

# Slow tourism motivations: a factor/cluster segmentation approach

Wagnew Eshetie Tsegaw 

Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia  
Correspondence: [w.eshetie12@gmail.com](mailto:w.eshetie12@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT:** Market segmentation has become a valuable instrument in planning appropriate marketing strategies. Therefore, the overall purpose of this study is to explore slow tourists' characteristics, revealing the differences in their motivations using a factor/cluster market segmentation approach. The sample population for this study consisted of tourists who have visited the Choke Mountains ecovillage in Ethiopia. Data were collected from international and domestic samples. Through factor analysis, the push and pull motivation factors were derived from 45 motivation items. As a result of cluster analysis, both samples were segmented into four distinct segments, i.e. escape seekers, want-it-all seekers, novelty seekers and passive seekers. The most significant contribution of this study is a theoretical understanding with empirical results using the new factors (i.e. motivation segmentation) in the context of the concept of slow tourism. This study helps destination managers in planning appropriate marketing strategies. The implications will be useful for destination development and marketing organisations as part of developing sustainable strategies that are in line with the specific needs and experiences of slow tourism participants.

**KEYWORDS:** ecolodge, Ethiopia, low carbon travel, responsible experience, responsible travel, sustainable tourism, village tourism

## Introduction

In today's competitive environment, destinations need to find ways to differentiate their tourism offerings by finding their competitive advantages and carefully choosing how they are positioned in the global market to attract a larger market share (Gomezlj & Mihalič, 2008). However, increased competition and acceleration has led to a counter-reaction in the travel and tourism industry, i.e. "slow tourism", which is a contemporary phenomenon characterised by tourists' tendency to travel, stay in a destination and visit places at a decelerated pace (Dickinson & Lumsdon, 2010). Slow tourists love to move from one place to another slowly (e.g. by walking or cycling), remain in a destination for long enough to discover its unique aspects and immerse themselves in local traditions and culture — all in an effort to enrich themselves as human beings (Oh et al., 2016). Slow tourism can be interpreted as both an emerging tourism niche as well as an overall approach to travel and represents a progressive genre of alternative tourism for remote locales beyond mass-tourism complexes.

The slow movement itself, calling for a more mindful approach, not only to travelling, but to life in general (Honoré, 2005), is growing at an accelerating rate and an increasing emphasis on tourism experiences is growing in importance (Mei, 2014). The experiences of consumers play an increasingly important role in economic and social life (Quan & Wang, 2004), and it is suggested that in the next decade, experiences will become of far greater value to many travellers (Heitmann et al., 2011). Moreover, the increasing ecological footprint of a fast pace of life and consequent environmental concerns are some of the major reasons for the

growth of the slow movement in general. Slow travel is seen as an answer to the current unsustainable tourism patterns (Dickinson & Lumsdon, 2010; Lipman & Murphy, 2012). Greenhouse gas emissions associated with travel, accommodation and related activities are growing and predicted to continue growing with the projected growth of tourism after the COVID-19 pandemic. Although slow tourism is not a panacea to all the problems the tourism industry is facing, it offers an alternative, more sustainable approach to travel and at the same time fits well in the Green Growth 2050 roadmap for tourism proposed in the Rio+20 Earth Summit (Lipman et al., 2013). In this context, one of the biggest debates among practitioners and academics is about the actual motivations and behaviours of slow travellers.

Despite the growing sociocultural awareness and movement toward slowness, and more specifically slow tourism, the literature documents little systematic research on the topic (Fullagar et al., 2012). A variety of theoretical and methodological approaches (including quantitative surveys, interviews, discourse analysis and self-reflection) grounded in different disciplines (geography, tourism studies, sociology) present their findings from a wide range of locations. There has been little research on slow tourism, but the interest in this concept is growing in highly developed countries (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011). However, much of the existing research on slow tourism is either descriptive or qualitative and, thus, empirical evidence is still lacking to offer an extended insight (Groenendaal, 2012). Though tourist motivations have been studied extensively in the literature (Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Kozak, 2002; Bansal & Eiselt, 2004), there has been scarce research on the characteristics of slow tourists — their motivations, choices and needs and the

resulting segmentation. A gap in this area is filled by Burmecha-Olszowy (2014), in which the difference between a farm stay connected with slow food, slow tourism, or a slow life with those who are not providing a slow offering is explained. More importantly, some studies evidenced the heterogeneous nature of tourist motivations, and highlight the importance of these motivations (e.g. Bansal & Eiselt, 2004). The context dependency of motivations to specific destinations and tourist market emphasises the need for further research.

This study aims to empirically investigate slow tourists' characteristics by segmenting and profiling the needs of slow tourists, so as to provide a better understanding of slow tourism, by using a cluster market segmentation approach. On a practical level, this study can provide an insight for destination brands and related companies so that they can refine their marketing strategies to cater more comprehensively to tourist requirements. Finally, there are currently some initiatives to develop slow tourism destinations (e.g. the Choke Mountain ecovillage in Ethiopia). The World Tourism Organization (WTO) has named Ethiopia's Choke Mountains Ecovillage among the best tourism villages in 2022. Tourists exposed to the everyday hustle and bustle and resulting tensions of professional and social competition are increasingly looking for opportunities for slow tourism destinations. Therefore, investigating what makes people choose this type of tourism (what motivates slow tourists) and what the offer is for slow tourists in a developing destination context (e.g. Ethiopia) stimulates research curiosity.

Generally, the tourists' motivations for slow tourism participation have been explored to a small extent. Furthermore, this significant issue in the broader tourism literature is still an underdeveloped area of study although the range of implementation of motivation studies in the tourism literature is abundant (Allan, 2012). However, even if slow tourism has received some attention in the academic literature, investigating slow tourists' motivations in a developing country context is under-researched. This article contributes to filling this gap by identifying the main drivers for travellers to participate in slow tourism experiences.

