Factors Influencing the Motivation of Young People When Choosing a City Destination in Europe – a Case Study From Esbjerg (Denmark)

[1] Nemanja Tomić
[2] Bojana Kovačević
[3] Nemanja Berber
[4] Nataša Milić

[1] University of Novi Sad, Serbia
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 3, 21 000 Novi Sad
E-mail: airtomic@gmail.com
[2] Higher School of Professional Business Studies, Serbia
Vladimira Perića Valtera 4, 21 000 Novi Sad
E-mail: bojancica81@gmail.com
[3] Higher School of Professional Business Studies, Serbia
Vladimira Perića Valtera 4, 21 000 Novi Sad
E-mail: berber_nemanja@yahoo.com
[4] University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
Niels Bohrs Vej 9-10, DK-6700
E-mail: natasa_milic@hotmail.com

Abstract. This paper examines the motivation factors which influence young people when choosing city destinations in Europe and aims to show if there are any differences in the decision-making process between Danish and international students. Previous research has taught us that the decision to buy a tourism product is a complex process. Therefore, any kind of differences can be essential in developing appropriate marketing strategies for different market segments. The findings of this study indicate that there are seven major factors for young people when choosing a city destination in Europe. Further analysis shows that there are significant differences among several motivation factors when it comes to Danish and international students. The contribution of this study is its indication towards which factors influence city destination choice among young people which will further enable European cities to develop and promote more appropriate and satisfactory tourism products and services for their young visitors.
Keywords: destination choice; young people; motivation; city destinations; Denmark.

Introduction

The reasons behind choosing a travel destination have been an important area of study in tourism literature for decades. A well known typology for understanding travel motivation is the "push and pull" model (Crompton, 1979). The main concept of this model is the decomposition of an individual's choice of a travel destination into two forces. The first force is the push factor that pushes an individual away from home and attempts to develop a general desire to go somewhere else, without specifying where that may be. The second force is the pull factor that pulls an individual toward a destination due to a region-specific lure, or perceived attractiveness of a destination (Lam and Hsu, 2006).

It is assumed that tourists would like to maximize satisfaction while choosing between a range of destinations, goods and services (Tribe, 2004). The key determinants in the decision-

making process are tourists' preferences and their expenditure budgets (Stabler et al., 2010). From an economic point of view, expenditure budgets are not as hard to analyze as tourists' preferences. Furthermore, the decision-making process is more often analyzed by social psychologists or geographers. These researchers are focused on studies of motivation, tourist segmentation and push and pull factors, while economists study tourists' preferences (Stabler et al., 2010).

There are many factors that influence tourists when they need to make a decision about their holiday and destination. According to Horner and Swarbrooke (2007), these factors can be internal (hobbies and interests, lifestyle, attitudes, past experiences, personality etc.) and external (word-of-mouth, promotions and offers, the climate, availability of suitable products etc.). The understanding and analyzing of the decision-making process is very important for destination marketing and management (Pearce, 2005).

The decision to buy a tourism product is the result of a complex process. Horner and Swarbrooke (2007) describe the process in five phases: travel desire, information collection and evaluation image, travel decision (choice between alternatives), travel preparation and travel experiences and the final phase which is connected to travel satisfaction outcome and evaluation.

Tourism development in cities has been seen as a solution for creating income and jobs in the city area since the 1970s (Law, 1993). There are many reasons why people visit cities, and these are: visiting friends and relatives, business, exhibitions, cultural attractions, sightseeing, entertainment, shopping, evening activities, sports and special events etc. (Law, 1993). In the decision-making process a city can be an alternative for a wide range of tourists' experience expectations. Therefore, it is important for cities to create promotions that communicate the benefits of a visit during the second phase of the decision-making process (Kolb, 2006). The promotion of a city must always focus on the needs and desires of a specific visitor group or segment. There are different means of segmentation:

- demographic (age, income, gender, family status, ethnicity),
- geographic (local, regional, national, international),
- psychographic (relaxation, excitement, nightlife, adventure, romance) and
- usage (traditional tourists, day visitors, business visitors) (Kolb, 2006).

The purpose of this paper is to find out which factors influence young people during the decision-making process and to see if there are any differences between Danish and international students.

The purpose of analyzing tourist motivation and activities is to explore visitors' desire, wants and needs. The analysis results will assist destination developers to understand target markets and improve the products, services and activities arranged to the tourists. Tourist motivation studies are useful in developing products, promotion, and marketing strategies. Destination marketing and development become important issues in both theoretical and practical tourism business. As global tourism markets become more and more competitive, many tourism destinations put efforts on improving quality of their products and services and enhancing the competitiveness.

Literature Review

Each destination offers a variety of products and services to attract tourists. From the destinations' point of view, it is very important to know why tourists choose (or not choose) this destination and how the tourists feel about the place they visited. Analysis of tourist motivation attempts to extend the theoretical and empirical evidence on the causal relationship among the push and pull motivations, satisfaction, and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005).

