



MANAGEMENT DYNAMICS

A Peer-reviewed Journal of Management and Economics



Published by
Shanker Dev Campus
Tribhuvan University, Nepal

Impact of Push and Pull Factors on Domestic Tourism Motivation in Nepal

Joginder Goet

Assistant Professor
Shanker Dev Campus
Tribhuvan University, Nepal
Email: goetj15@gmail.com

Article Info:

Received: 11 Oct 2021

Revised: 26 Nov 2021

Accepted: 2 Dec 2021

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.3126/m.v24i2.50034>

Keywords:

*domestic tourism
motivation,
pull factor,
push factor,
satisfaction.*

ABSTRACT

This study aims to investigate the link between push and pull variables and domestic travel motivation, as well as the effects of these elements. The research has used primary sources of data. A well-structured questionnaire was designed to collect data from 260 respondents. The convenience sampling technique was used to select a sample for the study. Moreover, Cronbach's Alpha was assessed to test reliability. The correlational and casual research designs were used. The findings revealed a positive and significant relationship between push and pull factors and domestic tourism motivation and push and pull factors have a significant impact on domestic tourism motivation. This study is useful for those travel owners and managers who want to grab markets. This research suggests a model that enhances push and pull factors through domestic tourism motivation in Nepal.

1. INTRODUCTION

People who go from one location to another for lust, pleasure, or reformation are mostly involved in tourism. The literature demonstrates that "tourism" has not been restricted to a universal definition because different tourism-related features lead to diverse viewpoints (Bogari, Crowther, & Marr, 2003). Numerous attempts have defined tourism in terms of distance from home, overnight stays in hotels, or travel for pleasure or leisure (Lowry, 1994). In our context, remaining consistent with established understanding, 'domestic tourism' travels within Nepal. Domestic tourism is the act of travelling for business or vacation within one's home country. In tourism research, the concept of travel motivation is gaining energy among researchers. "A state of need, a situation that serves as a driving force to demonstrate certain forms of behaviour toward particular types of activities, forming preferences, and arriving at some predicted satisfied consequences" is how motivation is defined (Backman et al., 1995). Travel motivation was described by Dann (1981) as "a meaningful state of mind that sufficiently predisposes an actor or a group of actors to travel and that is thereafter

interpretable by others as an acceptable reason for such decision." According to Cohen (2004), who outlined the motivations for travel and what it means to various people, those who seek out familiar places do so out of a desire for rest and relaxation. Their needs and behaviours alter as they search for areas that offer distinctiveness and where travel experiences are often more emotional. According to Pearce and Caltabiano (1983), one of the key factors explaining passengers' actions and behaviour is their motivation for travelling. According to this perspective, it's critical for a destination marketer to understand passengers' motives to cater to their needs; numerous subsequent research attempted to apply the pull and push motivational features in numerous contexts, including distinct countries, locations, and events (Jang & Wu, 2006).

According to tourism literature and associated models of travel destination selection and decision-making, the concept of push and pull motivation plays a role in tourists' decisions to visit a particular location (Crompton, 1979). This idea explains how certain natural forces push people away from their homes, and some extrinsic causes pull them in a certain direction (Mutinda & Mayaka, 2012). While pull incentives are linked to the qualities of the destinations chosen, push motivations are connected to the tourists' desires (Cha, McCleary, & Uysal, 1995; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981). Pull motivation draws a person to a certain location after push motivation has been established. Push motivation is the psychological need that propels a person to travel. Additionally, pull factors are external to the person and are sparked by the features of the destination, whereas push elements are internal to the person and create the desire to travel (Mohammad & Som, 2010). According to Klenosky (2002), push factors are particular causes that influence a person's decision to travel. Push motivation examines the underlying motivations that drive people to pursue a certain objective, whether they do so for status, recreation and rest, adventure, fitness and health, the need to flee, or social engagement (Lee et al., 2002). Prestige and relationships, satiating spiritual needs, avoiding the daily grind, and seeking relaxation are among the study's push factors. When it comes to travel, prestige enables people to have the urge to go to places they believe their friends and family have not yet visited as well as the delight of being able to share their experiences with them after the journey (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999). In more contemporary words, satisfying spiritual needs is tied to unwinding on a mental and physical level (Filep, 2012). According to Dann (1977), people may desire to flee their routine to cope with the idea that they aren't coping with the loneliness they experience daily. He goes even further by stating that most tourists do so to boost their egos while also discovering experiences that may not be possible in their everyday routines or proximity to their daily surroundings. Utilizing relaxation techniques can make it easier to handle daily stress. People travel to get away from their homes, unwind physically, and experience new things. Adventure and relaxation, among other motives, raised travellers' intentions to go on space missions, according to Olya and Han's (2020) research.

