

## **TRAVEL MOTIVATION: A TALE OF TWO MARINE DESTINATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

Melville SAAYMAN; Elmarie SLABBERT & Peet VAN DER MERWE  
*Business Management and Tourism, Institute for Tourism, Wildlife Economics & Leisure  
Studies, North West University, Potchefstroom, Republic of South Africa*

### **ABSTRACT**

*South Africa is not only known for being a wildlife and nature-based destination but offers a wide variety of marine related tourism products. The latter include scuba diving, snorkelling, swimming, world class surfing and whale watching. To capitalise on these assets, marketers clearly state that it is necessary to understand the market and the reasons why people travel. Therefore the purpose of this research is to determine the travel motives of tourists to two marine destinations. Very little research in this regard has been conducted in South Africa. The two marine destinations are Jeffreys Bay and Hartenbos. Two surveys were conducted by means of a structured questionnaire where 202 questionnaires were completed at Hartenbos and 210 at Jeffreys Bay. The statistical analysis entailed descriptive statistics and then more specific a factor analysis. The results revealed both common and different motivational factors when comparing the two marine destinations with one another as well as with other studies conducted. The following motivational factors overlap for the two destinations: escape and relaxation, destination attractiveness, and site attractiveness as well as personal attachment. For Jeffreys Bay, however, leisure activities and novelty were identified and for Hartenbos, socialisation and trip features as additional motives for travelling. These results therefore confirm that different destinations have different motives.*

**Key words:** Travel motivation; Motives; Jeffreys Bay; Hartenbos; Marine tourism.

### **INTRODUCTION**

It is a well known fact that over 50% of the planet's human population lives and works within 200 km of a coast which forms approximately 10% of the Earth land area (Eagles & McCool, 2002). Two of the main activities that take place along these coastlines are tourism and recreation. In fact, the growth rate of marine tourism has exceeded most other forms of tourism according to Eagles and McCool (2002). Marine tourism, according to Basiron (1997) and Orams (1999) is defined as "the temporary short-term movement of people to destinations outside their normal environment and activities within a marine setting". The latter includes activities such as ocean and coastal water sport, hotels and restaurants, island and beach resorts, sea sports, recreation, fishing boat operators, cruise ships and charter yacht companies. The marine setting also forms part of the coastal zone - a system with open boundaries which may include estuaries, onshore areas and offshore areas wherever they form an integral part of the coastal system. Such an open-ended definition provides for interactions between processes in coastal ecosystems. This again leads to the concept of an ecological coastal zone with constituent components ranging from watersheds to deep oceans (Myburgh & Saayman, 2001).

The South African coastline, approximately 3,000 km in length, extends from the semi-arid Namibian coast in the northwest, to the subtropical Moçambique border at Ponta do Ouro in the east (Myburgh & Saayman, 2001). Two very popular marine tourism destinations in South Africa are Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay. Hartenbos is situated in the Garden Route region of the Western Cape and mainly lends itself to family holidays (SA-Venues, 2001). Jeffreys Bay is situated between the Gamtoos and Kromme rivers, within 72 km of Port Elizabeth. It is known for its endless beaches and surfing waves and activities such as sandboarding, surfing, horse trails and quad biking. Jeffreys Bay also has a Shell museum, a Penguin Rehabilitation Centre, a Shark Aquarium and several game reserves (Garden Route, 2008).

These destinations are constantly offering tourists new products and attractions in order to remain competitive. However, Yoon and Uysal (2005) stated that in an increasingly saturated market place such as marine tourism where the emphasis is on the 5 S's (sea, sand, sex, surf and sun), the success of marketing destinations should be guided by a thorough analysis of tourist motivation. Saayman and Van der Merwe (2007) found in their research on travel motivation for tourists to the Kruger National Park that different tourist attractions or destinations have different motives. Hence this research aims to determine and compare the travel motives of tourists visiting two marine destinations - Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay. In order to achieve the latter, the article will be structured as follows: the literature review and problem statement follows the introduction, thereafter the methodology will be explained, the results and implication of study follows, whereafter a few conclusions will be drawn.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW – TRAVEL MOTIVES**

In 1994, Fodness (1994) stated that effective tourism marketing is impossible without an understanding of the consumers' (tourists') motivations or, to put it differently, what motivates people to travel? The aim of marketing, according to Saayman (2006), is the effective and efficient use of resources in the changing environment of today in order to ensure a profit, survival, and growth of the tourism organisation or destination. Fodness (1994) adds that further insights into tourists travel motivation can benefit tourism marketing specifically with regard to product development, service quality evaluation, image development, and promotional activities.

