African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance (AJPHERD) Volume 20(3:2), September 2014, pp. 1107-1123.

Comparing tourists' and residents' motivations for travelling to Kruger National Park, South Africa

ELMARIE SLABBERT AND PIERRE-ANDRE VIVIERS

TREES, North-West University, P. Bag X6001, Potchefstroom 2520, South Africa.
E-mail: elmarie.slabbert@nwu.ac.za

(Received: 04 August 2014; Revision accepted: 13 September 2014)

Abstract

This study analysed the motivations for visiting South Africa's Kruger National Park, with the aim of identifying similarities and differences between tourists' motives and those of people living near the Park. A factor analysis of the findings revealed five motives: education and learning, relaxation, photography, activities and destination attributes. T-tests revealed three significant differences between tourists' and the residents' motives to visit the park. 'Activities' was the most important for tourists and 'relaxation' and 'photography' for residents. The Park's attributes were the least important motive for both groups. 'Education' was considered an important motive to visit the park by both groups. It is evident that the type of product, in this case, a nature product, demands certain travel motivations and that motivations differ according to the type of person visiting the park. The needs of the tourists should not be adhered to at the cost of the communities adjacent to the Park since both stakeholders have an important role to play in the sustainability of the Park. Park management and marketers can use this information in their product development and marketing strategies for both markets.

Keywords: Nature based tourism, tourist motivation, Kruger National Park, tourists, residents.

How to cite this article:
Slabbert, E. & Viviers, A-P. (2014). Comparing tourists' and residents' motivations for travelling to Kruger National Park *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20 (3:2), 1107-1123.

Introduction

National parks in South Africa have three primary functions: to conserve the country's biodiversity, to maintain a relationship of community upliftment and capacity building with people living in the areas adjacent to the parks, and to provide a recreational outlet for people to experience and enjoy the wonders of the parks (Saayman & Saayman, 2006). Three role players are therefore involved: the Park management, the nearby residents and the tourists. Balancing the needs and preferences of these role players has become important for improving the sustainability of parks.

Tourists planning a holiday are exposed to the parks by means of marketing, and this helps motivate them to choose a park as their destination. Without tourists, the parks could face financial difficulties as tourists are providing an important source

of income. Apart from attracting tourists, however, one of the objectives of national parks is to take cognisance of the local communities and encourage them to see their neighbouring park in a positive light. However host communities are often excluded from tourism planning and decision-making which influences their attitudes and behaviour towards the parks. Their exclusion is unfortunately a common practice in developing countries with top-down development culture (Teye, Sönmez & Sirakaya, 2002). In South Africa the situation is not different and various barriers such as lack of awareness and interest prevent effective community involvement and participation in the tourism industry (Apleni, S.a.). They are not recognised as a viable market segment for the park.

To date, tourism research on the community has focused on the economic, social and environmental impacts of the tourism product and its development on the community (Fauzi & Buchary, 2002; Saayman, Saayman & Ferreira, 2009) and not on travel motivations. Despite extensive research on tourist motivation (e.g. Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Kim & Chalip, 2004), the literature still lacks empirical studies that investigate whether travel motives differ for different groups and destinations (Kozak, 2002), especially for nature based destinations such as Kruger National Park. Most of these studies however compare travel motivations of domestic and international tourists leaving a gap to understand differences in travel motivations of adjacent communities and tourists. The travel motivations of residents are also under-investigated even though they are considered to play an important role in the sustainability of the Park and the growth of domestic travel in South Africa.

The aim of this study was to compare the travel motives of tourists and communities adjacent to the Kruger National Park in order to understand differences in needs and adhere to these differences as they are considered important role players of the park.

Travel motivation

Travel motivation has been one of the most researched topics in a variety of fields, such as psychology, sociology, consumer behaviour, and tourism (Hung & Petrick, 2011). Berkman and Gilson (1978) state that motivation is a fundamental force behind all human behaviour. It can be defined as an internal factor that directs and integrates an individual's behaviour (Iso-Ahola, 1980). Behaviour can be seen as resulting from a process of internal psychological factors (e.g. needs, wants and goals) that can create disequilibrium within individuals where after certain behaviour then follows to correct the disequilibrium.

