Understanding the motivation of repeat visitors to Rome

Angelo Giraldi^{1*}

Received: 04/08/2015 Accepted: 22/11/2015

¹ Universitas Mercatorum, Via Appia Pignatelli, 62, Rome, Italy, 00178; tel: (+39) 06.78.05.23.27, fax (+39) 06.78.42.136; e-mail: a.giraldi@unimercatorum.it

* Corresponding author

Abstract

Tourism marketing studies and knowledge of the motivations of tourists' repeat visiting behaviour are highly fragmented even in an increasingly saturated marketplace. The success of a destination should be guided by a thorough analysis of tourist motivations to return to the destination. This study has three aims: to examine the travel motivations of repeat travellers, to determine whether there is a significant difference in travel motivations among travellers with different demographic and trip profiles, and to verify whether motivations and satisfaction are valid predictors of destination loyalty for return visitors. To accomplish these goals, this study considers the particular destination of the city of Rome, one of the most visited locations in the world. The objectives are pursued through quantitative analyses conducted on 232 questionnaires completed by visitors to Rome. Based on the results, this study confirms the previous literature on the topic and contributes some additional findings. Moreover, various managerial implications are proposed.

© 2016 Varna University of Management. All rights reserved

Keywords: Travel motivation, repeat visits, travel behaviour, destination management, Rome

Citation: Giraldi, A. (2016) Understanding the motivation of repeat visitors to Rome. *European Journal of Tourism Research* 13, pp. 43-57

Introduction

In the tourism marketplace, the success of a destination depends on tourist motivations and the consequent interplay between tourist satisfaction and loyalty (Yoon, Uysal, 2005). The motivations of first-time visitors should be considered; however, because retaining tourists is as important as attracting new ones, it is also necessary to understand repeat travellers' motivations to be able to create offerings that attract and retain tourists. In the tourism literature, there are abundant studies regarding travel motivations during the first-time destination selection process (Cha,

McCleary, Uysal, 1995), while repeat motivations and the consequent effects have not been thoroughly investigated (Freytag, 2010; Quintal, Polczynski, 2010; Tavares, Ivanov, Neves, 2016).

Tourist satisfaction and consequent repeat visitation are two core dimensions of tourists' destination loyalty (Oppermann, 1999; 2000) and continue to draw attention from both academics and practitioners. In the tourist market context, this focus is growing and reaching maturity because retaining tourists is as important as attracting new ones. In the

literature, several researchers have widely explored and determined the role of travel motivations during the pre-purchase destination selection process (Chen, Tsai, 2007; Lee, Jeon, Kim, 2011; Mechinda, Serirat, Gulid, 2009; Cha, McCleary, Uysal, 1995; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981); less attention, however, has been paid to repeat visit motivations (Hughes, Morrison-Saunders, 2002; Lau, McKercher, 2004; Xiang, Li, Cheng, Kim, Petrick, 2008).

Therefore, to the best of our knowledge, empirical inquiries into the motivations behind repeat visits are rare. Moreover, most of the empirical studies on travel motivations have focussed on North American and Asian countries. Less attention has been given to European countries, including Italian destinations. Although Rome is one of the top tourist destinations both in Europe and worldwide (UNWTO, 2014), we are not aware of any empirical study identifying the travel motivations of travellers to Rome nor of the motivations of travellers to revisit Rome.

The purposes of this study are to examine the motivations of tourists that spend a holiday in their country of origin – identified as national travellers – and tourists that spend holiday abroad – international travellers – to revisit Rome. Then, to explore the dimensions of the motivations behind repeat visits, to identify whether there are significant differences in travel motivations among travellers with different demographic and trip profiles, and to discuss the influences of repeat motivations and tourism satisfaction on destination loyalty. The concepts of motivation, tourism satisfaction, and destination loyalty are explored in the literature review that follows, as well as the sections covering the methods and the findings of this study. A discussion of theoretical and managerial implications follows the presentation of the results.

Literature review

Travel motivation

Motivation is the need that drives an individual to act in a certain way to achieve the desired satisfaction (Beerli, Martín, 2004). Because a paradigm of tourism is related to human beings and human nature, investigating why people

travel and what they enjoy is a complex proposition.

People decide to travel for different reasons and motives, perceived as forces that reduce a state of tension. This state gives rise to a need that stimulates an attitude or behaviour (Fodness, 1994). In practice, all human behaviours are motivated even though the choices to satisfy needs can depend on other psychological variables (Crompton, 1979). Therefore, human behaviours can be predicted by inner motives, such as desire, which direct people to reach their goals (Gleitman, 1986). These inner motives have been described as “internal stimuli”, or personal needs that can be psychological, social, and egocentric in nature. An internal motive is associated with drives, feelings, and instincts. In contrast, “external stimuli” are likened to environmental, physical and social factors from publicity and promotion (Iso-Ahola, 1989). Therefore, an external motive involves mental representations, such as knowledge and beliefs.

