Tourism Motivations and Tourism Experience Values of Young Egyptian Tourists

Omneya Mukhtar Yacout

Professor of Marketing
Faculty of Commerce, Alexandria University, Egypt

Rehab Yassin Zoweil

Lecturer - Hotels and Tourism department,
College of Management and Technology,
Arab Academy for Science, Technology & Maritime Transport, Egypt

Abstract

The youth tourism market is a highly lucrative market with tremendous effects on the tourism industry worldwide. Many studies examined the motivations of young tourists. However, the research on the relationship between youth travel motivations and tourism experience value is scarce and no previous studies were reported in Egypt. This study extends the research carried out in the field of tourism motivation and youth tourism. A sample of young Egyptian tourists was collected, and their tourism motivation and evaluation of tourism experience value were examined. Using cluster analysis, four clusters were identified. Differences among clusters were examined using ANOVA. The four clusters varied in their motivational strength. Clusters also varied in the tourism experience value ratings.

Introduction

Youth tourism is not a new phenomenon, but the needs of youth tourists were for a long time inaccurately estimated as they can be satisfied with services of lower quality (Carr, 2003). According to the World Tourism Organization UNWTO and WYSE Travel Confederation (2011), 23 percent of world tourism is from the youth student. The share of youth travelers has not only increased but it also became diversified due to the growing numbers of young travelers from emerging markets (UNWTO and WYSETC, 2011).

In general, youth have a significant social and economic impact not only on the present but also on the future of the tourism industry (Cavegnano and Staffiere, 2015). Economically the total value of international

youth travel was estimated as almost three times more than an average tourist (Richard, 2011).

To provide the young traveler with a travel experience that matches his needs and choice, it is important to understand the traveler's motives (Staffieri et al, 2017). Such understanding is not easy because youth motivations are complex as youth travelers have high levels of mobility and are eager to reach remote destinations seeking for lesser-known destinations (UNWTO and WYSETC, 2011). Furthermore, youth do not constitute a homogenous group; their motivation and demographic profiles widely vary. They participate in tourism activities for several purposes such as education and contact with other cultures to make new friends (Du Cros and Jingya, 2013). Besides, they look for greater freedom, activities, facilities and the desire to learn more about other cultures and to develop self-interest (Boukas, 2013).

Existing research on youth tourism is relatively underdeveloped; its heterogeneity in motivation and behavior remains relatively unexplored (Li et al., 2015; Shaffieri, et al. 2017). Studies examining youth tourism motivations focus on differences between youth and other motivations (e.g., Richards and Wilson, 2003), cross-cultural differences in youth motivation (e.g., Kim & Jogaratnam, 2007; Xu et al., 2009), factors which might affect youth tourism motivation such as demographics and travel characteristics (Prayag et al., 2015), personality traits and travel styles (Lepp & Gipson, 2008) and previous tourism experience (Xu et al., 2009).

Other studies examined the consequences of youth tourism motivation variables such as travel interest (Mohsin et al., 2017), future travel intentions (Ying and Krishnapillai,

2018) and satisfaction (Staffieri and Cavagnaro, 2018).

There is some insufficiency of research on the relationship between tourist motivation and tourism experience value (Prebensen et al., 2013) especially for young tourists. Thus, this research tries to fill a gap in the youth tourism motivation literature by examining the relationship between youth motivation and tourism experience value.

This research contributes to academia and practitioners in various ways. First, it adds to the scarce research in the field of youth tourism. Second, it examines the under-investigated relationship between youth tourism motives and tourism experience value. For practitioners, this research provides DMOs with an understanding of youth tourism motives and the type of values they would like to obtain from their tourism experiences. Although the research is conducted in Egypt, yet, its findings can contribute to understanding the travel motives of young tourists from other similar cultures.

To accomplish these objectives, the article is structured into six sections. After this introduction, a literature review on tourism motivation in general and youth tourism motivation is presented. The various conceptualizations of tourism experience value and the studies which examined its relationship to tourism motivations are also investigated. Next, the research methodology, including data collection, analysis methods, and findings are presented. Discussion, academic and practical implications will follow. Research limitations and recommendations for future researches are established in the last section.

Literature Review

Consumer Perceived Value Defined

Customer value generally includes customer comparison of what he receives and gives when he buys the good or service (Zeithaml, 1988). Intangible, intrinsic, and emotional aspects are also included in customer value judgments (Sánchez-Fernández and Iniesta-Bonillo, 2007). Sheth et al. (1991) had identified five consumption values that influence consumer choice; functional value, emotional value, social value, epistemic value and conditional value. In the field of tourism, Gallarza and Saura (2006) emphasized the importance of affective dimensions of the perceived value of destinations. Prebensen and Rosengren (2016) examined experience value in four different services in tourism. They reported the existence of hedonic and utilitarian benefits in these services. Hedonic benefits generally reflect sensual and symbolic benefits while utiltarian benefits reflect functional benefits. Sanchez et al., (2007) reported that perceived value of the purchase of a tourism product (including both consumption and purchase) included functional, emotional and social values. Empirical support for the existence of multiple values was supported in many studies (e.g., Sweeney and Soutar, 2001; Rageh et al., 2013).