The main purpose of this study is two-fold. First, to explore the primary reasons influencing slow tourists' decision-making while taking a holiday to slow tourism destinations, and second, to identify customer segments, particularly their sociodemographic characteristics and holiday-taking patterns. For this purpose, a *factor/cluster segmentation approach* appears to be the most useful method. It is obvious that while the most common characteristics of the segment are revealed, destination brands and related companies can also use these findings to develop their marketing strategies to cater more systematically to slow tourist requirements. The results of this study are expected to segment slow tourists according to their motivations into meaningful and manageable groups, and to identify the characteristics of slow tourism participants. Knowledge about tourist motivations would enable tourism destination planners to satisfy consumer needs better.

## Literature review

In this section, I review the literature about slow tourism, motivation and market segmentation to deepening knowledge on new trends in tourism.

### Slow tourism

Slow tourism is increasingly appreciated for the authentic experiences it can give. Tourism in the next decade will be more and more experiential and sustainable. Derived from the slow movement, slow tourism is defined as tour activities that are slow paced, with the aim of fully experiencing and enjoying the visited locale, as well as in-depth interactions with local residents (Pawłusiński & Kubal, 2018; Walker & Lee, 2019). Slow travel is a label which is intimately tied to identity (Dickinson et al., 2011; Smith, 2012) and is about making conscious choices (Gardner, 2009), considering the impact of holidays on the local community (World Travel Market, 2007), having a deeper sense of experience (Germann Molz, 2009), spending longer in a destination (Caffyn, 2012), engaging in a low carbon activity (Dickinson et al., 2011; Lipman & Murphy, 2012) with a low impact on the environment (Timms & Conway, 2011; Markwell et al., 2012; Singh, 2012), making real and meaningful connections with people, places, food, heritage and the environment (Caffyn, 2012), following a more fulfilling and worthwhile way of life (Smith, 2012) and consuming slowly (Hall, 2009). Although city life is also advocated as a slow tourism destination (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011), the concept prefers rural areas (Matos, 2004) with a slower pace of life and opportunities to walk, cycle and enjoy the countryside.

Slow tourism has emerged as a new form of tourism that is often considered a sustainable alternative to mass tourism (Fullagar et al., 2012), and has been directly associated with the slow food movement that developed in Italy during the late 1980s (Dickinson et al., 2011). The reasons to engage in slow tourism may be different for various demographic groups (Rawlinson, 2011). Dickinson et al. (2011) states that the pioneers and the authors of both newspaper and web page articles on slow travel have different foci, such as avoiding flights and reducing the usage of cars to reduce carbon emissions and negative environmental impacts that are especially due to travelling at an individual level, and the richness of a travel experience at a destination. Further, slow travel is a state of mind that should start at home by exploring nearby places of interest and the suggestion that tourists have to use slower modes of transport, such as ferries, busses and slow trains as 'speed destroys the connection with the landscape' (Gardner, 2009, p. 10). It is also suggested that slow travel involves an engagement with both people and place (Dickinson et al., 2011), reducing one's carbon footprint, having an ecological and ethical vision, focusing on local contacts and nearby sights, consuming local products and discovering heritage, conserving the locals' quality of life, and ensuring a high-quality tourism experience (Yurtseven & Kaya, 2011; Valls et al., 2019). Slow travellers devote time and develop an attachment to a particular place (Buckley, 2011; Yurtseven & Kaya, 2011) by engaging, appreciating and thus cultivating personalised relationships with the people and places that they visit. Thus, a new type of tourist is emerging — one who is responsible, conscious, respectful of nature, critical and open to learning about the customs, culture and religion of local populations. Therefore, slow tourism has become a novel travel trend and both tourism academics and practitioners are interested in understanding it more deeply (Oh et al., 2016; Husemann & Eckhardt, 2019). Park and Yoon (2009) featured slow tourism with fewer places travelled to and longer stays at the visited places.

Slow tourism has been a trending phenomenon of travel since

the late 20th century, responding to the exponential growth and accompanying problems of mass tourism. Slow travellers consider the impact of their holidays on the local community they visit (World Travel Market, 2007). It is one of the fastest-growing niche markets and is viewed as a form of sustainable tourism (Serdane et al., 2020; Le Busque et al., 2021). However, some studies show that the focus of slow tourism has been shifting from mere environmental sustainability to the practice of time and space in ways conducive to personal satisfaction and well-being (Parkins & Craig, 2009) which includes both the experience of the travel and the destination itself (Dickinson & Lumsdon, 2010; Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011; Rawlinson, 2011). It is argued that slow tourists have a more intense destination experience than regular tourists (Rawlinson, 2011), creating "richer memories" of the holiday (Lumsdon & McGrath 2011). The findings of this study suggest that slow tourism is essentially experience-based tourism. The emphasis in slow tourism is on meaningful experiences and not on environmentally friendly travelling. Such experiences were related to either immersion in culture and environment, or interaction with hosts and locals. These core experiences in slow tourism can be classified as escapist experiences, according to Pine and Gilmore (1998). The slow tourism movement is also a significant reaction to mass tourism, offering more authentic experiences that take particular care of the environment (Dickinson & Lumsdon, 2010; Clancy, 2017). However, since the slow tourism concept is relatively new, there is as yet no clear definition that covers the entire picture and the pillars on which it is based (Husemann & Eckhardt, 2019). Despite the importance of the deceleration mindset, little is known about how the decelerated tourism offering can be developed, promoted, or emphasised under the "slow tourism label". Consequently, there is a need for further research on how the tourism supply sector can market slow tourism better (Lin et al., 2020; Serdane, 2020).