Pull factors are those elements that influence a traveller's decision among several potential places. Once the decision to travel has been made, pull motivation, which is the tangible resources and traveller's perception and expectation towards the features, attractions, or traits of a given destination, is crucial in determining the destination choice of visitors (Klenosky, 2002). Pull factors are the external forces related to natural and historic attractions, food, people, recreation facilities, and the marketed image of the destination. Chhabra (2005) concluded that visitors to historical sites mostly did so in search of new opportunities for social engagement, relaxation, education, and cultural immersion. Different groups of attractions, such as those for amusement, recreation, events, the natural world, and culture (Getz, 2008). Pull factors are things that are outside of the people. They function as stimulators to entice people to travel, like in the case of resort advertisements (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). It is about the benefits of particular locations. They are breathtaking vistas, historical sites, cultural events, and sporting occasions (Sato et al., 2018). Sports participation or spectatorship

can also inspire people to travel (Hudman & Hawkins, 1989).

These elements are connected to the characteristics of the destination that are incorporated into the destination marketing strategy (Goossens, 2000), such as history and culture (Turnbull & Uysal, 1995), sports and activities (Oh, Uysal, & Weaver, 1995), natural resources (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994), and so on. Along with the physical charms of the place, the destination qualities include pulling motivation (Moutinho, 1987). Numerous studies demonstrate that push and pull travel motivations are interrelated rather than independent. The pull factor is the same as the push factor, except that it refers to the forces that pull people away from home and influence their decision to travel. This study's pull factors include accessibility and cost, historical, cultural, and heritage places, a desire for variety, events, and activities, and adventure.

Numerous studies demonstrate that push and pull travel motivations are interrelated rather than independent. The pull factor is the same as the push factor, except that it refers to the forces that pull people away from home and influence their decision to travel. This study's pull factors include accessibility and cost, historical, cultural, and heritage places, a desire for variety, events, and activities, and adventure. Since Kerala's largest industry is tourism, it is reasonable to believe that this study will have significant managerial ramifications because knowing why people visit Kerala would help destination planners create and market the region's competitive edge and image (Kanagaraj & Bindu, 2013). Push and pull forces had a direct positive impact on visitors' intentions to return to Vietnam. The findings also demonstrated that push and pull factors indirectly impacted travellers' propensity to return to their destination enjoyment (Khuong & Thu Ha, 2014). According to Van Vuuren and Slabbert (2012), the primary reasons people travel are for rest, enriching and educational experiences, engaging in leisure activities, preserving personal values, and having social interactions. Said and Maryono (2018) looked at the connections between motivation, knowledge, revisit intentions, satisfaction, promotion, lodging, historical/natural attractions, and education about domestic travel. The findings revealed that domestic travel was highly correlated with every variable except revisit plans. Additionally, the outcomes of the path analysis revealed a substantial relationship between revisit intentions and satisfaction and promotion. According to Wang (2016), university students' push travel motivation had a large and beneficial impact on their memorable travel experiences over Spring Break, whereas pull travel motivation did not appear to have a significant impact. Pull variables are much more relevant than push factors for domestic travel motivations, according to Baniya and Paudel's (2016) proposal. Push factors are nevertheless significant predictors of domestic travel motivations. According to Bogari, Crowther, and Marr's research from 2003, "culture value" and "religious" are the two main push and pull considerations for Saudi tourists. The study also supports the association between push and pull factors. Wen and Huang (2019) looked at hierarchical regression analysis.

