



UNIVERSITY
OF WOLLONGONG
AUSTRALIA

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Commerce - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Business

2012

Quality-of-life and travel motivations: integrating the two concepts in the Grevillea Model

Sara Dolnicar

University of Wollongong, s.dolnicar@uq.edu.au

Katie Lazarevski

University of Wollongong, katiel@uow.edu.au

Venkata Yanamandram

University of Wollongong, venkaty@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

Dolnicar, S., Lazarevski, K. & Yanamandram, V. (2012). Quality-of-life and travel motivations: integrating the two concepts in the Grevillea Model. In M. Uysal, R. R. Perdue & M. Joseph. Sirgy (Eds.), *Handbook of Tourism and Quality-of-Life Research: Enhancing the Lives of Tourists and Residents of Host Communities* (pp. 293-308). London: Springer.

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

Quality-of-life and travel motivations: integrating the two concepts in the Grevillea Model

Abstract

Over the past three decades, two bodies of literature have developed relatively independently: Quality of Life research in Psychology and Travel Motivations research in Tourism. Yet, the constructs underlying these two bodies of research are strongly interrelated. This book chapter: (1) reviews the Quality of Life research area with a specific focus on the role of vacations as a Quality of Life domain; (2) reviews prior work in the area of Travel Motivations with a specific focus on motivational segments which may be associated with differences in the importance people attribute to vacations in general; and (3) proposes a conceptual model, referred to as the Grevillea Model, that integrates heterogeneity in the population with respect to both the importance attributed to vacations and Travel Motivations.

Keywords

era2015

Disciplines

Business | Social and Behavioral Sciences

Publication Details

Dolnicar, S., Lazarevski, K. & Yanamandram, V. (2012). Quality-of-life and travel motivations: integrating the two concepts in the Grevillea Model. In M. Uysal, R. R. Perdue & M. Joseph. Sirgy (Eds.), *Handbook of Tourism and Quality-of-Life Research: Enhancing the Lives of Tourists and Residents of Host Communities* (pp. 293-308). London: Springer.

Quality of Life and Travel Motivations

Integrating the two concepts in the Grevillea Model

Sara Dolnicar, Katie Lazarevski and Venkata Yanamandram*

Institute for Innovation in Business and Social Research

University of Wollongong

Northfields Ave, 2521 Wollongong, Australia

Telephone: (61 2) 4221 3862, Fax: (61 2) 4221 4154

Email: firstname_lastname@uow.edu.au

* Authors listed in alphabetical order

Abstract

Over the past three decades, two bodies of literature have developed relatively independently: *Quality of Life* research in Psychology and *Travel Motivations* research in Tourism. Yet, the constructs underlying these two bodies of research are strongly interrelated. This book chapter: (1) reviews the *Quality of Life* research area with a specific focus on the role of vacations as a *Quality of Life* domain; (2) reviews prior work in the area of *Travel Motivations* with a specific focus on motivational segments which may be associated with differences in the importance people attribute to vacations in general; and (3) proposes a conceptual model, referred to as the Grevillea Model, that integrates heterogeneity in the population with respect to both the importance attributed to vacations and *Travel Motivations*.

1 Introduction

Why should tourism destinations worry about people's *Quality of Life and Travel Motivations*? In times of economic prosperity, tourism destinations may not need to worry about the role that vacations play in people's lives or the reasons why. In times of economic downturns, like the recent global financial crisis and its ongoing negative effects on economies and people's lives, however, the question of why people would continue to go on a vacation becomes highly relevant.

If taking a vacation does not contribute much to someone's overall quality of life, it can be assumed that vacations would be sacrificed when times are tough. Such a situation would be existentially threatening to tourism destinations and the tourism industry as a whole, as demand fluctuates strongly and unpredictably with external circumstances, tourism levels would operate independently of anything the tourism industry might do to control them. If, however, taking vacations forms an important part of a person's quality of life, it can be assumed that they will take vacations, no matter what they need to sacrifice to be able to do so. Again, this has major practical implications for the tourism industry: if people go on vacation under any circumstance, the tourism industry does not need to worry as much about demand fluctuations and can optimise their guest mix under the assumption of relatively stable demand and competition. The contribution vacations make to people's quality of life and the way the construct *Quality of Life* is determined for marketing purposes, are therefore of major consequence to the tourism industry.

The reasons why people travel to certain destinations may not be very important to a destination when there is ample demand for tourism in general. During times where demand drops and competition skyrockets, however, understanding people's travel motivations and

defining a suitable positioning for one's own tourism offer becomes essential. Understanding consumers' travel motivations is important for being able to develop an optimal marketing mix and for securing tourists from the relevant target market.

For these reasons, both the concepts of *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations* are of key importance to tourism industry. Even so, a number of key questions remain unresolved, limiting the usefulness of both the concepts to tourism, namely:

- To what extent do vacations contribute to people's quality of life? Is this contribution approximately the same across the entire population, or do groups of people exist who differ substantially in the extent to which vacations affect their quality of life?
- Are there base travel motivations that are shared by all tourists or are travel motivations by their very nature different, for different people, at different times in their travel career or at different stages in their lives?
- How are the concepts of *Quality of Life* and *Tourism Motivations* related?
- Is there an association between certain *Travel Motivations* and the levels of contribution of vacations toward *Quality of Life*?

The aim of this book chapter is twofold: (1) to review two bodies of literature — *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations* — and derive from this review answers to the unresolved questions above; and (2) to propose a conceptual framework that integrates the concepts of *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations* in a tourism context.