According to Dellaert, Etterma, and Lindh (1998), tourists' decisions are complex multi-faceted decisions in which the choices for different elements are interrelated and evolve in a decision process over time, and most studies of tourists' travel choice address tourist destination choice as the key element in the travel decision-making process. The decision-making process is influenced by a number of psychological (internal) and non-psychological (external) variables, and consists of a number of different stages that are marked by specific actions. Sirakaya and Woodside (2005) provided a comprehensive qualitative review of the tourist decision-making literature, and integrated the main conceptual and empirical work that has been reported in the tourism literature. According to their analysis, the destination choice set model developed by Um and Crompton (1990) is simpler and more theoretically and methodologically sound than the others in tourism decision research. In this model, a tourist's destination choice is made through a 3-stage sequential and funnel-like process: a composition of awareness set (an initial set of destinations

that a tourist is aware of at any given time), an evoked set (late consideration set), and final destination choice. The evoked set is developed from the awareness set. It consists of various destinations that people actively seek information about for alternatives to best meet their needs. According to the choice set model, the destination should be included in each choice set stage in order to be selected as a final destination. The criteria that affect this process include personal (push) factors, destination attributes (pull factors), and constraints. Crompton and Ankomah (1993) suggested that one might use 2 or 3 criteria to reduce the number of alternatives from the awareness set to the evoked set; otherwise, there could be too many attributes to compare. In addition, Lam and Hsu (2006) mentioned that the complex decision-making process leading to the choice of a travel destination had not been well researched. Past studies related to destination choice mainly focus on identifying important attributes affecting destination choice; professional judgment and factor analysis are the main methods (Goossens, 2000; Heung, Qu, & Chu, 2001; Kim & Prideaux, 2005; Kozak, 2002; Mutinda & Mayaka, 2012). These studies have contributed to identifying many factors; the 5-point (or 7-point) Likert scale was used for rating the importance of each factor, and the factors extracted are arranged in order of decreasing variance, but little has been learned about the relative importance of each one by pairwise comparison. Nicolau and Más (2006) pointed out the choice of tourist destination that distinguishes between various approaches to the definition of tourist destination; they showed an overview of the empirical evidence of destination choice with revealed and stated preference probabilistic models respectively, as demonstrated in Tables 1 and 2 of their paper. Either multinomial logit model or nested multinomial logit model is used to investigate the choice of destination in most of those papers. In addition to the above, the literature of destination choice is centered on the direct impact of destination attributes such as prices and distance (Nicolau & Más, 2006), climate (Hamilton & Lau, 2004), quality and pricing (Goossens, 2000). Furthermore, a number of studies were concerned with identifying pleasure motivations which influence the destination choice; however, empirical choice literature has devoted little attention to the impact of tourist motivations on the selection of destinations (Nicolau & Más, 2006). In this study, destination choice can be conceptualized as a tourist's selection of a destination from a set of alternatives; that selection is determined by various motivational factors.

Determining the factors that influence people's choice of destination is essential in developing appropriate marketing strategies. Age, income, gender, personality, education, cost, distance, nationality, risk, and motivation, etc., are factors that affect one's choice of destination (Hsu et al., 2009). Of these factors, travel motivation has been an important area of study in the tourism literature for decades. As motivation is a dynamic concept, it may vary from one person to another, from one market segment to another, from one destination to another, as well as from one decision-making process to the next (Uysal & Hagan, 1993). It is therefore not surprising that the concept of motivation is considered as an element of market segmentation in tourism in many empirical investigations (Kozak, 2002; Yavuz, Baloglu, & Uysal, 1998; Zhang & Marcussen, 2007). Kozak (2002) gives an analysis of tourist motivations by comparing British and German tourists who have visited Mallorca and Turkey. The analysis uses cross-tabulation, factor analysis and a series of independent t-tests to evaluate quantitative data. The findings show that personal motivation and destination attributes should be used for destination positioning studies. Efforts to understand the factors motivating tourists to visit a particular destination and how likely it is to be different from those of others visiting other destinations could help destination planners to set marketing strategies. It will also help the destination to build a self image for marketing and differentiating its own products and services from those of competing destinations. One popular typology for understanding travel motivation is the "push" and "pull" model by Crompton (1979). The push motivations have been thought useful for explaining the desire for travel while the pull motivations have been thought useful for explaining the actual choice of destination. Crompton drew seven socio-psychological (push) motivations (escape, self-exploration, relaxation, prestige, regression, kinship-enhancement, and social interaction) and two cultural (pull) motivations (novelty and education). Uysal and Jurowski (1994) summarized internal (push) and external (pull) motivators to travel. Internal motivators include desire for escape, rest, relaxation, prestige, health and fitness, adventure, and social interaction. External motivators were based on attractiveness of the destination, including tangible resources (beaches, recreational activities, and cultural attractions), and travelers' perceptions and expectations (novelty, benefit expectations,

and marketing image). In more recent studies, researchers have added shopping as a motivational characteristic of the destination (Hanqin & Lam, 1999; Sirakaya, Uysal, & Yoshioka, 2003). Oh, Uysal, and Weaver (1995) noted good shopping was considered as a pull item, an attribute of the destination. There are still other important factors such as destination image, food, and safety. Milman and Pizam (1995) pointed out that destination image is the visual or mental impression of a place held by the general public. Goossens (2000) discussed in depth the role mental imagery plays in the content of the pull force. Eating is one of the most enjoyable activities that tourists undertake during their holidays (Ryan, 1997). Quan and Wang (2004) found that food can act as either a primary or secondary trip motivation and adds value to the image of a destination. Safety is a major concern for tourists (Middleton, 1994). Heung et al. (2001) found that safety appeared to be the top priority for both Hong Kong and Taiwan travelers.

