



Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research

Journal home page: www.jrtr.org

ISSN:2148-5321

DESTINATION BASED PULL AND PUSH FACTORS: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Sezer KARASAKAL^a

Aslıhan DURSUN^b

^a Antalya Bilim Üniversitesi, Turizm Fakültesi, Antalya, Türkiye (sezer.karasakal@antalya.edu.tr)

^b Antalya Bilim Üniversitesi, Turizm Fakültesi, Antalya, Türkiye (aslihan.dursun@antalya.edu.tr)

EXTENSIVE SUMMARY

Pizam et al. (1979) defined travel motivation as “a set of needs and attitudes which predisposes a person to act in a specific touristic goal-directed way”. Many different approaches have been adopted by the scholars to explain tourist motivation, namely, needs of hierarchy (Maslow, 1970), sunlust and wonderlust (Gray, 1970), escape and seeking (personal escape, personal seeking, interpersonal escape, and interpersonal seeking) (Iso-Ahola, 1982), micro and macro approaches (Jamal and Lee, 2003), travel career ladder (Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983) and push-pull factors (Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979). The push-pull theory provides a useful approach for examining the motivations underlying travel behavior (Dann, 1977; Klenosky, 2002). Push factors have intangible aspects that push a tourist away from home while pull factors have tangible components pulling tourists towards the destination.

In this study, the authors reviewed the literature on pull and push motivation factors for destinations, and determined the most common factors by visitor nationality and preferred destination. During the examination of motivation dimensions; we considered together the tourist nationality with push factors and the destination preferences with pull factors. According to the results of our literature review, we can conclude that the most common push factors are escape, relaxation, novelty, socialization, information seeking, prestige, family/friends togetherness and ego enhancement while the most common pull factors are historical areas, natural beauties, activities, culture, security, weather/climate, shopping, economy and cleanliness.

The most common factor “escape” was shown up as a push factor in nationalities such as: American (Crompton, 1979), Australian (McGehee et al., 1996), British (Jang and Cai, 2002), Taiwanese (Kao et al., 2008), Chinese (Wu and Pearce, 2014), Indian (Kanagaraj and Bindu, 2013), Vietnamese (Linh, 2015) and Iranian (Nikjoo and Ketabi, 2015). On the other hand, one of the most common pull factors “natural beauty” was found as an attractiveness of Turkey and Thailand while “safety” was found as an important attractiveness of Egypt, Jordan, Malaysia, Vietnam, Bangladesh and Turkey.

The results of this study provide guidance to figure out which attractiveness factors differentiate Turkey among its competitors in the Mediterranean region and to find out which nationalities can be targeted as alternative markets. For instance, according to the literature review, the distinctive attraction factors of two main competitors of Turkey (Kavacık vd., 2012) are found as prestige and rich cuisine for France (Prayag and Hosany, 2014) and beautiful beaches and business opportunities for Egypt (Ayadi and Shujun, 2012). On the other hand, the outstanding pull factors found for Turkey are natural beauties, culture, historical areas, warm hospitality and

economy. In this context Turkey differs from these two competing destinations with “hospitality and economy” factors. Moreover, Australian (McGehee et al., 1996) and Chinese tourists (Ayadi and Shujun, 2012) appear to travel with motivation to learn about different cultures. Thus, "culture" as an attractiveness of Turkey can draw these two nationalities' attention. Consequently, highlighting the distinctive features of the destinations in marketing efforts under push and pull motivation basis can provide a competitive advantage.