Youth Travel Motivations

Motivation was defined as the sum of biological and cultural forces that control travel behavior leading to destination selection (Pearce, 2011). In examining the influence of travel motivation, the push-pull model was used based on the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations (Tangeland et al., 2012). Horner and Swarbrooke (1996) debated the push factors as inner forces to tourists

including individual motives, behavior, disposable income, health, family obligations, work commitments, experience, interests, lifestyle attitudes, feelings, and perceptions. On the other hand, pull factors were developed based on a destination's attractiveness as perceived by individuals. They embraced tangible resources and travelers' perceptions such as uniqueness, benefit expectation, and the promoted image of the destination (Baloglu and Usyal, 1996). Kim (2008) and Kelonsky (2002) disclosed that the two factors are not independent but related to each other working together to create a motive to travel. These motives cooperate in an energetic and developing context in addition tourist motivation is realized as a driver to describe tourist travel decisions. (Correia, 2000).

Another theory was "the leisure motivation theory", stated that different motives may act independently or collectively as driving forces for an individual to travel, summing motivation to take part in vacations into 4 components as follows (Rayan and Glenden, 1998; Klevien, 2005):

The intellectual component: the extent to which individuals desire opportunities for learning, creating, exploring, discovering or imaging; The social component: the need for the respect of others and the need for friendships and social relationships; The competence mastery component: the need to accomplish, lead, challenge, and compete;

The stimulus/avoidance component: the need to escape from a tensed normal environment to break and relax.

Furthermore, the Travel Career Pattern (TCP), that was developed by Pearce and Lee (2005), added that patterns and combinations of multiple motives are affected by previous travel experience and age. Huang and Hsu

(2009) proved that past visit experiences can influence decision-making, both positively and negatively. Another research demonstrated that past visit experience boosts (Kidwell and Jewel, 2008). This goes with Pearce findings (1988) on travel experience assuring that travel motivation changes when travel experience changes. Academic interest in examining youth tourism motivation included different streams. The first stream examined the nature of youth tourism motivation and how different it is from the travel motivation of other traveler segments. For example, Lepp and Gibson (2008) noted that youth tourists tend to have lower perceptions of risk, to pursue novelty, stimulation, and adventure on their travels. UNWTO and WYSETC (2016) stated that young travelers want to try a different

the stimulus of attitude on tourist future behavior and enhances the personal norms and behavior control on communicative intentions

lifestyle, live new experiences, visit new places, and to acquire new knowledge. Youth traveling can be both self-enhancing and self-transcending; self-enhancing allows them to escape the routines and experience uniqueness while self-transcending embraces the need of interacting with other people and nature (Cavagnaro and Staffieri, 2015). Moreover, A study done by Monaco (2018) indicated that youth may seek escape from daily routine or leisure time, but they are an instrument associated with culture, discovery and the construction of identity. Table (1) summarizes studies examining youth travel motivation.

Table (1) Studies examining youth travel motivation

Study	Youth tourism motivation	Country
Richards and Wilson (2004)	Physical and Mental relaxation (European students) Visiting friends and relatives (US students) Challenging one's abilities and building friendships (African students) Relaxation (Latin American students) Interaction with other travelers (Australia and New Zealand)	Eight countries
Heung and Leong (2006)	Novelty seeking Relaxing visiting new places	Hong Kong
Kim et al., (2007)	Knowledge Adventure Family	USA
Lepp and Gibson (2008)	novelty, stimulation adventure	USA
Xu et al., (2009)	Chinese students: learning about other cultures and history British students: fun, socialization	China and UK
Chabra (2010) For heritage tourism	Authenticity Novelty	USA
Bicikova (2014)	natural and cultural appeal	UK
Prayag and Hosany (2014)	Curiosity Novelty	UAE

	Enjoy time with family and friends Relaxation and rest Socializing with other people Experiencing a different lifestyle	
Li et al., (2015)	Self-development Escape Novelty Knowledge Entertainment Relaxation	China
Prayag et al., (2015	Socialization Learning and discovery Self-fulfillment Relaxation	China
Buffa (2015)	discovery of new cultures discovery of new landscapes contact with local community, contact with nature'	Portugal
Eusébio and Carneiro (2015)	Knowledge; Challenge Escape Novelty	Portugal
Çakar, Seyitoglu & Sayar (2016) For backpackers	Motivational factors were obtained from the site trip advisor. They included encounters with people, sociability, relaxation and safety.	Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States, New Zealand, Germany, Slovakia, Argentina, Indonesia, Spain, Ireland, Poland, South Korea, Thailand, Jordan, The Netherlands, South Africa and Austria.
Mohsin et al. (2017)	cultural experience scenic values adventure	Thailand
Staffieri & Cavagnaro (2018)	Eco-sustainable motivation 'Fun and escaping' Vogue' Independence	Netherlands
Ying and Krishnapillai (2018)	Relaxation Widening knowledge Self-actualization	Malaysia

The second stream of research examines cultural differences in youth tourism motivations. Kim and Lee (2000) in their study on youth university students found that American and Japanese students are different in their motivations to seek prestige, family intimacy, and novelty.