Needs and motivations are interrelated (Witt & Wright, 1992) and needs lead to motivations. People may travel to fulfil physiological needs (health) but also psychological needs (adventure and relaxation) (Mayo & Jarvis, 1981). Tourists'

motives may therefore be multiple and may differ between groups and destinations and from one decision-making process to the next (Uysal & Hagan, 1993). The individual thus becomes aware of needs and identifies destinations, such as Kruger National Park, that could fulfil those needs (Lubbe, 1998). It is important for managers to understand these differences as they will influence preferences and behaviour (Kim, 1999).

Various theoretical frameworks have been used to explain tourism motivation, the following four being the most prominent: Maslow's hierarchy of needs model (1970), used in a number of tourist motivation studies (e.g. Chon, 1989; Ryan, 1997); Iso-Ahola's dichotomous model (1982), which provided another theoretical facet for such studies (e.g. Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987; Crompton & McKay, 1997); Dann's push/pull dichotomy (1977), used in various studies (e.g. Jang & Cai, 2002; Kozak, 2002; Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2003; Joon & Uysal, 2005; Correia, Oom do Valle & Moco, 2007; Kao, Patterson, Scott & Li, 2008; Leong, Yeh, Hsiao & Huan, 2014); and Crompton's notion of disequilibrium (Crompton, 1979; Lee & Crompton, 1992; Shi, Cole & Chancellor, 2012).

In certain motivation studies the respondents are asked to indicate the main reasons for their trips and the degree to which a particular factor, such as nature, motivated them to travel (Mehmetoglu, 2007). Studies of nature based motives tend to focus more on identifying destination specific motives than on developing general theoretical models such as those mentioned above. However, with the rapid development of nature based tourism products and the travel market, it has become important to focus on the tourists rather than the location and examine what motivates them to travel to nature based destinations. The summary in Table 1 of research on motivations for travelling to these destinations shows that these visitors travel for specific reasons. The following are some details of motives found by various studies for travelling to a nature based destination.

Ballantine and Eagles (1994) found that people travel to such destinations because they want to learn about nature. Kerstetter, Hou and Lin (2004) found that they travel to wetlands for adventure, for education and for holistic reasons. Mehmetoglu (2007) identified nature, physical activities, novelty or learning, social contact and ego or status as motivations, and also mundane everyday reasons. A study by Beh and Bruyere (2007) revealed the following travel motives: escape, culture, personal growth, mega fauna, adventure, learning, nature and general viewing. Uysal, McDonald and Martin (1994) found that Australian tourists visited national parks for relaxation, novelty, enhancement of kinship relations, escape and prestige. In a study of Asian tourists' motives for visiting Taroko National Park in Taiwan, Tao et al. (2004) found two main motives: learning about nature and participating in recreation activities. Awaritefe (2004) found that people visited parks in Nigeria for self-actualisation, education and culture, and recreation and leisure. Pan and Ryan (2007) found that relaxation,

socialising, belonging, mastery and intellectual growth were the motives of visitors to Pirongia Forest Park in New Zealand. Luo and Deng (2008) identified novelty, self-development, return to nature, knowledge acquisition, and fitness and escape as motives.

Kruger and Saayman (2010) revealed the following motives for travelling to Kruger National Park: knowledge seeking, activities, park attributes, nostalgia, novelty and escape, and relaxation. The same study revealed the following motives for travelling to Tsitsikamma National Park: knowledge seeking, nature experience, photography, escape and relaxation, park attributes and nostalgia. Other studies in Africa have found that the motivation for visiting natural areas is to view wildlife and experience different cultures (Akama & Kieti, 2003; Awaritefe, 2003; Kerley, Geach & Vial, 2003).

Motives for visiting nature based tourism destinations are not specific to this kind of travel: there is overlap with motives for travelling to other kinds of destination (Crompton, 1979; Wright, 1996; Hanqin & Lam, 1999; Bansal & Eiselt, 2004). However, Table 1 shows that the desires for education and learning and for escape and relaxation strongly predict that a person will be motivated to visit nature based destinations specifically. On the other hand, Van der Merwe and Saayman (2008) found that people's motives for visiting particular parks might vary considerably.

Various studies have been found on travel motivations of tourists, however, no South African study could be found analysing the travel motivations of communities adjacent to the Park. This type of research, even on an international scale, is scarce and more effort is made to analyse the needs of tourists than local residents. However, the role of the community should not be underestimated in the sustainability of the park. Moorman (2006) stated that residents living adjacent to protected areas had a greater understanding of ecological concepts if they visited these areas which highlights visitation for educational reasons. Thus travel motivations are valid for different types of visitors, in this case tourists and local residents even though the latter is under-researched in this matter.

