

Fun, animal welfare or community development? Understanding young tourists' preferences for a wildlife tourism package

Elena Cavagnaro^{1*}, Simona Staffieri² and Tamara Huisman¹

¹Stenden Hotel Management School, Academy of International Hospitality Research, Stenden University of Applied Science, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

²Italian National Institute of Statistics, Rome, Italy

*Corresponding author email: elena.cavagnaro@stenden.com

This paper explores the impact of young travellers' value orientations on their choice for a wildlife tourism package. On the basis of existing literature, four different packages were designed: one mirroring the traditional offer of wildlife tourism as a hedonic experience; one enhancing the animal welfare aspect and intended to appeal to biospheric values; one enhancing the cultural and community development aspect and intended to appeal to altruistic values; and one combining both cultural and animal welfare aspects. Data were gathered on location in South Africa – one of world's main wildlife tourism destinations. Results suggest that the altruistic and biospheric value orientations have a strong influence on the choice for a wildlife package tour. Respondents with an above average altruistic value orientation opt for the tour that focuses on community development (third package) or that combines this aspect with animal welfare (fourth package); while respondents with an above average biospheric value orientation are attracted to the fourth package. Overall, the majority of respondents opt for one of the packages that include sustainability components. These outcomes combined with results from previous research bring us to the conclusion that young tourists are open to a sustainable tourism offer in general and wildlife tourism in particular.

Keywords: Youth tourism experience; values; wildlife tourism; sustainable tourism.

Introduction

In a world with limited resources and a growing demand for tourism, it is essential that tourism takes "full account of its current and future economic, social and environmental impacts, addressing the needs of visitors, the industry, the environment and host communities" (UNEP & UNWTO, 2005, 12). This is especially true for those forms of tourism, such as wildlife tourism, that enter into areas where endangered species find a last refuge. Confronted with a growing and global market demand for wildlife (Rodger & Moore, 2004), several organisations have taken steps to promote forms of wildlife tourism that are more respectful of the natural environment and wildlife, even though studies addressing tourists' choices for a more sustainable form of wildlife tourism are scarce. This is even truer for studies that focus on wildlife tourism and youth travellers.

Youth tourism is a very significant phenomenon: it is not only a booming market of increasing importance for many countries (Richards, 2008; UNWTO & WYSE Travel Confederation, 2008, 2011; Demeter & Brătucu, 2014), but it also constitutes an innovative force pioneering new approaches to tourism that may lead to new choices by the wider society (Fermani, Crocetti, & Carradori, 2011; Martinengo & Savoja, 1993, 1998)—this despite research on the youth tourism experience in general and in relation to sustainable (wildlife) tourism in particular being very limited (Richards, 2008; Cavagnaro & Staffieri, 2014).

Following a line of study developed by two of the authors of the present paper, the research reported upon here explores the impact of young travellers' value orientations on their

choice for a wildlife tourism package. In this research young tourists were asked on location to choose one out of four pre-designed packages: one mirroring the traditional offer of wildlife tourism as a hedonic experience; one enhancing the cultural and community development aspect and intended to appeal to altruistic values; one enhancing the animal welfare aspect and intended to appeal to biospheric values; and one combining both cultural and animal welfare aspects and thus offering a more fully sustainable tourism experience. Their answers were interpreted using the value profiles of the respondents to evaluate whether people with a different value orientation also opt for a different package.

The paper is structured as follows. A brief literature review highlights the main theories on which the research is based and how this work will contribute to their development. The research method section illustrates first how the four packages were designed and tested. It then presents the chosen method, a survey, and the location for the data collection. Next, results are presented and briefly discussed. Finally, a conclusion ties the whole paper together and provides some reflection on the importance of the results for the industry and for further research.

Literature review

This section highlights the main theories on which the study is based and how this work will contribute to their development. It is divided into three subsections: youth tourism; wildlife tourism; sustainability values.

Youth tourism experience

The UNWTO and WYSE Travel Confederation define youth tourism as independent trips for periods of less than one year taken by people aged 16–29 who are motivated, in part or in full, by a desire to experience other cultures, build life experience and/or benefit from formal and informal learning opportunities outside one's usual environment (UNWTO & WYSE Travel Confederation, 2008).

Experience is thus a central feature of youth tourism: as several authors noted, youngsters are hungry for experience and are willing to skimp on costs of services (accommodation, transport) in order to invest more in lifetime experiences (Richards & Wilson, 2003). Another distinguishing feature of young tourists is that they reject standard or homogenised products. They seek solutions, new ideas and experiences that generate emotions (Moisã, 2010). Thanks to the abundance of time and (often) the support of their financially rich but time-poor parents, youngsters undertake long trips, aimed mainly at increasing their knowledge of the world and learning about other cultures (UNWTO & WYSE, 2008, 2011; UNWTO, 2013). Still, little is known about the motivational, behavioural and experiential dimensions of young travellers. The experiential dimension has recently gained some attention: the emotional implications of travelling have led to a conceptualisation of youth tourism in terms of experience (Pearce & Lee, 2005). It has therefore been argued that the major difference between younger and older tourists lies in the type of experience each group is seeking and in the travel motivation of each group.