Travel motivation is a multi-motive dimensional. Tourists often have more than one motive for choosing a certain destination, for example, people can choose one destination with a motive of relaxation in a pleasant safe place combined with visiting a local historical heritage. Motivation is also a dynamic and flexible variable. The design of a motivation list 'must be flexible enough to incorporate individual changes across the life-span and consider the effects of broad cultural force on tourist motivation' (Pearce, 1993). For example, a person may change his travel preferences as he moves through the family life cycle from a single-career person to a more family-oriented person, his motives for choosing destinations may be changed accordingly.

Methodology

In this paper, young people are defined as students between 18 and 35 years old who are currently studying in Esbjerg. We thought that it would be interesting to compare Danish students with international students in order to see if there are any differences regarding factors that influence their decision-making process. Horner & Swarbrooke (2007) argued that there is relatively little research on national and cultural differences in relation to motivators. They further explain that some motivators are universal, although actual behavior will be influenced by the nationality and culture of tourists.

Finally, we focus on cities as destinations so it could be applicable to cities in Eastern Europe that are still trying to attract tourists. The main research question is derived from the following sub-questions: What sectors of the tourism supply are the most important for young people when making a decision about their next city destination in Europe? What do young people prefer? How can cities in developing countries compete with today's well-known city destinations in Europe? In order to see if there are differences between Danish and international students regarding the motives that influence their decisions when choosing city destinations in Europe, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. There are statistically significant differences in motives of Danish and international students when choosing a city destination in Europe.

The other two hypothesis are derived from the first one:

Hypothesis 2. There are statistically significant differences in motives of students belonging to different age groups.

Hypothesis 3. There are statistically significant differences in motives of students that are based on their gender.

The gathered data was processed and analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 19). In order to find out which factors most affect young people in their decision making process, the factor analysis was chosen as a relevant method. In this paper, 21 items were generated and then purified and validated through the factor analysis. For the purposes of this study, items measuring the independent variables were simultaneously subjected to a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation resulting in a seven factor solution with eigen values greater than 1.0.

In order to test our hypotheses we used several different statistical analyses: t-test for independent samples (Córdoba et al., 2010) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Xiaolong et al., 2010; Pârvulescu et al., 2011; Paillisson et al., 2011).

T-test for independent samples is used for comparison of mean values of results and definition of statistical significance of their differences. Independent samples are samples that do not have any correlation after the measurement (Field, 2009). Risk possibility level of 5% and 1% was taken into account in the process of definition of statistical significance of obtained results, whereas limit is based on freedom degrees were interpreted according to t-tables.

1.1. Sample profile

We limited our sample to students between 18 and 35 years old who are currently studying in Esbjerg. Although, the WTO defines youth tourists as being between ages 15 and 29, sometimes the upper age limit is as young as 25 years (Richards & Wilson, 2003). From the 192 respondents that filled out the survey, 128 (67 %) were female and 64 (33 %) were male. Most (65 %) of the respondents were 20-24 years of age, followed by those who are 25-29 years of age (27 %). There were very few people who are 30-35 years old (6 %) as well as people under 20 years old (2 %). The sample profile is relevant for this paper because 86 % of respondents visited some city in Europe at least once, and only 14 % didn't.

1.2. Questionnaire development and survey design

In designing the survey, the Likert scale was used for the most relevant question about factors that influence travelers' behavior. The survey is designed so it can be used for both groups that are compared: International and Danish students. At the beginning of the survey, a few demographic questions were asked such as age, gender, current living place and home country. After that a question about frequency of visiting cities in Europe was asked. The most important question for this topic was the last question about factors. Here, students were asked what factors are important for them when choosing between cities in Europe for their next visit. The respondents were asked to answer the statements on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "not important at all" (1) to "extremely important" (5).

The pilot project was done before the survey was distributed just to make sure that questions are understandable. The survey was sent to ten persons who are not working or studying in the tourism field and ten other persons who are familiar with the tourism field. The feedback from the pilot project was used to improve the questions in the survey and to make them clearer. Since one pilot respondent could not make a clear difference between the options "not important at all" and "not important", these were changed to "not important at all" and "not very important". There were also some options that were added after the pilot project to other questions. For example, the option "less than 20 years" was added to the age group question and "have not visited cities in Europe last year" was added to the question about frequency of visits.

The survey was conducted on-site: Danish students and international students living and studying in Esbjerg, were asked at the University of Southern Denmark to fill out the survey.

The on-site survey was done from the 24th of October until the 26th of October 2012. A total of 204 responses were gathered during this time and 192 of them were completely filled in. The data gathered from the 94 Danish students was compared with that of the 98 International students.

Results and Discussion

The components factor analysis created seven possible factors which were further analyzed by using the independent samples t-test and the one-way ANOVA test. These factors are:

- partying and having fun,
- accessibility to destination info,
- easy and cheap travel organization,
- outdoor activities,
- socializing with the local people,
- good shopping places,
- exploring the unknown.

The independent samples t-test was done in order to check if there are any statistically significant differences in factors that influence destination choice among Danish and international students. The one-way ANOVA test was used to define if there are statistically significant differences in motives of Danish and international students belonging to different age groups.