Mill and Morison (1985) support the notion that motivation plays a very important role in the process of travelling, vacation, and when visiting friends and relatives. Motivation comes into play when a person wants to satisfy a need and must take action to do so. These authors stated further that the behaviour of tourists is influenced by a small number of factors, and a person can be motivated by more than one factor at a time. A literature review on travel motivation revealed a wide variety of motivations and a great number of publications of which the following are the most relevant to this study (table 1).

TABLE 1. ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH ON TRAVEL MOTIVES

Researcher/s	Travel motives	Type of tourism products
Crompton (1977)	Identified seven socio-psychological motives for travelling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Escaping from the everyday environment</li> <li>• Discovering and evaluating of oneself</li> <li>• Recreation and travelling</li> <li>• Status</li> <li>• Regression</li> <li>• Strengthening of family ties</li> <li>• Facilitating of social interaction</li> </ul>	Leisure travel
Loker & Perdue (1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excitement and escape</li> <li>• Adrenalin excitement seeking</li> <li>• Family and friends-oriented</li> <li>• Naturalist (those who enjoyed nature surroundings)</li> <li>• Escape (those who valued the escape by itself)</li> </ul>	Leisure travel
Fodness (1994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge function</li> <li>• Utilitarian function (punishment, minimisation)</li> <li>• Value expressive function (self-esteem)</li> <li>• Value expressive function (self-enhancement)</li> <li>• Utilitarian function (reward maximisation)</li> </ul>	Leisure travel
Backman, Backman, Uysal & Sunshine (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excitement</li> <li>• External</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Socialising</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> </ul>	Events and festivals
Oh, Uysal & Weaver (1995)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety/comfort seekers</li> <li>• Culture/history seekers</li> <li>• Novelty/adventure seekers</li> <li>• Luxury seekers</li> </ul>	Leisure travel
Schneider & Backman (1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family togetherness</li> <li>• Socialisation</li> <li>• Social/leisure</li> <li>• Festival attributes</li> <li>• Escape</li> <li>• Event excitement</li> </ul>	Events and festivals
Kozak (2002)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culture</li> <li>• Pleasure seeking/fantasy</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Physical attributes</li> </ul>	Marine destination

Lee, Lee & Wicks (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural exploration</li> <li>• Family togetherness</li> <li>• Novelty</li> <li>• Escape</li> <li>• Event attractions</li> <li>• Socialisation</li> </ul>	Events and festivals
Bansal & Eiselt (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Adventure</li> <li>• Personal</li> <li>• Education</li> <li>• Sites and festivals</li> </ul>	Marine destination
Tao, Eagles & Smith (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning about nature</li> <li>• Participation in recreation activities</li> <li>• Change from home or work</li> <li>• To be free</li> <li>• Seeing as much as possible</li> <li>• Being entertained</li> <li>• Being physically active</li> <li>• Experience new and different lifestyles</li> <li>• Feeling of mastery and achievement</li> </ul>	Conservation and parks
Awaritefe (2004)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical tension reduction</li> <li>• Self actualisation</li> <li>• Belonging and love</li> <li>• Dynamic factor</li> <li>• Current decision</li> <li>• Static factor</li> <li>• Commercial</li> <li>• Information/advertisement destination</li> </ul>	Nigeria as tourism destination
Yoon & Uysal (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excitement</li> <li>• Knowledge and learning experience</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Achievement</li> <li>• Family togetherness</li> <li>• Escape</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Fun</li> </ul>	Marine destination
Jang & Wu (2006)	<p>Pull Factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cleanliness and safety</li> <li>• Facilities, events and costs</li> <li>• Natural and historic sites</li> </ul> <p>Push factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ego-enhancement</li> <li>• Self-esteem</li> <li>• Knowledge seeking</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Socialisation</li> </ul>	Leisure travel

