



Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research

Journal home page: www.jrtr.org

ISSN:2148-5321

IDENTIFYING MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS FOR TREKKING ACTIVITIES¹

Erdoğan BALLI^a 

Meltem CANOĞLU^b 

^aCukurova University, School of Karataş Tourism and Hotel Management, Adana, Turkey (eballi@cu.edu.tr)

^bOsmaniye Korkut Ata University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Osmaniye, Turkey (meltemcanoglu@osmaniye.edu.tr)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received:
15.08.2017

Accepted:
06.12.2017

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Trekking
Nature-based tourism
Tourist motivation

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to determine motivational factors for participating in trekking activities. Questionnaire technique has been utilized and short form of 'Recreation Experience Preference Scale' has been used in this study. The sample consists of 324 individuals participating in trekking within nature-based activities associations in Adana, Turkey. The research findings have revealed that "escape pressure, achievement/ stimulation, introspection and development, togetherness, learning and enjoy nature" are the main motivational factors for trekking participants. Besides, T- test and one way ANOVA tests have identified that motivational factors for participating in trekking activities significantly differ depending on demographic variables.

**Sorumlu Yazar:* Erdoğan BALLI

E posta: eballi@cu.edu.tr

¹ Part of this work was presented as a paper at 'The 2. International Tourism & Hospitality Management Congress (ITHMC, 2016), on 12-16 October 2016, Sarajevo/ Bosnia and Herzegovina.

INTRODUCTION

Among the alternatives of the tourism industry nicknamed as the chimneyless industry in the 21st century, especially natural tourism has gained momentum in recent years. Many tourism activities are done within the scope of nature tourism, one of which is trekking. It is recreational outdoor activities and the combination of hiking and walking activity in nature, rural and undeveloped area. Trekking is also known as the act of making a long journey across a difficult country on foot mostly for pleasure. Why make tourists, as a recreation activity, a long and difficult journey in nature on foot? What motivates people for participating in those activities? The profile of the trekking participants and their motivation for participating in trekking activities have been analyzed in the present study.

Although the characteristics and motivations of tourists are more widely understood, there are few empirical researched about the motivations of trekking participants and so little market information on their characteristics, preferences and motivations. This paper will help to understand trekking participants and will make new contributions to the literature. Thanks to understanding the motives of trekking participants, activity operators can better tailor their offerings to particular tourist needs and can specifically benefit from these issues with regards to market segmentation, product development, service quality evaluation and image development.

LITERATUR REVIEW

Motivation and Tourist Motivation

People's motivation is an interesting issue to be explored, especially in understanding leisure motivation. Motivation is a state of need or condition that drives an individual toward certain types of action that are seen as likely to bring satisfaction (Mountinho, 2000.p. 49). Motivation is the driving force which compels an individual to take action Morgan & Summers, 2005. p. 101). This implies that motivation moves a person to do something (Ryan &Deci, 2000. p.71). Travel motivation is related to the reason for which people travel (Hsu & Huang, 2008.p.14). Tourist motivation, therefore, can be defined as "the global integrating network of biological and cultural forces which give value and direction to travel choices, behavior and experience" (Sancheý, 2005. p.48). Motivations for travel cover a broad range of human behavior and experience. A list of travel motivations might include: relaxing, excitement, social interaction with friends, adventure, family interaction, status, physical challenges and escape from routine or stress (Esichaikul, 2012. p.49). McIntosh and Goeldner (1986. p.131-132) identified four motivation categories of travel; (i) physical motivators including those related to physical rest, participation in sports, need for recreation in a beach, and those motivations directly connected to a person's bodily health; (ii) cultural motivators concerning the desire for gaining knowledge about other countries in terms of cultural activities; (iii) interpersonal motivators including a desire for meeting new people, visiting friends or relatives, getting away from the routine conventions of life or making new friendships; and (iv) status and prestige motivators related to self-esteem and personal development.