1.3. Differences in motivation between Danish and international students

The independent samples t-test (Tables 1 and 2) was used to identify whether there are differences between Danish students and international students who participated in the research in relation to the seven factors found through the factor analysis and to measure the actual level and significance of those differences. According to the t-test of independent samples, in case of **accessibility to destination info (f2), socializing with the local people (f5), good shopping places (f6) and exploring the unknown (f7)** there are significant differences between Danish and international students.

Table 1. The evaluation of seven factors influencing the choice of destination according to the home country of students

	What is your home country?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
partying and having fun	Denmark	94	2,8670	,60431	,06233
	other	98	2,9439	,65066	,06573
accessibility to destination info	Denmark	94	2,6170	,71439	,07368
	other	98	2,2347	,59075	,05968
easy and cheap travel organization	Denmark	94	3,2553	,59151	,06101
	other	98	3,2041	,53220	,05376
outdoor activities	Denmark	94	2,7234	,78157	,08061
	other	98	2,7551	,67444	,06813
socializing with the local people	Denmark	94	2,2837	,57830	,05965
	other	98	2,5170	,57061	,05764
good shopping places	Denmark	94	2,5745	,98907	,10202
	other	98	1,9796	,94137	,09509
exploring the unknown	Denmark	94	2,7128	,78113	,08057
	other	98	2,9898	,48151	,04864

Table 2. Independent samples t-test (n=192)

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
partying and having fun	Equal variances assumed	,034	,853	-,847	190	,398	-,07686	,09072	-,25581	,10210
	Equal variances not assumed			-,848	189,806	,397	-,07686	,09058	-,25553	,10182
accessibility to destination info	**Equal variances assumed**	**3,749**	**,054**	**4,048**	**190**	**,000**	**,38233**	**,09445**	**,19603**	**,56862**
	Equal variances not assumed			4,032	180,541	,000	,38233	,09482	,19523	,56942
Easy and cheap travel organization	Equal variances assumed	,001	,976	,631	190	,528	,05124	,08114	-,10881	,21128
	Equal variances not assumed			,630	185,986	,529	,05124	,08132	-,10918	,21166

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
outdoor activities	Equal variances assumed	4,928	,028	-,301	190	,764	-,03170	,10522	-,23925	,17586
	Equal variances not assumed			-,300	183,529	,764	-,03170	,10555	-,23994	,17654
Socializing with the local people	**Equal variances assumed**	**,013**	**,908**	**-2,814**	**190**	**,005**	**-,23332**	**,08292**	**-,39689**	**-,06975**
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,813	189,421	,005	-,23332	,08295	-,39694	-,06970
good shopping places	**Equal variances assumed**	**1,809**	**,180**	**4,270**	**190**	**,000**	**,59488**	**,13932**	**,32007**	**,86968**
	Equal variances not assumed			4,266	188,432	,000	,59488	,13946	,31977	,86998
exploring the unknown	Equal variances assumed	28,576	,000	-2,971	190	,003	-,27703	,09323	-,46093	-,09313
	Equal variances not assumed			**-2,944**	**153,586**	**,004**	**-,27703**	**,09411**	**-,46295**	**-,09111**

In case of the **accessibility to destination info (f2)** there is a difference between Danish students (M=2.6170, SD=0.71439) and international students (M=2.2347, SD=0.59075), t(190)=4.048, p<0.000 two-tailed. The difference between the mean values of the characteristics of the groups (mean difference =0.38233, 95% CI: 0.19603 to 0.56862) was moderate (eta squared = 0.079). Danish students have valued accessibility to destination info more than international students. A difference is also found in the case of **socializing with local people (f5)** between Danish students (M=2.2837, SD=0.57830) and international (M=2.5170, SD=0.57061), t(190)=-2.184, p<0.005 two tailed. The difference between the mean values of the characteristics of the groups (mean difference =-0.23332, 95 % CI: -0.39689 to -0.06975) was small (eta squared = 0.040). Danish students valued socializing with the local people less than others, and that means that other international students choose their tourist destinations more by a possibility of socializing with the locals than Danish students. **Good shopping places (f6)** are important for both group of students, and there is a significant difference between Danish students (M=2.5745, SD=0.98907) and others (M=1.9796, SD=0.94137), t(190)=4.270, p<0.000 two-tailed. The difference between the mean values of the characteristics of the groups (mean difference =0.59488, 95% CI: 0.32007 to 0.86968) was moderate (eta squared = 0.088). Danish students pay more attention to shopping when they choose a destination than other students from abroad. At the end of t-test analysis, authors found significant differences between Danish students (M=2.7128, SD=0.78113) and other students from abroad (M=2.9898, SD=0.48151), t(153.586)=-2.944, p<0.004 two tailed, in the case of **exploring the unknown (f7).** The difference between the mean values of the characteristics of the groups (mean difference =-0.27703, 95 % CI: -0.46295 to -0.09111) was small (eta squared = 0.044). This means that international students pay more attention to the possibility of exploring the unknown than Danish students when choosing a destination.