2 The contribution of vacations to people's quality of life

Quality of Life refers to “the individual's experience or perception of how well he or she lives” (Naess, 1999), and is usually taken narrowly to mean a person's sense of well-being, his or her satisfaction or dissatisfaction with life, or happiness or unhappiness (Dalkey and Rourke, 1973). The idea of *Quality of Life* comes from the “social indicators movement” of the 1960s, when Bauer (1966, p. 1) commented on the lack of a system for charting social change, and coined the term, *social indicators* to refer to “...statistics, statistical series, and all other forms of evidence . . . that enable us to assess where we stand and are going with respect to our values and goals and to evaluate specific programs and determine their impact”. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976, pp.7-9) proposed to monitor the conditions of life, by attempting to measure the experiences of individuals with the conditions of life and defined the *Quality of Life* experience mainly in terms of satisfaction with life and specific life domains. Thus, the key emphasis of this definition is on the “measurement of human experiences of social conditions” (Land, 2004, p. 109). Wilson (1967, p. 294), who reviewed well-being research, concluded that the happy person is a “young, healthy, well-educated, well-paid, extroverted, optimistic, worry-free, religious, married person with high self-esteem, job morale, modest aspirations, of either sex, and of a wide range of intelligence”. Maslow (1962), who based his theory for development towards happiness and well-being on the concept of human needs, characterized the good life as a fulfillment of needs, arranged in a hierarchy of five categories, beginning with the physiological needs, and ascending stepwise to the needs of safety, belongingness and love, esteem and self-actualization.

Although there are competing views about the relationship between *Quality of Life* and well-being (Haas, 1999), *Quality of Life* generally refers to an evaluation of the general well-being of individuals and societies (Derek et al., 2009) with the key well-being indicator of

life satisfaction (Ryff and Keyes, 1995). While there are examples of uni-dimensional definitions of the concept of *Quality of Life*, the majority of *Quality of Life* definitions stress the multi-dimensional nature of the concept, typically manifested in the specification of a number of *Quality of Life* domains that can be found in health-related studies (e.g. Cummins, 1997; Felce, 1997; Schalock, 1996). *Quality of Life* has also been defined solely in terms of life satisfaction. Rejeski and Mihalko (2001) describe the ‘mainstream psychology’ definition of *Quality of Life* as being "the conscious cognitive judgement of satisfaction with one's life", a concept that has been operationalized using both uni-dimensional and multi-dimensional measures, that is, in terms of satisfaction with life in general, or of satisfaction with specific ‘domains’ of life considered separately. Others assume that overall life satisfaction is functionally related to satisfaction within a number of individual life domains, like the satisfaction hierarchy model of Lee and Sirgy (1995).

Thus, at a broader level, *Quality of Life* is an umbrella concept that refers to all aspects of a person's life, including physical health, psychological well-being, social well-being, financial well-being, family relationships, friendships, work, and the like. Yet, there appears to be surprisingly little agreement on which domains constitute *Quality of Life*, and which domains need to be included in measures of *Quality of Life*. Perhaps the notion of incorporating a definitive standardized set of domains into *Quality of Life* definitions is subject to criticism (Keith, 2001). This begs the question of whether or not *Vacations* should be included as a separate domain in *Quality of Life* studies. To answer this question, we conducted a review of published measures of *Quality of Life* developed for healthy adults¹. For the purposes of this paper, we have adopted Frisch’s (2000, p. 220) definition of *Quality of Life*, which refers to “an individual’s evaluations of the degree to which his or her most important needs, goals, and wishes have been fulfilled”. For this review, we have sourced the

original publications explaining each of the fourteen test batteries included in the review and extracted the domains that were used to derive the overall *Quality of Life* score. The details of the review are provided in the Appendix. A summary is given in Table 1 that lists the domains in the left-hand column and in the right-hand column, the percentage of reviewed studies, which included each one of those domains in their measure of *Quality of Life* in the right-hand column.

Table 1: Inclusion of *Quality of Life* Domains in Test Batteries

Domain	% of Test Batteries Including Domain
Work and material well being	100%
Health	100%
Family and love	79%
Leisure and recreational experiences	64%
Social life	57%
Education/learning	50%
Neighbourhood/community	36%
Spiritual life	29%
Vacation	29%
Goals/hopes for the future	21%
Self-esteem/acceptance	14%
Safety	14%
Stress	14%
Transport	14%

Standard of living	14%
--------------------	-----

As can be seen, *Vacations* are infrequently mentioned. *Work and material well-being* and *Health* are included in all item batteries, followed by *Family and love*, *Leisure and recreational experiences*, *Social life* and *Education/learning*. All other domains are included in only less than half of the item batteries. A number of key conclusions can be drawn from the review of literature and test batteries: first, there is general agreement that total perceived *Quality of Life* is a composite of satisfaction with a number of domains in life. Second, there is little agreement on the key domains that need to be included to cover the construct of *Quality of Life* in a satisfactory manner. The only undisputed domains are *Work*, *material well-being* and *Health*. Finally, almost two thirds of test batteries reviewed view *Leisure and recreation* as contributing to *Quality of Life*, with the contribution to life satisfaction dependent on the amount of time spent in leisure and the value that people attach to their leisure experiences (Shaw, 1984). *Leisure and recreation* and its importance to life satisfaction have been heavily researched in the general *Quality of Life* literature. For example, Diener and Suh (1997) and Karnitis (2006) acknowledged *Leisure and recreation* as a key domain in *Quality of Life*. Silverstein and Parker (2002) argued on the contribution of *Leisure* to ‘successful’ old age, a finding supported by Dann (2001), Nimrod (2007), and Coleman and Iso-Ahola (1993). Iwasaki et al. (2005), Iwasaki (2007), and Jeffrey and Dobos (1993) derived the importance of *Leisure* for *Quality of Life* from the relationship between *Leisure* and stress relief.