Literature on youth tourism experiences deals mostly with the educational aspect of experiences (McLellan, 2011; Stone & Petrick, 2013) and therefore explores a specific segment of young travellers: students (Morgan & Xu, 2009; Stinson & Richardson, 2006; Wright & Larsen, 2012). More attention has recently been given to benefits that all young travellers (including non-students) derive from their experiences and to their motivation to travel (Yousefi & Marzuki, 2012; Stone & Petrick, 2013; Cavagnaro & Staffieri, 2015). Also recently, it has been shown that segments can be individuated comprising young (Dutch) tourists open to sustainable tourism offers (Staffieri & Cavagnaro, 2015). Staffieri and Cavagnaro (2015) examined the influences of value orientations on young travellers' motivations and concluded that there are at least four target groups open to sustainable tourism offers. This conclusion, though, is only theoretical and therefore more research is needed to explore whether it also holds true when young travellers need to choose between different options. The present study takes a first step in this direction by focusing on wildlife packages.

Wildlife tourism

Wildlife tourism is defined as "tourism based on encounters with non-domesticated (non-human) animals" (Higginbottom, 2004, 2). Wildlife tourism has grown significantly over the last years (Higginbottom, 2004; Rodger et al. 2007; Tapper, 2006; Hughes, 2013). In 2014 the global market size of wildlife tourism was estimated at 12 million trips per year and its annual growth rate at around 10% (UNWTO, 2014). Rodger et al. (2007, 160) explain this increase by stating that "tourists have developed an increasing desire for interaction with the natural environment including wildlife populations".

The literature distinguishes among wildlife tourism in the natural habitat of the animals and in captivity (Higginbottom, 2004). Overall seven categories of wildlife tourism products (Reynolds & Braithwaite, 2001) have been distinguished. When focusing on tourism in the natural habitat, these can be reduced to three main forms, as summarised in Table 1.

Hughes (2013) confirms that both wildlife and wildlife watching tourism are often promoted not only as a means of protecting and preserving environmental resources but also as activities designed to raise awareness of and concern with environmental issues. Wildlife (watching) tourism therefore overlaps with other forms of sustainable tourism such as nature tourism (Higginbottom, 2004; Tapper, 2006) and ecotourism (Banerjee, 2012; Lemelin et al., 2008; Tapper, 2006). Ecotourism is an elusive concept. Some researchers define ecotourism as travelling to natural areas with the aim to enhance understanding and appreciation of the natural environment, while others also include a wish to be in contact with local people and enhance their wellbeing (Björk, 2000). This last aspect is central to community-based tourism, a form of tourism based on the participation of the local community (López-Guzmán et al., 2011) and geared towards generating sustainable income and employment for the local community (Salazar, 2012). Arguably, the difference among these options (and the interpretation of eco-tourism on which they are based) can be explained as a difference in the salience attributed to altruistic and biospheric values. Community-based tourism stresses altruistic values, such as striving for equality and social justice. Forms of eco-tourism focused on animal welfare stress biospheric values, such as protecting the environment and living in harmony with nature. Interestingly, sustainable tourism, as defined, for example, by UNEP and UNWTO (2005), requires an integration of both altruistic and biospheric values: it should namely create value both for the local community and the natural environment.

Considering the unresolved discussion around ecotourism, this study considers three different options for a "sustainable" wildlife tourism package: one more focused on animal welfare

Table 1: Forms of wildlife related tourism (Curtin, 2010; Reynolds & Braithwaite, 2001; UNWTO, 2014)

Wildlife tourism	Wildlife watching tourism	Safari
Nature-based tourism with a wildlife component	Specialist mammal watching	Most common form of wildlife watching tourism, referring to tourism that usually takes place in protected areas
Locations with good wildlife opportunities	Habitat specific tours	
Artificial attractions based on wildlife	Floral and butterfly tours	
Specialist animal watching	Thrill and adventure seeking activities	
Habitat specific tours	Safaris and cruises	
Thrill-offering tours	Conservation or research oriented trips	
Hunting / fishing tours	Opportunities for direct embodied experiences	

and nature; one more focused on community involvement and culture; and one combining these two. In terms of values, the first option stresses biospheric values and should therefore appeal to people scoring comparatively high on the biospheric value orientation; the second option stresses altruistic values and should therefore appeal to people scoring comparatively high on the altruistic value orientation; and the third one offers a combination of both value orientations and may equally appeal to people high on the biospheric and on the altruistic value orientation.

Although wildlife watching tourism and wildlife tourism are both associated with ecotourism, there is an important difference between them: wildlife watching tourism is non-consumptive (Cong et al., 2014; Tremblay, 2001; Duffus & Dearden, 1990; Hay & McConnell, 1981), whereas wildlife tourism may include consumptive activities such as hunting and fishing (Tapper, 2006). Considering that sustainable tourism has been defined as a form of tourism that has no negative and possibly a positive impact on the community and the natural environment of the destination (UNEP & UNWTO, 2005), it may be argued that wildlife watching tourism is closer to sustainable tourism than wildlife tourism.

Literature also distinguishes two types of wildlife tourists; those who have high knowledge levels, commitment or dedication, also called hard or deep eco-tourists, and those who have less knowledge, commitment or dedication, also called soft or shallow eco-tourists (Lemelin et al., 2008). Curtin (2010) adds that the small group size and environmental focus of serious wildlife tourists lowers their negative impact on the destination.

The focus of this study is on wildlife watching tourism because as a non-consumptive form of tourism it comes closer to sustainable tourism than wildlife tourism. The study does not focus on a special type of wildlife tourist, because its aim is to evaluate the choice for a sustainable package made by younger tourists in general and not a specific sub-group such as deep eco-tourists. It does, however, appreciate that tourists choosing for wildlife tours may share a higher interest and love of nature and animals than other type of tourists (Curtin, 2009). Finally, this study does take into account the respondents' value orientations and is therefore able to distinguish between tourists who are more sensitive to sustainability issues and tourists who are less sensitive.