1.4. Differences in motivation between students according to their age group

The one-way ANOVA test (Tables 3,4 and 5) has shown that there are statistically significant differences between age groups only in the case of **outdoor activities** ($F(3, 188)= 5.232$, $p<0.002$). The application of Turkey's post hoc test showed that respondents who are 20 years old or less (M=4; SD=0.0) see outdoor activities as a more important determinant when choosing their destination than those who belong to the age groups between 20 and 24 years of age (M=2.6532; SD=0.75217), between 25 and 29 years of age (M=2.8269; SD=0.67071) and between 30 and 35 years (M=2.8333; SD=0.24618).

Table 3. The evaluation of seven factors influencing the choice of destination according to the age of students

Descriptives		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
partying and having fun	Less than 20	4	3.1250	.43301	.21651	2.4360	3.8140
	Between 20 and 24	124	2.9315	.65047	.05841	2.8158	3.0471
	Between 25 and 29	52	2.8654	.61926	.08588	2.6930	3.0378
	Between 30 and 35	12	2.7500	.47673	.13762	2.4471	3.0529
	Total	192	2.9063	.62794	.04532	2.8169	2.9956
accessibility to destination info	Less than 20	4	2.6250	.72169	.36084	1.4766	3.7734
	Between 20 and 24	124	2.4395	.65283	.05863	2.3235	2.5556
	Between 25 and 29	52	2.3846	.67239	.09324	2.1974	2.5718
	Between 30 and 35	12	2.3333	.99620	.28758	1.7004	2.9663
	Total	192	2.4219	.68004	.04908	2.3251	2.5187
Easy and cheap travel organization	Less than 20	4	3.1667	.96225	.48113	1.6355	4.6978
	Between 20 and 24	124	3.2634	.54146	.04862	3.1672	3.3597
	Between 25 and 29	52	3.1795	.56961	.07899	3.0209	3.3381
	Between 30 and 35	12	3.1111	.62496	.18041	2.7140	3.5082
	Total	192	3.2292	.56113	.04050	3.1493	3.3090
outdoor activities	**Less than 20**	**4**	**4.0000**	**.00000**	**.00000**	**4.0000**	**4.0000**
	Between 20 and 24	**124**	**2.6532**	**.75217**	**.06755**	**2.5195**	**2.7869**
	Between 25 and 29	**52**	**2.8269**	**.67071**	**.09301**	**2.6402**	**3.0136**
	Between 30 and 35	**12**	**2.8333**	**.24618**	**.07107**	**2.6769**	**2.9898**
	Total	**192**	**2.7396**	**.72711**	**.05247**	**2.6361**	**2.8431**
Socializing with the local people	Less than 20	4	2.0000	.38490	.19245	1.3875	2.6125
	Between 20 and 24	124	2.4247	.64789	.05818	2.3096	2.5399
	Between 25 and 29	52	2.3718	.46980	.06515	2.2410	2.5026

	Between 30 and 35	12	2.4444	.32824	.09476	2.2359	2.6530
	Total	192	2.4028	.58469	.04220	2.3195	2.4860
good shopping places	Less than 20	4	2.0000	.00000	.00000	2.0000	2.0000
	Between 20 and 24	124	2.2742	.97396	.08746	2.1011	2.4473
	Between 25 and 29	52	2.4231	1.16056	.16094	2.1000	2.7462
	Between 30 and 35	12	1.6667	.49237	.14213	1.3538	1.9795
	Total	192	2.2708	1.00761	.07272	2.1274	2.4143
exploring the unknown	Less than 20	4	2.7500	.28868	.14434	2.2907	3.2093
	Between 20 and 24	124	2.9113	.70725	.06351	2.7856	3.0370
	Between 25 and 29	52	2.7692	.56414	.07823	2.6122	2.9263
	Between 30 and 35	12	2.6667	.57735	.16667	2.2998	3.0335
	Total	192	2.8542	.65888	.04755	2.7604	2.9480

Table 4. Anova test for the sample (n=192)

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
partying and having fun	Between Groups	.650	3	.217	.546	.652
	Within Groups	74.663	188	.397		
	Total	75.312	191			
accessibility to destination info	Between Groups	.370	3	.123	.264	.852
	Within Groups	87.958	188	.468		
	Total	88.328	191			
Easy and cheap travel organization	Between Groups	.457	3	.152	.480	.697
	Within Groups	59.682	188	.317		
	Total	60.139	191			
outdoor activities	**Between Groups**	**7.781**	**3**	**2.594**	**5.232**	**.002**
	Within Groups	**93.198**	**188**	**.496**		
	Total	**100.979**	**191**			
Socializing with the local people	Between Groups	.779	3	.260	.757	.520
	Within Groups	64.517	188	.343		
	Total	65.296	191			
good shopping places	Between Groups	5.880	3	1.960	1.960	.122
	Within Groups	188.036	188	1.000		
	Total	193.917	191			
exploring the unknown	Between Groups	1.245	3	.415	.955	.415
	Within Groups	81.672	188	.434		
	Total	82.917	191			

Table 5. Multiple comparison between age groups in relation to the value of the factors