In tourism research, push and pull concepts have been used to represent internal and external stimuli, respectively. These concepts assert that people travel because they are pushed and pulled to do so by “some forces” or factors (Dann, 1977; 1981). Scholars find that one of the best ways to understand tourist motivations is to examine and conceptualise tourists’ behaviour using push and pull (Chang *et al.*, 2015; Kim, Lee, 2002; Kim, Lee, Klenosky, 2003; Klenosky, 2002). Individuals are pushed by motivation variables into making travel decisions and are pulled by destination attributes (Uysal, Hagan, 1993). Pull factors refer to the attractiveness of the destination, which motivates people to travel once the decision has been made, such as to scenic beaches or for shopping and entertainment (Crompton, 1979). The pull factors stem from marketing advertisements, word of mouth and referrals from friends and relatives. Moreover, pull factors, such as advertising, electronic mass media, spectacle, and entertainment influence travel behaviour. Push factors are the internal drives, motivational factors or needs that occur because of imbalance and tension in the motivational system (Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994). In short, push factors are the states of

mind that create or produce a desire to travel, such as the needs for escape, novelty, or self-esteem. The need for escape refers to the desire to change pace and get away from one's routine. The need for novelty refers to the desire to go from a known to an unknown place or to discover a new experience, thrill, or adventure (Lee, Crompton, 1992). The need for esteem refers to the need for recognition, such as talking about the overseas trip with friends who have visited the destination (Oppermann, Chon, 1997). Push factors cause tourists to search for signs in objects, situations and events – such as escape, relaxation, rest, prestige, health and fitness, adventure, social interaction, family togetherness and excitement – that contain the promise of reducing prevalent drives (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; 1981; Iso-Ahola, 1982, 1989; Pearce, Caltabiano, 1983; Pyo, Mihalik, Uysal, 1989; Uysal, Hagan, 1993; Yuan, McDonald, 1990). In 1997, Gnoth stated that push factors arise out of motivation factors, which affect tourists as they search for signs in objects, situations and events to influence their decisions. Pull factors are the motivational factors or needs that are inspired by a destination's attractiveness (Yoon, Uysal, 2005) and the attractive characteristics of a destination may encourage and inspire intrinsic push motivations (McGehee *et al.*, 1996). A number of tourism studies have covered such topics as travel motivation events (Crompton, McKay, 1997; Uysal *et al.*, 1991), the purpose of travelling (Cohen, 1972; 1979) and motivation by cultural background (Smith, 1977).

Push and the pull factors work together in stimulating people to travel. Moreover, individuals exhibit patterns in their travel behaviour that reflect a hierarchy of their travel motives (Pearce, 1982). These patterns are linked to their life cycles and to travel inhibitors, such as money and health constraints, that can deter people from travelling. Scholars have emphasised that people have a range of motives for seeking travel experiences. Furthermore, several levels of travel must work together for multiple motivations. Moreover, motivations may change over time and across situations influencing destination choices. Individuals select the destinations that offer

them activities and experiences suitable for their psychological and motivational profiles.

As stated above, although several studies have been conducted on travel motivations and many motivation theories have been used to explain the phenomenon of tourist activities and the psychological processes in tourism, the results and effects of the motivation studies of tourism behaviour require more than an understanding of tourists' needs and wants. In tourism destination management, maximising travel satisfaction is crucial for a successful business (Freytag, 2010). Evaluations of the factors and the effects are necessary; however, to complete the study of and comprehend human actions in travel behaviour, it is necessary to investigate travellers' evaluations of the physical products of destinations and their psychological interpretations of destination products (Alegre, Cladera, 2010; Swan, Combs, 1976; Uysal, Noe, 2003; Yoon, Uysal, 2005). These concepts can be represented as travel satisfaction and destination loyalty (Jurowski *et al.*, 1996; Uysal, Noe, 2003, Lee, Fung, 2013).

Satisfaction construct

Tourism satisfaction is important to successful destination marketing because it influences the choice of destination, the consumption of product and services and the decision to return (Kozak, Rimmington, 2000). Understanding and measuring tourist satisfaction must be basic parameters used to evaluate the performance of destination products and services (Schofield, 2000) because the performance of these products and services is directly linked to repeat business.

Conceptually, satisfaction is perceived to be the final step of a psychological process and the final result of all the activities that have been carried out during the process of purchase and consumption, rather than merely the observation and/or direct consumption of a product or service (Oliver, 1996; Maunier, Camelis, 2013; Hosany, Prayag, 2013).

In the tourism literature, assessments of tourist satisfaction have been attempted using various perspectives and theories. According to Oh and Park (1997), at least nine theories of customer

satisfaction have been introduced: expectation/disconfirmation, assimilation or cognitive dissonance, contrast, assimilation-contrast, equity, attribution, comparison level, generalised negativity and value-percept.

This study focuses on the theories already presented in the tourism literature. Studies were conducted using the models of expectation/disconfirmation (Chon, 1989; Francker, Van Raaij, 1981; Oliver, 1980), equity (Fisk, Young, 1985; Oliver, Swan, 1989), norm (Cadotte, Woodruff, Jenkins, 1987), and perceived overall performance (Tse, Wilton, 1988). In 1980, Oliver proposed a model based on expectation/disconfirmation, in which consumers/travellers develop expectations about products before purchasing them. These expectations are the bases for subsequent comparisons with the actual product performance. Satisfaction depends on the confirmation or disconfirmation between the expectations and the performance. In 1989, Chon found that tourist satisfaction is based on the goodness of fit between the expectations about the destination and the perceived evaluative outcome of the experience at the destination. Regarding the equity theory, consumer satisfaction can be seen as the relationship between the costs incurred by the consumer/traveller and the benefits that he or she obtains (Oliver, Swan, 1989; Heskett, Sasser, Schlesinger, 1997). In this theory, if tourists receive benefits or value based on their time, effort, and money in travel, then the destination is worthwhile. Latour and Peat (1979) proposed the norm theory. The norm or ideal standard is the reference point for judging a product or destination. In this theory, the norm is based on a comparison between the current travel destination and other similar places that the tourist may have visited to assess the tourist's satisfaction. Scholars have also proposed a model based on actual performance regardless of travellers' expectations (Tse, Wilson, 1988). This model is effective when tourists do not know what they will enjoy and do not have any knowledge about their destination circumstances, and only their actual experiences are evaluated to assess tourist satisfaction.