Tourist motivations have been a central stage of tourism research for years. Iso-Ahola (1982, p.259) suggested that tourist motivation has a psychological (escape) and a social component (seeking). In the same way, Deci and Ryan (2000. p.237) supported intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and Crompton (1979. p. 418- 420) identified psychological motives (push) as escape, relaxing, exploration etc, and cultural motives (pull) such as novelty and education. Pull factors can be described as destination-specific attributes or outer motivations and push factors can be identified as inner motivation and factors that impact individuals (Nath, Saha&Oklevik, 2016. p.22). Through analyzing motivation in tourism, several types of motivations, based on which forms of tourism were developed. Physical motivations derive from tourism recreation, sport, health; cultural motivations originate from cultural tourism; whereas spiritual motivations come from religious tourism, pilgrimage etc.

Nature Tourism and Trekking

Work activity and other routines associated with the life style of modern society have given rise to increasing demand for different forms of tourism such as nature- based tourism. Public concern for nature, ecology and the environment in general has created growing interest in those forms of tourism in which there is greater interaction with natural spaces (Rayn, 1991. p.227). Eagles and Cascagnette (1995. p.26.) have concluded that nature tourists are those who travel with the intent of observing, experiencing and learning about nature. The purposes of nature tourists' visits seem to be enjoying, admiring and studying the natural environment and

appreciating the cultural values of the areas (Subbiah and Kannan, 2012. p.114). Nature-based tourism implies different concepts such as adventure tourism. Adventure tourism is concerned, these activities may be said to involve physical and social risks, search for intense, new experience and social interaction, thoughts and feelings, escape from personal situations and routines (Villalobos-Céspedes, Galdeano-Gómez, & Tolón-Becerra, 2012. p.271).

Trekking is one of the fastest growing activities within the context of nature tourism especially adventure tourism. Trekking is defined as a verb; 'to travel or migrate, especially slowly or with difficulty', or 'a long arduous journey, especially one made on foot' and as a noun; 'a journey or trip, especially one involving difficulty or hardship' (Oxford Dictionary, 2017). Trekking as a recreative activity is mainly performed in outdoors, natural areas and protected areas. Trekking is practiced in difficult terrain and climate, requiring specialized equipment, clothing and food, implying connotations of risk, jeopardy, and wilderness. Trekking refers to travel on foot through remote destinations that are, in most cases, inaccessible and unknown to the visitor. Despite many challenges, tourists are attracted by geodiversity and fascinating landscapes, changing weather conditions or spiritual survival (Różycki&Dryglas, 2014. p. 24). Trekking requires physical activity and spiritual discipline. It is often associated only with mountains, but one may be emphasized to distinguish eight types of trekking as such: mountain, desert, tropical, glacial, polar, river, swamps and volcanic trekking. Trekking is the combination of hiking and walking activity in nature, rural and undeveloped area and also known as the act of making a long journey across difficult country on foot, usually for pleasure. Why do people go on a long and difficult journey in nature on foot? What motivates people for participating in those activities?

Trekking Motivation

There are different reasons or motivation factors in terms of participating in trekking activities. Trekking is as an outdoor activity, several related studies help understanding of trekking participants' reasons (Driver, 1983; Pintrich, 2000, Ibrahim & Cordes, 2002; Ardahan&Mert, 2013a). Different theoretical approaches have been used and a variety of measurement models have been proposed in order to measure participating motivation in recreational activities. In the context of active recreation, the 'Recreation Experience Preference (REP)' scale (Driver, 1983) has been the most widely applied ones. According to Driver's (1983) study, the reasons for participating; achievement/ stimulation, autonomy/leadership, risk taking, equipment, family togetherness, similar people, new people, learning, enjoy nature, introspection, creativity, nostalgia, physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal, social pressures, escape physical pressure, social security, escape family, teaching, leading others, risk reduction and temperature.