Wildlife tourism and value orientations

Schwartz (1992, 21) defines values as "desirable transsituational goals varying in importance, which serve as a guiding principle in the life of a person or other social entity". Values are formed early in life and are considered to be rather stable antecedents of behaviour, including pro-environmental and pro-social behaviour (Stern, Dietz & Guagnano, 1995). Even though values are culturally shared, different individuals are likely to prioritise these values differently (Steg et al., 2014). So people differ in the importance that they assign to values, but they might also prioritise their own values differently in response to a certain offer or the way it is framed (Steg et al., 2014).

In his seminal studies dating from 1992 and 1994, Schwartz designed a theoretical model in which different value orientations are identified and plotted along two axes, one representing openness to change vs. conservatism,

and the other representing self-enhancement values vs. self-transcendence values. Later studies have proven that inside the self-transcended values a distinction can be made between pro-social (altruistic) values and pro-environmental (biospheric) values (Stern & Dietz, 1994; De Groot & Steg, 2008). Finally, it has been argued that alongside self-enhancement (egoistic values), hedonic values are also relevant to explain why people do or do not demonstrate a specific sustainable behaviour (Steg et al., 2012).

There are specific studies about wildlife value orientations (see e.g. Fulton et al., 1996; Jacobs et al., 2014). However, these studies do not take into consideration the four value orientations of environmental concern as described above. As it may be contended that these value orientations in general and the hedonic one in particular are strongly linked to a leisurely experience such as travelling (Kim et al., 2012), this study chooses to explore whether the four value orientations individuated by Steg et al. (2014) influence youth tourists' choice for a sustainable wildlife tourism package. The choice of this study is in line with research on the influence of value orientations on tourists' activities (Hedlund, 2012; Perkins & Brown, 2012). For example, Perkins and Brown (2012) found that while biospheric values strongly relate with a particular interest in ecotourism and tourism related pro-environmental attitudes, egoistic values are related with a greater interest in hedonistic tourism activities. These studies, though, do not specifically target youngsters.

Research method

The aim of this study is to explore whether the value orientations of young travellers influence the choice for a wildlife package tour. On the basis of existing research it is hypothesised that respondents with a hedonic or egoistic value orientation focus on pleasure when choosing a wildlife package, while respondents with an altruistic value orientation focus on community development. It is also hypothesised that respondents with a biospheric value orientation choose either the package with a focus on animal welfare or the package that combines animal welfare with community development (Perkins & Brown, 2012; Steg et al., 2012; Cavagnaro & Staffieri, 2015). Looking at demographics, the hypothesis is that females demonstrate higher pro-environmental and pro-social values (altruistic and biospheric value orientation) than men (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003), while older respondents show higher hedonic and egoistic value than younger respondents (Cavagnaro & Staffieri, 2014). Occupation and education are expected to have limited or no influence on the value orientation of young travellers.

In order to test these hypotheses wildlife tourism packages focusing on pleasure, community development, animal welfare, or a combination of the latter two sustainable features had to be designed. The researchers developed four wildlife packages based on literature on eco-tourism, community-based tourism, and sustainable tourism (Honey, 1999; Björk, 2000; López-Guzmán et al., 2011; Banjeree, 2012; Salazar, 2012; Cheia, 2013; Gascón, 2013). The main differences between the four packages are listed in Table 2.²

The packages were piloted by asking five young travellers to describe the differences between them. The pilot was successful: the respondents were clearly able to identify the

differences between the packages. Respondents individuated the first package as the less sustainable offer; described the difference between packages two and three in terms of planet focus and people focus respectively; and judged package four to be a synthesis of packages two and three. No major changes to the packages were therefore required.

The second step in the research was to develop and pilot a short survey. This survey contained the value orientation scale designed by De Groot and Steg (2008) and revised by Cavagnaro and Staffieri (2014); questions on the socio-demographic background of the respondents, including a question on prior wildlife tourism experiences; and a question asking respondents to choose between the four packages and motivate their choice (open question).

Data were collected in April and May 2015 in South Africa. South Africa has been a wildlife-watching destination since 1927, when Paul Kruger established the first game park (Lubbe, 2003). The Kruger Park very quickly acquired worldwide renown (Lubbe, 2003) and within one year a Tourist Department was set up to arrange itineraries and all-inclusive tours for tourists (Lubbe, 2003). In 1927 the Kruger National Park welcomed 650 guests in total (Ferreira and Harmse, 2014). In the following years the number of visitors to South Africa and the Kruger Park increased constantly, reaching 10 364 international tourists by 1934 (Lubbe, 2003). After the dramatic experiences of World War II and of the apartheid regime, tourism in South Africa increased sharply, reaching 4.5 million travellers in 1995; 6.7 million in 2004 and, also as a result of hosting the FIFA World Cup, 9.2 million in 2012 (World Bank, n.d.; Du Plessis & Maennig, 2011). As regards source markets, the United Kingdom is the greatest source of overseas arrivals, with 438 023 travellers in 2012, followed by the United States with 326 644, and Germany with 266 333 travellers (Forster, 2012; South African Government, 2013). However, the largest markets for inbound travel are neighbouring African countries (BMI, 2015). Besides the Western and African countries, Asia shows a remarkable growth as a source market (BMI, 2015; South African Government, n.d.). BMI (2015) states that South Africa remains famous as a safari holiday destination, as most of the safari areas are well developed. Snyder and Sulle (2011) argue that most tourists come to Africa for wildlife watching. Finally, it is interesting to note that South Africa's national tourism strategy involves promoting sustainable tourism.