Research on tourist motivation of both tourists and local residents can be a useful and effective approach for determining appropriate visitor opportunities and categorising heterogeneous tourist segments (Awaritefe, 2003; Poria, Butler & Airey, 2004). One can also develop interpretive programmes according to travel motivations, which can increase the number of visitors to an area (Fodness, 1994). Fodness also suggests that understanding tourism motivation can assist in product development, service quality evaluation, image development and promotional activities such as positioning.

Table 1: Previous research on travel motivations to nature based products

Researcher/s	Delineated factors	Location of nature based product
Uysal, McDonald and Martin (1994)	Relaxation Novelty Enhancement of kinship relationship Prestige Escape	Natural parks and natural areas in Australia
Tao et al. (2004)	Learning about nature Participating in recreation activities	Taroko National Park in Taiwan
Kerstetter et al. (2004)	Education Adventure Holistic	Coastal wetlands in Taiwan
Awaritefe (2004)	Education Recreation and leisure pursuits Self-actualisation Culture	Tourism destinations in Nigeria
Beh and Bruyere (2007)	Escape Culture Personal growth Mega Fauna Adventure Learning Nature Game-viewing	National reserves in North central Kenya
Metmetoglu (2007)	Nature Physical activities Novelty/Learning Mundane everyday Social contact Ego/status	Wilderness centre in Northern Norway and as wilderness centre in Finnmark Country
Pan and Ryan (2007)	Relaxation Social Belonging Mastery Intellectual	Pirongia Forest Park in New Zealand
Luo and Deng (2008)	Novelty-self development Return to nature Knowledge and fitness Escape	National Forest Park in China
Saayman and Saayman (2009)	Escape Participating in recreation activities Nature Social contact Attractions Photography	Addo Elephant National Park in South Africa
Kruger and Saayman (2010)	Knowledge seeking Activities Park attributes Nostalgia Novelty Escape and relaxation	Kruger National Park in South Africa
Kruger and Saayman (2010)	Knowledge seeking Nature experience Photography Escape and relaxation Park attributes Nostalgia	Tsitsikamma National Park in South Africa

Destination management can then promote attributes that best match tourist motivations (Kozak, 2002) and thus develop effective marketing strategies (Uysal & Hagan, 1993). Analysis of motivations can also help managers to position tourism products better (Scott, 1996) and provide for the needs of a variety of market segments such as tourists and local residents. Pan and Ryan (2007) states that the identification of motivating factors is important for developing effective marketing strategies and sustainable management plans for destinations. Since tourists' and local residents' motivations may differ, marketing strategies must also differ. Ultimately, this research may help national parks to understand the travel motives of both tourists and residents and provide for their individual needs and preferences. This will add value to the parks' efforts to involve the community, thus uplifting the community and establishing a balance between the different role players. With these benefits in mind, the purpose of this research was to analyse and compare the travel motivations of tourists and local residents to Kruger National Park. This was done by firstly determining the travel motivations and secondly analyse the differences and similarities between tourists and local residents.

Methodology

Exploratory research was conducted by means of two surveys, one among tourists at Kruger National Park and the other among residents living adjacent to the Park.

Samples and questionnaires

For the tourists a three-section questionnaire was developed. A tourist is viewed in this research as any person who visits Kruger National Park as opposed to his/her normal abode for at least 24 hours (adapted from Saayman, 2013). Section A collected demographic details (for example educational level and age). Section B explored spending behaviour (for example frequency of visits, length of stay, amount spent) and analysed motivations for visiting Kruger National Park, using the work of Tao et al. (2004), Kim et al. (2006), Saayman and Van der Merwe (2007), Saayman and Saayman (2008), Kruger and Saayman (2010). Aspects such as the following were included: Escape from routine, Learning about nature, Participation in recreation activities, To be free, Seeing as much as possible, Being entertained, Being physically active, Experience new and different lifestyles, Feeling of mastery and achievement, *Socialization,* Attributes, *Family togetherness/socialization,* Site attraction, Attractions, Nostalgia, *Novelty and* Photography. These motivations have been previously used in surveys conducted in the nature environment.