### **Motivation**

Motivation helps to explain the process of decision-making when preparing to travel (Chen & Chen, 2015), and is a pertinent factor behind tourist behaviour (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996), and while tourist motivation and segmentation have been examined in various tourism contexts (Shi et al., 2018; Duman et al., 2020), motivation remains largely unexplored (Kalantari et al., 2020), and the literature remains inconsistent in its reporting of tourist segments (Boksberger & Laesser, 2009; Shi et al., 2018). Destination marketers need to understand what motivates people to choose slow tourism, as well as what segments are interested in that specific type of tourism. Tourist motivations are characteristics of individuals that influence the choice of destinations, and the effects of motivational influences of this nature on an individual have also been labelled as push factors (Kim & Lee, 2002). It is suggested that push factors define whether a tourist goes on a vacation or not, whereas pull factors define where the tourist chooses to go). Many studies have attempted to find push and pull motivational factors in different contexts, such as motivation by nationality (Yuan & McDonald, 1990; Cha et al., 1995; Zhang & Lam, 1999), destinations (Jang & Cai, 2002), satisfaction and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005), senior citizens (Jang & Wu, 2006), and events (Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Lee et al., 2014).

The existence of different motivation patterns for particular destinations affects tourists' expectations and, therefore, their

overall satisfaction (Devasa et al., 2009). According to Oh et al. (2014), there are six general slow tourism motivations: relaxation, self-reflection, escape, novelty-seeking, engagement and discovery. Relaxation refers to a state of being free from pressure, stress, tension, anxiety and excitement (nervousness), giving the feeling of ease, comfort, calm and relief (Yoon & Uysal, 2005; McCabe, 2009). Self-reflection is defined as a generic need for feeling connected to the self, nourishing the self and identifying with the self (Howard, 2012). Escape is a dominant travel motivation (Beh & Bruyere, 2007). People are motivated to engage in slow travel to seek novel experiences through new temporalities, new places and new people that offer them sensations of thrills, adventures and stimulation. The engagement motivation is often labelled as learning, education, or knowledge acquisition (Beh & Bruyere, 2007). For the development of destinations, it is important to study the current and potential demand for slow tourism destinations that are currently being visited, as well as those that could be developed in the future. This study is one of the first in Africa to segment tourists to slow tourism destinations and can therefore serve as a springboard for future studies on the continent.

### **Tourist segmentation**

Tourists are different and heterogeneous. According to Wedel and Kamakura (1999), market segmentation is important because it helps an organisation use their resources efficiently and make better strategic decisions. Market segmentation analysis is "the process of grouping consumers into naturally existing or artificially created segments of consumers who share similar product preferences or characteristics" (Dolnicar et al., 2018, p. 11). Its purpose is to facilitate more cost-effective marketing through the formulation, promotion and delivery of purposely designed products that satisfy the identified needs of a specific target group. In other words, segmentation is justified on the grounds of achieving greater efficiency in the supply of products to meet identified demands and increased cost effectiveness in the marketing process. The primary bases for segmentation include demography, geography, behaviour, lifestyle, personality and benefits sought (Park & Yoon, 2009). Common for many market segmentation studies in tourism is the use of a clustering methodology to find a segmentation solution (e.g. Frochot, 2005; Park & Yoon, 2009; Pesonen, 2012).

People's lifestyles have a huge influence on their motivations and purchasing behaviours. The characteristics of tourists can also be evaluated by personality, which has an influence on their behaviour (Ekinci & Hosany, 2006) and cognitive processes, which can influence the choice of tourism destination (Lew, 1987). Travellers can even make strong emotional connections with some places (Hosany et al., 2017; Usakli & Baloglu, 2011).

Tourist segmentation is context-dependent, and thus requires (re)investigation, especially when conceptually distinct contexts are discovered. The present study was developed in the context of Choke Mountains, Ethiopia, an ecotourism village which offers a combination of a traditional and modern lifestyle. These complex sets of characteristics make Choke Mountain a heterogeneous destination which needs further comprehension by tourist marketers. No previous studies have analysed the profiles of visitors of the destination. In this study, developed in the context of Choke slow tourism (Ethiopia), I aim to identify the profiles of tourists based on their motivations. Segmentation assists tourism policy makers and operators to understand

the characteristics of different groups of tourists and enables them to tailor tourism offerings to satisfy those tourists (Shi et al., 2018).

## Methodology

### *Research context and setting*

The study presented in this article was conducted in Choke Mountains ecovillage in Ethiopia, at an elevation of 4 070m and around 40km north-east of Debre Markos, the third highest mountain in Ethiopia, where the first and the only popular destination for slow tourism and practising the art and principles of slow travel is situated. At Choke Mountains, tourists experience one of the most beautiful and undiscovered parts of Ethiopia, where, culture, nature and society form a natural unity. The local farming community in this village adapts the ideology of "Mulu ecovillage" which promotes fair trade tourism, sustainable tourism development, sustainable culture and nature conservation, and the use of local materials to transform the common land into multiple tourism sites (UNWTO, 2022). Additionally, the village aims to establish a strong community-based tourism approach by coordinating and hosting regular community events. The local inhabitants act as tour guides and operate lodges while cultivating and producing a range of goods derived from both animal and plant sources, including honey, beer, medicinal herbs, vegetables and coffee. The commitment and actions of the village in working towards a sustainable future are clearly visible (personal communication with a village resident, 2022).

### *Instrument development*

A questionnaire was used which consisted of two parts. The first part was about travel motivations and comprised a set of 45 statements adopted from Kozak (2002), Yoon and Uysal (2005), Peters (2006), Molera and Albaladejo (2007), Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010), Heitmann et al. (2011), Van Vuuren and Slabbert (2011), Robbins and Cho (2012), Oh et al. (2016) and Sutthitep et al. (2016). Each motivation was rated using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from "1 strongly disagree" to "5 strongly agree". The second section contained sociodemographic questions about sex, age, education, occupation and marital status. The first draft was reviewed by researchers and pretested with 36 participants. The pilot was administered to tour companies and travel agents. Also, the instrument was sent to several tour organisers via email and further feedback was received. Some of their feedback and suggestions were incorporated into the final questionnaire design. There were a total of 234 cases of good quality surveys collected in one year and analysed for further results. All scales obtained reliabilities (factor loadings) above 0.78. Subsequently, factor analysis was applied to examine factor loadings, and some of the items were deleted because of low loading or cross-loading.