They proved that differences in culture and values lead to a variety of travel preferences and experience value among university youth

students. A study conducted by Li et al., (2015) comparing international and domestic Australian students' groups revealed that International students who travel to study, had a lower desire to escape, were more curious and more intellectually motivated, as they were more likely to be engaged in activities that offer an opportunity to learn.

Other studies examined the effect of demographics and travel characteristics on youth motivation (e.g., Prayag et al., 2013). The relationship between personality traits and travel styles on one hand and youth travel motivation was also examined (Lepp and Gipson, 2008). Finally, travel interest (Mohsin et al., 2017), future travel intentions (Ying and Krishnapillai, 2018), and satisfaction (Staffieri and Cavagnaro, 2018) were examined as consequences of youth travel motivation.

Travel motivation and tourism experience value

Only a limited number of studies have examined the relationship between motivation and experience value. Hsu et al., (2010) used the two terms tourist motivation and tourist benefits interchangeably. However, Pesonen (2012) stressed that the difference between the two concepts may not be clear. He used motivation and benefits as two different concepts to reflect push and pull factors respectively. The rationale behind this distinction is that motivation resides inside of the individual regardless of the destination, while benefits reflect the tourist evaluation of destination-related attributes and thus, they are destination bound. Similarly, Paker and Vural (2016) used benefit segmentation to segment yachting tourists based on yachters' expectations from them. The corresponding demographic and motivation profiles were obtained. Prebensen et al., (2013) reported that

motivation affects tourists to experience value directly and indirectly through involvement.

On reviewing the literature on tourism motivation in general and on youth travel motivation, youth prioritize their tourism motivation differently. It is expected that such a difference in priorities is culturally bound and that it has consequences on the type of experience value they seek when they go on vacations. This means that understanding youth motivation requires examining it in different cultural contexts.

Research Method

The purpose of this exploratory research is to examine the relationship between youth tourism motives and the different dimensions of the tourism experience value. To do this, a survey was developed and distributed, the reliability and validity of the research constructs were analyzed, and cluster analysis was performed using SPSS version 16.

Questionnaire Design and Measurement of Research Variables

The questionnaire used in this survey consisted of three main sections; the travel needs section, the tourism experience value section, and the demographics and previous travel experience section. The scale used is the Travel Needs Scale by Tasci and Ko (2017) and the tourism value experience scale by Prebensen and Rosengren (2016) were used on a five-point Likert scale. The items of each scale are shown in tables (3) and (4). The demographics section included questions that are related to age, gender, income, education, and previous travel experience outside Egypt. Respondents were required to recall a destination they visited and were satisfied with and then to answer the questions based on experience with this destination.

Data Collection and Sampling

The Pilot Study was done before the survey was distributed just to make sure that questions were understandable and was modified accordingly. The questionnaire was randomly distributed and collected from students of two universities in Alexandria, Egypt: Faculty of Commerce, Alexandria University and College of Management, Arab Academy of Science and Technology. The study was conducted during the period from October 2019 to December 2019 on both faculty sites.

A self-administered questionnaire was distributed to students and collected back from them instantly. The total number of questionnaires distributed was 400 and the number of questionnaires returned was 375. The response rate was 93.75%. The returned questionnaires included missing questions exceeding 10% of the total number of questionnaire items and thus were deleted from the analysis. Missing data in questionnaires which included missing questions that did not exceed 10% were replaced by sample means. Thus, the final sample was 351.

Reliability and Validity of Research Variables

The convergent validity of the two research constructs was examined using exploratory factor analysis. The Extraction method used in the factor analysis was Principal Component Analysis and the rotation method was Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. AVE for the travel needs scale and tourism experience values were 42 % and 51 %, respectively.

Table (2) Descriptive statistics

Gender	
Male	165
Female	182
Missing	4
Age	
17-26	333
More than 26	14
Missing	4
Marital Status	
Single	337
Divorced	3
Married	9
Missing	2
Monthly Income	
Less than5000	206
From 5000-9999	54
From10000-14999	31
From15000-19999	11
From20000-24999	3
More than 25	9
Missing	37
Travel Abroad	
Yes	242
No	108
Missing	1
Purpose of Travel	
Study	56
Tourism	200
Work	35

Table (3) Factor Analysis and Alpha Coefficients of the Travel Needs Scale

	Ave 42 %Component			
	Social skills Alpha=70	Escape 57 remove routine 70	Self-actualization 62 remove travel 71	Novelty 53 remove with family 58
To feel satisfied			.563	
To have self-actualization			.718	
To feel successful			.785	
To learn about other places				.601
To learn about other people				.500
To do and see new things				.704
To be/spend time with family				.554
To be/spend time with friends				
To Improve my relationships				
To be around others similar to me			.472	
Become part of a group	.501			
To meet new people	.793			
To make new friends	.801			
To improve my social skills	.614			
To improve my social network				
To feel excitement				
To seek an adrenaline rush				
To feel emotionally charged		.534		
To be away from my everyday life		.742		
To feel detached from mundane tasks		.797		
To feel disconnected from my regular social circle		.718		
To move away from routine		.433		