Three locations were chosen in which to distribute the questionnaire: Johannesburg, because it is the starting point for wildlife tourists visiting the Kruger Park, and Cape Town and the Kruger National Park, because they are considered to be the most attractive locations for tourists in South Africa. It should be considered that although the country has many national parks, the Kruger National Park alone welcomed 1 450 481 visitors in 2012, accounting for nearly 18% of the international visitors (Ferreira & Harmse, 2014).

The distribution of the questionnaire varied slightly in the three locations. All questionnaires were distributed at places where people could sit to fill them out. In Johannesburg, questionnaires were handed out in a hostel and at the airport. For the sake of safety, questionnaires were not distributed elsewhere. In Johannesburg the researcher herself distributed all the questionnaires. They represent about 15% of the total. In Cape Town, the questionnaires were handed out in hostels and at tourist sites. Six hostels were asked to hand out the questionnaire to their guests who were either checking in or out. Five hostels were willing to help; one hostel refused. The questionnaires were also distributed at well-known sites, such as the top of the Table Mountain and the Robben Island Gateway, where people rested or queued. The last site for collecting the data was the Kruger National Park. Against expectations, this proved the most difficult site for reaching out to young travellers. Tourists could only be asked to fill out the questionnaires during a pause in their tour and due to the enormous size of the Park it was impossible to get a large number of young tourists in one place. Roughly 20% of all respondents were from this location. Most young tourists who were asked to fill out the forms were willing to do so. Most people who refused blamed their low command of the English language or a lack of time as they were on a guided tour. At this location, not all questionnaires were distributed by the researcher herself; therefore, only an estimate can be made of the non-respondents: 10%.

Comfrey and Lee (1992) consider 300 cases a good sample size. Due to the difficulties stated above, only 270 valid questionnaires were collected. Even though this study is of an explorative nature, the small sample size constitutes one of the limitations of this research.

The analysis of the data started by testing the internal consistency of the four value orientations, using Cronbach's alpha (Matkar, 2012). Results are presented in Table 3.

All Cronbach's alpha values, except for the hedonic value orientation, are above 0.7 or above 0.8, pointing to a good internal consistency (Field, 2009). The fragility of the hedonic scale had already been noticed by Cavagnaro and Staffieri (2014) who proposed to strengthen the scale by adding the values "an exciting life" and "a varied life". In the present study, adding these two values slightly increases the Cronbach's alpha for the hedonic value orientation from 0.539 to 0.656. Therefore, for the logistic models below the hedonic scale consisting of five values (gratification for oneself, a varied life, enjoying life, an exciting life, pleasure) was used.

The next step in analysing the data was to examine the motives for why respondents choose a specific wildlife tour package. Results of this analysis are presented in the next section. In the third and last step of the analysis, logistic regression was used to answer the hypotheses and determine whether:

Table 2: The four wildlife tour packages

Package	Focus
I	Fun; no regard for the wellbeing of people or animals
II	Wildlife watching; animal welfare; guides are certified and animals are not harassed
III	Less focus on wildlife watching, more focus on helping and learning about the local community
IV	A combination of tour II and III: it focuses on nature and culture by combining animal welfare and the wellbeing of the local community

Table 3: Value orientations and Cronbach’s alpha

Value orientation	Values	Cronbach’s alpha
Egoistic	Ambitious, influential, authority, wealth, social power	0.783
Hedonic	Gratification for oneself, enjoying life, pleasure	0.539
Altruistic	Helpful, social justice, a world at peace, equality	0.752
Biospheric	Preventing pollution, protecting the environment, unity with nature, respecting the earth	0.889

- The independent variables age, gender and education, under control of all covariates considered, have a significant influence on the dependent variables (value orientations).
- The independent variables value orientations, under control of all covariates considered (age, gender, education, residence), have a significant influence on the dependent variables (choice for wildlife package I, II, III or IV).

The goodness of fit of the logistic models was tested using the Hosmer-Lemeshow (HL) test, especially suitable in the case of small sample sizes. If the HL test statistic is not significant, the model fit is acceptable (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). The HL test statistic confirms the goodness of fit for all of the logistic regression models carried out. The next section presents and discusses the main findings.

Main findings and discussion

This section describes the sample, the motives for a package choice and the results of the testing of the hypotheses. Only significant results are reported and commented upon.

Description of sample

A total of 270 valid questionnaires were received. Gender distribution was quite balanced, with 59.3% of the respondents being female. Respondents’ ages varied from 18 to 29 years. The majority of respondents were 27–29 years old (37.4%), followed by the 18–23 age group (33.0%) and those 24–26 years old (29.6%).

The Western countries with the highest representation in the sample were Germany (19.6%), followed by the Netherlands (12.2%), the UK (12.2%), and the USA (10.7%). It was expected that Germany, the UK and the USA would top the list, as these countries are the greatest source of overseas arrivals (Forster, 2012). As the Netherlands is the third European country in terms of international arrivals in South Africa (South African Government, 2015), it is no wonder that many respondents came from this country. For further analysis,

four geographic areas were distinguished: Europe (61.1% of the sample), Africa (16.3%), North America (15.2%), and Other (7.4%).

The majority of respondents (74.0%) were employed, while slightly more than a quarter said they were students (25.6%). A very small minority said they were unemployed (0.4%). Among employed people, the majority said they had a job in the commercial sector (16.5%) and that they worked or volunteered (15%). Considering that the vast majority of respondents were employed, occupation has not been considered in the following analysis as a discriminating variable.

As regards education, there was an evident split between respondents with a master’s, bachelor’s or PhD (60.0%) and respondents with a high school or college degree (40.0%). This dichotomy between higher (or academic) and lower (non-academic) education has been used in the logistic models.