However, while *Leisure* is generally accepted as a domain of *Quality of Life*, *Vacations* are rarely included as a separate domain. Instead, *Vacations* tend to be mostly implicitly

covered by the *Leisure* domain. Inclusion under the broader *Leisure* domain, however, prevents the development of understanding of the role of *Vacations* away from home. Such information should be of great interest to tourism destinations and the tourism industry since it provides insight into not only interesting target markets, but also aspects such as elasticity of demand.

A substantial amount of work provides support for the need to have a separate *Vacations* domain in *Quality of Life*. For example, the desire to travel has been argued as a fundamental need, and viewed almost as a universal right (Urry, 1990; Urry, 1995). Vacations are an integral feature of modern life for many people in developed nations and represent a possible avenue for individuals to pursue life satisfaction (Rubenstein, 1980). Hobson and Dietrich (1994, p. 23) observed that there is an “underlying assumption in our society that tourism is a mentally and physically healthy pursuit to follow in our leisure time”. A number of studies investigating the role of *Vacations* in *Quality of Life* were not published in tourism journals, but provide evidence for the fact that vacations should receive more attention with respect to their potential for improving people’s quality of life. For example, Card et al. (2006) conducted a study into the role of travel in improving the lives of people with a disability. Sands (1981) found that vacations were associated with increased intellectual functioning of women over 65. Balla and Zigler (1971) discovered that vacations were associated with greater independence and less wariness in institutionalized retarded children.

Vacations have been argued to play a triple role in contributing to *Quality of Life* by providing: (1) physical and mental rest and relaxation; (2) space for personal development and the pursuit of personal and social interests; and (3) a form of symbolic consumption, enhancing status (Richards, 1999). Despite the general acknowledgements of the importance of vacations, only a very small number of studies have been conducted to date that investigate

the contribution of *Vacations* to travellers' quality of life. Neal et al. (1999) were the pioneers of this line of research. They studied people's satisfaction with travel and tourism experiences in the overall *Quality of Life* context. While this study highlighted the importance of satisfaction with tourism services, it was predominantly focused on service evaluations and satisfaction with the last trip. Therefore, evaluations of the travel experience constituted the majority of the questionnaire whilst satisfaction with life overall constituted a smaller proportion of the questionnaire. Neal et al. (2004) extended their previous study by examining the role of tourism services in *Quality of Life*. They discovered that satisfaction with travel services and experiences, trip reflections, satisfaction with service aspects of tourism phases and non-leisure life domains impacts on satisfaction with life in general. Gilbert and Abdullah (2004) investigated whether or not the activity of holiday-taking has any impact on the life satisfaction or subjective well-being of those taking vacations. Their results indicated that such activity changed the sense of well-being of those participating in it. A comparison between a holiday-taking group and a non holiday-taking group provided evidence that the former experienced a higher sense of well-being before and after the vacations when compared to the latter. Roy and Atherson (1982) found that group vacations promoted positive attitudes and greater quality of life in hospitalized dialysis patients. Javalgi, Thomas and Rao (1992) attributed pleasure travel as an important issue affecting the quality of life of Korean seniors. Lee and Tideswell (2005) found vacation travel improved the *Quality of Life* of senior citizens and that it created new interests in their lives.

In sum, although *Leisure* is generally viewed as a key domain contributing to *Quality of Life*, *Vacations* are not typically regarded as separate. This is despite the fact that there has been a significant body of work demonstrating the positive effects of vacations on people's well-being, as distinct from home based leisure activities.

3 The heterogeneity of the contribution of vacations to people's *Quality of Life*

A number of researchers acknowledge that the domains of *Quality of Life* are not equally important to all people. For example, Murray (1938) argued that the strengths of various needs differ from individual to individual. For example, individuals of one social class may share similar notions of which needs are important to them, and those notions differ across social classes. Gratton's (1980) study found that the majority of the middle class sample was esteem, self-actualization oriented, while the majority of the working class was esteem, belonging oriented. Gratton's assessment of group differences allows a fuller understanding of needs and the importance an individual assigns to their satisfaction. His findings imply that some life domains and aspects of domains will be intrinsically more important than others to particular groups of people, and this difference in domain importance will vary across social class. As a consequence, many of the measures in Psychology (e.g., Frisch et al., 1992) ask people to state their satisfaction with each domain and how important each of the domains is to them. Such an approach effectively acknowledges that: (1) domains are not at all equally important; and (2) the importance of each of the domains varies across people and, consequently, no single rigid model of domain importance in *Quality of Life* can be developed.

To date, only one publication (Dolnicar, Lazarevski and Yanamandram, under review) investigates heterogeneity in the contribution vacations make to different people's quality of life. Their findings indicate that distinct segments exist, with one segment viewing vacations as a core (essential) contributor to quality of life; another segment considering vacations as

non-essential, but having an enhancing effect on their quality of life; and a third segment viewing vacations as playing no role whatsoever on their quality of life.

4 Travel Motivations

Pearce (1982) defines motivation as psychological/biological needs and wants, including integral forces that stimulate, direct, and amalgamate a tourist's behaviors and activity.

Travel Motivations refer to why tourists decide to engage in something, the time they are willing to sustain that activity, and how intensively they are going to pursue it (Dornyei, 1994). Thus, *Travel Motivations* provide insight into the psychology of tourist behaviour (Goeldner and Ritchie, 2003), because motivations are seen as the driving force behind all actions (Crompton, 1979b; Fodness, 1994). Understanding what motivates people to travel allows researchers to better define the value of tourism behaviour, and ultimately predict or influence future travel patterns (Uysal and Hagan, 1993).