### *Sample and data collection*

International and domestic tourists were the main target for the current study and a convenience sampling approach was used since that approach allows respondents to be selected based on the researcher's ease of access (Saunders et al., 2012). This sampling technique is used by many tourist-segmentation studies (Allan & Shavanddasht, 2019). Data collection was conducted over a one-year period from December 2021 to

December 2022. The self-administered questionnaire was distributed to 234 possible respondents. After the participants had submitted the questionnaires, the administrators checked to see whether they had completed the questionnaire correctly. Table 1 provides a demographic profile of the sample. The first part of the questionnaire consisted of tourists' demographic characteristics, which were used to profile the tourist segments. The second part contained questions related to the slow tourist motivations, which served as a base for segmentation. To identify the motivational dimensions, tourists were asked to rate, on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 meant "not at all important" and 5 suggested a benefit was "very important"), in their choice of a slow tourism destination.

### *Data analysis*

The analysis was conducted with STATA 14.0. It employs factor and cluster analysis as appropriate. Factor analyses with varimax rotation were performed on motivations to identify smaller sets of explanatory composite factors. Only those factors with an eigenvalue equal to or higher than 1.0 were considered. Factor loading of 0.30 is considered significant, while a factor loading of 0.50 is considered very significant (Field, 2005). To ensure quality of measurement, the variables were also subjected to reliability (Cronbach's alpha reliability test) and appropriateness (Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy) testing. In the second step, I derived 45 motivation items for slow tourism. Two-stage cluster analysis (K-mean cluster analysis) was conducted. In the first stage, the factor scores of each respondent were used to segment slow tourists into homogeneous groups. Following that, sociodemographic and travel profiles in each cluster were developed and compared using a chi-square test to find statistical differences among the international and domestic tourist clusters.

## Results

### *Sample profile*

The sample size of the international tourists was 117 and the sociodemographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. The domestic tourist cluster had the highest percentage of students (32.5%) and the lowest percentage of others (45.2%). Further, it is dominated by males (55.6%). Of the respondents, 63.3% are married and 48.7% are undergraduates.

The sample size of the domestic tourists was also 117 tourists. Most of the respondents (42%) belonged to the younger age group of 21-40 years old. 72.6% of the visitors were single. Descriptive analysis of the sample showed that there were more male respondents (61.5%) than female. The group is dominated by single people (72.6%). 56.4% of the respondents are in the educational level of undergraduates (Table 1).

### *Principal components analysis*

The 45 push-and-pull motivation items were factor analysed using principal components analysis (PCA). From all motivation items, seven factors were derived with eigenvalues of greater than one. The total variance accounted for was 72.4%. The results of the factor analysis are reported in Table 2 and Table 3. The seven factors generated were escape, relaxation, novelty seeking, engagement, self-reflection and discovery, and environmental concerns. According to the K-means clustering procedure, mean values of the seven factors were extracted.

TABLE 1. Sociodemographic profile of the respondents (N = 234)

Characteristic	International		Domestic	
	n	%	n	%
Sex (n = 117)				
Male	65	55.6	72	61.5
Female	52	44.4	45	38.5
Age (n = 105)				
< 21 years	7	6.0	7	6
21-40 years	53	45.3	49	42
41-60 years	45	38.5	43	37
> 60 years	12	10.3	18	15
Education (n = 117)				
Primary school	6	5.1	13	11.1
High school	9	7.7	10	8.5
Undergraduate	57	48.7	66	56.4
Postgraduate	18	15.4	16	13.7
Other	15	12.8	12	10.3
Marital status (n = 117)				
Single	43	36.7	85	72.6
Married	74	63.3	32	27.4
Occupation (n = 117)				
Student	38	32.5	54	46.2
Employed	34	29.1	26	22.2
Pensioner	28	23.9	20	17.1
Others	17	14.5	17	14.5

As a result of factor analysis for slow tourism motivations, four clusters were generated. The four clusters were expected to show a variety of characteristics.

The clusters were characterised as follows:

- Cluster 1 — those who perceived and valued at a high level the "escape" more than other factors;
- Cluster 2 — a group who perceived and valued all seven factors;
- Cluster 3 — a group who perceived a high level in the "novelty" motivation dimension, but the lowest level on other motivation dimensions; and

- Cluster 4 — a group who perceived and exhibited low motivation in all seven factors.

Thus, each cluster was named according to the motivation actors in that cluster that received the highest ratings such as escape seekers, want-it-all seekers, novelty seekers and passive seekers.

To investigate whether there were statistically significant levels of association between some selected sociodemographic variables and the clusters, a series of chi-square tests were conducted). These results were used to identify the distinctive sociodemographic characteristics of the clusters. The results are reported in Table 4 and Table 5. Significant differences ( $p = 0.001$ ) were found between clusters regarding all sociodemographic variables, including age, sex, occupation, educational level and marital status. A summary of each cluster follows and is shown in Tables 6 and 7.

*Cluster 1 (28.2% international and 12.9% domestic)*

I named this cluster "escape seekers" since tourists in this cluster are looking for relaxation and release from their stressful, hectic daily lives. In terms of demographic and tourism behavioural characteristics of the international samples of this segment, the escape seeker cluster is mainly male tourists (57.6%), 21 to 40 years old (60%) and married (57.6%). On the other hand, the domestic tourists are mainly female tourists (60%), 21-40 years old (66.7%), at least with undergraduate studies (40%) and single (60%).