Considering value orientations, the majority of respondents’ scored highest on the hedonic value orientation (48.1%), followed by the altruistic and biospheric value orientations (22.6 and 17.4%). This high hedonism score is justifiable considering that all respondents were engaged in a high hedonic activity. A small group of respondents demonstrated a combination of the hedonic and altruistic value orientations (3.7%), while very few respondents scored highest on the egoistic value orientation (3.0%).

Finally, Table 4 shows how many respondents opted for a specific package tour.

The least popular package tour was Tour I, the tour with a focus on pleasure. This seems unexpected, due to the high number of respondents with a hedonic value orientation. An attempt to explain this result is provided below.

Choice motives

Respondents were asked to specify the motives for their package, due to the high number of respondents with a hedonic value, 237 answered this question. This explains the difference between the number of overall respondents (see Table 4) and the numbers presented below. Table 5 shows the results of a content analysis of the respondents’ responses

Forty-four respondents chose Package I and answered the motivation question. Of these young tourists a vast majority (90.9%) said they had chosen it for its hedonic component. (As one of the respondents said, “It looks like fun”). Of the respondents who chose Package II and answered the motivation question (77), the majority stated that their choice was motivated by its focus on wildlife (44.2%), its eco-friendliness (22.1%) and attention to animal welfare (19.5%). Of the 57 respondents who motivated their choice for Package III, a majority pointed to its focus on the local community (49.1%) and on culture (33.3%). A minority (14.0%) motivated its choice for Package III by referring to its

Table 4: Frequencies of choice for a wildlife package tour

Package	Package’s focus	Frequency	Percentage
II	Wildlife watching; animal welfare; guides are certified and animals will not be harassed	88	32.6
IV	A combination of tour II and III: it focuses on nature and culture by combining animal welfare and the wellbeing of the local community	68	25.2
III	Less focus on wildlife watching, more focus on helping and learning about the local community	62	23.0
I	Fun; no regard for the wellbeing of people or animals	52	19.3
Total		270	100

Table 5: Choice motives

Package	Choice motives (% of respondents)	Frequency
II	Wildlife focus (44.2%); eco-friendly (22.1%); animal-welfare (19.5%)	77
IV	Benefit for community and animal welfare (55.9%); responsible tourism (20.3%); fits my personal values (8.5%)	59
III	Local community (49.1%); culture (33.3%); fun (14%)	57
I	Fun (90.9%)	44

fun component. Finally, 59 respondents motivated their choice for Package IV by pointing to its benefit for the community and for animal welfare (55.9%), to its focus on responsible tourism (20.3%) and to personal values of the respondents (8.5%). Summing up: these results suggest that the reason for the respondents' choice for one of the packages matched the focus of each package. It can therefore be argued that not only were the four packages perceived as being different but also that the perceived differences are in line with the way the researchers designed the packages.

Influence of demographic variables on value orientations

In line with existing literature (Diamantopoulos et al., 2003), female respondents scored higher on the altruistic and biospheric value orientation than male respondents (respectively $\beta = 1.060$, $p < 0.001$ and $\beta = 0.463$, $p < 0.1$). No other significant influences of gender on value orientations were found.

Age only partially influenced the value orientation: progressing from the youngest age group (18–23 years of age) to the middle age group (24–26 years old) the probability of respondents opting for the egoistic value orientation decreased ($\beta = -0.561$, $p < 0.1$); while progressing from the youngest to the oldest age group (27–29 years) the probability of respondents demonstrating a hedonic value orientation increased ($\beta = 0.513$, $p < 0.1$). No other significant influences of age on value orientations were found.

Education demonstrated no influence on the four value orientations.

Tables 6 to 9 present the logistic models for these four value orientations.

Influence of value orientations on the package choice

The focus of Wildlife Tour Package I is on enjoyment. As has been shown above, this focus is also recognised by the respondents in the open question where they reported on motives for choosing one of the four packages. This notwithstanding, hedonic values do not significantly influence the choice for this package. This may be explained by pointing out that a tourism experience is virtually by definition a hedonic experience; therefore, in a tourism context, hedonic values do not by definition motivate individuals to choose the most hedonic among a collection of experiences that are all in some way pleasurable. Altruistic and biospheric value orientations, on the other hand and as expected, negatively influenced the choice for this package ($\beta = -0.925$, $p < 0.05$ and $\beta = -0.868$, $p < 0.05$). It may therefore be argued that people who value social justice, equality and environmental protection are clearly appalled by the lack of consideration for people and planet demonstrated in Package Tour I. This tentative interpretation

Table 6: Logistic model, Egoistic value orientation

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	0.401	0.121	1.493
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.232	
24–26	-0.561	0.088	0.571
27–29	-0.261	0.398	0.77
Country (ref. Europe)		0.312	
North America	-0.028	0.937	0.972
Africa	0.693	0.071	1.999
Other	-0.047	0.922	0.954
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	-0.119	0.662	0.888
Constant	-0.034	0.920	0.967

Table 7: Logistic model, Hedonic value orientation

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	0.291	0.253	1.337
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.207	
24–26	0.121	0.710	1.128
27–29	0.513	0.096	1.67
Country (ref. Europe)		0.856	
North America	0.055	0.877	1.057
Africa	0.314	0.398	1.369
Other	0.167	0.728	1.182
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	0.060	0.823	1.062
Constant	-0.508	0.132	0.602

Table 8: Logistic model, Altruistic value orientation

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	1.060	0.000	2.886
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.638	
24–26	0.304	0.361	1.356
27–29	0.088	0.780	1.092
Country (ref. Europe)		0.900	
North America	0.165	0.652	1.180
Africa	0.226	0.553	1.254
Other	0.230	0.643	1.259
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	-0.059	0.831	0.942
Constant	-0.815	0.019	0.443