The 'push-pull factor' theory of tourism motivation by Dann (1977) is perhaps the most recognized theory within the realm of tourism research. In answering the question, 'what makes tourists travel', Dann (1977) indicated that there is distinction between pull and push forces. The push factors are considered to be socio-psychological motivations that predispose the individual to travel, while pull factors are considered to be external, situational, or cognitive motivations that attract the individual to a specific destination once the decision to travel has been made (Uysal and Hagan, 1993). These forces describe how individuals are pushed by motivation variables into making travel decisions and how they are pulled or attracted by destination attributes (Uysal and Hagan, 1993). Push motivations can be seen as the desire for escape, rest and relaxation, prestige, health and fitness, adventure and social interaction, family togetherness, and excitement, while pull motivations are those that are

inspired by a destination's attractiveness, such as beaches, recreation facilities, cultural attractions, entertainment, natural scenery, shopping, and parks (Yoon and Uysal, 2005).

A number of studies empirically identify motivations of travelers using the concept of push and pull factors. For example, Yuan and McDonald (1990) examined the motivations for overseas travel and found that individuals from each of four countries (Japan, France, West Germany and the United Kingdom) travel to satisfy similar unmet needs (push factors: novelty, escape, prestige, enhancement of kinship relationships, and relaxation/hobbies). However, attractions for choosing a particular destination (pull factors) appear to differ among the countries studied. Based on the results of their study, Yuan and McDonald (1990) proposed that individuals from different countries have similar reasons to travel, but the level of importance attached to the factors differs across countries.

Jamrozny and Uysal (1994) examined push and pull factors that are likely to motivate five different German overseas travel groups (families, individuals travelling alone, couples, friendship, and organized tour groups). They found that overseas travellers from Germany, to a large extent, displayed variations in push motivations while travelling alone and in friendship groups, as opposed to when travelling as families, couples, and tour groups. Their findings further suggested that of push and pull motivations play a crucial role in decision-making with respect to sub-travel groups as well.

Crompton (1979a) also answered the call for a more thorough investigation into tourist motivations, identifying nine core motives through in-depth interviews with tourists. Seven of the motives identified were labelled as "socio-psychological", and two as "cultural". Findings suggest that some participants did not go to a certain destination for cultural insights or artefacts, rather, they went for socio-psychological reasons unrelated to any specific

destination: “The destination served merely as a medium through which these motives could be satisfied” (Crompton, 1979b, p. 415). Crompton’s results have been substantiated by other studies (Crandall, 1980; Rubenstein, 1980). In understanding tourist motivations, subsequent literature has documented a number of approaches that contribute to the way consumer motivations and needs are explored.

Based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory, the Travel Career Ladder and Travel Career Patterns are two conceptual frameworks that emerged prominently in travel motivation research. Pearce and colleagues (Pearce, 1993; Moscardo and Pearce, 1986; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983) developed the Travel Career Ladder framework that describes tourist motivation as consisting of five different levels, organized into a hierarchy, or ladder, with the relaxation needs being at the lowest, followed by safety/security needs, relationships needs, self-esteem and development needs in that order, and finally, at the highest level, fulfillment needs. Broadly, the Travel Career Ladder framework proposes that with accumulated travel experience people progress upwards through the levels of motivation. In doing so, some travelers ascend the hierarchy, whereas others remain at a particular level, depending on contingency or limiting factors such as health or financial considerations. The Travel Career Ladder framework also highlights that people have multiple motives for seeking out holiday experiences, although one set of needs in the ladder levels may be dominant. Thus, travellers’ motives influence what they seek from a destination and choose the destination based on how well they perceive it suits their personal, psychological and motivational profile. The theory is partially supported by Gartner (1996) who considers that people may have more than one motive in participating in a particular type of tour.

Although previous empirical studies demonstrated that the Travel Career Ladder framework was an acceptable initial tool in understanding travel motivation (eg., Lee, 1998),

the framework has been criticized for the explicit use of the term *ladder* as it resembled an analogy of a physical ladder with a focus on ascending the steps and being on only one step at a time. Pearce and his colleagues (Lee and Pearce, 2002; Pearce and Lee, 2005) modified the Travel Career Ladder framework by de-emphasizing the hierarchical elements, and proposed the Travel Career Patterns approach in which it is the dynamic, multilevel motivational structure that is seen as critical in understanding travel motivation, and the patterns of these motivations that reflect and define travel careers. Pearce and his colleagues empirically tested the Travel Career Patterns framework by conducting surveys in both Western and Eastern cultural contexts, generating similar motivation factors. They are, in their order of importance, (1) novelty, (2) escape/relax, (3) relationship (strengthen), (4) autonomy, (5) nature, (6) self-development (host-site involvement), (7) stimulation, (8) self-development (personal development), (9) relationship (security), (10) self-actualization, (11) isolation, (12) nostalgia, (13) romance, and (14) recognition. Findings show that within these 14 travel motivational factors, respondents at higher travel career levels place more emphasis on externally-oriented motivation factors, such as self-development through seeking nature, while respondents at lower travel career levels focus more on internally-oriented motivation factors such as romance. The findings indicated that novelty, escape/relaxation, and relationships are the most important and core motivation factors to all travelers, and that recognition, romance, and nostalgia are the least important factors. From these findings, Pearce and Lee (2005) proposed the Travel Career Patterns model, where *Travel Motivations* are conceptualized as having three layers. The most important motives (novelty, escape/relaxation, and enhancing relationships) are embedded in the core layer. The next layer, surrounding the core, includes the moderately important travel motives, which vary from inner-oriented travel motives (e.g., self-actualization) to externally oriented motives

(e.g., seeking nature). The outer layer consists of common, relatively stable and less important travel motives (e.g. isolation, social status).

5 Heterogeneity of *Travel Motivations*

While much of the travel motivation literature discusses motivations to travel for the entire market, it has been acknowledged since the early 1970s that motivations are different for different people. For example, Plog (1974) developed a tourist typology dividing tourists into two personality types: allocentric (active) and psychocentric (passive). Plog posits that motivations relate to the personality type. Since Plog's seminal work, a large number of segmentation studies have been published which investigate different motivation profiles amongst tourists.

