significance (P-Values), Research Note. *Management Dynamics*, 12, Jan: 51 – 53
- Figuroa-Domecq, C., Pritchard, A., Segovia-Pérez, M., Morgan, N. & Villacé-Molinero, T. (2015). Tourism gender research: A critical accounting. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 87-103
- Hani, F. F. (2016). Exploring pull factors of travel motivation: An exploratory study in Sylhet region. *Asian Business Consortium*, 1(3), 15-20.
- Higie, R.A. & Feick, L.F. (1989). Enduring Involvement: Conceptual and Measurement Issues, in NA - Advances in Consumer Research Volume 16, eds. Thomas K. Srull, Provo, UT : Association for Consumer Research, Pages: 690-696.
- Jun, J. J., Kyle, G.T., Vlachopoulos, S. P., Theodorakis, N. D. Absher, J.D. & Hammitt, W.D. (2012). Reassessing the Structure of Enduring Leisure Involvement. *Leisure Sciences*, 34: 1-18.
- Kyle, G.T., Absher, J.D., Hammitt, W.E., Cavin, J. & Cavin, D. (2004). *Testing a modified involvement scale*. Paper presented at National Recreation and Park Association Leisure Research Symposium. Reno, NY.
- Kyle, G.T., Absher, J.D., Hammitt, W.E. & Cavin, J. (2006). An examination of the motivation-involvement relationship. *Leisure Sciences*, 28, 467-485.
- Kyle, G.T., Kerstetter, D.L. & Guadagnolo, F.B. (2002). Market segmentation using participant involvement profiles. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 20(1), 1-21.
- Lawler, E.E. (1973). *Motivations in work organizations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.



Lee, S., Quintal, V. & Phau, I. (2017). Investigating the push and pull factors between visitors' motivations of fringe and urban parks. *Tourism Analysis*, 22, 389-406.

Lopes, D. & Brandão, F. (2018). Camping in Portugal: a perspective in the light of the experience economy. *Revista Turismo & Desenvolvimento*. 29, 31-46.

MacLeod, N. (2017). Camping Tourism. In: Lowry, Linda L., (ed.) *The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Travel and Tourism*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Manfredo, M.J., Driver, B.L. & Tarrant, M.A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scale. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28, 188-213.

Mannel, R.C. & Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourism experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 314-331.

Maslow, S.H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.

Mikulić, J. Prebežac, D, Šerić, M & Krešić, D. (2017). Campsite choice and the camping tourism experience: investigating decisive campsite attributes using relevance-determinance analysis. *Tourism management*, 59, 226-233.

Mill, R.C. & Morrison, A.M. (1985). *The tourism system: An introduction text*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Morris, M., van Riper, C.J., Kyle, K.T., Wallen, K.E. & Absher, J. (2018). Accounting for Gender in a Study of the Motivation-Involvement Relationship, *Leisure Sciences*, 40(6), 494-507.

Pallant. J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual: a step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Packer, J. & Ballantyne, R. (2002). Motivational factors and the visitor experience: A comparison of three sites. *Curator*, 45(3), 183-198.

Park, S., Yang, Y. & Wang, M. (2019). Travel distance and hotel service satisfaction: An inverted U-shaped relationship, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76(A), 261-270.

Pizam, A. & Mansfeld, Y. (1999). *Consumer behaviour in travel and tourism*. New York: Haworth Press Inc.

Poldrugovac, K., Janković, S. & Peršić, M. (2019). 'The significance of competitive pricing and revenue management in the camping industry', *International Journal of Revenue Management*, 11(1/2), 76-88.

Pritchard A. (2018). Predicting the next decade of tourism gender research. *Tourism management perspectives*, 25, 144-146.

Saayman, M. (2000). *En route with Tourism*. 2nd ed. Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.



Salkind, N.J. (2006). *Tests and measurement for people who (think they) hate tests and measurement*. London: Sage.

Schuett, M.A. (1993). Refining measures of adventure recreation involvement. *Leisure Sciences*, 15, 205-216.

Seabra, C., Vicente, M., Silva, C. & Abrantes, J.L. (2014). Motivation and Involvement in International Tourism. *International Journal of Multidisciplinarity in Business and Science*, 2(2).

Sherif, M. & Cantril, H. (1947). *The psychology of ego-involvements: Social attitudes and identifications*. New York: Wiley.

Sherif, M. & Hovland, C. I. (1961). *Social judgment, assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sherif, M., Taub, D. & Hovland, C. I. (1958). Assimilation and contrast effects of anchoring stimuli on judgments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 55(2), 150–155.

Šimková, E. & Holzner, J. (2014). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 159, 660 – 664

Swarbrooke, J. & Horner, S. (2007). *Consumer behaviour in tourism*. Burlington, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Van Heerden, C.H. (2008). Leisure motorhoming: The case of the motorhome club of South Africa. *South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation*, 30(1), 125-136.

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

Yousefi, M. & Marzuki, A. (2015). An analysis of push and pull motivational factors of international tourists to Penang, Malaysia. *International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 16, 40-56.

Wu, J. S., Xu, J. B. & Ekiz, E. H. (2009). Investigating the push and pull motivation of visiting domestic destinations in China: A means-end approach. *Journal of China Tourism Research*, 5, 287-315.

Witt, C.A. & Wright, P.L. (1992). Tourism motivation: Life after Maslow. In: Johnson, P. & Thomas, B (eds.). *Choice and demand in tourism*. London: Mansell.