Table 9: Logistic model, Biospheric value orientation

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	0.463	0.069	1.589
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.297	
24–26	-0.307	0.346	0.736
27–29	0.168	0.585	1.183
Country (ref. Europe)		0.981	
North America	-0.053	0.882	0.948
Africa	0.060	0.872	1.062
Other	0.163	0.736	1.177
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	0.027	0.921	1.027
Constant	-0.277	0.409	0.758

is strengthened by the fact that respondents from the middle age group (who, as demonstrated above, are less egoistic than their younger fellow travellers) are also less tempted to choose this package tour ($\beta = -0.824, p < 0.1$). Interestingly, more respondents from Africa opted for this package than their European counterparts ($\beta = 1.238, p < 0.01$). It may tentatively be argued that African tourists are less interested in the local culture (focus of Tour III and integrated in IV) because they come from a similar background. Literature also points to the sensitive relationship between people of African origin and animal protection – the focus of Tour II (Cavagnaro, Staffieri & Ngesa, 2015). Table 10 presents the logistic model for Package Tour I.

Wildlife Package II focuses on animal welfare. It is therefore not surprising and in line with expectations that biospheric values have a positive influence on the choice for this package ($\beta = 0.717, p < 0.01$). Altruistic values have a negative influence ($\beta = -0.903, p < 0.05$), a result we will return to later on. Interestingly, fewer respondents from Africa tended to choose this package as compared to Europeans ($\beta = -1.334, p < 0.01$). This result strengthens the suggestion above regarding the sensitivity, bordering on hostility, of African people towards what in their view may seem an exaggerated effort to protect animal welfare in countries where people suffer from severe poverty (Cavagnaro, Staffieri & Ngesa, 2015). Older respondents seemed less inclined than younger respondents to choose this package ($\beta = -0.689, p < 0.05$). Table 11 presents the logistic model for Package Tour II.

Wildlife Package Tour III focuses on community development. Considering the influence of the two transcendent value orientations, we observe a situation that is exactly the reverse of that observed for Package II: altruistic values have a positive influence ($\beta = 0.910, p < 0.01$) and biospheric values a negative influence ($\beta = -0.823, p < 0.05$). A clear split between these two value orientations when confronted with a people-orientated or a planet-orientated choice has already been observed in the literature (de Groot & Steg, 2008), though not yet in relation to a tourism offer. Interestingly, hedonic values

also have a positive influence on the choice of this package ($\beta = 1.235, p < 0.001$). This may be explained by the fact that some respondents motivated their choice for this package by pointing to its fun component.

No influence of demographic variables was found on the choice for this package. Table 12 presents the logistic model for Package Tour III.

Finally, Package Tour IV – the package combining animal-friendly and community-tourism. In line with expectations, more respondents with a higher altruistic or biospheric value orientation chose this package than other respondents (respectively $\beta = 0.787, p < 0.05$ and $\beta = 0.674, p < 0.05$). Hedonic oriented respondents tend not to choose Package IV ($\beta = -0.828, p < 0.01$): possibly the insistence on both animal welfare and community benefits is considered less pleasurable than a focus on the community only, such as in Package III.

Table 10: Logistic model, Package I

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	0.369	0.300	1.446
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.064	
24–26	-0.824	0.096	0.439
27–29	0.287	0.475	1.332
Country (ref. Europe)		0.015	
North America	-0.215	0.695	0.807
Africa	1.238	0.006	3.450
Other	0.961	0.100	2.613
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	-0.345	0.342	0.708
Egoistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.259	0.453	0.771
Hedonic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.215	0.533	1.240
Altruistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.925	0.014	0.396
Biospheric value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.868	0.018	0.420
Constant	-0.923	0.075	0.397

Table 11: Logistic model, Package II

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	-0.221	0.461	0.802
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.066	
24–26	0.031	0.930	1.032
27–29	-0.689	0.052	0.502
Country (ref. Europe)		0.060	
North America	-0.338	0.393	0.713
Africa	-1.334	0.009	0.263
Other	-0.502	0.380	0.605
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	0.740	0.019	2.096
Egoistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.193	0.502	1.212
Hedonic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.405	0.155	0.667
Altruistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.903	0.004	0.405
Biospheric value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.717	0.018	2.048
Constant	-0.430	0.341	0.651

Table 12: Logistic model, Package III

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	0.187	0.582	1.206
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.998	
24–26	0.026	0.951	1.026
27–29	0.015	0.970	1.015
Country (ref. Europe)		0.692	
North America	0.211	0.630	1.235
Africa	0.101	0.829	1.106
Other	-0.701	0.312	0.496
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	-0.012	0.973	0.988
Egoistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.069	0.830	0.933
Hedonic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	1.235	0.000	3.437
Altruistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.910	0.007	2.485
Biospheric value (ref. Low level)			
High level	-0.823	0.014	0.439
Constant	-2.148	0.000	0.117

Here, too, no influence of demographic variables was found. Table 13 presents the logistic model for Package Tour IV.

Finally, it can be stated that results on the influence of demographic variables on the choice for a specific wildlife package tour are inconclusive. On the contrary, results suggest a strong influence of value orientations: an altruistic or biospheric value orientation clearly pushes young travellers towards a more responsible choice.