Kim, Borges & Chon (2006)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family togetherness</li> <li>• Socialisation</li> <li>• Site attraction</li> <li>• Festival attraction</li> <li>• Escape from routine</li> </ul>	Environment
Swanson & Horridge (2006)	<p>Internal motivators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for escape</li> <li>• Rest</li> <li>• Relaxation</li> <li>• Prestige</li> <li>• Health and fitness</li> <li>• Adventure</li> <li>• Social interaction</li> </ul> <p>External motivators, attractiveness of the destination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tangible resources (beaches, recreational activities and cultural attractions)</li> <li>• Traveller's perceptions and expectations (novelty, benefit expectations, and marketing image).</li> </ul>	Shopping tourism
Molera & Albaladejo (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature and peacefulness</li> <li>• Physical and cultural</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Trip features</li> <li>• Rural life</li> </ul>	Marine destination
Saayman & Van der Merwe (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature</li> <li>• Activities</li> <li>• Attractions</li> <li>• Nostalgia</li> <li>• Novelty</li> <li>• Escape</li> </ul>	Conservation and parks
Saayman & Saayman (2008)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nature</li> <li>• Activities</li> <li>• Family and socialisation</li> <li>• Escape</li> <li>• Attractions</li> <li>• Photography</li> </ul>	Conservation and parks

The literature review above clearly discovered that very little research has been done on travel motives of tourists to marine tourism destinations. Whilst two studies were found, neither of them was conducted in South Africa. Emphasising the importance of such research. Oh *et al.* (1995) stated that if destinations strive to increase their share of visitors, it becomes essential to understand why people travel and why they choose a specific destination. The two studies found, were Correia and Oom do Valle (2007) who conducted research on the travel motivations of tourists to exotic places and Kozak (2002) who did a comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destination: case study Mallorca and Turkey of which Mallorca is regarded as a marine tourism destination. Kozak (2002) indicated that the motives

for German and British tourists visiting Mallorca are: culture, pleasure-seeking/fantasy, relaxation and physical attributes. On the other hand, Correia and Oom do Valle (2007) identified the following push and pull motives to exotic destinations: knowledge, leisure, socialisation, facilities, core attractions and landscape features. These two studies do not exhibit much resemblance except for physical attributes and landscape features. A reason for this might be that different cultures have different travel motives.

## METHODOLOGY

Exploratory research was conducted by means of two surveys, one at Hartenbos and the other at Jeffreys Bay. The questionnaire was developed by means of a comprehensive literature review and based on the research by the authors listed in table 1.

The first survey took place in the town of Hartenbos during the Easter School Holidays, from the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 6<sup>th</sup> of April 2007. A total of 340 questionnaires were distributed by fieldworkers, of which 202 completed and useful questionnaires were received for data analyses. Sampling was based on the willingness and availability of tourists to complete the questionnaires.

The second survey took place in Jeffreys Bay using the same questionnaire and procedure as at Hartenbos. The survey took place from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup> of April 2007. Based on availability sampling and the willingness to complete the questionnaire, 250 questionnaires were distributed of which 210 were suitable for analysis. The data for both surveys were captured in Microsoft Excel and the descriptive statistical analyses were performed by using the Statistical Programme for Social Sciences (SPSS 14.0). The statistical analyses included descriptive analyses, more specifically factor analyses. The latter is explained in more detail in the section that deals with the results.

## RESULTS

The results will consist of two sections - a comparison of the demographic profile of visitors to the two destinations and a factor analysis.