Nineteen items were measured in the motivation section, using a five-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important, 2 = less important, 3 = important, 4 = very

important, 5 = extremely important). Section C explored general aspects of consumer behaviour (for example, preferences for type of magazines, newspapers and accommodation). The article uses predominantly information obtained from Sections A and B.

The survey was conducted in Kruger National Park in June and December by means of a systematic sampling. Thus questionnaires were distributed to overnight visitors in the southern camps of this park. All visitors to these camps during the survey were asked to complete the questionnaire in their own time. Field workers collected the questionnaires again during the evenings and early mornings. A total of 1020 questionnaires were administered of which 908 were suitable for use in the final analyses.

For the local residents a three-section questionnaire was developed, again based on a review of the literature. For the purpose of this study a local resident is seen as a permanent citizen of towns, cities and residential areas adjacent to the park. Section A collected demographic details (educational level and age). Section B explored the overall impact of the Park on residents (positive and negative aspects of the Park, the Park as an asset to the community). Section C asked local residents about visits to the Park and included their travel motivations, using the work of Crompton (1979) and other studies conducted in national parks in South Africa, as for the tourist group. For this group the article uses predominantly information obtained from Sections A and C since the questionnaire formed part of a broader community research project.

The survey was conducted in eight communities adjacent to the Park: Nelspruit, Phalaborwa, Marloth, Malelane, Komatipoort, Hazyview, Hoedspruit and Bosbokrand. Residents were asked to complete the questionnaire at various shopping centres and therefore the sample is based on availability sampling. Fieldworkers distributed the questionnaires and collected them after completion. A total of 1800 questionnaires were administered in these towns bordering the Park of which 1168 were suitable for analyses.

Data analysis

The data for both surveys were captured in Microsoft Excel and the descriptive statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS 21.0). Two kinds of descriptive analysis were done: factor analysis and *t*-tests. The factor analysis was done to determine the motivational patterns and this method is a common statistical technique to uncover such patterns. The *t*-test was used to compare the tourists and residents in terms of their motivations to visit the Park.

Results

The results are presented below: first, a comparison of the age and educational profiles of the two groups, and then the results of the factor analysis and *t*-tests.

Age and educational profile of tourists and local residents

Table 2 shows the mean ages of the respondents and their educational levels. The tourists were older and better educated than the local residents.

.

Table 2: Socio-demographic profile of tourists and local residents

Characteristic	Description	Tourists	Residents
Age	Average	46.44 ± years of age	35.55 ± years of age
Educational level	No School	1%	7%
	Matric	24%	52%
	Diploma, degree	43%	23%
	Post graduate	15%	4%
	Professional	15%	2%
	Other	2%	12%

Motives for visiting Kruger National Park

In order to compare the two groups' motivation scores consistently, the data from the two samples were aggregated after the data fit was determined. Exploratory factor analysis was performed on the 19 items to reveal the underlying patterns of motives. Principal Axis Factoring was used, as it is recommended for consumer or behavioural research (Iacobucci, 2001). Using an oblique rotation with Kaiser normalization, a five-factor solution was obtained that indicated logical groupings of travel motivations, where only factors with eigenvalues of larger than one were considered. Only items that loaded at .30 or more on a factor were reported, to decrease the possibility of misclassification (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995). The mean value of each factor was calculated as the average of all items contributing to a specific factor, so that mean scores could be interpreted on the original five-point Likert scale. Cronbach's coefficients were also examined for each factor to check the reliability of the data and to serve as a measure of internal consistency among the items. The Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p<.001$) and the KMO measure of sampling adequacy was .883, which is well above the recommended level and described by Kaiser (1974) as 'meritorious'. The total variance explained by the final solution was 64.87%. Cronbach's coefficients were consistent (>0.5). Names were given to the factors to reveal the motivators.

Table 3 shows that the results indicated five factors: education and learning, relaxation, photography, activities and destination attributes. Relaxation has the highest mean, followed by education and learning, activities, photography and

destination attributes. Looking at the results of the component correlation matrix shown in Table 4, one can see from the low correlation between the different factors that the factors are clearly distinguished and therefore people visit the Park for specific reasons.