Basically, the valuation of satisfaction –

product, service, or tourist – must be considered in multiple ways to capture travellers' different motivations for visiting destinations and their different satisfaction levels and standards.

As observed in the above discussion, the evaluation of tourism satisfaction must be considered in multiple dimensions. Indeed, due to this complexity, a measurement scale with multiple indicators was developed in the empirical analysis to incorporate the approaches used in the previous studies (Yoon, Uysal, 2005) to most effectively assess tourist satisfaction.

Destination loyalty

Loyalty has long been considered important because it can bring practical benefits by increasing repeat patronage and saving marketing costs by inducing repeat purchase or spreading positive recommendations to other people. The concept and degree of loyalty is one of the critical indicators used to measure the success of marketing strategies (Flavian, Martinez, Polo, 2001). Loyalty research is a relatively recent phenomenon in the areas of tourism, hospitality, and recreation and leisure. In the last three decades, tourism and leisure researchers have incorporated the concept of consumer loyalty into tourism products, destinations and leisure/recreation activities (Anastassova, 2011; Backman, Crompton, 1991; Baloglu, 2001; Gursoy, Chen, Chi, 2014; Oppermann, 2000; Wang, 2004).

Being less complex than satisfaction, loyalty can also be operationalised in different ways. Specifically, it has been measured through a behavioural approach, attitudinal approach and composite approach (Jacoby, Chestnut, 1978). The behavioural approach is related to consumers' loyalty – product or brand – and has been operationally characterised as sequence purchase, proportion of patronage, or probability of purchase. In the attitudinal approach, based on consumer preference or intention to buy, consumer loyalty is an attempt on the part of consumers to go beyond overt behaviour and express their loyalty in terms of psychological physiological commitment or statement of preference. Finally, the composite or combination approach is an integration of

the behavioural and attitudinal approaches (Backman, Crompton, 1991). It has been argued that a customer who purchases and has loyalty to a particular brand and/or product must have a positive attitude towards that brand.

Regarding destination loyalty and considering the above, Bowen and Chen (2001) suggested that tourism researchers should use different measurement variables or constructs to assess loyalty to different types of tourist products. Oliver (1999) states that loyalty is a construct, which can be conceptualised by several perspectives.

Thus, the reviewed literature suggests that a full understanding of loyalty must consider both motivational and satisfaction constructs simultaneously. Cronin and Tayler (1992) and Homburg and Giering (2001) measure the construct "future behavioural intention" by using two indicators: the intention to repurchase and the intention to provide positive recommendations. A similar approach is used in tourism research, and tourist loyalty intention is represented in terms of the intention to revisit the destination and the willingness to recommend it to friends and relatives (Oppermann, 2000; Cai *et al.*, 2003; Niininen *et al.*, 2004; Giraldi, Cesareo, 2014). Therefore, two indicators, "revisiting intention" and "willingness to recommend", are used as measures of destination loyalty intention, as well as the indicator "destination attachment".

Methodology

Based on the theoretical foundations set out above, the following research questions are formulated:

RQ1 – What are the travel motivations of travellers to revisit Rome?

RQ2 – Are there any significant differences among repeat travellers to Rome with different demographic and trip profiles?

RQ3 – Are motivations and satisfaction valid predictors of destination loyalty for return visitors?

The instrument of this study was a questionnaire administered via the mall-intercept personal interview used to determine

travel motivations, travel satisfaction and destination loyalty. The questionnaire was written in English and was translated in five languages: Italian, French, Russian, German, and Spanish, checked through translation and back-translation procedures (Brislin, 1970). The questionnaire contained four sections.

To measure tourist motivation, pull and push variables were utilised. A two-step empirical investigation was conducted. The first phase – to define the motivation items linked to the repeat visit to a destination – was based on a thorough literature review. The push and pull motivation constructs consisted of a set of 25 items. Both of the variables items were developed on the basis of a review of the related literature and were modified to apply to the research site and target population. The second phase – to better define the motivation items – was realised through a qualitative web-based content analysis of information shared by tourists in online forums between January 2014 and March 2014. In detail, the user generated content posted on the main travel blogs and sites were considered to enhance the previous analysis and results. Then, again using a literature review, the 16 final items were developed. Respondents were asked to recall memories of their past travel experiences in Rome and to compare those memories with their current visits, with a particular focus on their motivations in each visit. A five-point Likert-type scale was used as the response format for the motivation variables, with assigned values ranging from 1 being "Not at all important" to 5 being "Extremely important".

In the second section, four different questions were developed to apply the aforementioned consumer satisfaction theories to satisfaction with travel experiences in Rome (Yoon, Uysal, 2005). These questions were: (1) How does Rome, in general, rate compared with what you expected? (1 = much worse than I expected and 5 = much better than I expected); (2) Was this visit worth your time and effort? (1 = definitively not worth it and 5 = definitely well worth it); (3) Overall, how satisfied were you with your holiday in Rome? (1 = not at all satisfied and 5 = very satisfied); and (4) how would you rate Rome as a vacation destination compared with similar places (e.g., Paris,

Berlin, London) that you may have visited? (1 = much worse and 5 = much better).

In the third section, six items were inserted into the questionnaire to measure destination loyalty to Rome. These are two indicators related to revisitation, one item pertaining to recommendation to friends and relatives and three items to destination attachment (Bowen, Chen, 2001; Yoon, Uysal, 2005). The fourth section of the questionnaire collected demographic information and trip profiles – travel party, reason for trip, and length of stay – about the respondents.