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) What is your age group?	(J) What is your age group?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
outdoor activities	**Less than 20**	**Between 20 and 24**	**1.34677***	.35767	**.001**	.4196	2.2739
		Between 25 and 29	**1.17308***	.36533	**.008**	.2261	2.1201
		Between 30 and 35	**1.16667***	.40650	**.023**	.1129	2.2204
	Between 20 and 24	**Less than 20**	-1.34677*	.35767	.001	-2.2739	-.4196
		Between 25 and 29	-.17370	.11632	.444	-.4752	.1278
		Between 30 and 35	-.18011	.21286	.832	-.7319	.3717
	Between 25 and 29	**Less than 20**	-1.17308*	.36533	.008	-2.1201	-.2261
		Between 20 and 24	.17370	.11632	.444	-.1278	.4752
		Between 30 and 35	-.00641	.22549	1.000	-.5909	.5781
	Between 30 and 35	**Less than 20**	-1.16667*	.40650	.023	-2.2204	-.1129
		Between 20 and 24	.18011	.21286	.832	-.3717	.7319
		Between 25 and 29	.00641	.22549	1.000	-.5781	.5909

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

1.5. Differences in motivation between students according to their gender

The independent samples t-test (Tables 6 and 7) was used to identify whether there are differences between the gender of respondents who participated in the research in relation to the 7 factors found through factor analysis and to measure the actual level and significance of those differences. According to the t-test for independent samples, in case of **good shopping places (f6)** there are significant differences between male and female respondents.

Table 6. The evaluation of seven factors influencing the choice of destination according to the gender of students

Group Statistics

	What is your gender?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
partying and having fun	Male	64	2.9063	.71755	.08969
	Female	128	2.9063	.58103	.05136
accessibility to destination info	Male	64	2.3906	.60729	.07591
	Female	128	2.4375	.71541	.06323
Easy and cheap travel organization	Male	64	3.2917	.51606	.06451
	Female	128	3.1979	.58178	.05142
outdoor activities	Male	64	2.7344	.71252	.08907
	Female	128	2.7422	.73705	.06515

Socializing with the local people	Male	64	2.3646	.65793	.08224
	Female	128	2.4219	.54618	.04828
good shopping places	**Male**	**64**	**1.7813**	**.74469**	**.09309**
	Female	**128**	**2.5156**	**1.03471**	**.09146**
exploring the unknown	Male	64	2.7969	.56145	.07018
	Female	128	2.8828	.70287	.06213

Table 7. Independent samples t-test for the sample (n=192)

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95 % Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
partying and having fun	Equal variances assumed	4.094	.044	.000	190	1.000	.00000	.09639	-.19012	.19012
	Equal variances not assumed			.000	105.457	1.000	.00000	.10336	-.20493	.20493
accessibility to destination info	Equal variances assumed	.900	.344	-.449	190	.654	-.04688	.10433	-.25266	.15891
	Equal variances not assumed			-.474	145.913	.636	-.04688	.09880	-.24213	.14838
Easy and cheap travel organization	Equal variances assumed	2.700	.102	1.092	190	.276	.09375	.08586	-.07561	.26311
	Equal variances not assumed			1.136	140.388	.258	.09375	.08250	-.06934	.25684
outdoor activities	Equal variances assumed	214	644	-.070	190	.944	-.00781	.11161	-.22796	.21233
	Equal variances not assumed			-.071	129.988	.944	-.00781	.11035	-.22612	.21050
Socializing with the local people	Equal variances assumed	1.271	261	-.639	190	.524	-.05729	.08965	-.23413	.11955
	Equal variances not assumed			-.601	107.561	.549	-.05729	.09536	-.24633	.13174

good shopping places	Equal variances assumed	14.844	.000	-5.058	190	.000	-.73438	.14520	-1.02078	-.44797
	Equal variances not assumed			**-5.628**	**166.410**	**.000**	**-.73438**	**.13050**	**-.99202**	**-.47673**
exploring the unknown	Equal variances assumed	1.593	.208	-.851	190	.396	-.08594	.10094	-.28505	.11317
	Equal variances not assumed			-.917	153.625	.361	-.08594	.09373	-.27110	.09923

In the case of **good shopping places** there is a difference between male (M=1.7813, SD=0.74469) and female respondents (M=2.5156, SD=1.03471), t(166.410)=5.628, p<0.000 two-tailed. The difference between the mean values of the characteristics of the groups (mean difference =0.73438, 95 % CI: -0.99202 to -0.47673) was small (eta squared = 0.030). Female students have valued good shopping places more than male students when choosing a tourist destination.

Conclusion

One of the aims of this paper was to find out which factors influence young people when choosing a city destination. The results of the factor analysis led us to seven important factors in the decision-making process. These factors are: partying and having fun, accessibility to destination info, easy and cheap travel organization, outdoor activities, socializing with the local people, good shopping places and exploring the unknown.

Richards & Wilson (2003) also used factor analysis in their research on independent youth and student travel, and they identified four main motivating factors as experience seeking, relaxation seeking, sociability and contributing to the destination. It is not surprising that there are similarities between these two factor analyses, because both are dealing with motivation factors for young people. However, the tourist information sources and saving money factors, which are also important for students in Esbjerg do not fit into any of Richard's & Wilson's four factor groups. These differences might be caused by focusing only on city destinations in Europe and students living in Esbjerg in this research. The importance of tourist information sources (especially electronic sources) for destination choice is also confirmed in a study done by Jacobsen and Munar (2012). Their study provides empirical evidence of self-reported impacts of selected electronic and other information sources on international tourists' destination choices regarding a holiday location.