Manfredo, Driver and Tarrant (1996) summarized the results of 36 different studies that have used REP. Their analysis generally supported the prevailing structure of motive domains and scales (Graefe, Thapa, Confer & Absher, 2000. p.107). They sorted the factors in nineteen domains, as; achievement/stimulation, autonomy/leadership, risk taking, equipment, family togetherness, similar people, new people, learning, enjoy nature, introspection, creativity, nostalgia, physical fitness, physical rest, escape personal-social pressures, escape physical pressure, social security, teaching- leading others, and risk reduction. In their study, Rosenthal, Driver and Waldman (1982) examined the motive domains for outdoor recreation: and identified eight motivation factors; exploration, escape role overload, general natural experience, introspection, exercise, being with similar people, seeking exhilaration, and escaping physical stressors. Brehm and Tittlbach (2010) have determined that people's motivations for participating in outdoor activities are; switching off , the beauty of nature, the sounds of nature, mental relaxation, visual beauty , meeting people, new experiences , getting healthier , getting fitter, temperature stimuli. In order to determine the reasons for the individuals to participate in recreational activities, Eryılmaz and Akgündüz (2017) also analyzed the results of 10 different studies that have been conducted through REP. They have identified 20 motivational domains; loneliness, sociability, nature, distance, excitement, success, spirituality, learning exercise, independence, teaching, exploration, demonstration, ability, competence, equipment, entertainment, rest, creativity, spatial.

In another study conducted by Ardahan (2011), the reasons were found as; physical and mental fitness, physical and mental rehabilitation, to improve oneself and to learn new skills, tempting things in nature, to be a fighter and to revolt, to have new social relations and to make new friends, to observe people, to improve social status and take social power, recognition and to be recognized, to nonnock and get out of boredom, and to meet a

celebrity in this activity. In their study, Ekinci, Yenel and Sarol(2012) found, the reasons for motivating the individuals to participate in trekking are comprised of 5 subdimensions such as social, health, education, time and observation. Ardahan and Mert (2013), in their studies, determined participation motivation factors as socialization, competition, healthy, escape and relaxing.

In sum, the relevant literature indicates that motivating factors for participation may vary among individuals who involved in trekking activities. This research aims to (i) indicate motivating factors for participation in trekking and (ii) determine whether there occurs a difference between these factors and the demographic characteristics of participants.

METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted in Adana Province and surroundings. Adana is a major city in southern Turkey and situated on the Seyhan and Ceyhan Rivers, on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, at the foothill of the Taurus Mountains. As a tourism destination Adana, with its natural beauty, historical, cultural and local values are actively making headway on a world tourist market. There are various routes suitable for hiking in the region and a new one is added each passing day. There are many hiking activities in all seasons of the year in the region. These walking activities include individuals living in the region, as well as a large number of people from many parts of Turkey and the world.

This research aims to determine the profiles of the trekking participants and their motivation for participating in trekking activities in Adana Region. The research has used scanning model in order to identify participants' motivation to participate in trekking activities. Questionnaire technique has been utilized as a data collection method. The questionnaire consisted of two sections, the first part of which contained questions relating to demographic characteristics of participants. The second has 34 items motivating people to participate in trekking activity. The items were taken from Driver's (1983) 'Recreation Experience Preference Scale'. A five-point Likert scale was used and the range covers (1: definitely disagree, 5: definitely agree). The measure was in Turkish and linguistically adapted to the cohort.

The questionnaire was pre-tested twice; the first one was conducted with academicians and specialists face to face and the second was carried out with 38 participants who go trekking in January 2016. Several revisions were done in the questionnaire depending on the pre-test results. The final version of the questionnaire was implemented face to face or via the internet between March and June 2016.

The research was carried out with individuals who participate in trekking in Adana. By the end of June 2016, 324 useable questionnaires were obtained from the participants. Research data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, factor analysis, independent sample T-test and ANOVA.

Reliability and Validity

This research has used Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, the most widely preferred method to test the reliability of the scale. Reliability analyzes applied to the Recreation Experience Preference scale ($p < 0.0001$) were found to be less than 0.05 in the ANOVA table. This indicates that the scale is homogeneous, correlated, and that the resulting Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is interpretable. For all items of Recreation Experience Preference, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.935. These values also indicate the reliability of the scale (Özdamar, 2011.p. 605)

This research has used Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, the most widely preferred method to test the reliability of the scale. Reliability analyzes applied to the Recreation Experience Preference scale ($p < 0.0001$) were found to be less than 0.05 in the ANOVA table. This indicates that the scale is homogeneous, correlated, and that the resulting Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is interpretable. For all items of Recreation Experience Preference, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated as 0.935. These values also indicate the reliability of the scale (Özdamar, 2011.p. 605)

The study also conducted exploratory factor analysis so as to measure the validity of the structure. Factor analysis was applied to 34 item-involvement scale. The factors with eigen-values greater than 1 were included to use varimax rotation, to consider factor loadings greater than 0.50 and to prefer variables with communalities

greater than 0.50 (Hair, Black, Babin& Anderson, 2010, p.104). The suitability of the scale data for factor analysis was examined through the KMO sample adequacy and the Bartlett's sphericitytest.