A pilot test was given to 15 tourists who visited Rome to test the overall reliability of the instrument. Moreover, a panel of faculty members in the field of travel and tourism marketing checked the content validity of the instrument. The target population was national and international visitors to the city of Rome. The sampling process used a convenience approach. Visitors who stated their reason for visiting as either leisure or business and who had stayed for at least one day but less than one year (Mill, Morrison, 1985) were approached randomly and asked to complete a questionnaire. During a five-week period in April and May 2014, two days per week were randomly selected, for a total of ten days studied. Two experienced interviewers intercepted respondents who were waiting in queues at the following locations: Fiumicino International Airport, Saint Peter's Square, the Roman Forum and various tourism information kiosks. These locations were deemed appropriate for data collection for two reasons. First, they were very attractive or mostly frequented by visitors. Second, a pilot study showed that the average response time to complete the questionnaire was seven minutes and visitors who were waiting in line at monuments or airports had sufficient time to complete it. In general, participants were responsive and willing to participate. The rate of refusal was low, less than 10 per cent.

Univariate and multivariate statistical procedure was used to analyse the data. First, descriptive statistics were run to determine frequency distribution. Second, an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed to identify the

underlying dimensions of the travel motivation. Then, a One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine the mean difference of the travel motivations among travellers with different demographic profiles. Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted using the statistical package IBM SPSS 18.0.

Data analyses and results

A total of 232 questionnaires were completed and returned, representing a response rate of 92%. Table 1 summarises the demographics and trip profiles of the respondents. Most were between 21 and 35 in age. Female respondents accounted for 55.2 per cent of the total and males for 44.8 per cent. The majority of respondents were unmarried. In terms of occupation, 23.7 per cent were employees of companies, 22.8 per cent were students and 16.8 per cent were self-employed. Most of the respondents were highly educated (33.60 per cent had attended college and 39.2 per cent had graduate or post-graduate degrees). The respondents came from several countries, with 29 different nationalities interviewed. The most represented nationalities were: Italian (40.2 per cent), English (12.0 per cent), German (10.0 per cent), American (6.0 per cent), Spanish (5.6 per cent), Dutch (4.3 per cent) and French (3.4 per cent). Of the respondents, 61.6 per cent had visited Rome 2-3 times and almost 20.0 per cent had been to Rome more than 5 times.

Regarding trip profiles, almost all of the respondents (91.9 per cent) reported that their major reason for visiting the city on the various occasions was vacation. Approximately 4.7 per cent visited Rome for business, conventions and exhibitions. The majority of the respondents were travelling with a partner or with friends (72.4 per cent) and were on self-funded trips (75.9 per cent). The lengths of stay varied, with 2-6 days being the most common at 68.10 per cent.

Travel motivation

The means and the standard deviations for the travel motivations are presented in Table 2. The travel motivation attributes ranged from the highest mean score of 4.00 to the lowest mean score of 1.74. The scores were clustered at

Table 1. Profile of the respondents

Variable	Category	Distribution
		(Valid percentage)
Gender	Male	104 (44.8)
	Female	128 (55.2)
Age	<20	18 (7.8)
	21-35	121 (52.2)
	36-50	52 (22.4)
	51-65	33 (14.2)
	>65	8 (3.4)
Educational Background	Junior middle school and below	5 (2.2)
	Senior middle school	58 (25.0)
	Junior college	78 (33.6)
	Graduate and above	91 (39.2)
Marital Status	Unmarried	148 (63.8)
	Married	65 (28.0)
	No response	19 (8.2)
Occupation	Company employee	55 (23.7)
	Manager/executive	10 (4.3)
	Professional	39 (16.8)
	Self-employed	13 (5.6)
	Retired	13 (5.6)
	Occasional worker	15 (6.5)
	Unemployed	2 (0.9)
	Teacher	18 (7.8)
	Housewife	4 (1.7)
	Student	53 (22.8)
	Other	10 (4.3)

Table 2. Travel Motivation

Attribute*	Rank	Mean	SD
Visiting the historical and cultural attractions that I have visited before	1	4.00	0.96
Recalling good memories of my prior visit(s)	2	3.96	0.93
Bringing my family/friends here because it really impressed me and I have good memories of it	3	3.95	1.00
Visiting the historical and cultural attractions that I missed on my prior visit(s)	4	3.72	1.06
Accompanying my relatives/friends	5	3.70	1.23
Enjoying the newly developed folk and cultural performances /shows	6	2.88	1.05
Enjoying the folk and cultural performances/shows that I missed on my prior visit(s)	7	2.88	1.09
Enjoying the folk and cultural performance/shows that I have enjoyed before	8	2.72	1.12
Shopping	9	2.70	1.26
Visiting my relatives/friends	10	2.44	1.32
Religious pilgrimage/worship	11	2.19	1.30
Business/professional affairs	12	2.11	1.32
Do not have enough time to visit more remote destinations	13	2.04	1.17
Do not have enough money to visit more remote destinations	14	2.00	1.17
Accompanying my clients/superiors here	15	1.77	1.08
My company/affiliation organised a tour here	16	1.74	1.09

Note: * 5-point scale: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

approximately 1 standard deviation. The five major factors – inclusive of both pull and push factors – that motivated travellers to revisit Rome were “visiting the historical and cultural attractions that I have visited before”, “recalling good memories of my prior visit(s)”, “bringing my family/friends here because it really

impressed me and I have good memories of it”, “visiting the historical and cultural attractions that I missed on my prior visit(s)” and “accompanying my relatives/friends”. The minor factors were related to a shortage of time or money and to activities linked to business travel.