Our first hypothesis was that there are statistically significant differences in motives of Danish and international students when choosing a city destination in Europe. This hypothesis was confirmed by doing the t-test of independent samples. Based on the test results we can conclude that Danish students value the accessibility to destination info and the availability of good shopping places more than international students. However, international students seem to be more open and adventurous than Danish students since they pay more attention to connecting with the local people and exploring the unknown.

The second hypothesis was only partially confirmed since the only statistically significant differences in motives of students belonging to different age groups were found in the case of outdoor activities. Only students of 20 years old or less, pay more attention to outdoor activities when choosing a city destination.

The third hypothesis was also partially confirmed. The only statistically significant difference was in the case of good shopping places. This factor was more important for female respondents than male, which was to be expected since women usually have more developed shopping preferences than men.

Finally, we can conclude that there are significant differences between Danish and international students when it comes to choosing a city destination in Europe. However, if we neglect their origin, both male and female students are generally motivated by the same factors except in the

case of shopping places. A similar trend can also be seen in the case of different age groups where only the youngest consider the possibility for outdoor activities when choosing their city destination. Based on these results, we can also conclude that generally, young people of the same gender and age tend to be motivated by very similar factors when choosing a city destination in Europe.

The student target group is very important for tourism supply and for new city destinations in Europe. The estimation of the UNWTO for 2010 is that around 20% of the 940 million international tourists travelling the world were young people (UNWTO & WYSE Travel Confederation, 2011). Furthermore, international travel marketers need to understand travelers' unique needs or characteristics in order to develop successful marketing plans (Kim et al., 2006). Further research on cultural and national differences in relation to motivation can be very useful for new city destinations in organizing their marketing campaigns.

Acknowledgements

References:

1. Córdoba, E. B., Martínez, A. C., & Ferrer, E. V. (2010). Water quality indicators: Comparison of a probabilistic index and a general quality index. The case of the Confederación Hidrográfica del Júcar (Spain). *Ecological Indicators, 10*(5), 1049-1054.
2. Crompton, J. (1979). Motivation for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*(4), 408–424.
3. Crompton, J., & Ankomah, P. (1993). Choice set propositions in destination decision. *Annals of Tourism Research, 20*, 461–476.
4. Dellaert, B. G. C., Etterma, F., & Lindh, C. (1998). Multi-faceted tourist travel decisions: a constraint-based conceptual framework to describe tourists' sequential choice of travel components. *Tourism Management, 19*(4), 313–320.
5. Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS (Introducing Statistical Methods)*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
6. Goossens, C. (2000). Tourism information and pleasure motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*, 301–321.
7. Hamilton, J. M., & Lau, M. A. (2004). *The role of climate information in tourist destination choice decision-making. Working Paper FNU-56. Center for Marine and Climate Research. Hamburg*, Germany: Hamburg University.
8. Hanqin, Z., & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of Mainland Chinese visitor's motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management, 20*, 587–594.
9. Heung, V. C. S., Qu, H., & Chu, R. (2001). The relationship between vacation factors and socio-demographic and traveling characteristics: the case of Japanese leisure travelers. *Tourism Management, 22*(3), 259–269.
10. Horner, S., & Swarbrooke, J. (2007). *Consumer Behavior in Tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier.
11. Hsu, T. K., Tsai, Y. -F., & Wu, H. H. (2009). The preference analysis for tourist choice of destination: A case study of Taiwan. *Tourism Management, 30,* 288-297.
12. Jacobsen, J. K. S., & Munar, A. M. (2012). Tourist information search and destination choice in a digital age. *Tourism Management Perspectives, 1,* 39-47.
13. Kim, K., Jogaratnam, G., & Noh, J. (2006). Travel decisions of students at a US university: Segmenting the international market. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, *12*(4), 345-357.
14. Kim, S. S., & Prideaux, B. (2005). Marketing implications arising from a comparative study of international pleasure tourist motivations and other travel-related characteristics of visitors to Korea. *Tourism Management, 26*, 347–357.
15. Kolb, M. B. (2006). *Tourism Marketing for Cities and Towns. Using branding and events to attract tourists*. Oxford: Elsevier.
16. Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management, 23*, 221–232.
17. Lam, T., & Hsu, C. H. C. (2006). Predicting behavioral intention of choosing a travel destination. *Tourism Management, 27*(4), 589-599.

18. Law, M. C. (1993). *Urban Tourism: Attracting Visitors to Large Cities*. Great Britain: Mansell Publishing.

19. Middleton, V. M. (1994). *Marketing in travel and tourism* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

20. Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1995). The role of an awareness and familiarity with a destination: the central Florida case. *Journal of Tourism Research, 33*(3), 21–27.

21. Mutinda, R., & Mayaka, M. (2012). Application of destination choice model: Factors influencing domestic tourists destination choice among residents of Nairobi, Kenya. *Tourism Management, 33*, 1593-1597.

22. Nicolau, J. L., & Más, F. J. (2006). The influence of distance and prices on choice of tourist destinations: the moderating role of motivations. *Tourism Management, 27*, 982–996.

23. Oh, H., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P. (1995). Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivations: a canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 14*(2), 123–137.