Table 3 shows the five factors. Factor 1 is 'education and learning'. Seven items with factor loadings above .6 constitute this factor: learning about animals (mean = 3.67), learning about endangered species (3.54), for education reasons (3.39), to learn about specific animals (3.37), to develop an appreciation of wildlife (3.75), to learn about plants (3.11) and to learn about nature (3.69). It is clear that visitors are keen to learn and be educated while visiting the Park.

The most important factor, Factor 2, is 'relaxation'. This is made up of three items: to relax (4.20), to get away from normal routines (3.77) and for family recreation (3.99). These items grouped together are considered the main reasons for travel in general, and the respondents see the Park as a place to relax. Factor 3, 'photography', includes only two items: to photograph animals (3.51) and to photograph plants (2.70). The respondents clearly appreciated the opportunities the Park offers for photographing animals and plants and saw this as an important activity while visiting the Park. Factor 4, 'activities', consists of two items: to explore the environment (3.39) and to spend time with friends (3.27). Factor 5, 'destination attributes', consists of four items: respondents grew up with the Park (2.78), the Park is well-known (3.03), the Park offers great facilities (3.48) and to do hiking trails (2.22).

The findings of this study showed that the respondents' five top-ranked motives for visiting the Park were (in order, with means):

- To relax (4.20)
- For family recreation (3.99)
- To get away from routines (3.77)
- To develop an appreciation of wildlife (3.75)
- To learn about nature (3.69).

Comparison of travel motivations between tourists and residents

To determine whether the type of visitor, i.e. tourists or residents, had any influence on the travel motives, effect sizes were used to determine whether the statistical significance of the t-test was of practical importance. Ellis and Steyn (2003) therefore state that a natural way to comment on practical significance is by using the standardised difference between the means of groups. Statistical significance testes have a tendency to yield small p-values as the size of the data sets increase as is the case of this study. Therefore the effect size is independent of sample size and a measure of practical significance (Steyn, 1999 and Steyn,

2000, as cited by Ellis & Steyn, 2003). Cohen (as cited by Ellis & Steyn, 2003) gives the following guidelines for the interpretation of the effect size in the current study:

- Small effect: d=0.2
- Medium effect: d=0.5, and
- Large effect: d=0.8.

Data with $d \geq 0.8$ are practically significant, since this is the result of a difference having a large effect. A large enough effect is thus important in practice and described for differences in means.

Table 3: Factor analysis of travel motivations

Factor label	**Factor loading**	**Coefficient**	**Mean value ***
Education and learning		**.917**	**3.51**
to learn about animals	.867		3.67
to learn about endangered species	.805		3.54
for education reasons	.784		3.39
to develop an appreciation for wildlife	.734		3.75
to learn about specific animals	.707		3.37
to learn about nature	.702		3.69
to learn about plants	.665		3.11
Relaxation		**.676**	**3.99**
to relax	.754		4.20
to get away from routines	.723		3.77
for family recreation	.416		`3.99
Photography		**.687**	**3.11**
to photograph plants	.659		2.70
to photograph animals	.455		3.51
Activities		**.563**	**3.33**
to explore the area	.605		3.39
to spend time with friends	.537		3.27
Destination attributes		**.583**	**2.89**
the park is well-known	.637		3.03
grew up with the park	.529		2.78
the park has great facilities	.408		3.48
to do hiking trails	.300		2.22

* The criteria were based on a five-point scale, ranging from 1= not important at all to 5= extremely important.

Table 4: Factor correlation matrix for Kruger National Park

Factor	Education and Learning	Relaxation	Photo-Graphy	Activities	Destination Attributes
Education and Learning	1.000				
Relaxation	.306	1.000			
Photograpy	.328	.112	1.000		
Activities	.406	.153	.112	1.000	
Destination Attributes	.379	.334	.313	.309	1.000

It is clear from Table 5 that statistical significant differences exist for four factors ($p<0.05$), and three differences between the travel motivations of tourists and local residents visiting the Park were of practical significance (as indicated by the effect size). There was a large practically significant difference between tourists and residents when it came to 'relaxation' as a motive for travelling to the Park (-0.81). Although both groups consider the Park a place to relax, the residents identified this as a particularly important travel motive. There was also a small practically significant difference between tourists and residents in regard to 'activities' (0.34). Tourists were more motivated to participate in activities in the Park than residents. A small practical significant difference were found for 'photography' (-0.19) as well where residents were more motivated to take pictures in the park than tourists. Thus in practise it is important to market the park to residents as a place to relax and take pictures and to tourists as a place to participate in park activities.