Given the large number of segmentation studies using *Travel Motivations* as a segmentation base, we have conducted a review, similar to that of *Quality of Life* measures. Segmentation studies published between 2006 and 2010 in the three major international tourism research journals (*Tourism Management*, *Journal of Travel Research* and *Annals of Tourism Research*) were included in the review. Table 2 provides a frequency count of the motivational variables that have been used across these studies.

Table 2: Use of Motivational Variables in Segmentation Studies (2006 – 2010)

Motivational Variable	Percentage of Occurrence
Authentic experience	85
Relaxation / rejuvenation	85
Escape routine	77
Family & friendship - building connections with others	69
Fun and entertainment	69
Knowledge improvement	69
Novelty	69
Excitement and adventure	54
Meet people / socialise	46
Nature	46
Tranquillity / solitude	46
Exploration	38
Historical / heritage sites	31
Physical activity	31
Recognition	31
Curiosity	23
Meet others who enjoy the same thing	23
Safe environment	23
Sightsee	23
Climate	15

Friendly locals	15
Indulgence	15
Recommendation from a friend or relative	15
Value for money	15
Experiences for children	8
Health	8
Luxury accommodation	8
Visit attraction / attend a specific event	8

Of the thirteen motivational segmentation studies reviewed in this study, ten relate the concepts behind the segmentation to motivation theory, whereas three do not provide any theoretical justification for the use of motives as a segmentation base. Among those authors who provide justification for their use of motives as the segmentation base, the main reason for selecting them is that motives are believed to affect purchase decisions (Park and Yoon, 2009). Motives are described as “underlying forces” that have the power to direct travel decisions (Beh and Bruyere, 2007), and act as the starting point that “triggers the decision process” (Chang, 2006, p. 1225). Foundational motivation theory studies including Crompton (1979), Dann (1977), Iso-Ahola (1982; 1999), and Maslow (1962) are referred to in only a limited number of reviewed studies (Rittichainuwat, 2008; Moreno Gil et al., 2009; Mehmetoglu, 2007; Beh and Bruyere, 2007; Park and Yoon, 2009). In most instances, authors address the reality of different motives and certain aspects of motivation theory (such as push and pull motives that play a specific role in determining travel decisions) or acknowledge that different decisions are made for different reasons (Martin and del Bosque,

2008), or identify that the motivation to travel occurs when different needs must be met (Beh and Bruyere, 2007).

6 Prior attempts of integrating the concepts of *Quality of Life* and *Tourism Motivations*


Although there are several studies on *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations*, there are only a few studies that integrate the two concepts. For example, Hsu, Cai and Wong (2007) emphasized the importance of understanding the motivation of senior travelers in the efforts to improve the quality of life for senior citizens through vacation activities. They proposed a theoretical model based on intense scrutiny of textual data collected through in-depth interviews. Their tourism motivations model consists of two main components: (1) external conditions include societal progress, personal finance, time, and health, of which personal finance and time are mediated through family support and responsibility; (2) internal desires include improving well-being, escaping routines, socializing, seeking knowledge, pride and patriotism, personal reward, and nostalgia.

7 Integrating Travel Motivations and Quality of Life in the Grevillea Model

Dolnicar, Lazarevski and Yanamandram (under review) have recently proposed a Grevillea Model (illustrated in Figure 1) of the importance of vacations for people's quality of life. They use the metaphor of the Grevillea, an Australian native shrub, because it comes in hundreds of varieties (symbolising the large amount of difference in people with respect to the contribution vacations make to their quality of life). The core *Quality of Life* domains are

symbolised by the branches and leaves of the shrub, which are fundamental to its survival. Domains which are not essential but have the potential to enhance people's quality of life are symbolized by the flowers of the Grevillea, which are known to be spectacular in shape and colour. The Grevillea Model is in line with Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory and TCL framework, because it acknowledges that some needs (or domains) are more important than others, and is also in line with literature which agrees that *Quality of Life* consists of a number of domains. However, the Grevillea Model differs from both these frameworks in that heterogeneity between people (and within people over a person's lifetime) are acknowledged.

Figure 1: Grevillea Model (Dolnicar, Lazarevski & Yanamandram, under review)




We now present an extended Grevillea Model. The extended Grevillea Model is the first attempt at conceptually integrating *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations* while acknowledging heterogeneity among people, with respect to both the importance of different *Quality of Life* domains and their *Travel Motivations*. The model is depicted in Figure 2.

The left-hand illustration represents people who perceive *Vacations* as an enhancement domain of *Quality of Life*, illustrated by the flowers of the Grevillea. As can be seen in this picture, the flowers of the Grevillea are different, symbolising that different people, all of whom see *Vacations* as an enhancement domain, have different travel motives. This has direct implications for tourism marketing: first, people who view *Vacations* as an enhancement domain may reduce their travel activity in times of crises, but represent very attractive target segments when not confronted with difficulties. While these people have in common that they could be willing to sacrifice their vacations in tough times, they differ in their motivations for travel, so unique communication strategies will have to be developed to separately target segments who share similar travel motivations.

The right hand picture represents people who see vacations as a core domain of their *Quality of Life*. Because, for this segment, travel is an integral part of their life, they are likely to be more reluctant to sacrifice vacations, even in times of crisis, making them a highly attractive market segment for tourism destinations and businesses. Yet, heterogeneity in travel motivations needs to be acknowledged, because (as depicted by the different shapes of the flowers) subgroups of this segment are driven to travel for different reasons. Communication messages need to reflect this heterogeneity.