Conclusions and recommendations

The aim of this paper was to explore the impact of young travellers' value orientations on their choice for a wildlife tourism package. Results suggest that while the impact of demographic variables is weak, values do have a significant impact. Moreover results show that, as expected, pro-environmental and pro-social values push young travellers towards a more responsible choice. Hedonic values may also partly be applied: they seem conducive to a pro-social choice. This confirms and strengthens research by Staffieri and Cavagnaro (2015) in which target groups of young (Dutch) students had been found to be open to a sustainable tourism offer. From a professional perspective, this result encourages tour operators to consider values as a better basis than demographics to segment their customers.

Results also show that both young travellers with a higher altruistic or biospheric value orientation are inclined to choose a package that links animal-friendly and community tourism. But when confronted with the choice between an eco-orientated and a community-orientated package, their ways part: biospheric-orientated travellers choose the first package and altruistic-orientated choose the second package. It may be suggested that responsible tour operators, when designing wildlife packages, take this result into account and give preference to an integrated approach to eco-tourism and community tourism.

The present study is confined to wildlife tourism. More research is needed to explore whether values also influence

the choice of young travellers when other tourism experiences, such as city trips, are considered.

Notes

- ¹ A shorter, preliminary version of this paper was presented at the CHME 2016 Conference in Belfast. We wish to thank the CHME reviewers for their useful comments. They helped us to strengthen the paper.
- ² For the full description of the packages please write to the corresponding author.

References

- Banerjee, A. (2012). Is wildlife tourism benefiting Indian protected areas? A survey. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(3), 211–227.
- Björk, P. (2000). Ecotourism from a conceptual perspective: An extended definition of a unique tourism form. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2(3), 189.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Business Monitor International (BMI). (2015). South Africa Tourism Report Q1, 2015. Charing: Business Monitor International.
- Cavagnaro, E. & Staffieri, S. (2014). Values and youth tourism, an exploratory study, *Proceedings of the CHME Annual Conference for the Council of Hospitality Management Education*. 28–30 May 2014, University of Derby, Buxton, Derby.
- Cavagnaro, E., & Staffieri, S. (2015). A study of students' travellers values and needs in order to establish futures patterns and insights. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, 1(2), 94–107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JTF-12-2014-0013>
- Cavagnaro, E., Staffieri, S., & Ngesa, F. (2015). Looking from a local lens: Inbound tour operators and sustainable tourism in Kenya. *Research in Hospitality Management*, 5(2), 135–145.
- Cheia, G. (2013). Ecotourism: Definition and concepts. *Revista de turism, studii și cercetări în turism*, 15, 56–60.
- Comfrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cong, L., Wu, B., Morrison, A. M., Shu, H., & Wang, M. (2014). Analysis of wildlife tourism experiences with endangered species: An exploratory study of encounters with giant pandas in Chengdu, China. *Tourism Management*, 40, 300–310.
- Curtin, S. (2009). Wildlife tourism: The intangible, psychological benefits of human-wildlife encounters. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 12(5-6), 451–474.
- Curtin, S. (2010). The self-presentation and self-development of serious wildlife tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 12(1), 17–33.
- De Groot, J. I. M., & Steg, L. (2008). Value orientations to explain beliefs related to environmentally significant behavior: How to measure egoistic, altruistic and biospheric value orientations. *Environment and Behavior*, 40(3), 330–354.
- Demeter, T., & Brătucu, G. (2014). Typologies of youth tourism. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series V: Economic Sciences*, 7(56/1), 115–122.
- Diamantopoulos, A., Schlegelmilch, B. B., Sinkovics, R. R., & Bohlen, G. M. (2003). Can socio-demographics still play a role in profiling green consumers? A review of the evidence and an empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(6), 465–480.
- Du Plessis, S., & Maennig, W. (2011). The 2010 FIFA World Cup high-frequency data economics: Effects on international tourism and awareness for South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 28(3), 349–365.

Table 13: Logistic model, Package IV

	B	Sig.	Exp(B)
Gender (ref. male)			
Female	−0.155	0.630	0.856
Age class (ref. 18–23)		0.343	
24–26	0.422	0.295	1.525
27–29	0.542	0.151	1.720
Country (ref. Europe)		0.884	
North America	0.315	0.446	1.370
Africa	0.053	0.907	1.054
Other	0.213	0.703	1.237
Education (ref. Non-academic)			
Academic	−0.499	0.116	0.607
Egoistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.051	0.868	1.052
Hedonic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	−0.828	0.008	0.437
Altruistic value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.787	0.017	2.198
Biospheric value (ref. Low level)			
High level	0.674	0.035	1.962
Constant	−1.574	0.001	0.207