Underlying dimensions of travel motivation

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the data set. EFA with orthogonal (VARIMAX) rotation was used to determine the underlying dimensions of travel motivation. The Bartlett test of Sphericity shows that nonzero correlation exists with a value of 800.54 at 0.001 significance. The Measure of Sampling Adequacy of 0.700 exceeds the necessary threshold of sampling adequacy with the minimum of 0.50 (Hair *et al.*, 2009).

The Principal Component Analysis with VARIMAX rotation and Latent Root Criterion extracted 15 travel motivation attributes into five factors. The Scree-test suggested that five factors would be appropriate. Two attributes with factor loading less than 0.40 and communality less than 0.50 were dropped. Then, the factor analysis was rerun. The five travel motivation factors accounted for 61.86 per cent of the variance (Table 3). In order to respond to the first research question, the following factors are named on the basis of the attributes they cover: “*business and professional affairs*”, “*nostalgia and novelty seeking*”, “*memory recalling*”, “*family and shopping*”, and “*having no alternatives*”.

Specifically, factor one, “*business and professional affairs*” (3 items), represented 21.063 per cent of the total variance explained with an eigenvalue of 2.95 and an alpha coefficient of 0.787. Factor two was termed “*nostalgia and novelty seeking*”. It was composed of 3 items and accounted for 15.542 per cent of the total variance explained and an alpha coefficient of 0.723. Factor three was named “*memory recalling*”. The total variance explained by this factor was 11.048, and this factor had an alpha coefficient of 0.513, which was under the threshold recommended in the literature; for this reason, the factor will not be considered in the next analysis. Factor four, named “*family and shopping*”, accounted for 9.389 in terms of variance, and because factor three presented an alpha coefficient lower than the acceptable level, this item will also be excluded from the following analysis. The last factor, labelled “*having no alternatives*”, accounted for 7.673 per cent of the total variance and presented an acceptable alpha equal to 0.668. The three factors were used to construct the summated scale scores as independent variables for the One-way ANOVA and regression analysis.

Table 3. Exploratory Factor Analysis of Repeat Tourists' Motivations

Factor	Factor loading	Eigen-value	% of variance	Cumulative % of variance
Business and Professional Affairs		2.940	21.063	21.063
<i>Accompanying my clients/superiors here</i>	0.867			
<i>Business/professional affairs</i>	0.848			
<i>My company/affiliation organised a tour here</i>	0.735			
Nostalgia and Novelty Seeking		2.170	15.542	36.605
<i>Enjoying the newly developed folk and cultural performances /shows</i>	0.851			
<i>Enjoying the folk and cultural performances/shows that I missed on my prior visit(s)</i>	0.813			
<i>Enjoying the folk and cultural performance/shows that I have enjoyed before</i>	0.650			
Memory Recalling		1.540	11.048	47.653
<i>Visiting the historical and cultural attractions that I have visited before</i>	0.776			
<i>Recalling good memories of my prior visit(s)</i>	0.732			
<i>Bringing my family/friends here because it really impressed me and I have good memories of it</i>	0.571			
Family and Shopping		1.310	9.389	57.042
<i>Shopping</i>	0.727			
<i>Accompanying my relatives/friends</i>	0.692			
<i>Visiting my relatives/friends</i>	0.584			
Having no alternatives		1.070	1.673	64.715
<i>Do not have enough time to visit more remote destinations</i>	0.858			
<i>Do not have enough money to visit more remote destinations</i>	0.837			

Travel motivation differences by demographic and trip profile

The One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to test whether international travellers with different demographic profiles and different trip profiles have different travel motivations. The independent variables are the items included in the demographic profiles, including gender, age, marital status,

occupation, nationality, and the trip profiles, including travel party, reason for trip and length of stay. All the items were recoded to conduct the analysis. The dependent variables are the travel motivation factors: business and professional affairs, nostalgia and novelty seeking, and having no alternatives (Table 4 and Table 5).

Table 4. Travel Motivation differences by demographic

Demographic Profile	Dimension of travel motivation		
	<i>Business and Professional Affairs</i>	<i>Nostalgia and Novelty Seeking</i>	<i>Having No Alternatives</i>
Gender			
Male	1.99	2.80	2.13
Female	1.78	2.84	1.92
F value	2.660	0.132	2.530
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.114	0.722	0.112
Marital Status			
Single	1.85	2.81	1.98
Married	1.81	2.74	2.15
F value	1.540	1.995	1.040
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.217	0.138	0.353
Age			
Group 1: < 20	2.22	2.64	2.22
Group 2: 21-35	1.81	2.79	1.90
Group 3: 36-50	1.87	2.86	2.05
Group 4: 51-65	1.82	2.93	2.24
Group 5: > 65	2.25	2.95	2.00
F value	1.012	.424	0.954
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.402	0.791	0.434
Education			
Group 1: Primary/Below	2.46	2.66	2.30
Group 2: Secondary /High school	2.14	2.95	1.90
Group 3: College/University	1.87	2.82	2.09
Group 4: Master's degree/PhD	1.67	2.75	2.01
F value	3.487**	0.733	0.496
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.017	0.534	0.686
Occupation			
Group 1: White collar	1.98	2.97	1.92
Group 2: Blue collar	1.81	2.78	2.08
Group 3: Not in workforce	1.80	2.71	2.04
Group 4: Other	1.96	2.89	1.94
F value	0.552	1.050	0.352
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.647	0.371	0.788
Citizenship ^a			
Group 1: Europe	1.90	2.87	2.01
Group 2: America	1.58	2.69	1.84
Group 3: Oceania	2.09	2.19	2.92
Group 4: Asia	1.77	2.44	2.00
F value	0.940	1.853	2.166
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.422	0.138	0.093

Notes: ^a The different nationality were merged using as a criterion the continents of origin; **Significant at $p < 0.05$.