As shown in tables (3), four dimensions appeared, and the factor loadings were high for the dimensions of the travel needs, and no cross-loading appeared in the factor analysis. The social skills factor included four items and its alpha coefficient was 70%. Self-actualization included four items and its alpha coefficient was 62% and when the item "to be around others similar to me" was deleted, its alpha coefficient became 71%. The escape dimension included five items and its alpha coefficient was 57%. When the item "to move away from routine" was deleted, alpha became 70%. Novelty included four items and its alpha coefficient was 53%, when the item" to be/spend time with family" was deleted, alpha was 58%.

For the tourism experience value, the exploratory factor analysis revealed the existence of four factors. As shown in table (4), alpha coefficients were 68%, 73%, 64% and 75% for the dimensions: emotional value, functional value, social value and value for money, respectively

Table (4) Factor Analysis and Alpha Coefficients of the Tourism Experience Value

	Emotional value Alpha=.68	Functional Value Alpha=.73	Social value Alpha=.64	Value for money Alpha=.75
Value for money				.786
Suitable price				.851
Organized		.823		
Acceptable quality		.875		
Adventure feeling	.491			
Stable quality		.588		
Feel socially acceptable			.661	
Improve self-concept			.596	
Make others accept me			.786	
Genuine experience	.613			
Satisfies my curiosity	.630			
Impress others			.654	
Exciting place	.427			
Stimulates activity	.744			
Educational				
Makes me happy	.583			

Cluster analysis

Cluster analysis (CA) is an exploratory data analysis tool that organizes data through forming clusters so that cases in each cluster are similar to each other and (Burns and Burns, 2008). Based on Hair et al., (1998), the cluster variate is the set of variables representing the characteristics used to compare objects in the cluster analysis. The four travel motives identified previously were used as the cluster variate. Then, univariate and multivariate outliers were detected. Univariate outliers were identified by obtaining the standardized coefficients and eliminating values exceeding +_ 3. 13 univariate outliers were removed. Mahalanobis test of distance was used to detect multivariate outliers by evaluating the position of each observation compared with the center of all observations on a set of variables (Hair et al., 1998, p.67). The significance levels for D2 were calculated and assorted ascendingly. No multivariate outliers

were obtained. Thus, the sample size reached 338.

Standardization was not used since all variables were measured using the same scale (5-point Likert scale). Distance measures reflect similarity through the proximity of observations to one another across the variables in the cluster variate (Hair et al., 1998). The squared Euclidean distance was used. Based on Hair et al., (1998), two assumptions underly cluster analysis, Sample representativeness and absence of multicollinearity which is the correlation coefficients between variables are not significantly high.

The sample representativeness assumption was violated due to the small sample size, but the research can be described as exploratory. For multicollinearity, VIF was used (Myers et al., 2006) and the VIFs of the eight variables included in the cluster variate were less than 10 indicating the absence of multicollinearity (Norusis, 1990).

The hierarchical cluster analysis was used as a clustering algorithm due to the small size of the sample (Norusis, 1990). Ward's method was used since it measures the distance between two clusters as the sum of squares between the two clusters summed over all variables (Hair et al., 1998). To determine how many clusters should be formed, Hair et al., (1998) argue that it would be best to compute some cluster solutions and then select one alternative solutions based a priori criteria, practical judgment, common sense, and theoretical foundations. Three solutions were examined, a two, three, and four cluster solution. A four-cluster solution was selected. ANOVA, Scheffe test, and a comparison of means were performed (Table 5). A cross-tabulation of demographic variables and the four clusters was also performed (Table 5).

The ANOVA table shows that there are significant differences among the four clusters with respect to the four tourism motives (self-actualization, novelty, escape and social needs) and two of the tourism experience value dimensions (social and emotional values). All results were significant at (p<.000).

Table (6) shows descriptive statistics of research variables for the four clusters. Shceffe's post hoc test was also conducted and the results are shown on table (7).

Table (5) Results of ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Self-actualization	Between Groups	107.579	3	35.860	105.913	.000
	Within Groups	113.085	334	.339		
	Total	220.665	337			
Novelty	Between Groups	15.644	3	5.215	22.356	.000
	Within Groups	77.906	334	.233		
	Total	93.550	337			
Social needs	Between Groups	65.675	3	21.892	98.698	.000
	Within Groups	74.082	334	.222		
	Total	139.757	337			
Escape	Between Groups	95.025	3	31.675	127.826	.000
	Within Groups	82.764	334	.248		
	Total	177.789	337			
Value for money	Between Groups	1.306	3	.435	.779	.507
	Within Groups	186.802	334	.559		
	Total	188.109	337			
Functional value	Between Groups	.771	3	.257	.662	.576
	Within Groups	129.673	334	.388		
	Total	130.444	337			
Emotional value	Between Groups	6.452	3	2.151	7.411	.000
	Within Groups	96.927	334	.290		
	Total	103.379	337			
Social value	Between Groups	19.844	3	6.615	12.278	.000
	Within Groups	179.931	334	.539		
	Total	199.775	337			

Table (6) shows descriptive statistics of research variables for the four clusters.