Both groups agreed that they visited the Park for education and learning purposes, and because of the attributes of the Park. The latter was, however, the least important motive for both groups. Tourists placed slightly more emphasis on the education and learning factor as well as on the destination attributes, although differences were not significant at the five percent probability level.

Table 5: *t*-test for comparison between local residents and tourists

	Respondents	n	Mean±SD	Std.Error Mean	p- value	Effect Sizes
Education and learning	Tourists	917	3.54±0.96	0.03	.177	0.06
	Local Residents	891	3.48±1.01	0.03		
Relaxation	Tourists	918	3.64±0.89	0.03	.000	-0.81
	Local Residents	891	4.36±0.75	0.03		
Photography	Tourists	913	3.00±1.13	0.04	.000	-0.19
	Local Residents	884	3.22±1.16	0.04		
Activities	Tourists	916	3.53±0.97	0.03	.000	0.34
	Local Residents	875	3.12±1.18	0.04		
Destination attributes	Tourists	912	2.94±0.97	0.03	.023	0.10
	Local Residents	890	2.84±0.85	0.03		

Discussion

The data revealed that the main motives of both tourists and residents for visiting the Park were education and learning, relaxation, photography, activities and destination attributes. The following conclusions can be drawn when comparing

this study's findings about the motives of these two groups with the findings of other studies of motives for visiting nature based tourism destinations.

Firstly, relaxation appeared to be the main motive, since it had the highest mean value of the five factors (3.99). The same motive for visiting nature based destinations has been found by other researchers (Beh & Bruyere, 2007; Pan & Ryan, 2007; Luo & Deng, 2008; Kruger & Saayman, 2010). Relaxation was the most important motive for the local residents, with a mean of 4.36. Most previous studies have found that tourists also consider relaxation an important motive, but it is clear in this case that local residents place more emphasis on this function of the Park. This supports the conclusion that parks is a recreation outlet not only for tourists but also for residents, and this is often neglected. Park management should ensure that day visitor facilities are accessible and equipped to provide for the needs of this local market. Such facilities should also be promoted in communities living adjacent to parks.

Secondly, the data revealed that the desire for education and learning was a strong motive, with a mean of 3.51. This motive has also been identified by Tao et al. (2004), Kerstetter et al. (2004), Awaritefe (2004), Pan and Ryan (2007), Luo and Deng (2008) and Kruger and Saayman (2010). Since no significant differences could be found in this regard between the two groups, it is clear that both tourists and residents who visit the Park want to learn more about nature in the Park. It is therefore important that the Park continue to focus on education, by offering educational programmes, talks and guided experiences. These should also be available for day visitors.

Thirdly, photography was identified as a strong motive for travelling to the Park, with a mean of 3.11. The Park offers various opportunities for photography and is the ideal place to photograph South Africa's 'Big Five'. This motive has only been found by Saayman and Saayman (2009) in Addo Elephant Park and by Kruger and Saayman (2010) in Kruger National Park. The local residents consider photography more important than the tourists do. They can access the Park on a regular basis to take pictures, and therefore Park management can use photography as a means to attract local people to the Park and create competitions to encourage this.

Fourthly, activities were also identified as a motive by residents and tourists. Similar results were found by Tao et al. (2004), Mehmetoglu (2007), Saayman and Saayman (2009) and Kruger and Saayman (2010). Even though respondents wanted to relax when visiting the Park, they enjoyed participating in activities such as exploring the environment and spending time with friends. The tourists placed more emphasis than the residents on activities as a travel motivator and should therefore be informed of activities such as hiking, game drives, star

gazing and so on. It is therefore important for the Park to ensure that it offers appealing activities and informs visitors of such activities during check-in.

Fifthly, destination attributes received a mean of 2.89 as motive, which is lower than the other motives. Only Kruger and Saayman (2010) have so far identified a similar motive. Destination attributes were, however, more important to tourists than residents. Local residents live in the same area and have probably become used to the scenery. Tourists visit the Park once or twice a year and therefore facilities are more important to them. However, taking the low mean into consideration, it is clear for both groups that the nature experience is more important than the type of facilities that the Park has to offer.