The study found that seeking out novel experiences (a push factor), destination-specific attractions, and socialistic nostalgia (pull factors) predicted the likelihood of returning. It was discovered that destination familiarity affected revisit intention but not recommendation readiness. It seemed that loyal tourism was unrelated to personal values. According to Ezeuduji and Dlomo (2020), inhabitants' motivations for domestic travel include the need for social connection, relaxation, exposure to new experiences and cultures, visits to friends and family, and an escape from the monotony of daily life. The splendour of South Africa's natural riches, varied history and culture, and first-rate recreational facilities are all pulling factors for domestic tourism. Most studies only analyze international tourism because of the unavailability of data or undervaluing domestic tourism. Similarly, it is hard to find tourism marketing and management researches that systematically analyzed the impact of push factors and pull factors on the travel motivations of domestic tourists in Nepal. Such a gap, in general, made it challenging for policymakers to develop effective policies and

strategies for tourism management. Hence, this research is carried out to examine the impact of push factors and pull factors on domestic tourism in Nepal. The following hypotheses are developed for the study.

H1: There is a significant relationship between push and pull factors with domestic tourism motivation.

H2: There is a significant impact of push and pull factors on domestic tourism motivation.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

The study's main purpose is to analyze the observation of people towards domestic tourism motivation in Nepal. The study employs a causal-comparative research design to identify the relationship and effect of push and pull factors on domestic tourism motivation. This research study has been based on the primary source of data. The structured questionnaire was the main instrument of data collection for the study. Based on the literature review, a structured questionnaire was developed, which includes Likert scale statements related to domestic travel motivation in Nepal. Primary data was used, which were collected through self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaire was structured based on the closed-end answer, based on a six-point Likert Scale with strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree as the extremes (6). A non-probability sampling technique was used to collect data and sample characteristics such as age, gender, level of education, occupation, and monthly income (convenience sampling). In convenience sampling, units are obtained from the population based on simple availability. In random sampling, each unit from the sampling frame has an equal chance of being included in the survey. As a result, 300 respondents were initially targeted via social networking sites and emails, but the data was reduced to 260 respondents after missing responses were removed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The relationship between push and pull factors in domestic tourism motivation is analyzed. Another part of the analysis tries to evaluate the impact of push and pull factors on domestic tourism motivation through regression analysis, where dependent variables of domestic tourism motivation and independent variables of push factors and pull factors.

Table 1
Correlation Analysis

	Mean	Std. Dev.	DTM	Push factor	Pull factor
DTM	4.883	0.664	0.836		
Push factor	5.008	0.644	.586**	0.912	
Pull factor	4.943	0.703	.590**	.803**	0.914

Note. N=260, **Correlation is significant at 0.01 (2-Tailed)

Table 1 reveals the correlation between the independent variables i.e., push and pull factor, and dependent variables i.e., domestic tourism motivation. Among independent variables, the correlation coefficient ($r=0.586$) of the push factor with the dependent variable domestic travel motivation is moderate and the independent variable pull factor with the dependent variable domestic travel motivation also moderates the correlation coefficient ($r=0.590$). The results show that there exists a positive and significant correlation between the dependent variable of domestic travel motivation and the independent variables push factor and pull factor of travel motivation.