Before performing an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the 34 items, four items were excluded from further analyses due to low initial communalities (<0.50). In the analysis that follows, communality of 30 items was determined to be satisfactory (ranging from 0.594 to 0.857). Afterwards, factor analysis was performed for 30 items. Factor analysis explained 71.4% of variance that is higher than 60%, which is considered as satisfactory for explaining variance percentage (Hair et al., 2010.p. 130.) and the analysis yielded six factors. While loading of each item to the factors, two items of the scale were identified to have cross-loading problems. Namely, the item "to tell others about the trip" loaded to the first and second together. The second item with cross loading problem was "to think about good times I've had in the past", it loaded to first factor to the third factor. Thus, those two items were excluded and factor analysis was done again with the second analysis applied to 28 items. This also yielded six factors and explained 72,1 % of variance (see Table 1).

Table1.Explanatory Factor Analysis of Trekking Motivation

Scale and Items	Loadings	Eigen-value	Exp. Variance	Mean	α
Escape Pressures (9 Items)		11,155	39,840	4,549	,957
To avoid everyday responsibilities for awhile	,877			4,574	
To have your mind move at a slower pace	,877			4,589	
To be away from crowds of people	,847			4,537	
To experience tranquility	,842			4,583	
To have a change from your daily routine	,814			4,574	
To relax physically	,807			4,636	
To keep physically fit	,743			4,486	
To feel your independence	,696			4,482	
To be alone	,665			4,482	
Achievement/Stimulation (5 Items)		2,755	9,841	3,820	,845
To test your abilities	,849			3,833	
To develop your skills and abilities	,751			4,130	
To test your endurance	,706			4,083	
To show others you can do it	,633			2,811	
To experience excitement	,632			4,241	
Introspection & Development (3 Items)		2,149	7,676	3,759	,861
To think about your personal values	,840			3,722	
To be creative	,810			3,889	
To develop a sense of self-pride	,785			3,667	
Togetherness (4 Items)		1,579	5,639	3,693	,764
To do something with your family	,753			3,232	
To be with friends	,731			3,477	
To be with [others/people] who enjoy the same things you do	,695		3,6932	3,889	
To be with respectful people	,581		2,9568	4,176	
Learning (4 Items)		1,446	5,163	3,905	,800
To get to know the lay of the land	,823			3,491	
To learn more about things [here/there].	,685			4,149	
To learn more about nature	,595			3,908	
To meet new people in the area	,590			4,079	
Enjoy Nature (3 Items)		1,113	3,976	2,957	,737
To enjoy the smells and sounds of nature	,810			2,750	
To experience a nicer temperature	,666			2,945	
To view the scenic beauty	,640			3,176	

VarimaxRotated. Principal Component Analysis; Total VarianceExplained: %.72,135;
KMO Measure of SamplingAdequacy: % 86,0; Chi-Square: 7099,029 p<0,0001
Cronbach's Alpha forwholescale: 0,929

The first factor explained 39,8% of variance and consisted of 9 items. When all nine items loaded to the factor were examined, most of items were related with the escape from personal, social and physical pressures so this factor was named as "*escape pressure*". The second factor explained 9,8% of variance and consisted of 5 items, those referring to achievement and stimulation. Therefore, second factor was determined as "*achievement/stimulation*". The third factor "*introspection & development*" was comprised of 3 items with 7,7% of variance. The fourth "*togetherness*" includes 4 items with 5,6% of variance; the fifth "*learning*" has 4 items, with 1,6% of variance; the last one "*enjoy nature*" holds 3 items, with 1,4% of variance.