Conclusions

This study revealed differences between tourists' and local residents' motives for visiting Kruger National Park. Residents view the Park strongly as a place to relax, and this aspect should therefore be promoted in their community to encourage them to visit the Park. Since residents exhibited a slight preference for taking photographs in the Park, this can be considered a particular attraction for residents and significant places can be identified where residents can take photos. This could also influence residents' attitudes towards the Park and create a sense of place and attachment to the Park. A wider variety of activities can be developed to serve the needs of the tourists, since they prefer to participate in activities such as exploring the area and spending time with family and friends. In general, relaxation as a motive was shown to be important, as has been found by various other studies, so this motive should also be considered when designing camp areas, facilities and marketing strategies for the Park. This study also confirmed the importance of the desire to learn as a motive. Since education is one of the main purposes of an ecotourism attraction, the Kruger National Park should invest in research to determine which educational activities are preferred by visitors, both tourists and local residents, and capitalise on those identified.

References

Akama, J.S. & Kieti, D.M. (2003). Measuring tourist satisfaction with Kenya's wildlife safari: A case study of Tsavo West National Park. *Tourism Management*, 24(1), 73-81.

Apleni, L. (S.a). A missed opportunity: community participation in tourism in South Africa, at http://led.co.za/sites/led.co.za/files/cabinet/orgname-law/document/2013/42917_aisa_policy _brief- _erln.pdf. July 2014.

Awaritefe, O.D. (2003). Destination environment quality and tourist's spatial behavior in Nigeria: A case study of third world tropical Africa. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(4), 251–268.

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

Ballantine, J.I. & Eagles, P.F. (1994). Defining Canadian ecotourists. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(4), 210-214.

Bansal, H. & Eiselt, H.A. (2004). Exploratory research of tourists' motivations and planning. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 387-396.

Beh, A. & Bruyere, B.L. (2007). Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1464-1471.

Berkman, H.W. & Gilson, C.C. (1978). *Consumer Behavior: Concepts and Strategies*. Belmont, California: Dickenson Press.

Chon, K.S. (1989). Understanding recreational traveler's motivation, attitude and satisfaction. *Revue de Tourisme*, 1, 3–7.

Correia, A., Oom do Valle, P. & Moco, C. (2007). Why people travel to exotic places. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(1), 45-61.

Crompton, J. & McKay, S.L. (1977). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.

Crompton, J. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), 408-424.

Dann, G.M.S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184–194.

Ellis, S.M. & Steyn, H.S. (2003). Practical significance (effect sizes) versus or in combination with statistical significance (p-values). *Management Dynamics*, 12(4), 51-53.

Fauzi, A. & Buchary, E.S. (2002). A socio-economic perspective of environmental degradation at Kepulauan Seribu Marine National Park, Indonesia. *Coastal Management*, 30, 167–181.

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

Fredline, L., Jago, L. & Deery, M. (2003). The development of a generic scale to measure the social impact of events. *Event Management*, *8*, 23–37.

Gunn, C.A. (1994). *Tourism Planning: Basics, Concepts, Cases* (3rd ed.). Washington DC: Taylor & Francis.

Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.

Hanqin, Z.Q. & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of Mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management*, 20(5), 587-594.

Hung, K. & Petrick, J.F. (2011). Why do you cruise? Exploring the motivations for taking cruise holidays, and the construction of a cruising motivation scale. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 386-393.

Iacobucci, D. (2001). Factor analysis. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 10(1&2), 75–82.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1980). *Social Psychology of Leisure and Recreation*. Dubuque, IA: Wim. C. Brown.

Iso-Ahola, S. (1982). Towards a social psychology of tourism motivation: a rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256-261.

Jang, S. & Cai, L.A. (2002). Travel motivations and destinations choice: A study of British outbound market. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 13(3), 111-333.

Kaiser, H. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 35, 31-36.

Kao, M.C., Patterson, I., Scott, N. & Li, C.K. (2008). Motivations and satisfactions of Taiwanese tourists who visit Australia: An exploratory study. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 24(1), 17–33.

Kerley, G.I.H., Geach, B.G.S. & Vial, C. (2003). Jumbos or bust: Do tourists' perceptions lead to an under-appreciation of biodiversity? *South African Journal of Wildlife Research*, 33(1), 13–21.

Kersetter, D.L. & Hou, J. & Lin, C. (2004). Profiling Taiwanese ecotourists using a behavioural approach. *Tourism Management*, 25(4), 491-498.