Cluster	Self-actualization	Novelty	Social needs	escape	Value for money	Functional value	Emotional Value	Social value	Foreign Travel experience	Gender	Age	Marital status
1 N=137 Mean	3.5635	4.4666	4.0684	4.1369	3.8228	4.0438	4.1482	3.5894	N=96	F=66 M=70	17-26=134 >26=2	S=128 D=1 MR=7
Std. dev	.60648	.50721	.42025	.47740	.70319	.62468	.54594	.70255		Missing=1	Missing =1	Missing =1
2 N=73 Mean	4.6301	4.8311	4.2363	4.6359	3.8630	4.1249	4.2598	3.8827	N=47	F=38 M=35	17-26=68 .>26=5	S=72 D=1
Std dev	.42150	.25533	.63859	.37406	.84413	.69314	.57087	.78693				
3 N=37 Mean	3.2523	4.3333	3.9818	2.7005	3.7297	4.1892	4.0325	3.2740	N=28	F=20 M=17	17-26=37	S=37
Std dev	.59528	.56656	.37425	.32006	.82995	.60625	.58224	.72608				
4 N=91 Mean	3.0686	4.2255	3.1266	3.9120	3.7064	4.0700	3.8867	3.2359	N=42	F=50 M=38	17-26=87 >26=2	S=87 D=1 MR=1
Std.dev	.64561	.54435	.41712	.64983	.69484	.56548	.47985	.73967		Missing=2	Missing=2	
Total Mean N=338	3.6266	4.4658	3.8416	4.0269	3.7899	4.0843	4.0892	3.5230	N=233	F=174 M=160	17-26=321 >26=14	S=324 D=3 MR=8
Std. Dev	.80919	.52687	.64398	.72634	.74712	.62215	.55386	.76994				Missing =3

Table (7) Scheffe's post hoc test

Dependent Variable	(I) Ward Method	(J) Ward Method	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Self-actualization	1	2	-1.06666*	.08432	.000
		3	.31122*	.10781	.041
		4	.49484*	.07869	.000
	2	3	1.37788*	.11743	.000
	3	4	1.56151*	.09143	.000
Novelty	1	2	-.36440*	.06998	.000
		3	.13332	.08948	.529
		4	.24118*	.06531	.004
	2	3	.49772*	.09746	.000
	3	4	.60558*	.07588	.000
		4	.10786	.09417	.726
Social needs	1	2	-.16788	.06825	.111
		3	.08660	.08726	.805
		4	.94186*	.06369	.000
	2	3	.25448	.09504	.069
	3	4	1.10974*	.07400	.000
		4	.85526*	.09183	.000
Escape	1	2	-.49901*	.07213	.000
		3	1.43635*	.09223	.000
		4	.22487*	.06732	.012
	2	3	1.93537*	.10046	.000
	3	4	.72389*	.07821	.000

Value for money	1	2	-.04023	.10837	.987
		3	.09302	.13856	.929
		4	.11637	.10114	.724
	2	3	.13325	.15092	.854
	3	4	.15660	.11751	.621
		4	.02335	.14581	.999
Functional value	1	2	-.08112	.09029	.848
		3	-.14539	.11544	.663
		4	-.02624	.08426	.992
	2 3	3	-.06428	.12574	.967
		4	.05488	.09790	.957
Emotional value	1	2	-.11161	.07806	.564
		3	.11563	.09981	.719
		4	.26151*	.07285	.005
	2	3	.22725	.10871	.226
	3	4	.37312*	.08464	.000
Social value	1	2	-.29337	.10636	.057
		3	.31541	.13599	.148
		4	.35342*	.09926	.006
	2 3	3	.60878*	.14812	.001
		4	.64680*	.11532	.000

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Cluster 1, the balancers n= 139, the means for this cluster are very close to the sample means, they are slightly lower than the enthusiasts. This cluster includes 96 students who had foreign travel experience, 66 females and 70males, 134 students were between the age of 17 and 26, 128 were single, one divorced and 7 were married.

Cluster 2, The enthusiasts (n=137), the mean values for self-actualization, novelty and escape were significantly higher than those of the other three clusters (p<.000). The means for social needs and value for money were also higher than the three other clusters but not significant. The means were also significantly higher than the cluster 3 and 4 for the social values(p<.000) and higher than cluster 4 for the emotional value. The mean for value for money was the highest among the four clusters, but it was insignificant. The number of students with foreign travel experience in this cluster was 37, number of females was 38 and number of males was 35, they were mostly between the age of 17 to 26 and mostly single.

Cluster 3, the realists n=37, the most important finding for this group is their low ratings for the need for escape 2.7 and they had the highest mean for functional value but both differences were not significant. Their mean for social needs was significantly higher than Cluster 4 in social needs. They were also higher than cluster 4 in self-actualization and novelty, but the differences were not significant. This cluster included 28 students who had foreign travel experience, 2 females and 17 males. All of them were between the age of 17 and 26 and they were all single.