Figure 2: Extended Grevillea Model



Finally, as in the original Grevillea Model, the symbolism of the Grevillea also acknowledges that people change in the course of their lives and that domains that may be core to their *Quality of Life* in certain stages of their life move to becoming only enhancement domains or drop out of a person's list of *Quality of Life* domains completely, much like the different seasons affect the flower: "Grevilleas mostly flower from late winter into spring, but there are a number of species which you will find adding color to the hot summer" (Greengold Garden Concepts, 2006).

8 Conclusions

Quality of Life and *Travel Motivations* are crucial concepts in understanding the drivers of tourism activity. Traditionally, while *Leisure* and *Recreation* is generally accepted to

contribute to people's *Quality of Life*, *Vacations* are ignored. In addition, heterogeneity between people with respect to their *Quality of Life* domains is rarely explicitly acknowledged. Finally, *Travel Motivations*, a heavily researched construct which is known to affect travel decisions in a major way, have to date not been integrated into the *Quality of Life* perspective. The Extended Grevillea Model brings *Quality of Life* and *Travel Motivations* together and acknowledges, for both these constructs heterogeneity in the market as well as the existence of changes over time in people. As such the model offers a new perspective on the role of both *Quality of Life* domains and *Travel Motivations* for travel decision making and provides conceptual guidance to tourism industry about strategic decisions relating to target market segments.

9 Acknowledgements

We thank the Faculty of Commerce for their support.

10 References

- Balla, D., & Zigler, E. (1971), The therapeutic role of visits and vacations for institutionalized retarded children, *Mental Retardation*, 5, 7-9.
- Bauer, R.A. (1966). *Social Indicators*, MIT Press, Boston, MA.
- Beh, A., & Bruyere, B. L. (2007). Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1464-1471.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). *The Quality of American life: Perceptions, Evaluations and Satisfactions*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Card, J., Cole, S., & Humphrey, A. (2006). A comparison of the accessibility and attitudinal barriers model: Travel providers and travelers with physical disabilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 161-175.
- Card, J., Cole, S., & Humphrey, A. (2006). A comparison of the Accessibility and Attitudinal Barriers Model: Travel providers and travelers with physical disabilities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 161-175.
- Chang, J. (2006). Segmenting tourists to aboriginal cultural festivals: An example in the Rukai tribal area, Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1224-1234.
- Coleman, D., & Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1993). Leisure and health: The role of social support and self-determination. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 111-128.
- Crandall, R. (1980). Motivations for leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 12(1), 45-54.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979a). An assessment of the image of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(4), 18-23.
- Crompton, J. (1979b). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6 (4), 408-424.
- Cummins, R.A. (1997). Assessing quality of life in Brown, Roy (ed) *Quality of Life for People with Disabilities. Models, Research and Practice*, 2nd ed., Stanley Thornes Ltd, Cheltenham, 117.
- Dalkey, N.C., & Rourke, D.L. (1973). The Delphi procedure and rating quality of life factors. In EPA, The Quality of Life Concept, II-209-II-221. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, Ego-enhancement and Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.
- Dann, G.M.S. (2001). Senior tourism and quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), 235-238.
- Derek, G., Ron, J., & Geraldine, P. (2009). Quality of Life. *Dictionary of Human Geography*, 5th ed., Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford.
- Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1997). Measuring quality of life: Economic, social, and subjective indicators. *Social Indicators Research*, 40(1), 189-216.

- Dolnicar, S., Lazarevski, K., & Yanamandram, V. (under review). Quality of life: A novel tourism segmentation base. Manuscript submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.
- Dornyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 272-284.
- Felce, D. (1997). Defining and applying the concept of quality of life, *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 41(2), 127.
- Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21 (3), 555-581.
- Frisch M.B., Cornell, J., Villanueva, M., & Retzlaff, P.J. (1992). Clinical validation of the Quality of Life Inventory: a measure of life satisfaction for use in treatment planning and outcome assessment. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 92-101.
- Frisch, M.B. (2000). Improving mental and physical health care through *Quality of Life* therapy and assessment. In E. Diener and D.R. Rahtz (Eds.), *Advances in Quality of Life Theory and Research*, Kluwer Academic Press, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 207-241.
- Gartner, W.C. (1996). *Tourism development: Principles, Processes, and Policies*. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Gilbert, D., & Abdullah, J. (2004). Holiday taking and the sense of well-being. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(1), 103-121.
- Goeldner, C.R., & Ritchie, B. (2003). *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies*, 9th ed., Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
- Gratton, L. C. (1980). Analysis of Maslow's need hierarchy with three social class groups, *Social Indicators Research*, 7(1-4), 463-476.
- Haas, B. (1999). Clarification and integration of similar quality of life concepts, *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 31 (3), 215-220.
- Hobson, J. and Dietrich, U. (1994). Tourism, health and quality of life: Challenging the responsibility of using the traditional tenets of sun, sea, sand, and sex in tourism marketing. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 3(4), 21-38.
- Hsu, C.H.C., Cai, L.A., & Wong, K.K.F. (2007). A model of senior tourism motivations – Anecdotes from Beijing and Shanghai, *Tourism Management*, 28, 1262-1273.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256-262.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1999). Motivational foundations of leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 35-49). College State, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Iwasaki, Y. (2007). Leisure and quality of life in an international and multicultural context: what are major pathways linking leisure to quality of life?, *Social Indicators Research*, 82(2), 233-264.
- Iwasaki, Y., Mannell, R.C., Smale, B.J.A., & Butcher, J. (2005). Contributions of leisure participation in predicting stress coping and health among police and emergency response services workers. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 10(1), 79-99.