Table 5. Travel Motivation differences by trip profile

Trip Profile	Dimension of travel motivation		
	<i>Business and Professional Affairs</i>	<i>Nostalgia and Novelty Seeking</i>	<i>Having No Alternatives</i>
Times in Rome			
Group 1: 1-5	1.75	2.75	2.05
Group 2: 5-10	2.31	3.22	1.89
Group 3: > 10	2.44	2.92	1.88
F value	7.910***	3.930	0.435
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.000	0.021	0.648
Travel party			
Group 1: Alone	1.81	2.79	2.12
Group 2: Couple	1.72	2.93	2.10
Group 3: Family/Friends	1.79	2.69	1.95
Group 4: Work	3.07	3.14	1.84
F value	11.964***	2.154	0.604
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.000	0.094	0.613
Reason for trip			
Group 1: Alone	1.71	2.81	2.00
Group 2: Family/Relatives	2.08	2.87	2.07
Group 3: Society/Work	3.24	2.88	2.03
F value	21.506***	0.138	0.081
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.000	0.871	0.922
Length of stay			
Group 1: 1-5 days	1.84	2.80	2.03
Group 2: 5-10 days	1.75	2.70	1.79
Group 3: > 10 days	2.42	3.31	2.30
F value	3.335**	3.295	1.707
Degree of freedom	231	231	231
P value	0.037	0.039	0.184

Note: ***Significant at $p < 0.001$, **Significant at $p < 0.05$.

Answering to the second research question, there were significant differences in the motivation of “*business and professional affairs*” ($F = 3.487$, $p < 0.05$) among education groups. Moreover, the ANOVA test showed a significant difference in “*business and professional affairs*” among the different groups that described the times that the respondents had visited Rome ($F = 7.910$, $p < 0.001$). The respondents who had visited Rome more than ten times were more motivated than the respondents who had visited fewer times. There were differences in the same groups regarding “*nostalgia and novelty seeking*” ($F = 3.930$, $p < 0.001$). Regarding the trip profile, in the travel party and reason for trip groups, significant differences were found in the factor “*business and professional affairs*” ($F = 11.964$, $p < 0.001$; $F = 21.506$, $p < 0.001$). There were no significant differences for the other factors and groups.

Motivations, customer satisfaction and destination loyalty

As discussed above in the theoretical framework, motivations are often perceived as playing a key role in tourists' satisfaction and in their resulting destination loyalty. To examine the relationship among the motivations, satisfaction and destination loyalty, multiple regression analyses were conducted.

The regression model was developed considering as independent variables each of the motivation factors identified through the exploratory factor analyses and the four items used to measure tourist satisfaction and as dependent variables the items composing destination loyalty. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 6.

The results show that the relationships among motivation factors, satisfaction and destination loyalty were significant. First, the

Table 6. Regression analysis

Factor	Destination Loyalty			
	B	β	t	Sig.
Business and professional affairs	0.057	0.093	1.793	0.074
Nostalgia and novelty seeking	0.126	0.185	3.600***	0.000
Having no alternatives	-0.043	-0.074	-1.467	0.144
Tourist satisfaction	0.581	0.609	12.247***	0.000
Constant	1.171		5.685***	0.000
R = 0.677; R ² = 0.458				
Durbin-Watson = 1.840				
F = 47.899***				

*** Significant at $p < 0.001$.

multicollinearity in the data set was tested through the calculation of tolerance index and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) (Hair *et al.* 2009). The results show how the independent variables are not correlated among themselves, having a VIF in the range of 1.035 to 1.125 and tolerance indices from 0.889 to 0.966. The results of the Durbin-Watson test, to verify the autocorrelation among residuals, fall in the range of values deemed acceptable by Dillon and Goldstein (1984). The values indicate an absence of autocorrelation; therefore, the model does not present substantial concerns related to the distribution of the errors.

Responding to the third research question, the data reveal that motivations and satisfaction would predict 45.8% of the variance. The results indicate that the beta coefficients of “*nostalgia and novelty seeking*” and “*tourism satisfaction*” were statistically significant factors in predicting the dependent variables.

Managerial implications

The empirical results of this study provide tenable evidence about the motivations considered by the respondents in deciding to revisit a destination, specifically the city of Rome. Although motivation, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty have received attention from tourism scholars and practitioners, empirical studies of these constructs have not been conducted pertaining to repeat motivations, differences among respondents in terms of demographics and trip profiles and predictive roles of motivation and satisfaction in loyalty. Studies examining these factors, however, may have a substantial capability to generate more precise applications related to destination behaviour, especially concerning repeat motivation. Indeed, previous studies on

repeat tourists’ motivations have focussed on comparing motivations of first-time visitors with those of repeat visitors. While these comparisons can reveal the differences between first-time and repeat visitors, these previous studies have treated the two segments without considering the potential heterogeneity of the motivations of repeat visitors.

This research identified the motivational factors focussing only on motivations in repeat visits to a destination. While some of these findings support repeat visit motivations identified in previous cross-sectional studies, others differ (Rittichainuwat *et al.*, 2007). Specifically, “*novelty seeking*” has long been considered almost an exclusive driving force for first-time visitors; however, it can be observed that repeat visitors may also revisit a destination to seek novelty. Moreover, this study confirms that there are no differences between groups regarding demographic profiles; it also confirms that there are differences between groups regarding trip profiles, an expected finding given the results of EFA that identified one factor related to “*business and professional affairs*”. Finally, the results confirm that motivations – particularly the factor linked to “*nostalgia and novelty seeking*” – and satisfaction must be considered valid predictors of destination fidelity, an important construct for the Destination Marketing Organisations (DMOs).