*Cluster 2 (35.9% international and 22.2% domestic)*

I named this cluster "want-it-all seekers", referring to tourists who had all types of motivation. In this cluster, international tourists were mainly male (61.9%), 21 to 40 years old (54.7%), at least with an undergraduate education (64.2%), married (64.3%) and employed (42.8%). These tourists mostly valued relaxation, environmental concerns and engagement. Conversely, domestic tourists were largely male (61.5%), single (53.8%) and students

TABLE 2. Factor analysis — motivational dimensions, items and statistics of international tourists (N = 117)

Motivational dimensions and items	Factor loadings	Eigen value	Variance (%)	Cronbach's alpha
Escape		6.62	17.1	0.857
To escape from daily life routine	0.875			
To escape from life pressures	0.796			
Relaxation		8.21	13.2	0.910
To relax and reset at the site	0.896			
To improve my mental and physical state	0.928			
Novelty seeking		7.73	12.2	0.838
To visit a distinctive place	0.902			
To explore new places and experiences	0.827			
Engagement		4.24	16.4	0.867
To learn about local culture	0.836			
To explore authentic nature/authenticity of destination	0.793			
Self-reflection & discovery		3.42	7.3	0.755
To develop my personal and spiritual values	0.821			
To gain a new perspective on my life	0.841			
Social interaction		2.71	3.5	0.697
To establish social interactions with other slow travellers	0.432			
To interact more with family	0.659			
Environmental concern		2.33	2.7	0.829
I care about air quality of the destination	0.712			
I care about reduction of traffic at the destination	0.512			
Total variance explained			72.40	

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.839. Chi-square = 2076.862. Bartlett's test of sphericity,  $p < 0.001$

TABLE 3. Factor analysis — motivational dimensions, items, and statistics of domestic tourists (N = 117)

Motivational dimensions and items	Factor loadings	Eigen value	Variance (%)	Cronbach's alpha
Escape		10.62	21.12	0.976
To escape from daily life routine	0.875			
To escape from life pressures	0.796			
Relaxation		9.16	19.73	0.842
To relax and reset at the site	0.896			
To improve my mental and physical state	0.928			
Novelty seek		4.33	7.28	0.588
To visit a distinctive place	0.902			
To explore new places and experiences	0.827			
Engagement		9.45	20.41	0.879
To learn about local culture	0.836			
To explore authentic nature/authenticity of destination	0.793			
Total variance explained			68.54	

(42.3%). These tourists also valued social interaction, relaxation and novelty.

*Cluster 3 (23% international and 17.9% domestic)*

I termed this cluster "novelty seekers" since tourists in this cluster went to the destination with the purpose of exploring and visiting distinctive places. The international tourists were mainly female (59.3%), 41–60 years old (54.7%), at least with an undergraduate qualification (66.7%), married (63%) and students (55.5%). In contrast, domestic tourists were principally male (71.4%), 21–40 years old (85.7%), and were undergraduates (71.4%), single (81%), and students (52.4%).

*Cluster 4 (12.8% international and 47% domestic)*

I named this cluster "passive seekers" since tourists in this cluster exhibited low motivation in all seven factors. These were mainly male (60%), 41–60 years old (54.7%), married (73%) and retired

(60%). On the other hand, domestic tourists were principally male (63.6%), 41–60 years old (54.5%) and undergraduate (63.6%), single (81.8%), and students (49%).

### Conclusion

This study aimed to provide a more comprehensive overview of slow tourism and travel research from a developing country context and offer future avenues for research. The most significant contribution of this study is a theoretical understanding with empirical results using the new factors (i.e. motivation segmentation) in the context of slow tourism. This study provided more insights into the possible segments of tourists looking for slow tourism destinations based on motivations. The findings of this study indicate that in terms of motivation, international tourists are found to be escape seekers, self-reflection and discovery seekers, want-it-all seekers, novelty

TABLE 4. Results of sociodemographic characteristics — international tourists (N = 117)

Sociodemographic characteristic	Clusters 1 : escape seekers (n = 33) n (%)	Clusters 2 : want-it-all seekers (n = 42) n (%)	Clusters 3: novelty seekers (n = 27) n (%)	Clusters 4: Passive seekers (n = 15) n (%)	chi-square	p-value
Sex (n = 117)					8.07	<0.001
Male (n = 65)	19 (57.6)	26 (61.9)	11 (40.7)	9 (60)		
Female (n = 52)	14 (42.4)	16 (38.1)	16 (59.3)	6 (40)		
Age (n = 117)					16.02	<0.001
< 21 years (n = 7)	2 (6)	2 (4.8)	1 (3.7)	2 (13.3)		
21–40 years (n = 53)	20 (60)	23 (54.7)	5 (18.5)	5 (33.3)		
41–60 years (n = 45)	10 (30)	12 (28.5)	20 (74)	3 (20)		
> 60 years old (n = 12)	1 (3)	5 (12)	1 (3.8)	5 (33.3)		
Education (n = 117)					17.80	<0.001
Primary school (n = 6)	3 (9)	2 (4.8)	0 (0)	1 (6.7)		
High school (n = 9)	8 (24)	0(0)	0(0)	1(6.7)		
Undergraduate (n = 57)	8 (24)	27 (64.2)	18 (66.7)	4 (26.7)		
Postgraduate (n = 30)	12 (37)	8 (19)	6 (22.2)	4 (26.7)		
Other (n = 15)	2(6)	5 (12)	3 (11.1)	5 (33.2)		
Marital status (n = 117)					7.56	<0.001
Single (n = 43)	14 (42.4)	15 (35.7)	10 (37)	4 (26.7)		
Married (n = 74)	19 (57.6)	27 (64.3)	17 (63)	11 (73.3)		
Occupation (n = 117)					19.03	<0.001
Student (n = 38)	10 (30.3)	12 (28.6)	15 (55.5)	1 (6.7)		
Employed (n = 34)	15 (45.4)	18 (42.8)	1 (3.7)	0 (0)		
Retired (n = 28)	5 (15.3)	8 (19)	6 (22.2)	9 (60)		
Other (n = 17)	3 (9)	4 (9.6)	5 (18.6)	5 (33.3)		

The percentage of the cell having expected count less than five in all cases analysis is less than 15%.