- Jamrozy, U., & Uysal, M. (1994). Travel motivation variation of overseas German visitors. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 6(3/4), 135-160.
- Javalgi, R.G., Thomas, E.G. and Rao, S.R. (1992), Consumer behavior in the US pleasure travel marketplace: An analysis of senior and non-senior travelers, *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(2), 14-19.
- Jeffres, L. W., & Dobos, J. (1993). Perceptions of leisure opportunities and the quality of life in a metropolitan Area. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 25(2), 203-217.
- Karnitis, E. (2006). Increasing *quality of life* as the goal for development of Latvia. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 1, 125-138.
- Keith, K. (2001). International quality of life: Current conceptual, measurement, and implementation issues, in Glidden, Laraine Masters (ed) *International Review of Research in Mental Retardation* 24, Academic Press, San Diego, 49.
- Land, K.C. (2004). An evidence-based approach to the construction of summary quality-of-life indices, in W. Glatzer, S. Belowvov and M. Stoffregen (eds.), *Challenges for Quality of Life in the Contemporary World*, Springer, New York, 107–124.
- Lee, D. J., and M. J. Sirgy. 1995. Determinants of involvement in the consumer/ marketing life domain in relation to *Quality of Life: A theoretical model and research agenda*. In *Development in Quality of Life Studies in Marketing*, edited by H. L. Meadow, M. J. Sirgy, and D. Rahtz, 13-18. Dekalb, IL: Academy of Marketing Science.
- Lee, S.H., & Tideswell, C. (2005). Understanding attitudes towards leisure travel and the constraints faced by senior Koreans, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11(3), 249-263.
- Lee, U.I. (1998). *International Tourist Behaviour: A Comparative Study of Japanese and United Kingdom Tourists in Cairns*. Master's thesis, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia.
- Lee, U-I., & Pearce, P.L. (2002). Travel motivation and travel career patterns. In *Proceedings of First Asia Pacific Forum for Graduate Students Research in Tourism*, 22 May, Macao (pp. 17-35). Hong Kong: The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.
- Lundberg, D. E. (1971). Why tourists travel. *Cornell HRA Quarterly*, February, 75-81.
- Martin, H. S., & del Bosque, I. A. R. (2008). Exploring the cognitive-affective nature of destination image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 263-277.
- Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Toward a Psychology of Being*. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ.
- Mehmetoglu, M. (2007). Typologising nature-based tourists by activity--Theoretical and practical implications. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 651-660.
- Moreno Gil, S., & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2009). Understanding the Museum Image Formation Process: A Comparison of Residents and Tourists. *Journal of Travel Research*, 47(4), 480-493.
- Moscardo, G. M., & Pearce, P. L. (1986). Historic theme parks: An Australian experience in authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13(3), 467-479.
- Murray, H.A. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*, Oxford University Press, New York.

- Naess, S. (1999). Subjective approach to quality of life, *Feminist Economics*, 5(2), 115-118.
- Neal, J.D., Sirgy, M.J., & Uysal, M. (1999). The role of satisfaction with leisure travel/tourism services and expenditure in satisfaction with leisure life and overall life. *Journal of Business Research*, 44, 153-163.
- Neal, J.D., Sirgy, M.J. & Uysal, M. (2004). Measuring the effect of tourism services on travellers' *Quality of Life* : Further validation, *Social Indicators Research*, 69, 243-277.
- Nimrod, G. (2007). Retirees' leisure: Activities, benefits, and their contribution to life satisfaction. *Leisure Studies*, 26(1), 65-80.
- Park, D.-B., & Yoon, Y.-S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 99-108.
- Pearce, P.L. (1982). *The Social Psychology of Tourist Behavior*. Oxford Pergamon Press.
- Pearce, P.L. (1993). Fundamentals of tourist motivation. In D.G. Pearce & R.W. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*, Routledge, London, 113-134.
- Pearce, P.L., & Caltabiano, M.L. (1983). Inferring travel motivation from travelers' experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(Fall), 16-20.
- Pearce, P.L., & Lee, U. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation, *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 226-237.
- Plog, S.C. (1974). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, February, 55-58.
- Rajeski, W., & Mihalko S. (2001). Physical activity and quality of life in older adults, *The Journals of Gerontology, Series A: Biological Sciences*, 56A, 23-36.
- Richards, G. (1999). Vacations and the *quality of life*: Patterns and structures. *Journal of Business Research*, 44(3), 189-198.
- Rittichainuwat, N. (2008). Responding to Disaster: Thai and Scandinavian Tourists' Motivation to Visit Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 422-432.
- Roy, C., & Atherson, E. (1982), Mini-vacations with center dialysis patients: A three year summary, *Social Work in Health Care*, 8, 117-123.
- Rubenstein, C. (1980). Vacations: expectations, satisfactions, frustrations, fantasies. *Psychology Today*, 14, 62-76.
- Ryff, C.D., & Keyes, C.L.M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 719-727.
- Sands, J.D. (1981), The relationship of stressful life events to intellectual functioning in women over 65. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 74, 11-22.
- Schalock, Robert L (1996) 'Reconsidering the conceptualisation and measurement of quality of life, in Schalock, Robert L (ed) *Quality of Life, Vol. 1. Conceptualization and Measurement*, American Association on Mental Retardation, Washington.
- Shaw, S. (1984). The measurement of leisure: A *Quality of Life* issue. *Society and Leisure*, 7 (1), 91-107.

- Silverstein, M., & Parker, M. (2002). Leisure activities and quality of life among the oldest old in Sweden. *Research on Aging*, 24(5), 528-547.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, Sage Publications, London, U.K.
- Urry, J. (1995). *Consuming Places*, Routledge, London.
- Uysal, M., & Hagan, L. R. (1993). Motivation of pleasure to travel and tourism. In M. A. Khan, M. D. Olsen, & T. Var (Eds.), *VNR'S Encyclopedia of Hospitality and Tourism*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 798-810.
- Wilson, W. (1967). Correlates of avowed happiness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 67(4), 294-306.
- Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26, 45-56.
- Yuan, S., & McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinants of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(1), 42-44.