- Duffus, D. A., & Dearden, P. (1990). Non-consumptive wildlife-oriented recreation: A conceptual framework. *Biological Conservation*, 53(3), 213–231.
- Fermani, A., Crocetti, E., & Carradori, D. (2011). *I Giovani e la vacanza: Tratti di personalità e motivazione alla scelta*. Macerata: Edizioni Università di Macerata.
- Ferreira, S., & Harmse, A. (2014). Kruger National Park: Tourism development and issues around the management of large numbers of tourists. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 13(1), 16–34.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. London: Sage.
- Forster, N. (Ed.). (2012). *South African hospitality outlook: 2013–2017*, Sunninghill: PWC.
- Fulton, D. C., Manfredi, M. J., & Lipscomb, J. (1996). Wildlife value orientations: A conceptual and measurement approach. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 1(2), 24–47.
- Gascón, J. (2013). The limitations of community-based tourism as an instrument of development cooperation: The value of the Social Vocation of the Territory concept. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(5), 716–731.
- Hay, M. J., & McConnell, K. E. (1981). An analysis of participation in non consumptive wildlife recreation [Reply]. *Land Economics*, 57(2), 288–292.
- Hedlund, T. (2011). The impact of values, environmental concern, and willingness to accept economic sacrifices to protect the environment on tourists' intentions to buy ecologically sustainable tourism alternatives. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 11, 278–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1467358411423330>
- Hughes, K. (2013). Measuring the impact of viewing wildlife: Do positive intentions equate to long-term changes in conservation behaviour? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(1), 42–59.
- Higginbottom, K. (Ed.). (2004). *Wildlife tourism, Impact, Management and Planning, Altona Vic*. Australia: Common Ground Publishing and CRC for Sustainable Tourism.
- Jacobs, M. H., Vaske, J. J., & Sijtsma, M. T. (2014). Predictive potential of wildlife value orientations for acceptability of management interventions. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 22(4), 377–383. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2014.03.005>
- Kim, J.-H., Ritchie, J. R. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(1), 12–25.
- Lemelin, R. H., Fennell, D., & Smale, B. (2008). Polar bear viewers as deep ecotourists: How specialised are they? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(1), 42–62.
- López-Guzmán, T., Sánchez-Cañizares, S., & Pavón, V. (2011). Community-based tourism in developing countries: A case study. *Tourismos: An international multidisciplinary journal of tourism*, 6(1), 69–84.
- Lubbe, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Tourism management in southern Africa*. Cape Town: Pearson South Africa.
- Martino, M. C., & Savoia, L. (1993). *Giovani e Turismo. Un'indagine sulle Vacanze Giovanili*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Matkar, A. (2012). Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for standard of customer services in Maharashtra State Cooperative Bank. *IUP Journal of Bank Management*, 11(3), 89.
- McLellan, C. E. (2011). International education travel and youth of color: College is too late! *Education and Urban Society*, 43(2), 244–265.
- Moisã, C. O. (2010). Aspects of the youth travel demand. *Annales Universitatis Apulensis Series Oeconomica*, 12(2), 575–582.
- Morgan, M., & Xu, F. (2009). Student travel experiences: Memories and dreams. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18(2–3), 216–236.
- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. L. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 226–237.
- Perkins, H. E., & Brown, P. R. (2012). Environmental values and the so-called true ecotourist. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51, 793–803. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0047287512451133>
- Reynolds, P. C., & Braithwaite, D. (2001). Towards a conceptual framework for wildlife tourism. *Tourism Management*, 22(1), 31–42.
- Richards, G. (2008). *Youth travel matters: understanding the global phenomenon of youth travel*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2003). *New horizons in independent youth and student travel. A report to the International Student Travel Confederation (ISTC) and the Association of Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS)*. Amsterdam: International Student Travel Confederation.
- Rodger, K., & Moore, S. A. (2004). Bringing science to wildlife tourism: The influence of managers' and scientists' perceptions. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 3(1), 1–19.
- Rodger, K., Moore, S. A., & Newsome, D. (2007). Wildlife tours in Australia: Characteristics, the place of science and sustainable futures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 15(2), 160–179.
- Salazar, N. B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: Issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 9–22.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25(1), 1–65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *The Journal of Social Issues*, 50(4), 19–45.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2006). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steg, L., Perlaviciute, G., Van der Werff, E., & Lurvink, J. (2014). The significance of hedonic values for environmentally relevant attitudes, preferences, and actions. *Environment and Behavior*, 46(2), 163–192.
- Stern, P. C., & Dietz, T. (1994). The value basis of environmental concern. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 50(3), 65–84.
- Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., & Guagnano, G. A. (1995). The new ecological paradigm in social-psychological context. *Environment and Behavior*, 27(6), 723–743.
- Stinson, C. M., & Richardson, P. (2006). International travel and learning from a community college perspective. *Inquiry*, 11(1), 28–34.
- Stone, M. J., & Petrick, J. (2013). The educational benefits of travel experiences: A literature review. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52(6), 731–744.
- Snyder, K. A., & Sulle, E. B. (2011). Tourism in Maasai communities: A chance to improve livelihoods? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(8), 935–951.
- South African Government. (2013) Tourism, 2013, Report no. 03-51-02 (2012). Pretoria: Statistics South Africa. <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-51-02/Report-03-51-022012.pdf>
- Tapper, R. (2006). *Wildlife watching and tourism: A study on the benefits and risks of a fast growing tourism activity and its impacts on species*. Bonn: UNEP, CSM and TUI.
- The World Bank. (n.d.). *International Tourism, number of arrivals*. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/ST.INT.ARVL/countries?page=6&display=map>
- Tremblay, P. (2001). Wildlife tourism consumption: Consumptive or non-consumptive? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(1), 81–86.
- United Nations Environment Program and United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNEP & UNWTO). (2005). *Making tourism more sustainable: a guide for policy makers*. Madrid: United Nations Environment Program and World Tourism Organization.
- United Nations World Tourism Organization, and World Youth Student & Educational Travel Confederation (UNWTO and WYSE). (2008). *Youth travel matters: Understanding the Global Phenomenon of Youth Travel*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- United Nations World Tourism Organization, and World Youth Student & Educational Travel Confederation (UNWTO and WYSE Travel Confederation). (2011). *The power of youth travel*, Madrid: World Tourism Organization.

- United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2013). *Tourism Highlights* (2013 edition). Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- United Nations World Tourism Organization. (2014). *Briefing paper on the economic value of wildlife watching tourism in Africa*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization.
- Wright, N. D., & Larsen, V. (2012). Every brick tells a story: Study abroad as an extraordinary experience. *Marketing Education Review*, 22(2), 121–142.
- Yousefi, M., & Marzuki, A. (2012). Travel motivations and the influential factors: The case of Penang, Malaysia. *Anatolia*, 23(2), 169–176.