FINDINGS

Table 2 depicts the demographic characteristics of 324 trekking participants. Among the participants, nearly 54% were male and 46% were female. Considering age groups of the participants, nearly 31% of them are between 35 to 44 years old, closely followed by 25 to 34 years old (29%). Regarding the marital status, it appears that nearly 51% of them are married while 49% are single. Besides, almost 44% of the participants have an undergraduate education, 32% of the participants have a bachelor degree, % 14 of the participants high school education, 5,6% master or doctoral degree and 2% secondary school and others. Furthermore, 42% of participants have 1 to 5 years trekking experience, which is followed by less than 1 year % 31, 6-10 years 18 %, and over 11 years 10%, respectively. 42% of individuals participate in trekking 3 or 4 times a year, 30 % once a year, 17% once a month and 15% of them 3 or 4 times in a month. In addition, most of the respondents (61%) participate in trekking with their friends.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Gender	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Female	150	46,3
Male	174	53,7
Age Group	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
15-24	70	21,6
25-34	93	28,7
35-44	99	30,6
45-54	48	14,8
55 and over	14	4,3
Marital status	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Married	166	51,2
Single	158	48,8
Education Level	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Secondary school and its under	17	5,2
High school	44	13,6
Undergraduate	142	43,8
Bachelor	103	31,8
Master or Doctoral Degree	18	5,6
Trekking Experience	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
< 1year	98	30,2
1-5 years	135	41,7
6-10 years	59	18,2
> 11 years	32	9,9
Participation Frequency	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
once a year	87	26,9
3 or 4 times a year	135	41,7
once a month	54	16,7
3 or 4 times a month	48	14,8
Participating Partner	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
alone	42	13,0
with family members	85	26,2
with friends	197	60,8

(n=324)

With a view to determining whether there occurs a difference between six dimensions of trekking participating motivation and gender and marital status, “Independent Sample T-test” was used. The next two tables demonstrate only the dimensions in which significant differences have been observed among the groups in question. Table 3 displays a significant difference between the dimensions of motivation- escape pressures, achievement/stimulation, learning-and gender in favor of female participants.

Table 3.DifferencesBetween Motivation and Gender

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Escape Pressures	Female	150	4,7211	,29969	4,571	31,904	,000
	Male	174	4,4008	,81154			
Achievement	Female	150	3,9272	,77254	2,150	2,590	,032
	Male	174	3,7269	,88760			
Learning	Female	150	4,0154	,71328	2,225	6,002	,027
	Male	174	3,8103	,91390			

p<0,05

Table 4 reveals a significant difference between achievement/stimulation, introspection & development, togetherness, enjoy nature dimensions and participants’ marital status. Thus, the average values of the married participants are higher than those who are single in terms of the dimensions of achievement/stimulation, introspection & development; enjoy nature, while no significant difference has been identified between togetherness and marital status.

Table 4.DifferencesBetween Motivation and Marital Status

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Achievement	Married	198	3,9085	,79664	2,401	,598	,017
	Single	126	3,6801	,89179			
Introspection	Married	198	3,8687	,85472	2,714	7,516	,007
	Single	126	3,5873	,99011			
Togetherness	Married	198	3,5606	,87593	-3,596	4,494	,000
	Single	126	3,9016	,75815			
Enjoy Nature	Married	198	3,0960	,98339	3,362	2,573	,001
	Single	126	2,7381	,85021			

p<0,05

The differences between six dimensions of trekking participation motivation levels in terms of age, education level, trekking experience, participation frequency, participating partner have been analyzed through ANOVA and Scheffe's post hoc. The following four tables present the dimensions in which significant differences occur among the groups in question.

Table 5. Differences Between the Dimensions and Age Group

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Age Groups</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. deviation</i>	<i>F value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Achievement	A 15-24	3,9886	,79919	4,371	,002	D < A and B
	B 25-34	3,9472	,76676			
	C 35-44	3,8009	,77006			
	D 45-54	3,4125	1,08953			
	E 54over	3,6571	,58928			
Enjoy Nature	A 15-24	3,1524	1,05361	6,340	,000	D < A and C
	B 25-34	3,1434	,88519			
	C 35-44	2,9562	,93149			
	D 45-54	2,4514	,69272			
	E 54over	2,4762	1,00183			

p<0,05

According to Table 5, a significant difference has been determined between participants' age and their trekking participation motivation dimensions Achievement/ stimulation (F: 4,371; p <0.05) and Enjoy Nature (F: 6,340; p <0.05). Post hoc tests have revealed that "achievement/ stimulation" ensures significantly higher levels of motivation to participants in the 45-54 age groups than those in 15-24 and 25-34 age groups in trekking activities. On the other, "Enjoy Nature" has been found to motivate participants in the 15-24 and 35-44 age groups much more than in the 45-54 age groups.