Kim, C. (1999). Cross-cultural perspectives on motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1), 201–204.

Kim, N. & Chalip, L. (2004). Why travel to the FIFA World Cup? Effects of motives, background, interest, and constraints. *Tourism Management*, 25(6), 695-707.

Kim, S.S., Lee, C. & Klenosky, D.B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 169-180.

Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis to tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 221-232.

Kruger, M. & Saayman, M. (2010). Travel motivation of tourists to Kruger and Tsitsikamma National Parks: a comparative study. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research*, 40(1), 93-102.

Lee, T.H. & Crompton, J.L. (1992). Measuring novelty seeking in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 732-751.

Leong, A.M.W., Yeh, S., Hsiao, Y. & Huan, T.T.C. (2014). Nostalgia as travel motivation and its impact on tourists' loyalty. *Journal of Business Research* (In press).

Lubbe, B. (1998). Primary image as a dimension of destination image: an empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(4), 21-43.

Luo, Y. & Deng, J. (2008). The new environmental paradigm and nature based tourism motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 392-402.

Mannell, R. & Iso-Ahola, S. (1987). Psychological nature of leisure and tourist experiences. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 314-331.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and Personality* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper.

Mayo, E.J. & Jarvis, L.P. (1981). *The Psychology of Leisure Travel: Effective Marketing and Selling of Travel Services.* Boston: CBI Publishing Company.

Mehmetoglu, M. (2007). Typologysing nature-based tourists by activity – theoretical and practical implications. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 651-660.

Moorman, R.S. (2006). Benefits of local residents visiting La Selva Biological Station, Costa Rica. *Environmental Conservation*, 2, 89-99.

Nyaupane, G.P., Morais, D.B. & Graefe, A.R. (2004). Nature-based tourism constraints: A cross-activity comparison. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 540–555.

Pan, S. & Ryan, C. (2007). Mountain areas and visitor usage – motivations and determinants of satisfaction: The case of Pirongia Forest Park, New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(3), 288-308.

Poria, Y., Butler, R. & Airey, D. (2004). Links between tourists, heritage, and reasons for visiting heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(1), 19–28.

Ryan, C. (1997). *The Tourist Experience: A New Introduction*. London: Cassell.

Saayman, M. (2013). *En Route with Tourism: An Introductory Text*. Claremont: Juta.

Saayman, M. & Saayman, A. (2009). Why travel motivations and socio-demographics matter in managing a national park. *Koedoe*, 51(1), 1-9.

Saayman, M. & Saayman, A. (2006). Creating a framework to assess the economic contribution of National Parks in South Africa: The case of the Addo Elephant National Park. *Tourism Economics*, 12(4), 619–633.

Saayman, M., Saayman, A. & Ferreira, M. (2009). The socio-economic impact of the Karoo National Park. *Koedoe*, 51(1), 1-10.

Scott, D. (1996). A comparison of visitors' motivations to attend three urban festivals. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(3), 121–128.

Shi, L., Cole, S. & Chancellor, H.C. (2012). Understanding leisure travel motivations of travelers with acquired mobility impairments. *Tourism Management*, 33, 228-231.

Simmons, D.G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15(2), 98–108.

Teye, V., Sönmez, S. & Sirakaya, E. (2002). Resident attitudes toward tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(3), 668-688.

Toa, C.H., Eagles, P.F.J. & Smith, S.L.J. (2004). Profiling Taiwanese ecotourists using a self-definition approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(2), 149-168.

Uysal, M. & Hagan, L. (1993). Motivations of pleasure travel and tourism. In M. Khan, M. Olsen & T. Var. (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Hospitality and Tourism* (pp. 798–810). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Uysal, M., McDonald, C.D. & Martin, B.S. (1994). Australian visitors to US national parks and natural areas. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 6(3), 18-24.

Van der Merwe, P. & Saayman, M. (2008). Travel motivations of tourists visiting Kruger National Park. *Koedoe*, 50(1), 154-159.

Itt, C.A. & Wright, P. (1992). Tourist motivation: Life after Maslow. In P. Johnson and B. Thomas (Eds.), *Choice and Demand in Tourism* (pp. 33–56). London: Mansell.

Wright, P. (1996). North American ecotourists: market profile and trip characteristics. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(4), 2-10.

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.