11 Appendix

Review of *Quality of Life* test battery dimensions for healthy adults

<i>S.NO.</i>	<i>Publication Details</i>	<i>No. of Domains</i>	<i>Domains</i>	<i>Leisure</i>	<i>Vacation</i>
1	Cummins, R. A., McCabe, M. P., Romeo, Y., & Gullone, E. (1994). The comprehensive quality of life scale: Instrument development and psychometric evaluation on tertiary staff and students. <i>Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54</i> , 372–382.	7 domains	Material well-being, health, productivity, intimacy, safety, place in society, emotional well-being.	No	No
2	Dazord, A., Gerin, P., & Boissel, J. P. (1994). Subjective Quality of Life assessment in therapeutic trials: Presentation of a new instrument in France (Subjective Quality of Life Profile: SQLP) and first results. In J. Orley & W. Kuyken (Eds.), <i>Measurement of Quality of Life in health care settings</i> . Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag.	5 domains; 15 sub-domains	Functional life (motor function, psychological life, sensory function, sexual life, sleep, digestion, and pain), social life (specific relationships, social roles, interest), material life (income and housing), spiritual life (religious beliefs, faith and inner life), fifth unspecified domain (what is the most important thing in your current life?).	Yes	No
3	Dunbar, G. C., Stoker, M. J., Hodges, T. C., & Beaumont, G. (1992), The development of SBQOL - a unique scale for measuring quality of life. <i>British Journal of Medical Economics, 2</i> , 65-74.	10 domains; 28 sub-domains	Psychic well-being, physical well-being, social relationships, activities/hobbies/interests, mood, locus of control, sexual function, work/employment, religion, and finances.	Yes	No
4	Gall, T., & Evans, D. R. (2000), Preretirement expectations and the quality of life of male retirees in later retirement, <i>Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 32</i> (3), 187-197.	5 domains; 15 sub-domains	General well-being (material well-being, physical well-being, personal growth), interpersonal relations (marital relations, parent-child relations, extended family relations, extra familial relations), organizational activity (altruistic behavior, political behavior),	Yes	Yes

			occupational activity (job characteristics, occupational relations, job satisfiers), leisure and recreational activity (creative/aesthetic behavior, sports activity, vacation behavior).		
5	Ferrans, C. E., & Powers, M. J. (1985). Quality of life index: development and psychometric properties. <i>Advances in Nursing Science</i> , 8(1), 15-24.	16 sub-domains	Health care, physical health and functioning, marriage, family, friends, stress, standard of living, occupation, education, leisure, future retirement, peace of mind, personal faith, life goals, personal appearance and self-acceptance.	Yes	No
6	Flanagan, J. C. (1978). A research approach to improving our quality of life. <i>American Psychologist</i> , 33(2), 138-147.	5 domains	Physical and material well-being, relations with other people, social, community, and civic activities, personal development and fulfillment, recreation	Yes	Yes
7	Frisch, M. B. (1994). Quality of Life Inventory. National Computer systems, Product Number 02104, Minneapolis, MN.	16 domains	Love, work, health, goals & values, play, creativity, helping, friends, relatives, home, money, children, learning, neighbourhood, community, self-esteem	No	No
8	Johnston, D. F. (1988). Toward a comprehensive "quality of life" index. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 20, 473-496.	9 sub-domains	Family stability, earnings and income, housing, health, employment, education, poverty, equality, public safety.	No	No
9	Kreitler, S., & Kreitler, M. M. (2006). Multidimensional quality of life: A new measure of quality of life in adults. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 76(1), 5-33.	17 sub-domains	Functioning in the family, physical health, physical functioning, active living, sexuality, body image, cognitive functioning, work and profession, social functioning, positive emotions, negative emotions, meaningfulness in life, confusion and bewilderment, ability to cope, stress, self-image, living conditions.	No	No

10	Lance, C. E., Mallard, A. G., & Michalos, A. C. (1995). Tests of the causal directions of global-life facet satisfaction relationships. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 34, 69–92.	11 domains	Health, finances, family relations, paid employment, friendships, housing, life partner, recreational activity, religion, transportation and education.	Yes	No
11	Lazim, M. A., & Osman, M. T. (2009). A new Malaysian quality of life index based on fuzzy sets and hierarchical needs. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 94(3), 499-508.	11 domains	Income and distribution, working life, transport and communications, health, education, housing, environment, family life, social participation, public safety and culture and leisure	Yes	No
12	Lever, J. P. (2000). The development of an instrument to measure quality of life in Mexico city. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 50, 187-208.	19 sub-domains	Work, children, couple relationship, economic well-being, physical well-being, family, environment, sociability, close friends, social aspects, personal development, self-image, social surroundings, recreational activities, housework, losses (deaths), moral and religious dimensions, personal expression and creativity, personal knowledge.	Yes	Yes
13	Neal, J. D., Sirgy, M. J., & Uysal, M. (2004). Measuring the effect of tourism services on travellers' quality of life: Further validation. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> , 69, 243-277.	Leisure and non-leisure domains	Trip experience, leisure, job, family situation, personal health, relationships with people, community and neighbourhood, and standard of living and financial situation	Yes	Yes
14	Olson, D. H., & Barnes, H. L. (1992). Quality of Life Scale. In D. H. Olson, H. I. McCubbin, H. Barnes, A. Larsen, M. Muxen, & M. Wilson (Eds.), <i>Family Inventories</i> (3rd ed.; pp. 55-67). Minneapolis, MN: Life Innovations.	12 domains	Marriage and family life, friends, extended family, health, home, education, time, religion, employment, mass media, financial wellbeing, neighbourhood/community.	No	No

ⁱ Note that many test batteries for Quality of Life have been developed for subgroups of the population, e.g. cancer patients, children with disabilities etc. Given the topic of our research these measures are not relevant and we have focused only on measures of Quality of Life which have been developed for healthy adults.