Table 6. Differences Between Dimensions and Trekking Experience

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. deviation</i>	<i>F value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Escape Pressures	A < 1year	4,5454	,54318	2,978	,032	B > C
	B 1-5 years	4,6391	,49580			
	C 6-10 years	4,3401	1,00138			
	D > 11 years	4,5660	,62686			
Introspection	A < 1year	3,6769	,94579	3,150	,025	D > C
	B 1-5 years	3,8395	,78528			
	C 6-10 years	3,5367	1,05230			
	D > 11 years	4,0833	1,00179			
Togetherness	A < 1year	3,7117	,79816	3,462	,017	B > C
	B 1-5 years	3,8138	,84223			
	C 6-10 years	3,3939	,92299			
	D > 10years	3,6797	,77051			

p<0,05

ANOVA test results have shown a difference between the dimensions of motivation; escape pressures (F: 2,978; p <0.05), introspection & development (F: 3,150; p <0.05) and togetherness in terms of participants' trekking experience (Table 6.). Post hoc results have concluded that escape pressures and together ness motivate those who have 1-5 experience to participate in trekking much more than those who have less than 1 year participation

experience. In addition, participants with more than 10 years of participation experience are more motivated than those with 6-10 years of participation experience due to introspection & development.

As shown in Table 7., there is a significant relationship between the dimensions of escape pressure (F: 5,197; $p < 0.05$) and learning (F: 6,325; $p < 0.05$); the scores of the individuals who participate in trekking 3-4 in a year are significantly higher than those participation once a year depending upon escape pressures, whereas as for the learning dimension, the average scores of individuals participating in trekking once a month are significantly higher than those once a year and 3-4 times a month.

Table 7. Difference Between Dimensions and Participation Frequency

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. deviation</i>	<i>F value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Escape Pressures	A once a year	4,3314	,75146	5,197	,002	B > A
	B 3-4 times a year	4,6731	,46209			
	C once a month	4,5494	,92294			
	D 3-4 times a month	4,5947	,38486			
Learning	A once a year	3,7672	,84547	6,325	,000	C > A and D
	B 3-4 times a year	3,9375	,76661			
	C once a month	4,2778	,85598			
	D 3-4 times a month	3,6458	,82648			

p<0,05

Significant differences have been found in all of motivation factors depending upon the participation partner. "escape pressures" and learning have been determined to provide less motivation for individuals who participate in trekking with family compared to those participating alone or with friends. Participants who go trekking alone are more motivated than those with friends thanks to through achievement/ stimulation; introspection & development motivates single attendants much more than those participating with family; enjoy nature motivates those who join with their friends more than with their family. In addition, participants who join alone or with their friends are more motivated than those joining with their family members in terms of learning.

Table 8. Differences Between the Dimensions and Participating Partner

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Groups</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. deviation</i>	<i>F value</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Escape Pressures	A alone	4,8333	,22391	8,676	,000	B < A and C
	B with family	4,3483	1,00419			
	C with friends	4,5751	,46219			
Achievement	A alone	4,1259	,69517	3,258	,040	A > C
	B with family	3,7869	,91865			
	C with friends	3,7685	,82439			
Introspection	A alone	3,5714	1,11478	6,625	,002	C > B
	B with family	3,5137	1,10381			
	C with friends	3,9052	,74386			
Togetherness	A alone	3,4643	,64053	4,237	,015	B > A
	B with family	3,8954	,95205			
	C with friends	3,6548	,82384			
Learning	A alone	4,2202	,56902	3,636	,027	B < A and C
	B with family	3,8212	,91450			
	C with friends	3,8744	,83055			
Enjoy Nature	A alone	2,9762	1,17884	10,187	,000	C > B
	B with family	2,5765	,80242			
	C with friends	3,1168	,91002			

p<0,05

As a result of ANOVA analysis; no significant difference has been determined in any of the participation motivation factors based upon the educational status of the participants.