TABLE 5. Results of sociodemographic characteristics — domestic tourists (N = 117)

Sociodemographic characteristic	Clusters 1: escape seekers (n = 15) n (%)	Clusters 2: want-it-all seekers (n = 26) n (%)	Clusters 3: novelty seekers (n = 21) n (%)	Clusters 4: passive seekers (n = 55) n (%)	chi-square	p-value
Sex (n = 117)					11.03	<0.001
Male (n = 72)	6 (40)	16 (61.5)	15 (71.4)	35 (63.6)		
Female (n = 45)	9 (60)	10 (38.5)	6 (28.6)	20 (36.4)		
Age (n = 117)					14.8	<0.001
<21 years (n = 7)	0(0)	4 (15.4)	0 (0)	3 (5.5)		
21–40 years (n = 49)	10 (66.7)	12 (46)	18 (85.7)	9 (16.3)		
41–60 years (n = 43)	3(20)	7 (26.9)	3 (14.3)	30 (54.5)		
>60 years (n = 18)	2 (13.3)	3 (11.5)	0 (0)	13 (23.6)		
Education (n = 117)					17.9	<0.001
Primary school (n = 13)	1 (6.7)	6 (23)	1 (4.8)	5 (9)		
High school (n = 10)	2 (13.3)	2 (7.7)	3 (14.3)	3 (5.5)		
Undergraduate (n = 66)	6 (40)	10 (38.5)	15 (71.4)	35 (63.6)		
Postgraduate (n = 16)	3 (20)	5 (19.2)	2 (9.5)	6 (10.9)		
Other (n = 12)	3 (20)	3 (11.5)	0 (0)	6 (10.9)		
Marital status (n = 117)					15.7	<0.001
Single (n = 85)	9 (60)	14 (53.8)	17 (81)	45 (81.8)		
Married (n = 32)	6(40)	12 (46.2)	4 (19)	10 (18.2)		
Occupation (n = 117)					13.6	<0.001
Student (n = 54)	5 (33.3)	11 (42.3)	11 (52.4)	27 (49)		
Employed (n = 26)	5 (33.3)	9 (34.6)	8 (38.2)	4 (7.3)		
Retired (n = 20)	4 (26.7)	4 (15.4)	1 (4.7)	11 (20)		
Other (n = 17)	1 (6.7)	2 (7.7)	1 (4.7)	13 (23.7)		

The percentage of the cell having an expected count less than five in all cases analysis is less than 10%

TABLE 6. Results of cluster analysis — domestic tourists (N = 117)

Factors/clusters	Clusters 1: escape seekers (n = 15)	Clusters 2: want-it-all seekers (n = 26)	Clusters 3: novelty seekers (n = 21)	Clusters 4: passive seekers (n = 55)	F-value	p-value
Escape	2.14	2.71	1.56	3.39	91.13	<0.001
Relaxation	<b>4.42</b>	1.23	2.55	<b>3.97</b>	99.44	<0.001
Novelty seeking	1.06	2.76	<b>4.56</b>	<b>3.78</b>	121.21	<0.001
Engagement	1.66	2.63	2.35	<b>3.65</b>	101.52	<0.001
Self-reflection & discovery	<b>3.26</b>	1.42	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.62</b>	114.64	<0.001
Social interaction	1.22	2.23	1.26	<b>4.34</b>	107.4	<0.001
Environmental concern	2.28	1.23	1.59	<b>3.47</b>	118.36	<0.001

Mean values were computed based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important)  
 Bold values show the motivation factors that received the highest ratings compared to other motivations

TABLE 7. Results of cluster analysis — international tourists (N = 117)

Factors/clusters	Clusters 1 : escape seekers (n = 33)	Clusters 2 : want-it-all seekers (n = 42)	Clusters 3: novelty seekers (n = 27)	Clusters 4: Passive seekers (n = 15)	F-value	p-value
Escape	2.14	3.23	1.56	1.65	87.32	<0.001
Relaxation	1.24	<b>4.67</b>	2.55	2.23	115.41	<0.001
Novelty seeking	<b>4.03</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>4.05</b>	2.76	120.45	<0.001
Engagement	1.66	<b>3.65</b>	<b>4.34</b>	2.63	131.85	<0.001
Self-reflection & discovery	<b>3.26</b>	<b>3.56</b>	3.46	2.42	124.53	<0.001
Social interaction	1.22	2.34	1.26	1.31	134.5	<0.001
Environmental concern	2.28	<b>4.47</b>	1.59	1.57	112.65	<0.001

Mean values were computed based on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important, 5 = very important). Bold values show the motivation factors that received the highest ratings compared to other motivations.

seekers and engagement seekers. On the other hand, domestic tourists are found to be mainly relaxation seekers, self-reflection and discovery seekers, novelty seekers and passive seekers (Table 8).

Market segmentation is a well-established and commonly used concept in tourism; and businesses and destinations benefit from a segmentation strategy because it allows them to focus on a clearly defined subset of consumers which they are best suited to serve, thus developing a long-term competitive advantage. The assessment of tourist motivations is used to better understand visitors' choices, preferences and needs (Kozak, 2002; Bansal & Eiselt, 2004). Although a few studies have examined slow tourists' motivations, they were mostly in a developed country context and are not comparable. The strength of this research is that it covers international and domestic slow tourists. Therefore, the objective of this study was to examine, better understand and segment domestic and international slow tourists' motivational dimensions in a slow tourist destination context. To the best of my knowledge, this research presents the only academic endeavour profiling international and domestic visitors to slow destinations in Ethiopia.