The major findings of this study have significant managerial implications for the city of Rome. First, the exploratory factor analysis showed that tourists have different motivations. Thus, it is suggested that destination marketers consider the practical implications of the

identified motivation variables because these variables can be fundamental factors in increasing satisfaction and enhancing destination loyalty. Specifically, destination managers should give attention to creating offerings based on presentations of the places individuals have already visited as well as new destinations. Furthermore, it can be intuitively assumed that if tourists are satisfied with their travel experiences, they will be inclined to revisit those destinations and recommend them to others. This research provides empirical evidence supporting this notion. Destination managers should establish a higher tourist satisfaction level to create positive post-purchase tourist behaviour and improve and sustain destination competitiveness.

Limitation and directions to future research

Regarding limitations and future research, this study has clear limitations that must be addressed. First, future research is needed to include more respondents to improve the representativeness of the sample. Second, although the authors made efforts to identify as many motivational items as possible, there could be some aspects that escaped the authors' notice in developing the survey instruments. In future research, more motivational items should be identified through qualitative or quantitative methods. Finally, the study was conducted in a specific setting – the city of Rome – and in a specific time range. For future inquiries, an application of the study in the same setting but adopting a longitudinal approach will help produce more reliable and stable results.

References

- Alegre, J., & Cladera, M. (2010). Tourist expenditure and quality: why repeat tourists can spend less than first-timers. *Tourism Economics*, 16(3), 517-533.
- Anastassova, L. (2011). Tourist loyalty and destination brand image perception: the case of Sunny beach resort, Bulgaria. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(2), 191-204.
- Backman, S. J., Crompton, J. L. (1991). The usefulness of selected variables for predicting activity loyalty. *Leisure Science*, 13, 205-220.
- Baloglu, S. (2001). An investigation of a loyalty typology and the multi-destination loyalty of international travelers. *Tourism Analysis*, 6(1), 41-52.
- Beerli, A., Martín, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 657-681.
- Bowen J. T., Chen S. L. (2001). The relationship between customer loyalty and customer satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 13(5), 213-217.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-Translation for Cross-Cultural Research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
- Cadotte, E. R., Woodruff, R. B., Jenkins, R. L. (1987). Expectations and norms in models of consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 305-314.
- Cai, L. A., Wu, B. Bai, B. (2003). Destination image and loyalty. *Cognizant Communication Corporation*, 7, 153-162.
- Cha, S., McCleary, K., Uysal, M. (1995). Travel motivation of Japanese overseas travellers: a factor-cluster segmentation approach. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), 33-39.
- Chang, L., Stylos, N., Yeh, S. and Tung, Y. (2015). How do Motivation, Pre-Visit Information Search and Destination Image affect Post-Visit Behavioural Intention? The case of an island destination. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 9, 8-23.
- Chen, C-F., Tsai, D. C. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions? *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115-1122.
- Chon, K. (1989). Understanding recreational travelers' motivation, attitude and satisfaction. *The Tourist Review*, 44(1), 3-7.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*, 39, 163-182.
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, 13, 179-201.
- Crompton J. L., McKay S. L. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 425-439.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(2), 408-424.

- Cronin, J. J., Taylor, S. A. (1992). Measuring service quality: a reexamination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56, 55-68.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1981). Tourism motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187-219.
- Dillon, W. R., Goldstein M. (1984). *Multivariate Analysis, Methods and Applications*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fisk, R. P., Young, C. E. (1985). *Disconfirmation of equity expectations: Effects on consumer satisfaction with services*. In E. Hirschman, H. Holbrook (Eds.), *Advances in Consumer Research*. Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research.
- Flavian, C., Martinez, E., Polo, Y. (2001). Loyalty to grocery stores in the Spanish market of the 1990s. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 8, 85-93.
- Fodness D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 555-581.
- Francken, D. A., van Raaij, W. F. (1981). Satisfaction with leisure time activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 13(4), 337-352.
- Freytag, T. (2010). Dejà-vu: tourist practices of repeat visitors in the city of Paris. *Social Geography*, 5, 49-58.
- Giraldi, A., Cesareo, L. (2014). Destination image differences between first-time and return visitors: An exploratory study on the city of Rome. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(4), 197-205.
- Gleitman, H. (1986). *Psychology* (2nd Ed.). New York: Norton.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 283-304.
- Gursoy, D., Chen, J.S., Chi C. G. (2014). Theoretical examination of destination loyalty formation. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 26(5), 809-827.
- Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. Anderson R. E. (2009). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Heskett, J. L., Sasser, W. E., Schlesinger, L. A. (1997). *The service profit chain*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Homburg, C., Giering, A. (2001). Personal Characteristics as Moderators of the Relationship between Customer Satisfaction and Loyalty – An empirical Analysis. *Psychology and Marketing*, 18(1), 43-66.
- Hosany, S. Prayag, G. (2013). Patterns of tourists' emotional responses, satisfaction, and intention to recommend, *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 730-737.
- Hughes, M., Morrison-Saunders, A. (2002). Repeat and first time visitation in an experience specific context: The Valley of the Giants Tree Top Walk. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 13(1), 20-25.
- 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. (1989). *Motivation for leisure*. In E. L. Jackson, T. L. Burton. (Eds.), *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past charting the future* (247–279). State College, PA: R. A. Venture.
- Jacoby, J., Chesnut, R. W. (1978). *Brand loyalty measurement and management*. New York: Wiley.
- Jurowski, C., Cumbow, M. W., Uysal, M., Noe, F. P. (1996). The effects of instrumental and expressive factors on overall satisfaction in a park environment. *Journal of Environmental System*, 24(1), 47-67.
- Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K. (2002). Push and pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 257-260.
- Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K., Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 169-180.
- Klenosky, D. B. (2002). The “pull” of tourism destination: A means-end investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(4), 385-395.
- Kozak, M., Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269.
- LaTour, S. A., Peat, N. C. (1979). Conceptual and methodological. Issues in consumer satisfaction research, Ralph day,