CONCLUSION

The effect of motivation not only leads to a better understanding of tourists, but also provides useful information about the design of tourist activities and probable destination. In spite of numerous studies having been conducted regarding the motivation of tourists, there have been few studies about nature based tourism participant especially trekking participant, which is a kind of nature- based tourism.

This study has explored the demographic characteristics and motivational factors of trekking participants in Adana Province in Turkey. The participants were found to be mostly male, married, middle ages, well educated, 1-5 years trekking experience, participate 3 or for times and with friends. The research has used a scale, the scale created by choosing the items that are deemed appropriate for trekking participants on Driver's (1983) "Recreation Experience Preference" scale. The scale was determined to be reliable in measuring the motivations of the participants ($\alpha = 935$). Domain motivation factors were also found, namely; escape(1) pressure (\square :4,55) , (2) achievement/ stimulation (\square :3,82), (3) introspection and development (\square :3,76), (4) togetherness (\square :3,69), (5) learning (\square :3,91) and (6) enjoy nature (\square :2,96). It is evident that the dimensions are generally overlapped with those founded in previous studies (Rosenthal, Driver & Waldman, 1982; Driver, 1983; Manfredi, Driver & Tarrant, 1996; Pintrich, 2000; Ibrahim & Cordes, 2002; Brehm&Tittlbach, 2010; Ardahan&Mert, 2013). The strongest motivating factor of the participants was identified to be Escape Pressure. Especially those people who live in a big city like Adana, have become motivated for travelling as tourists to wilderness areas since they need to escape from an artificial, monotonous environment. One of the interesting research is that the enjoy nature dimension is the least important factor in motivating people for trekking activity.

T-test and one way ANOVA test results have suggested that motivating factors for participating in trekking activities significantly differ depending on demographic characteristics. This result is parallel to some earlier studies (Kalkan, 2012; Ekinci,2012). Significant difference has been determined between the dimensions of motivation- escape pressures, achievement/stimulation, learning-and gender; between achievement/stimulation, introspection&development, togetherness, enjoy nature dimensions and participants' marital status; between participants' age and their trekking participation motivation dimensions achievement/ stimulation and enjoy nature. ANOVA test results have also shown a difference in the dimensions of motivation escape pressures, introspection & development and togetherness in terms of participants' trekking experience; between the dimensions of "escape pressure (F: 5,197; p <0.05 and learning (F: 6,325; p <0.05 ") and participation frequency and between the dimensions of escape pressure, learning and participating partner.

While the future of the trekking tourism segment has many challenges, including carrying capacities, environmental fragility and limitations, and climate change, the segment is equally ripped with opportunities for growth. Taking into consideration the motivation factors, the practitioners, are recommended that they determine appropriate marketing strategies and arrange their marketing mix accordingly. In addition, tour leaders, who play a major role in the implementation phase of trekking activity, are also important in terms of the satisfaction of the needs of the participants and the success of the activity, knowing and taking into account the motivations and differences of the participants.

The sample includes only the province of Adana, which is among the limitations of this study. Others are that the study period covers only spring activities and trekking is only one of the activities carried out within nature tourism. Future research may be done in different destinations about other types of nature- based activities and covering all periods of the year.

REFERENCES

- Ardahan, F. (2011). *The profile of the turkish mountaineers and rock climbers: The reasons and the carried benefits for attending outdoor sports and life satisfaction level*. 8'th International Conference Sport and Quality of Life, Brno/Czech Republic.
- Ardahan, F. & Mert, M. (2013a). The validity and reliability of motivational factors scale and the benefits scale of participating in trekking activities for Turkish population. *Journal of Human Sciences*.10 (2), 338-355.