### **Comparison of the demographic profile and travel characteristics of tourists**

Descriptive analysis (table 2) indicates that the gender percentage of the Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay respondents appears to be almost equal. In terms of age distribution, both marine destinations appear to attract relatively middle-aged tourists. However, Jeffreys Bay attracts a slightly younger market than Hartenbos. The average age of tourists to Hartenbos is 42 and Jeffreys Bay 37. A reason could be because Hartenbos is more of a family destination whilst Jeffreys Bay attracts a greater combination of young tourists as well as families. According to table 2 the results show that for this time of the year neither of these marine destinations attracts a large percentage of senior tourists (60 years and older). Although Jeffreys Bay attracts more English speaking tourists (31%) than Hartenbos, it is clear that both destinations still attract a higher percentage of Afrikaans speaking tourists. A higher percentage of tourists to Hartenbos are married (92%) compared to the 63% at Jeffreys Bay, which correlates with the younger market of Jeffreys Bay. Most tourists to Hartenbos originate from the Western Cape compared to Jeffreys Bay that attracts most tourists from Gauteng. Tourists to both these destinations are well educated. Research by Petrosillo *et al.* (2007), who determined a market

profile of tourists to marine resorts in Italy, supports the fact that marine tourists are well qualified and middle aged.

TABLE 2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Attribute	Percent: Hartenbos N = 202	Percent: Jeffreys Bay N = 210
<b>Gender:</b>		
Male	56%	40%
Female	44%	60%
<b>Age:</b>		
< 18	0%	3%
18-30	7%	29%
31-40	43%	33%
41-50	33%	25%
51-60	11%	7%
> 60	6%	3%
<b>Language:</b>		
Afrikaans	93%	65%
English	7%	31%
Other	-	4%
<b>Marital status:</b>		
Married	92%	63%
Not married	4%	29%
Other	4%	8%
<b>Number of accompanying children:</b>		
None	21%	38%
1-2	46%	40%
3-4	31%	22%
>4	2%	0%
<b>Province of residence:</b>		
Western Cape	37%	7%
Eastern Cape	12%	16%
Northern Cape	7%	4%
Free State	16%	20%
Gauteng	13%	35%
Mpumalanga	5%	4%
Limpopo	1%	5%
KwaZulu-Natal	0%	1%
North West	9%	10%
<b>Education:</b>		
No school	3%	1%
Matric	36%	36%
Diploma/Degree	41%	35%
Post graduate	13%	17%
Professional	4%	7%
Other	3%	4%

The travel characteristics of tourists to Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay revealed that most tourists travel in groups of approximately four people (table 3). The statistics showed that the average length of stay in Jeffreys Bay is eight nights whereas tourists stay an average of twelve nights in Hartenbos. When analysing the average expenditure of tourists per trip, statistics indicated that more money was spent by tourists to Hartenbos (R8 344.05) than to Jeffreys Bay (R5 656.20). This also correlates with the length of stay at each of these marine destinations (table 3).

**TABLE 3. TRAVEL CHARACTERISTICS**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Percent: Hartenbos</b>	<b>Percent: Jeffreys Bay</b>
<b>Group size:</b>		
1-3	20%	23%
4-5	57%	42%
>5	23%	35%
<b>Number of nights stayed:</b>		
1-3	4%	15%
4-6	13%	23%
7-10	29%	36%
>10	54%	26%
<b>Average expenditure per trip:</b>	R8 344.05	R5 656.20

### **Motives for visiting marine destinations**

This section focuses on exploring the underlying patterns of the reported travel motivations by means of a factor analysis. To determine the appropriateness of principal components analysis (data reduction procedure) for the collected data, a correlation matrix for the motivational data, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy and the Barlett test of sphericity were examined. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy aims to examine whether the strength of the relationship between variables is large enough to proceed to a factor analysis. The measure was .754 for Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay respectively which is acceptable. The Barlett test was found to be significant in both cases ( $p < .00001$ ). Therefore the data reduction by principal components would be legitimate. A factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the 17 motivational factors for Hartenbos and 19 motivational factors for Jeffreys Bay. The varimax rotation method was chosen due to very little correlation between factors per destination. The factor analysis was performed to identify the underlying dimensions of the respondents' motivation to visit these marine destinations. An eigenvalue of 1.0 was used for factor extraction criterion and loadings of .40 were used for item inclusion. This resulted in six factors for both Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay. The six factors for Hartenbos accounted for 64.58% of the total variance and the six factors for Jeffreys Bay accounted for 60.24% of the total variance. The factors were labelled according to similar characteristics. For Hartenbos they were labelled as Escape and relaxation (Factor 1), Destination attractiveness (Factor 2), Socialisation (Factor 3), Personal attachment (Factor 4), Site attributes (Factor 5) and Trip features (Factor 6). Eigenvalues for these factors ranged from 1.01 to 4.04. 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 Alpha values should be interpreted with caution due to the limited number of items (statements) that loaded successfully onto the same factors. For Jeffreys Bay the factors were



labelled as Escape and Relaxation (Factor 1), Destination attractiveness (Factor 2), Leisure activities (Factor 3), Site attributes (Factor 4), Novelty (Factor 5) and Personal attachment (Factor 6).