This study could also help destination managers and marketers to develop and promote slow tourism products based on the profiles of the segments. For example, in terms of demographic and tourism behaviour characteristics of the international samples of the escape seekers cluster, they are mainly male tourists (57.6%), whereas the domestic ones are mainly female tourists (60%). The international "want-it-all seeker" tourists were mainly male (61.9%). These tourists mostly valued relaxation, environmental concern and engagement. Conversely, domestic tourists were largely male (61.5%), single (53.8%) and students (42.3%). These tourists also valued social interaction, relaxation and novelty. As there were no previous studies on motivation segmentation of tourists to slow tourism destinations, direct comparison of these findings was not possible. However, the results show that slow tourists are not a homogeneous segment since it can be practised by people of different ages, sexes, educational levels and so on. Therefore, the ideal type of slow tourist — one that would embrace slowness, travel experiences and environmental consciousness during their trip (Lumsdon & McGrath, 2011) and for whom an overall tourism experience would be slow (Dickinson et al., 2011) — rarely exists. Overall, the findings of descriptive statistics and factor analysis suggest several important implications for the tourism industry, especially for destination marketers and managers. The study revealed a distinct pattern in some motivational dimensions of domestic and international tourists. It implied that the destination marketing organisers should develop different promotional strategies for the domestic and international segmented clusters. This

TABLE 8. Summary of the research findings

Cluster	International tourists	Domestic tourists
Cluster 1	Escape seekers Self-reflection & discovery	Relaxation seekers Self-reflection & discovery seekers
Cluster 2	Want-it-all seekers	
Cluster 3	Novelty seekers Engagement seekers	Novelty seekers Self-reflection & discovery seekers
Cluster 4		Passive seekers

study also examines whether slow tourism motivation factors differ significantly in terms of sex, marital status, age, status of employment and educational level. From the managerial and marketing point of view, these differences direct marketers to identify which tourist segments should be targeted, and what motivational factors should be introduced to stimulate tourists' decision-making processes. The research findings provide the potential for marketing strategies targeting specific tourist segments, as well as assisting in the design of better slow tourism products at slow destinations. It also guides marketers in their attempts to identify the expectations of slow tourists, tailor their tourism products and use segmentation in marketing as an effective strategy.

This study contributes to the slow tourism literature by proposing a comparative segmentation of motivation for domestic and international tourists. The study results can also benefit practitioners in the slow tourism sector. The study provides important insights for destination managers and marketers to sustainably develop slow tourism in their regions. It will help to customise slow tourism product development and marketing strategies based on the needs and profiles of these market segments.

This study has limitations that can be explored in future research. Though the study collected data from the available sample ( $N = 234$ ), it is not supposed to be adequate. Therefore, increasing the sample size and acquiring more reliable and relevant data could increase the validity of the study results, which also would make a significant contribution in tourists' segmentation research. In future studies, rather than taking self-identified slow tourists as a sample, the criteria for sampling slow tourists should be their length of stay at the destination and their willingness to explore the destination more thoroughly. Further, data from a bigger geographical region would allow for a more accurate representation of the slow tourism market.

## ORCID iD

Wagnew Eshetie Tsegaw – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8586-1306>

## References

- Allan, M. (2012). *Geotourism: Toward a Better Understanding of Motivations for a Geotourism Experience: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Allan, M., & Shavanddasht, M. (2019). Rural geotourists segmentation by motivation in weekends and weekdays. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 19(1), 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358417694513>
- Baloglu, S., & Uysal, M. (1996). Market segments of push and pull motivations: A canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 8(3), 32–38. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596119610115989>
- Bansal, H., & Eiselt, H. A. (2004). Exploratory research of tourist motivations and planning. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 387–396. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00135-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00135-3)
- Beh, A., & Bruyere, B. L. (2007). Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1464–1471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.01.010>
- Buckley R. (2011). Tourism under climate change: Will slow travel supersede short breaks? *AMBIO*, 40, 328–31.
- Burmecha-Olszowy, M. (2014). Slow tourism – cechy i funkcje nowego nurtu w turystyce. *Rozprawy Naukowe Akademii Wychowania Fizycznego we Wrocławiu*, 45, 177–184.