Table 2 shows that the value of R^2 is 0.384, indicating that the independent variables (push and pull factor) described up to 38.4% of the dependent variable (domestic tourism motivation). The remaining 61.6% can be achieved through other factors outside the two variables. Adjusted R^2 (0.377) is called the coefficient of determination which tells percentage of variations in the dependent variable explained by the independent variable. In the study,

Adjusted R² is 37.7% which shows that 37.7% of variations in domestic tourism motivation (dependent variable) are explained by the push and pull factor of travel motivation (independent variable) after adjusting by the degree of freedom. The standard error of estimate measures the variability of the observed value of the dependent variable around the regression line. In the study, the standard error of the estimate is .55489, indicating that the average distance of the data points from the fitted regression line deviated from the given calculated value.

Table 2*ANOVA and Model Summary*

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	39.639	2	19.820	66.438	.000
Residual	58.769	257	.298		
Total	98.409	259			
R Square = .384			Adjusted R Square = .377		

Table 2 shows that the overall model is fit. This means that the regression model has a less than 0.001 likelihood (probability) of giving a wrong prediction. Hence, the regression model has a confidence level of above 99% which confirms that our regression model was good and appropriate and the results are reliable. Therefore, the model is significant at a 1% level of significance.

Table 3*Regression Analysis*

Model	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
(Constant)	1.393	0.318	4.385	0.000	Tolerance	VIF
Push actor	0.333	0.099	3.353	0.000	0.355	2.814
Pull actor	0.369	0.102	3.599	0.000	0.355	2.814

Table 3 reveals that the push factor has significantly contributed to domestic tourism motivation at (Beta = 0.333, t = 3.353, p = 0.000). And pull factor has also significantly contributed to the dependent variable at (Beta = 0.369, t = 3.599, p = 0.000). Thus, it can be confirmed that push and pull factors have a significant impact on domestic tourism motivation. These findings determine that the second research hypothesis is accepted and confirmed. Among the two independent variables pull factor have higher coefficients (pull factor = 0.369 in comparison with the push factor (push factor = 0.333) on the attainment of domestic tourism motivation. Therefore, policymakers, tourism service providers, destination planners, and potential tourist motivators must emphasize pull factors to achieve a higher level of domestic tourism motivation. The value of VIF < 3, i.e. (2.814), indicates that there is no multi-collinearity, i.e., no adverse effect on the regression line.

4. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The main objective of this study was to study the impact of push and pull factors on domestic tourism motivation in Nepal. The study found that push and pull factors significantly impact domestic tourism motivation and a positive and significant correlation between the dependent variable of domestic travel motivation and independent variables of push factor and pull factor of travel motivation. The finding is consistent with Baniya and Poudel's (2016) study, which found that domestic tourism motivation is influenced by push and pull factors. But Wang (2016) concluded that only push factors significantly impact the domestic travel motivation of tourists but not pull factors. Hence, this research is not consistent with the findings of Wang (2016). Traditionally, push factors are considered important in initiating travel desire, while pull factors are considered more decisive in explaining destination choice (Crompton, 1979). Travel motivation studies attempt to answer

the question 'why people travel' or 'why people visit a particular destination' because the underlying assumption is that motivation is one of the driving forces of behavior.