**TABLE 4. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF MOTIVES FOR VISITING HARTENBOS**

Factor label	Factor 1: Escape and relaxation	Factor 2: Destination attractiveness	Factor 3: Socialisation	Factor 4: Personal attachment	Factor 5: Site attributes	Factor 6: Trip features
To break away from regular routine	.824					
To relax	.801					
Safe holiday destination	.686					
For family recreation	.554					
Association with culture of destination	.512					
Various activities		.721				
Affordable		.685				
For events			.778			
To explore a new destination			.670			
To spend time with friends			.616			
For conferences			.548			
I grew up with Hartenbos				.774		
I own a holiday home in Hartenbos				.728		
Climate					.808	
Great accommodation and facilities					.632	
Distance of the destination						.846
Various other attractions						.569
<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>.770</b>	<b>.516</b>	<b>.586</b>	<b>.402</b>	<b>.572</b>	<b>.450</b>

Based on the correlation matrices shown in tables 5 and 7, it is evident that these factors are all distinct factors measuring different components of visitor motives.

TABLE 5. COMPONENT CORRELATION MATRIX FOR HARTENBOS

Component	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.000	.090	-.069	-.209	.059	-.313
2	.090	1.000	.070	-.079	.176	-.087
3	-.069	.070	1.000	-.044	.005	.032
4	-.209	-.079	-.044	1.000	-.044	.151
5	.059	.176	.005	-.044	1.000	.004
6	-.313	-.087	.032	.151	.004	1.000

TABLE 6. FACTOR ANALYSIS OF MOTIVES FOR VISITING JEFFREYS BAY

Factor label	Factor 1: Escape and relaxation	Factor 2: Destination attractiveness	Factor 3: Leisure activities	Factor 4: Site attributes	Factor 5: Novelty	Factor 6: Personal attachment
To relax	.873					
To break away from routine	.835					
For family recreation	.460					
Children activities		.745				
Safe destination		.646				
Associate with language and culture		.579				
Attractions in immediate area		.412				
Night life			.705			
Factory shops			.625			
Events			.621			
To spend time with friends			.641			
Good accommodation and facilities				.740		
Affordable				.710		
Climate				.602		
Explore a new destination					.824	
Distance					.609	
Surfing					.503	
Grew up in Jeffreys Bay						.761
Visit holiday home						.658
<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>	<b>.686</b>	<b>.655</b>	<b>.597</b>	<b>.592</b>	<b>.453</b>	<b>.489</b>

TABLE 7. COMPONENT CORRELATION MATRIX FOR JEFFREYS BAY

Component	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	1.000	.125	.069	.171	.260	.100
2	.125	1.000	.166	.027	.158	.181
3	.069	.166	1.000	-.024	.030	.086
4	.171	.027	-.024	1.000	.213	-.059
5	.260	.158	.030	.213	1.000	.147
6	.100	.181	.086	-.059	.147	1.000

In an analysis of the results, it is clear that the two destinations have common, but also very different motives. Both destinations have escape and relaxation, destination attractiveness, personal attachment and site attributes as main motives. Hartenbos differs in terms of trip features and socialisation, compared to novelty and leisure activities in the case of Jeffreys Bay. Therefore this research confirms that even in the case of similar destinations (marine), travel motives differ. This research confirms the findings of Saayman and Van der Merwe (2007) that different destinations have different motives. If these results are compared with other research conducted on travel motives the following will suffice.