Cluster 4, the *non-socials* (n=91), the means for this cluster are significantly lower than the other clusters in self-actualization and social needs. The means for this group were also significantly lower than those of clusters 1 and 2 in novelty, escape, emotional value and social value. Besides, this cluster had the lowest mean for the value for money, but it was not significant. This cluster included 42 students who had foreign travel experience, 50 females and 38 males; most of them were between the ages of 18 to 26 and were mostly single.

Discussion

The purpose of this research is to examine the various travel motivations among young Egyptians. The relationship between these motivations and tourism experience values was also examined. A sample of young Egyptians was collected from two universities in the city of Alexandria, Egypt. A cluster analysis was conducted to group respondents based on their travel motivations. The differences among the resulting clusters were then analyzed using ANOVA and Scheffes's post hoc test.

Several insights can be identified from the findings. First, the existence of multiple tourism motivations was supported by several studies. Pearce and Lee's (2005) Travel Career Approach supported the existence of multiple travel motives that are affected by previous travel experience and age. Bond and Falk (2013) also noted that contrary to short visits, in tourism decisions individuals seek to satisfy multiple identity- related needs and in some cases, they are incorporated into a single experience. For tourists from low-income countries, travel represents an experience that satisfies multiple motives, unlike tourists from high- income countries who might find satisfaction in non-travel related experiences. This effect is intensified in countries which have faced tremendous economic and social changes such as Egypt.

Second, when the hierarchical cluster analysis was conducted, the clusters did not vary for the type of travel motive, they varied for the strength of the motive. Four clusters were identified in the cluster analysis and significant differences were reported among clusters for the four travel motivations and social and emotional values (p<.000). Conversely, there were no significant differences reported among the four clusters

for the two tourism value dimensions of value for money and functional value.

The first cluster, the enthusiasts (n=137), includes young tourists with significantly higher ratings than other groups for self-actualization, novelty and escape. They also had significantly higher ratings for social values than two other clusters. This group was balanced in terms of the number of males and females; they were between 17 and 26 years of old and were mostly single.

The second cluster, the *non-socials* (n=91) had significantly lower means for self-actualization and social needs. Besides, this cluster had the lowest mean for the value for money, but it was not significant. This cluster was slightly female-biased (50 females and 38 males), mostly single and between the age of 17 to 26.

The third cluster, *the balancers*, (n=139), the means for this cluster are slightly lower than the enthusiasts. This cluster was balanced in terms of gender distribution (66 females and 70 males. Most students were between the age of 17 and 26, it also included one divorced and seven married respondents.

The fourth cluster, the *realists* (n=37), reported low ratings for the need for escape (2.7) and they had the highest mean for functional value but both differences were not significant. This cluster included 20 females and 17 males. All of them were between the age of 17 and 26 and they were all single.

Third, the findings provide support to the relationship between travel motivation and tourism experience value previously reported by Prebensen et al., (2013). Enthusiasts had higher ratings for self-actualization, novelty, escape and social values. For the Balancers, the means for tourism motivation and tourism experience value dimensions are slightly lower than the enthusiasts. Conversely, the

non-socials had significantly lower means for self-actualization and social needs. Finally, the *realists* (n=37), reported low ratings for the need for escape and they had the highest mean for functional value but both differences were not significant.

The relationship between travel motivation and tourism experience value is similar to the finding of Prebensen et al., (2013). The findings also support Pearce and Lee's (2005) Travel Career Pattern, where combinations of multiple motives are affected by previous travel experience and age. In the case of young tourists, motives were acting collectively to affect their tourism experience value.

Academic and Practical Implications

This research entails several implications for academics and practitioners. First, it is important for academics to examine the tourism motivations of young tourists as a distinct segment with different travel motivations and different perceptions of tourism experience value. Taking into consideration the increasing importance of this segment, understanding their tourism needs and requirements of tourism experience value warrants further attention from academics. Second, no gender differences were identified in this segment with respect to their tourism motivations and tourism experience value dimensions. Second, the combination of travel motivations may be culturally bound, that is the motivations of young tourists may vary from one country to another emphasizing the effect of cultural and socioeconomic variables in the formation of tourism motivations. Third, for practitioners, the youth segment represents a distinct segment with different tourism needs. Tailoring marketing programs that satisfy their needs is a must taking into consideration

the percentage of young people in the Egyptian society.

References

– Baloglu, S. and Uysal, M. (1996). "Market segments of push and pull motivations: a canonical correlation approach", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. 8. 3, pp. 32-38.

– Bicikova, K. (2014). "Understanding student travel behavior: A segmentation analysis of British university students", Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 31(7), 854–867.

– Bond, N. and Falk, J. H. (2013), "Tourism and identity-related motivations: why am I here (and not there)?", International Journal of Tourism Research, Vol. 15, pp.430–442.

– Boukas, N. (2013). "Youth visitors' satisfaction in Greek cultural heritage destinations: the case of Delphi", Tourism Planning and Development, 10(30); 285-306.