- Bloomington Wilkie, W. L. (Eds.), (pp. 31-35). IN: Indiana University Press.
- Lau, A., McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus Acquisition: A Comparison of First-Time and Repeat Visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(3), 279-285.
- Lee, S., Jeon, S., Kim, D. (2011). The impact of tour quality and tourist satisfaction on tourist loyalty: The case of Chinese tourists in Korea. *Tourism Management*, 32(5), 1115-1124.
- Lee, T. H., Crompton, J. L. (1992). Conceptualizing and Measuring Novelty Seeking in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(4), 732-751.
- Lee, T. H., Fung Y. H. (2013). Examining how attending motivation and satisfaction affects the loyalty for attendees at Aboriginal festivals. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 18-34.
- Maunier, C., Camelis, C. (2013). Toward an identification of elements contributing to satisfaction with the tourism experience. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 19(1), 19-39.
- McGehee, N. G., Loker-Murphy, L., Uysal, M. (1996). The Australian international pleasure travel market: Motivations from a gendered perspective. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 7(1), 45-57.
- Mechinda, P., Serirat, S., Gulid, N. (2009). An examination of tourists' attitudinal and behavioral loyalty: Comparison between domestic and international tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(2), 129-148.
- Mill, R. C., Morrison, A. M. (1985). *The tourism system: An introductory*. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Niininen O., Szivas, E., Riley, M. (2004). Destination loyalty and repeat behaviour: An application of optimum stimulation measurement. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 6, 439-447.
- Oh, H., Parks, S. C. (1997). Customer satisfaction and service quality: a critical review of the literature and research implications for the hospitality industry. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 20(3), 35-64.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17, 46-49.
- Oliver, R. L. (1999). Whence consumer loyalty? *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33-44.
- Oliver, R. L., Swan, J. E. (1989). Consumer perceptions of interpersonal equity and satisfaction in transactions: a field survey approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 53, 21-35.
- Oppermann, M. (1999). Predicting destinations choice – a discussion of destination loyalty. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 5(1), 51-65.
- Oppermann, M. (2000). Tourism destinations loyalty. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(1), 78-84.
- Oppermann, M., Chon K. S. (1997). Convention participation decision-making process. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(1), 178-191.
- Pearce, P. L. (1982). *The social psychological of tourist behavior*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Pearce, P. L., Caltabiano, M. (1983). Inferring travel motivations from travelers' experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(2), 16-20.
- Pyo, S., Mihalik, B. J., Uysal, M. (1989). Attraction attributes and motivations: A canonical correlation analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 277-282.
- Quintal, V. A., & Polczynski, A. (2010). Factors Influencing Tourists' Revisit Intentions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, 22(4), 574-578.
- Rittichainuwat, B.N., Qu, H., & Mongkhonvanit, C. (2007). Understanding the motivation of travelers on repeat visits to Thailand. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 14(1), 5-21.
- Schofield, P. (2000). Evaluating castlefield urban heritage park from the consumer perspective: Destination attribute importance, visitor perception, and satisfaction. *Tourism Analysis*, 5(2-4), 183-189.
- Smith, V.L. (1977). *In hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Swan, J., Combs, L. (1976). Product performance and consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40, 25-33.
- Tavares, J. M., Ivanov, S., Neves, O. F. (2016). Determinant of tourists' spending during tours: the case of repeat vs. first-time visitors to State Minas Gerais, Brazil.

- Tourism Planning and Development*, 13(1), 23-36.
- Tse, D. K., Wilton, P. C. (1988). Models of consumer satisfaction: An extension. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 25, 204-212.
- Uysal, M., Backman, K., Backman, S., Potts, T. (1991). *An examination of event tourism motivations and activities*. In R. D. Brotherton, F. M. Go, J. R. B. Ritchie (Eds.), *New horizons in tourism and hospitality education, training and research: Conference proceedings* (pp. 203-218). Calgary, Canada: University of Calgary.
- Uysal, M., Hagan, L. R. (1993). *Motivation of pleasure to travel and tourism*. In M. A. Kahn, M. D. Olsen, T. Var (Eds.), *VNR'S encyclopedia of hospitality and tourism* (pp. 798-810). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Uysal, M., Noe, F. (2003). *Satisfaction in outdoor recreation and tourism settings*. In E. Laws (Ed.), *Case Studies in Tourism Marketing* (pp. 140-158). London: Continuum Publisher.
- Wang, D. (2004). Tourist behaviour and repeat visitation to Hong Kong, *Tourism Geography*, 6(1), 99-118.
- Xiang, Li, Cheng, C. K., Kim, H., Petrick, J. F. (2008). A systematic comparison of first-time and repeat visitors via a two-phase online survey. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 278-293.
- Yoon Y., Uysal M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(2), 45-56.
- Yuan, S., McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinants of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(1), 42-44.
-