Firstly, in terms of the two studies conducted at other marine destinations by Kozak (2002) and Correia and Oom do Valle (2007) the following findings can be deduced from their research: In a comparison with the study conducted by Kozak (2002), Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay show two similarities, relaxation and physical attributes but differ in terms of the other motives. In the case of Correia and Oom do Valle (2007) Hartenbos shows similarities in terms of site attributes and destination attractiveness that are similar to core attractions and site attributes as well as socialisation as motives. In the case of Jeffreys Bay there are also the similarities of destination attractiveness, leisure activities and site attributes. Therefore the destinations under investigation show similarities although not conclusive. This could be ascribed to differences in the offerings of these marine destinations as well as the fact that different destinations attract different markets.

Secondly, both destinations support escape as a main motive and this motive is found to be the most common motive in all research conducted in this research field (see table 1) and is therefore supported by a great number of researchers: Crompton (1977), Loker and Perdue (1992), Schneider and Backman (1996) to name but a few. Hence tourists in general want to “escape” from their everyday routine.

Thirdly, both these studies identified personal attachment as a motive, which comprises two aspects - growing up with a specific destination as well as owning a holiday or second home. This motive has not been found in similar research thereby adding a new motive, but also showing the importance and benefits for the destinations when tourists acquire property.

Fourthly, Jeffreys Bay differs from Hartenbos in terms of novelty and leisure activities. Novelty was found to be a motive by researchers such as Oh *et al.* (1995), Lee *et al.* (2004) and Saayman and Van der Merwe (2007). Leisure as a motive was also confirmed by Schneider and Backman (1996) and Correia and Oom do Valle (2007).

Fifthly motives for Hartenbos differed in terms of socialisation and trip features compared to Jeffreys Bay. Trip features has only been found as a motive in one study conducted by Molera and Albaladejo (2007). With regard to socialisation as media, Backman *et al.* (1995), Schneider and Backman (1996), Lee *et al.* (2004), Jang and Wu (2006), Kim *et al.* (2006), Swanson and Horridge (2006) and Correia and Oom do Valle (2007) found this an important motive.

## IMPLICATIONS

Based on the results of the research conducted at two popular marine destinations, the following implications can be identified:

Firstly, tourism marketers need to use these motives to focus their marketing efforts to attract tourists with similar needs. Hence, in the marketing and branding of the two marine destinations under investigation, these motives can be very useful. For example, it can assist in market segmentation, in developing a marketing campaign as well as identifying main reasons why tourists visit a specific destination. The latter can also assist in building a specific image. Research by Saayman and Van der Merwe (2007) showed that it is not always the obvious offerings by a destination that attract tourists to a specific destination.

Secondly, the research confirms that different products, attractions or destinations have different motives. This is mainly influenced by the market (socio-demographics) that visits the destination as well as the product mix. Therefore whatever works for one destination is not necessarily going to be successful for another. This research supports the notion that research of this nature is paramount for making informed marketing and product development decisions.

Thirdly, these motives could be used to distinguish marine destinations from one another thereby increasing their competitiveness. The latter stresses the importance of research in this regard and the following can serve as examples. In the case of Jeffreys Bay, it can be regarded as a destination for younger people who like to swim and surf. For Hartenbos it is an older crowd that enjoys a more peaceful destination.

Fourthly, this research highlights the fact that by promoting the acquisition of property, i.e. investing in property, also greatly impacts on travel motivation. Even though it seems very basic it is nevertheless an aspect that does not get much attention from tourism marketers in general.

## CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this research was to determine the travel motives of tourists to two marine destinations in South Africa. Surveys were conducted at both Hartenbos and Jeffreys Bay. The results revealed similarities as well as clear differences in the motives of tourists travelling to these marine destinations even though both offer marine products. Results identified new motives such as personal attachment as well as very popular and common factors such as socialisation and escape. From the research it is evident that tourism marketers need to do research to determine why tourists or visitors visit a specific destination. The results can be used firstly to focus their marketing efforts and secondly to develop products for specific

markets. It is also evident that whatever works for one product or destination is not necessarily going to be successful in another even though it is a similar product. Hence more research on travel motives needs to be done. In terms of this article, it is advised to repeat this research during the December holiday season. From this research it is evident that more statements should be added to elaborate on the factors with fewer than four statements. The article made a contribution by adding new research and motives for this field of knowledge where little research is conducted regardless of the fact that marine tourism represents a large part of world tourism and travel.