– Buffa, F. (2015), "Young Tourists and Sustainability. Profiles, Attitudes, and Implications for Destination Strategies", Sustainability, Vol. 7, pp. 14042-14062.

– Burns, R., and R. Burns (2008). "Business Research Methods and Statistics Using SPSS", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, CA.

– Çakar, K., Seyitoglu F. and Sayar, N. (2016). "Backpackers' Travel Motivations and Experiences", In Avicikurt, C. Dinu, M.S., Hacioglu, N. Efe, R. Soykan, A. and Tetik, N (ed.). Global Issues and Trends in Tourism, St. Kliment Ohridski University Press Sofia. Chapter 46, pp. 553- 560.

– Carr, N. (2013). "University and college student's tourism", in Ritchie, B.W.(Ed.), Managing Educational Tourism, Channel View Publications, Clevedon, pp. 181-225.

– Cavagnaro, E., and Staffieri, S. (2015). "A study of students' travelers values and needs in order to establish futures patterns and insights", Journal of Tourism Futures, 1(2), 94–107.

– Chabra, D. (2010). "Student motivations: A heritage tourism perspective". Anatolia, 21(2), 249– 269.

– Correia, A. N., Oom do Valle, P. and Moco, C. (2007). "Modeling motivations and perceptions of Portuguese tourists", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 6 no. 1, pp. 76-80.

– Du Cros, H., and Jingya, L. (2013). "Chinese youth tourists' views on local culture", Tourism Planning and Development, 10(2): 187-204.

– Eusébio, C. and Carneiro, M. J. (2015). "How diverse is the youth tourism market? An activity-based segmentation study", Tourism, Vol. 63, No. 3, 295 – 316.

– Staffieri, S., Cavagnaro, E., & Rowson, B. (2017). "Change as a travel benefit: exploring the impact of travel experiences on Italian youth", Research in Hospitality Management, 7 (2): 81-89.

– Gallarza, M.G. and Gil Saura, I. (2006). "Value Dimensions, Perceived Value, Satisfaction and Loyalty: An Investigation of University Students' Travel Behaviour", Tourism Management, 27, 437-452.

– Hair, J. S., R. E. Anderson, R. L. Tetham and W. C. Black (1998). "Multivariate Data Analysis", 5th ed. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, NJ. p. 484.

– Heung, V. C. S., & Leong, J. S. L. (2006). "Travel demand and behavior of university students in Hong Kong", Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research, 11 (1), 81–96

– Horner, S. & Swarbrooke, J. (1996). "Marketing tourism, hospitality, and leisure in Europe", International Thomson Business Press, London. Book reviews in Journal of Vacation Marketing, vol 4 n. 4 pp. 415- 417.

– Hsu, C.H.C; Cai, L.A. and Li, M. (2010), "Expectation, Motivation, and Attitude: A Tourist Behavioral Model", Journal of Travel Research, Vol.49 No.3, pp. 282–296.

– Huang, S., & Hsu, C. (2009). "Effects of travel motivation, past experience, perceived constraint, and attitude on revisit intention", Journal of Travel Research, 48 (1), 29-44.

– Kidwell, B., & Jewel, R. D. (2008). "The influence of past behavior on behavioral intent: an information-process-sing explanation", Psychology and Marketing, 25 (12), 1151-1166.

– Kim, K. (2008). "Analysis of structural equation model for the student pleasure travel market: motivation, involvement, satisfaction, and destination loyalty", Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 24 (4), 385-395.

– Kim, K., Oh, I. K., & Jogaratnam, G. (2007). "College student travel: A revised model of push motives", Journal of Vacation Marketing, 13 (1), 73–85.

– Kim. C., and Lee, S. (2000). "Understanding the cultural differences in tourist motivation between Angol-American and Japanese tourists", Journal of travel and touirism marketing. 9 (1-2). 153-170.

– Kim. K., Oh, I. & Jogaratnam, G. (2007). "College student travel: A revised model of push motives", Journal of Vacation Marketing. 13 (1). 73-85.

– Kleiven, J. (2005). "Measuring leisure and travel motives in Norway: Replicating and supplementing the leisure motivation scales", Tourism Analysis. 10 (2). 109-122.

– Klenosky, D. (2002). "The pull of tourism destinations: a means-end investigation", Journal of Travel Research, 40 (4), 385-395.

– Lepp, A., & Gibson, H. (2008). "Sensation seeking and tourism: Tourist role, perception of risk and destination choice", Tourism Management, 29 (4), 740–750.

– Li, M., Zhang, H., Xiao, H. and Chen, Y. (2015). "A Grid Group analysis of Tourism Motivation", International Journal of Tourism Research, 17,1, 35-44.

– Mohsin, A., Lengler, J. and Chaiya, P. (2017). "Does Travel interest mediate between motives and intention to travel? A case of Asian Travelers", Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 31, pp.36-44.