24. Paillisson, J. -M., Soudieux, A., & Damien, J. -P. (2011). Capture efficiency and size selectivity of sampling gears targeting red-swamp crayfish in several freshwater habitats. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems, 401*(06), 1-12.

25. Pârvulescu, L., Pacioglu, O., & Hamchevici, C. (2011). The assessment of the habitat and water quality requirements of the stone crayfish (Austropotamobius torrentium) and noble crayfish (Astacus astacus) species in the rivers from the Anina Mountains (SW Romania). *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems, 401*(03), 1-12.

26. Pearce, L. P. (1993). Fundamentals of tourist motivation. In D. G. Pearce and R. W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism Research: Critique and Challenges* (pp. 113-134). London: Routledge.

27. Pearce, L. P. (2005). *Tourist Behaviour: Themes and Conceptual Schemes*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.

28. Quan, S., & Wang, N. (2004). Towards a structural model of the tourist experience: an illustration from food experience in tourism. *Tourism Management, 25*(3), 297–305.

29. Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2003). Today's Youth Travelers: Tomorrow's Global Nomads. New Horizons in Independent Youth and Student Travel. Retrieved November 17, 2012, from: http://www.atlas-euro.org/pages/pdf/FINAL_Full_Report.pdf

30. Ryan, C. (1997). *The tourist experience: A new introduction*. London: Cassell.

31. Sirakaya, E., Uysal, M., & Yoshioka, C. (2003). Segmenting the Japanese tour market in Turkey. *Journal of Tourism Research, 41*, 293–304.

32. Sirakaya, E., & Woodside, A. G. (2005). Building and testing theories of decision making by travelers. *Tourism Management, 26*, 815–832.

33. Stabler, M. J., Papatheodorou, A., & Sinclair, M. T. (2010). *The Economics of Tourism*. London and New York: Routledge.

34. Tribe, J. (2004). *The Economics of Recreation, Leisure and Tourism*. Great Britain: Elsevier.

35. Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research, 17*(3), 432–448.

36. UNWTO, & WYSE Travel Confederation. (2011). The power of youth travel. Retrieved January 19, 2013, from the UNWTO Web site: http://www2.unwto.org/en/publication/am-reports-volume-2-power-youth-travel

37. Uysal, M., & Hagan, L. R. (1993). Motivation of pleasure to travel and tourism. In M. Khan, M. Olsen, & T. Var (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of hospitality and tourism* (pp. 798–810). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

38. Uysal, M., & Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(4), 844–846.

39. Xiaolong, W., Jingyi, H., Ligang, X., & Qi, Z. (2010). Spatial and seasonal variations of the contamination within water body of the Grand Canal, China. *Environmental Pollution, 158*(5), 1513-1520.

40. Yavuz, N., Baloglu, S., & Uysal, M. (1998). Market segmentation of European and Turkish travelers to North Cyprus. *An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality, 9*(1), 4–18.

41. 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.

42. Zhang, J., & Marcussen, C. (2007). Tourist motivation, market segmentation and marketing strategies. Retrieved January 17, 2013, from the Bornholm Centre for Regional and Tourism Research Web site: http://www.crt.dk/media/Tourism_Motivation_and_Marketing_Strategies_Denmark_Jie_Zhang_Carl_Henrik_Marcussen_CRT_2007.pdf

Факторы, влияющие на мотивацию молодых людей при выборе города назначения в Европе – изучение проблемы на примере Эсбьерг (Дания)

[1] Неманья Томич
[2] Бояна Ковачевич
[3] Неманья Берберский
[4] Наташа Милич

[1] Университет города Новы Сад, Сербия
3, Трг Доситея Обрабовича, 21 000 Нови Сад
E-mail: airtomic@gmail.com
[2] Высшая школа профессиональных бизнес-исследований
Владимира Перич Вальтер 4, 21 000 Нови Сад, Сербия
E-mail: bojancica81@gmail.com
[3] Высшая школа профессиональных бизнес-исследований, Сербия
Владимира Перич Вальтер 4, 21 000 Нови Сад
E-mail: berber_nemanja@yahoo.com
[4] Университет Южной Дании, Дания
Нильс Bohrs Вэй 9-10, DK-6700
E-mail: natasa_milic@hotmail.com

Аннотация. В работе рассматриваются мотивационные факторы, которые влияют молодых людей при выборе районов города в Европе и имеет целью показать, есть ли какие-либо различия в процессе принятия решений между датскими и иностранных студентов. Предыдущие исследования научил нас, что решение купить туристический продукт представляет собой сложный процесс. Таким образом, любой вид различий может быть существенным в разработке соответствующих маркетинговых стратегий для различных сегментов рынка. Результаты этого исследования показывают, что существует семь основных фактора для молодых людей при выборе города назначения в Европе. Дальнейший анализ показывает, что существуют значительные различия между несколькими факторами мотивации, когда дело доходит до датских и иностранных студентов. Вклад этого исследования является его признаком, к которому факторы влияют город выбор назначения среди молодежи, который будет способствовать дальнейшему позволяют европейских городов, чтобы развивать и продвигать более целесообразных и удовлетворительные туристических продуктов и услуг для своих маленьких посетителей.

Ключевые слова: выбор назначения; молодые люди; мотивация; районов города; Дания.