Part II:
Motivations and Identity

8 Motivations to travel to Macau: a multi–group analysis

Ali Bavik, Antónia Correia and Metin Kozak

The objectives of this chapter are to:

□   Bridge the gap in the literature around the tourism market of Macau through a motivation-based clustering analysis to depict what goes beyond gambling motivations;

□   Assess empirical data collected through the development of a questionnaire survey that was conducted in Macau;

□   Introduce two clusters derived from the study findings, namely gamblers and non-gamblers, with culture, value for money, socialization, relaxation, and nightlife found to be the main drivers of all tourist groups;

□   Address both theoretical and practical implications of gambling tourism.

Keywords: tourist motivations, gambling tourism, culture tourism, market segmentation, Macau.

Introduction

The number of tourists visiting casino resorts has increased in recent years. Their visits are mostly driven by leisure purposes, where gambling is one of the many activities they could do during their stay (Zeng et al., 2014). They prefer traveling to destinations where gambling is legal, even if they do not spend all the time at the casinos (Shaffer & Korn, 2002). Macau has become a hot spot for gambling tourism nowadays, mostly due the legal and fashion status casinos have in Macau (Loi & Kim, 2010). This status was achieved in the last two decades, mostly by the huge increase of Chinese gamblers in Macau (Lam, 2005; Tao et al., 2011; Vong, 2007; Zeng et al., 2014); residents' support for this activity (Carmichael, 2000); and gambling tourism development (Beeton & Pinge, 2003). Other authors have developed essays to analyse the gambling tourism market (Morrison et al., 1996; Wong & Rosenbaum, 2012).

The extremely focused research on gambling tends to forget that for most of the tourists, gambling is not the only motivation they have. In fact, in Macau leisure gamblers spend less time in gambling compared to those who gamble on a regular base (Shaffer & Korn, 2002). Tourism literature offers a multitude of motives to travel, starting from the widely known push and pull motivations of Crompton (1979) to a context-specific motivation models (e.g., Cohen, 1979; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Hsu & Huang, 2008; Iso-Ahola, 1982). Motivations to visit a particular destination have been explained by learning motives (Klenosky, 2002), socialization motives (Saayman & Saayman, 2012), adventure (Cha et al., 1995), relaxation (Turnbull & Uysal, 1995) and nightlife (Kozak, 2002). These are some of the motives that drive tourists to travel for leisure or other purposes. This study aims to bridge the gap of literature assessing tourists' motivations to visit Macau, where gambling seems to be only one of the motivations. A structural equation model was developed and tested, and the sample was divided in two groups – gamblers and non–gamblers – to depict how their motivations differ by means of a multi-group analysis.

Literature review

Motivation, particularly human motivation, has been one of the most popular topics in psychology (e.g., Murray, 1938). In general, motivation refers to the "factors that activate, direct, and sustain goal-directed behavior" (Nevid, 2012, p. 284). The goal here may be wanting, interest, need, or desire that drives someone in a certain way. The *need* refers to "a disequilibrium which stresses toward equilibrium" (Murray, 1938,

p. 67). Motivation involves the physiological and/or biological, social, emotional, and cognitive elements that trigger behavior (Gnoth, 1997). The arousal of these factors is called *motive*. It relates to the reason for an action trigger or strengthens the behavior (Crompton, 1979; Kim et al., 2007).

Inclusively conceptual and empirical studies indicate that two main types of motivations influence the direction and the strength of the behavior. The first one is *intrinsic* motivation, which arises from the intrinsic value of the outcome (enjoyment or interest) for an individual; and the second is *extrinsic* motivation, which arises from the desire to obtain some outcomes (reward) or to avoid negative consequences (Dann, 1977; Pearce & Caltabiano, 1983; Solomon et al., 2014; Uysal & Hagan, 1993). With these internal and external forces, motivation plays a major role in the decision-making process for consumers particularly for tourists (Mansfeld, 1992), and influence the choice of a visit to a certain tourism destination.

Iso-Ahola (1982, p. 257) defines tourist motivation as "a meaningful state of mind which adequately disposes an actor or a group of actors to travel". In the last five decades, significant effort has been devoted to examining tourist motivations, owing to tourism's considerable amount of economic contribution to destinations. The relevant literature shows that tourist motivations are complex in nature, a multi-dimensional phenomenon, and there have been a variety of approaches. Several authors proposed various scales, frameworks and classifications to explain motivations of tourists to travel (e.g., Cohen, 1979; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Hsu & Huang, 2008; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Kim, Goh & Yuan, 2010; Ryan & Glendon, 1998).

Why do people travel? And, why do people go to certain places? Basically, these two questions have been paid considerable attention in the tourism literature. To answer these questions, some preliminary studies were conducted in the early 1970s. For example, Lundberg (1971) identifies and categorizes 18 motivational attributes into four groups, including educational and cultural motivations, escape and pleasurable motivations, ethnic motivations, and sundry motivations. Plog (1974) aimed to understand tourists' lifestyles, including attitudes, perceptions, needs, interests, opinions and activities, and he proposed a typology based on personality traits, motivations and activity preferences. The author classified on two traits: *psychocentric* (self-centered) and *allocentric* (other-centered). Based on the model, psychocentric tourists prefer familiar destinations whilst allocentrics are considered as adventurous.

A number of other studies attempted to advance the literature by better classifying and conceptualizing tourist motivations. For example; Iso-Ahola (model of tourism motivations, 1982), Beard and Raghep (leisure motivation scale, 1983), Pearce (travel career ladder, 1983, 1991, 2005), Gnoth (motivation and expectation formation process, 1997), Witt and Wright (expectancy model and recently, 1992), and Hsu, Chai, and Li (a tourist behavioral model, 2010). Despite the fact that these studies provided mindful insights and alternative explanations about travel motivations, Dann (1977) and Crompton's push and pull model (1979) is commonly accepted and used in the relevant literature (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; Kim et al., 2007; Kim & Lee, 2002; e.g., Klenosky, 2002; Turnbull & Uysal, 1995; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994).

The most common classification used in the literature for tourist motivations results from the evidence of these studies, which indicate that the motivations behind the choice of travel destinations are generally driven by two factors, namely *push* and *pull*. To date, the conceptualization of push and pull factors are broadly accepted for use in tourism research and marketing (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; Cha et al., 1995; Kim et al., 2007; Kim & Lee, 2002; Turnbull & Uysal, 1995; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). The term 'push motive' is generally understood as the internal motive that drives an individual to go away from their natural environment (Dann, 1977). For instance, the need for a change of scenery and/or escape from routine life. Heckhausen, Dixion, and Baltes (1989) emphasize the emotional aspects of motives. Accordingly, Yoon and Uysal (2005) suggest that push factors represent emotional and internal desires, including self-actualization, rest, leisure or social interaction.

Therefore, people considered to be motivated to travel for prestige and socialization purposes as well (Crompton, 1979; Heckhausen et al., 1989). Reversely, the term 'pull factors' refer to characteristics of the destination that triggers an individual desire for travel (Crompton, 1979; Kim et al., 2007; Uysal & Hagan, 1993; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Some examples of pull factors would be natural landscapes, special events at a destination, and specific activities (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; Cha et al., 1995; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). Literature shows that several studies adopted the dichotomy of push-pull factors broadly in tourism research to identify tourists' motives. While doing this, an overwhelming majority of studies prefer quantitative (e.g., Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; Kozak, 2002; Turnbull & Uysal, 1995; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994; Yuan & McDonald, 1990) whilst only a few studies utilize qualitative approach (Crompton, 1979; Klenosky, 2002).