– Monaco, Salvatore. (2018). "Tourism and the new generations: emerging trends and social implications in Italy", Journal of Tourism Futures, vol. 4 no. 1, pp.7-15

– Myers, L. M., G. Gamst and A. J. Guarino. 2006. "Applied Multivariate Research: Design and Interpretation", Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, CA.

– Norusis, M. J. 1990. "SPSS: Advanced Statistics User's Guide", SPSS, Chicago, Ch.

– Paker, N. and Vural, C.A. (2016). " Customer segmentation for marinas: Evaluating marinas as destinations", Tourism Management, Vol.56 No. October, pp.156-171.

– Pearce, P. L. & Lee, U. (2005). "Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation", Journal of Travel Research, Vol. 43, 93, pp. 226-237.

– Pearce, P. L. (1988). "The Ulysses factor: evaluating visitors in tourist settings", New York, Spinger Verlag. (6th ed.).

– Pearce, P. L. (2011). "Tourist behavior and the contemporary world", Bristol: channel view publications.

– Pesonen, J.A. (2012), "Segmentation of rural Tourists: Combining Push and Pull motivations",

Tourism and Hospitality Management, Vol.18, No.1, pp. 69-82.

– Prayag, G. and Hosany, S. (2014). "When Middle East meets West: Understanding the Motives and Perceptions of Young Tourists from United Arab Emirates", Tourism Management, 40, pp.35-45. Vol. 63/ No. 3/ 2015/ 295 – 316.

– Prayag, G., Disegna, M., Cohen, S.A. and Yan, H. (2015). "Segmenting Markets by bagged clustering: Young Chinese travelers to Western Europe", Journal of Travel Research, 54,2, pp.234-250.

– Prebensen, N.K. and Rosengren, S. (2016). "Experience value as a function of hedonic and utilitarian dominant services", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol.28 No. 1, pp. 113-135.

– Prebensen, N. K., Woo, E., & Uysal, M. S. (2013). "Motivation and involvement as antecedents of the perceived value of the destination experience", Journal of Travel Research, 52(2), 253-264.

– Rageh, A., Melewar, T.C and Woodside, A. (2013). "Using netnography research method to reveal the underlying dimensions of the customer/tourist experience", Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal, Vol.16 No.2, pp.126-149.

– Richards, G. (2011). "An economic contribution that matters", In WYSE Travel Confederation/UNWTO (2011), The Power of Youth Travel, 7-8

– Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2004). "The international student travel market, travel style, motivations, and activities", Tourism review international, 8 (2), 57-67.

– Richards, G., and Wilson, J. (2003). "New Horizons in Independent Youth and Student Travel. Today's Youth Tourists: Tomorrow's Global Nomads?", A Report for the International Student Travel Confederation (ISTC) and the Association of Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS).57-67.

– Ryan, C., & Glendon, I. (1998). "Application of Leisure motivation scale to tourism", Annals of Tourism Research, 25 (1), 169 – 184.

– Sánchez-Fernández, R. and Iniesta-Bonillo, M.A. (2007). "The concept of perceived value: a systematic review of the research", Marketing Theory, Vol.7, No.4, pp. 427–451.

– Sheth, J.N., Newman, B.I. and Gross, B.L. (1991). "Consumption values and market choices: theory and applications", South-Western Publishing, Cincinnati.

– Staffieri, S. and Cavagnaro, E. (2018). "Youth Travel Experience: An Analysis of the Relations between Motivations, Satisfaction and Perceived Change", WIT Transactions on Ecology and The Environment, Vol 227, pp.95-106

– Staffieri, S., Cavagnaro, E., & Rowson, B. (2017). "Change as a travel benefit: exploring the impact of travel experiences on Italian youth", Research in Hospitality Management, 7 (2): 81-89.

– Sweeney, J. C., & Soutar, G. (2001), "Consumer perceived value: the

– Development of multiple item scale", Journal of Retailing, Vol.77 No.2, pp.203–220.

– Tangeland. T., Vennesland. B., & Nybakk, E. (2012). "Second home-owners' intention to purchase nature-based tourism activity products: A Norwegian case study", Tourism Management, 36, 364-376.

– Tasci, A.D. and Ko, Y.J. (2017), "Travel needs revisited", Journal of Vacation Marketing, Vol. 23 No.1, pp. 20–36.

– UNWTO and WYSE Travel Confederation. (2011). "The Power of Youth Travel", Available online: http://www2.unwto.org/publication/am-reports-volume-2-power-youth-travel (accessed on 22 July 2019).

– UNWTO and WYSE Travel Confederation (2016). "United Nations World Tourism Organization and World Youth Student and Educational Travel Confederation", Affiliate members global reports, volume thirteen – the power of youth travel, UNWTO, Madrid.

– Xu, F., Morgan, M., & Song, P. (2009). "Students' travel behavior: A cross-cultural comparison of UK and China", International Journal of Tourism Research, 11(3), 255–268.

– Ying, K.S. and Krishnapillai, G. (2018). "Young domestic tourists- Are they motivated to travel?", Advanced Science Letters, 24,5, pp.3444-3449.

– Zeithaml, V.A. (1988). "Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence", Journal of Marketing, Vol.52 No.3, pp. 2-22.