- Ardahan, F. & Mert, M. (2013b). The validity and reliability of motivational factors scale and the benefits scale of participating in mountaineering activities for turkish population. *The Online Journal of Recreation and Sport*, 2, 49-63.
- Brehm, W. & Tittlbach S. (2010). *Outdoor sports motivation study: Why do people take part in outdoor activities?. Research report*. Friedrichshafen: Messe Outdoor.
- Ibrahim, H., & Cordes, K.A., (2002). *Outdoor recreation, enrichment for a lifetime*. 2. Edt., IL: Sagamore Pub.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals Of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Deci, L. & Ryan, M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Driver, B. L. (1983). *Master list of items from Recreation Experience Preference scales and domain*. Unpublished document. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station.
- Eagles, P.F. & Cascagnette, J.W. (1995) Canadian ecotourists: Who are they?. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 20(1): 22-28.
- Ekinci, E., Yenel, F. & Sarol, H. (2012). *Doğa yürüyüşlerine katılım motivasyon ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması*. I. Rekreasyon Araştırmaları Kongresi: 222 – 228.
- Eryılmaz, G. & Akgündüz, Y. (2017). Bireyleri rekreatif faaliyetlere yönelten motive edici faktörler. *Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research*, 4 (1), 13-26.
- Esichaikul, R. (2012). Travel motivations, behavior and requirements of European senior tourists to Thailand. *PASOS, Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural*, 10.2 47-58.
- Graefe, A. R., Thapa, B., Confer, J. J., & Absher, J. D. (2000). *Relationships between trip motivations and selected variables among Allegheny National Forest visitors*. USDA Forest Service Proceedings, RMRS-P-15, 4: 107-112.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin B. J. & Anderson R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective*. Boston: Pearson.
- Hsu, C.H. C. & Huang S. (2008). Travel motivation: a critical review of the concept's development. *Tourism management: analysis, Behaviour & Strategy*, 14-27.
- Huang, S. S. (2009). Measuring tourism motivation: Do scales matter?. *Tourismos: An International Multidisciplinary Journal of Tourism*, 5 (1): 153-162
- Iso-Ahola, S.E. (1982). "Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256-262.
- Kalkan, A. (2012). *Açık alan rekreasyonu, doğa sporları yapan bireylerin bu sporları yapma nedenleri: Antalya örneği*. Unpublished Master Thesis. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Antalya
- Karmakar, M. (2011). Eco tourism and its impact on the regional economy – A study of North Bengal (India). *Tourismos*, 6, (1), 251-270.
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L. & Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: A meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 28, 188-213.
- Mannell, R. C. & Kleiber, D. A. 1997. *The social psychology of leisure*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- McIntosh, R.W. & Goeldner, C.R. (1986). *Tourism: principles, practices and philosophies*. 5th ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons,
- Morgan, M. J. J., & Summers, J. (2005). *Sports marketing*. Australia: Cengage Learning.
- Mountinho L, (2000). *Strategic management in tourism*. New York: CABI Pub.

- Nath, A., Saha, P. & Oklevik, O. (2016). *Exploring motives and segments in nature based tourism: A pilot study in glacier tourism in Norway*. Global Conference on Business and Finance Proceedings. 11 (2):20-27
- Oxford Dictionary. (2017). <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/trekking> (Accessed, 12.05.2017)
- Pintrich, P.R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology. *Theory and Research. Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 92–104.
- Ryan, C. (1991). *Recreational tourism: A social science perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
- Rosenthal, D. H., Driver, B. L. & Waldman, D. (1982). Construct validity of instruments measuring recreationists' preferences. *Leisure Sciences*. 5, 89-108.
- Różycki, P., & Dryglas, D. (2014). Trekking as a phenomenon of tourism in the modern world. *Acta Geoturistica*, 5(1), 24-40.
- Sanchez, M. (2005). *Tourism: Leisure and recreation*. New Delhi: Global Printer.
- Subbiah, K. & Kannan, S. (2012) The management strategies of ecotourism development in Papua New Guinea. *International Journal of Economics Business and Management Studies*, 1(3), 114-120.
- Villalobos-Céspedes, D., Galdeano-Gómez, E., & Tolón-Becerra, A. (2012). International demand for nature-based tourism in Costa Rica: Socio-demographic and travel indicators. *Tourismos*, 7(1), 269-287.