- Caffyn, A. (2012). Advocating and implementing slow tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 37(1), 77-80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2012.11081690>
- Chen, J. & Chen, P. (2015). Push-pull factors in international birders' travel. *Tourism Management*, 48, 416-425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.12.011>
- Clancy, M. (2017). *Slow tourism, food, and cities: Pace and the search for the good life*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315686714>
- Dickinson, J. E., & Lumsdon, L. (2010). *Slow travel and tourism*. Routledge.
- Dickinson, J. E., Lumsdon, D., & Robbins, D. K. (2011). Slow travel: issues for tourism and climate change. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.524704>
- Dolnicar, S., Grün, B., & Leisch, F. (2018). *Market segmentation analysis: understanding it, doing it, and making it useful*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-8818-6>
- Fullagar, S., Wilson, E., & Markwell, K. (2012). Starting slow: Thinking through slow mobilities and experiences. In S. Fullagar, E. Wilson, & K. Markwell (eds), *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities* (pp. 1-9). Channel View. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845412821-003>
- Gardner, N. (2009). A manifesto for slow travel. *Hidden Europe Magazine*, 25, 10-14
- Germann Molz, J. (2009). Representing pace in tourism mobilities: Staycations, slow travel, and the amazing race. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 7(4), 270-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766820903464242>
- Gomezelj, D. O., & Mihalič, T. (2008). Destination competitiveness – Applying different models, the case of Slovenia. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 294-307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.009>
- Groenendaal, E. (2012). Slow tourism initiatives: An exploratory study of Dutch lifestyles entrepreneurs in France. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, & E. Wilson (eds), *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities* (pp. 201-213). Channel View. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845412821-017>
- Hall, C. M. (2009). Degrowing tourism: Décroissance, sustainable consumption and steady-state tourism. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 20(1), 46-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2009.10518894>
- Heitmann, S., Robinson, P., & Povey, G. (2011). Slow food, slow cities, and slow tourism. In P. Robinson, S. Heitmann, & P. Dieke (eds), *Research themes for tourism* (pp. 114-127). CAB. <https://doi.org/10.1079/9781845936846.0114>
- Honoré, C. (2005). *In Praise of Slow: How a Worldwide Movement is Challenging the Cult of Speed*. Orion Books Ltd.
- Howard, C. (2012). Speeding up and slowing down: Pilgrimage and slow travel through time. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, & E. Wilson (eds), *Slow tourism: Experiences and mobilities* (pp. 11-24). Channel View.
- Husemann, K. C., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2019). Consumer deceleration. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 45(6), 1142-1163. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcr/ucy047>
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 221-232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00090-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00090-5)
- Le Busque, B., Mingoia, J., & Litchfield, C. (2021). Slow tourism on Instagram: An image content and geotag analysis. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 47(5-6), 623-630. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2021.1927566>
- Lipman, G., Delcay, T., & Whitelaw, P. (2013). Competiveness, jobs, and green growth: A "glocal" model. *The Travel & Tourism Competitiveness Report 2013: Reducing Barriers to Economic Growth and Job Creation* (pp. 71-77). World Economic Forum.
- Lipman, M. B., & Murphy, L. (2012). "Make haste slowly": Environmental sustainability and willing workers on organic farms. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, & E. Wilson (eds), *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities* (pp. 84-98). Channel View. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845412821-009>
- Lin, L.-P., Huang, S. C., & Ho, Y. C. (2020). Could virtual reality effectively market slow travel in a heritage destination? *Tourism Management*, 78, A104027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.104027>
- Lumsdon, D., & McGrath, P. (2011). Developing a conceptual framework for slow travel: a grounded theory approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(3), 265-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2010.519438>
- Markwell, K., Fullagar, S., & Wilson, E. (2012). Reflecting upon slow travel and tourism experiences. In Fullagar, S, Markwell, K and Wilson, E (Eds.), *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Nobilities*. Channel View.
- Matos, R. (2004). Can slow tourism bring new life to Alpine regions? In K. Weiermair & C. Mathies (eds), *The tourism and leisure industry: Shaping the future* (pp. 93-103). Hawthorn Hospitality Press.
- McCabe, S. (2009). Who needs a holiday? Evaluating social tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(4), 667-688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2009.06.005>
- Mei, X. Y. (2014). Boring and expensive: The challenge of developing experience-based tourism in the Inland region, Norway. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 12, 71-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2014.09.003>
- Nicholson, R. E., & Pearce, D. G. (2001). Why Do People Attend Events: A Comparative Analysis of Visitor Motivations at Four South Island Events. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(4), 449-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750103900412>
- Oh, H., Assaf, A. G., & Baloglu, S. (2016). Motivations and goals of slow tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(2), 205-219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287514546228>
- Park, D-B., & Yoon, Y-S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.03.011>
- Parkins, W., & Craig, G. (2006). *Slow living*. Berg Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350044890>
- Parkins, W., & Craig, G. (2009). Culture and the politics of alternative food networks. *Food, Culture & Society*, 12(1), 77-103. <https://doi.org/10.2752/155280109x368679>
- Pawlusiński, R., & Kubal, M. (2018). A new take on an old structure? Creative and slow tourism in Krakow (Poland). *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 16(3), 265-285. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2017.1330338>
- Pesonen, J. (2012). Segmentation of rural tourists: combining push and pull motivations. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 18(1), 69-82. <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.18.1.5>
- Pine, B. J., & Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(4), 97-105.
- Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: an illustration from food experiences in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 297-305. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00130-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00130-4)
- Rawlinson, J. (2011). *The Evolution of Slow Travel - International*. Mintel Oxygen.
- Serdane, Z. (2020). Slow philosophy in tourism development in Latvia: The supply side perspective. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 17(3), 295-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2019.1650103>
- Serdane, Z., Maccarrone-Eaglen, A., & Sharifi, S. (2020). Conceptualising slow tourism: A perspective from Latvia. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 45(3), 337-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2020.1726614>
- Shi, T., Liu, X., & Li, J. (2018). Market segmentation by travel motivations under a transforming economy: Evidence from the Monte Carlo of the Orient. *Sustainability*, 10(10), A3395. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103395>
- Singh, S. (2012). Slow Travel and Indian Culture: Philosophical and Practical Aspects. In S. Fullagar, K. Markwell, & E. Wilson (Eds.), *Slow tourism: experiences and mobilities* (pp. 214-26). Channel View.
- Smith, M. (2012). *The emerging consumption of, and demand for slow travel: Just another niche travel adjective?* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Exeter University, UK.
- Nicholson, R. E., & Pearce, D. G. (2001). Why Do People Attend Events: A Comparative Analysis of Visitor Motivations at Four South Island Events. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(4), 449-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750103900412>
- Timms, B. F., & Conway, D. (2011). Slow Tourism at the Caribbean's Geographical Margins. *Tourism Geographies*, 14(3), 396-418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2011.610112>
- UNWTO. (2022). *Choke Mountains Ecovillage Ethiopia. An Ecotourism ideology*. <https://www.unwto.org/tourism-villages/en/villages/choke-mountains-ecovillage/>

- Valls, J.-F., Mota, L., Vieira, S. C. F., & Santos, R. (2019). Opportunities for slow tourism in Madeira. *Sustainability*, 11, A4534. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11174534>
- Walker, T. B., & Lee, T. J. (2019). Visitor and resident perceptions of the slow city movement: The case of Japan. *International Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 19(2), 112-127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15980634.2019.1621535>
- Wedel, M., & Kamakura, W. A. (1999). *Market Segmentation: Conceptual and Methodological Foundations*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4651-1>
- World Travel Market. (2007). *Global Trends Report 2007*. World Travel Market.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016>
- Yurtseven, H. R., & Kaya, O. (2011). Slow tourists: A comparative research based on Cittaslow's principles. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 1(2), 91-98.