REFERENCE

- Backman, K. F., Backman, S. J., Uysal, M., & Sunshine, K. M. (1995). Event tourism: an examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management & Event Tourism*, 3(1), 15-24.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of tourism research*, 26(4), 868-897.
- Baniya, R. & Paudel, K. (2016). An Analysis of Push and Pull Travel Motivations of Domestic Tourists in Nepal. *Journal of Management and Development Studies*, 27.16-30.
- Bogari, N. B., Crowther, G., & Marr, N. (2003). Motivation for domestic tourism: A case study of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Tourism analysis*, 8(2), 137-141.
- Cha, S., McCleary, K. W., & Uysal, M. (1995). Travel motivations of Japanese overseas travelers: A factor-cluster segmentation approach. *Journal of travel research*, 34(1), 33-39.
- Chhabra, D. (2005). Defining authenticity and its determinants: toward an authenticity flow model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(1), 64-68.
- Cohen-Hattab, K. (2004). Historical research and tourism analysis: the case of the tourist historic city of Jerusalem. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(3), 279-302.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 409-424.
- Dann, G. M. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement, and tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 4(4), 184-194.
- Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourist motivation and appraisal. *Annals of tourism research*, 8(2), 187-219.
- Ezeuduji, I. O., & Dlomo, N. C. (2020). Residents and Domestic Leisure Travel: Mtubatuba Local Municipality in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *EuroEconomica*, 39(1), 84-97.
- Filep, S. (2012). Positive psychology and tourism. In M. Uysal, R. Perdue and M.J. Sirgay (Eds.) *Handbook of Tourism and Quality of Life research*. (pp. 31-50). London: Springer.
- Getz, D., (2008). Event Tourism: Definition, Evolution, and Research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 403-428.
- Goossens, C. (2000). Tourism information and pleasure motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2), 301-321.
- Hudman, L. E., & Hawkins, D. E. (1989). *Tourism in contemporary society: an introductory text*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Jang, S. & Wu, C. M. E. (2006). Seniors' travel motivation and the influential factors: an examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Management*, 27, 306-316.
- Kanagaraj, C., Bindu, T. (2013). An Analysis of Push and Pull Travel Motivation of Domestic Tourists to Kerala. *International Journal of Management. Business Studies*. 3(2). 112-118.
- Khuong, M. N., & Ha, H. T. T. (2014). The Influences of Push and Pull Factors on the International Leisure Tourists' Return Intention to Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam--A Mediation Analysis of Destination Satisfaction. *International Journal of Trade, Economics, and Finance*, 5(6), 490-496.
- Klenosky, D. B. (2002). The "pull" of tourism destinations: A means-end investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(4), 385-395.
- Lee, G., O'Leary, J. T., Lee, S. H., & Morrison, A. (2002). Comparison and contrast of push and pull motivational effects on trip behavior: An application of a multinomial logistic regression model. *Tourism Analysis*, 7(2), 89-104.
- Lowry, L. L. (1994). What is travel and tourism, and is there a difference between them: A continuing discussion. *New England Journal of Travel and Tourism*, 5, 28-29.
- Mohammad, BAMA, & Som, APM (2010). Analysis of push and pull travel motivations of foreign tourists to Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12), 41- 50.

- Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer behavior in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), 5-44.
- Mutinda, R., & Mayaka, M. (2012). Application of destination choice model: Factor influencing domestic tourists' destination choice among residents of Nairobi, Kenya. *Journal of Tourism Management*, 33, 1593-1597.
- Oh, H. C., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P. A. (1995). Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivations: A canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 14(2), 123-137.
- Olya, H. G., & Han, H. (2020). Antecedents of space traveler behavioral intention. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(3), 528-544.
- Pearce, P. L., & Caltabiano, M. L. (1983). Inferring travel motivation from travelers' experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(2), 16-20.
- Said, J., & Maryono, M. (2018). Motivation and perception of tourists are push and pull factors to visit national parks. *Web Conferences*, 31, 08022. doi:10.1051/ e3sconf/20183108022.
- Sato, S., Kim, H., Buning, R. J., & Harada, M. (2018). Adventure tourism motivation and destination loyalty: A comparison of decision and non-decision makers. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 8, 74-81. South African Resort", 295-311.
- Turnbull, D. R., & Uysal, M. (1995). An exploratory study of German visitors to the Caribbean: Push and pull motivations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 4(2), 85-91.
- Uysal, M., & Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4): 844 - 846.
- Van Vuuren, C., & Slabbert, E. (2012). Travel motivations and behavior of tourists to a South African resort. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 295-304.
- Wang, C. (2016). University students' travel motivation, memorable tourism experience and destination loyalty for spring break vacation.
- Wen J., & Huang, S. (2019). The effects of push and pull travel motivations, personal values, and destination familiarity on tourist loyalty: a study of Chinese cigar tourists to Cuba, *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 24:8, 805-821, DOI: 10.1080/10941665.2019.1635504.