## REFERENCES

- AWARITFE, O.D. (2004). Motivation and other considerations in tourist destination choice: a case study of Nigeria. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(3): 303-330.
- BACKMAN, K.F.; BACKMAN, S.J.; UYSAL, M. & SUNSHINE, K.M. (1995). Event tourism: An examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3(1): 15-24.
- BANSAL, H. & EISELT, H.A. (2004). Exploratory research of tourists motivations and planning. *Tourism Management*, 25(3): 387-396.
- BASIRON, M.I. (1997). Marine tourism industry – trends and prospects. Paper presented at the National Seminar on the development of marine tourism industry in South East Asia at Langkawi, 25-28 September.
- CORREIA, A. & OOM DO VALLE, P. (2007). Why people travel to exotic places. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality*, 1(1): 45-61.
- CROMPTON, J.L. (1977). Motives for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 1(4): 408-424.
- EAGLES, P.F.J. & McCOOL, S.F. (2002). *Tourism in national parks and protected areas: planning and management*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- FODNESS, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3): 555-581.
- GARDEN ROUTE (2007). "Jeffreys Bay." Hyperlink [<http://www.gardenroute.org/jbay/index.html>]. Retrieved 11 February 2008.
- GARDEN ROUTE (2008). "Jeffreys Bay." Hyperlink [<http://www.jaybay.co.za/history.html>]. Retrieved 2 February 2008.
- JANG, S. & WU, C.E. (2006). Seniors travel motivations and the influential factors: an examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Management*, 27: 306-316.
- KIM, H.; BORGES, M.C. & CHON, J. (2006). Impacts of environmental values on tourism motivations: the case of FICA, Brazil. *Tourism Management*, 27: 957-967.
- KOZAK, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23: 221-232.
- LEE, C.K.; LEE, Y.K. & WICKS, B.E. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 25: 61-70.
- LOKER, L. & PERDUE, R. (1992). A benefit segmentation of a non-resident summer travel market. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(1): 31-35.
- MILL, R.C. & MORRISON, A.M. (1985). *The tourism system: an introductory text*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- MOLERA, L. & ALBALADEJO, I.P. (2007). Profiling segments of tourists in rural areas of South-Eastern Spain. *Tourism Management*, 28: 757-767.
- MYBURGH, E. & SAAYMAN, M. (2001). *Ecotourism in action: practical guidelines and principles*. Potchefstroom: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.

- OH, H.C.; UYSAL, M. & WEAVER, P.A. (1995). Product bundles and market segmentation based on travel motivations: a canonical correlation approach. *Hospitality Management*, 14(2): 123-137.
- ORAMS, M. (1999). *Marine Tourism: developments, impacts and management*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- PETROSILLO, I.; ZURLINI, G.; CORLIANO, M.E.; ZACCARELLI, N. & DADAMO, M. (2007). Tourist perceptions of recreational environment and management in a marine protected area. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 1(79): 29-37.
- SAAYMAN, M. (Ed.) (2006). *Marketing tourism: products & destinations: getting back to basics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Potchefstroom: Leisure Consultants and Publications.
- SAAYMAN, M. & VAN DER MERWE, P. (2007). Travel motivations of tourists visiting Kruger National Park. Paper presented at the first international tourism conference of ICNT, 23-24 November, Heide, Germany.
- SAAYMAN, M. & SAAYMAN, A. (2008). Why travel motivation and socio-demographics matter in managing a national park. Paper presented at the 1st QATEM (Quantitative approaches in Tourism Economics and Management). Perpignan, France, 27 Junie.
- SA-VENUES (2001). "Jeffreys Bay." Hyperlink [<http://www.sa-venues.com>]. Retrieved 27 February 2007.
- SCHNEIDER, I.E. & BACKMAN, S.J. (1996). Cross-cultural equivalence of festival motivations: A study in Jordan. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 4(3/4): 139-144.
- SWANSON, K.K. & HORRIDGE, P.E. (2006). Travel motivations as souvenir purchase indicators. *Tourism Management*, 27: 671-683.
- TAO, 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.
- YOON, Y. & UYSAL, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26: 45-56.