

A SUBCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF TOURISM MOTIVATIONS

Abstract

Culture has been proposed by marketing theorists as one of the underlying determinants of consumer behavior. This trend necessitates cross-cultural inquiries in tourism. However, investigations into tourism motivation are scarce and have only used nationality or ethnicity as proxies to define culture. The study reported here aimed to fill this gap. Three subcultural groups were identified based on the grid–group cultural theory and their cross-cultural differences and similarities in tourism motivations were examined. It was revealed that in the grid–group dichotomy of cultural types, the dimension of group had a greater influence on individuals' tourism motivation than grid. The theoretical contributions and limitations of this study are discussed and future studies are proposed.

Keywords: tourism motivation; cross-cultural research; grid–group cultural theory

Tourism motivation has long been conceptualized in the literature and is central to understanding tourist behavior. Because the underlying reasons as to why people travel are difficult to understand, many scholars have studied this topic and substantial progress has been achieved (e.g., Dann, 1981; Pearce & Lee, 2005; Plog, 1974). Nevertheless, a review of the literature on tourism motivation revealed that culture, a critical element that shapes the identity and behavioral preferences of individuals, has not been fully addressed, although some investigators have indicated the importance of incorporating it into such studies.

Culture—defined as a set of beliefs or standards shared by a group of people (Goodenough, 1971)—is widely accepted by marketing theorists to be one of the underlying

determinants of consumer behavior, including that of tourists. It encompasses elements such as shared values, beliefs, and norms, which collectively distinguish particular groups of people from others (Pizam, Jansen-Verbeke, & Steel, 1997). These widely shared values are subtly inculcated into individuals from an early age (Otaki, Durrett, Richards, Nyquist, & Pennebaker, 1986) and are resistant to change (Hofstede, 1997). The incorporation of culture into the study of tourism motivation is therefore more crucial than ever. However, most previous studies of tourism have used nationality as a proxy for culture (e.g., Y. Lee, Kim, Seock, & Cho, 2009). Although these studies have contributed enormously to understanding the increasingly diversified tourism market, the use of nationality as the sole surrogate for cultural affiliation has been criticized as underestimating the role of cultural dimensions or contextual factors that cause such differences (Earley & Singh, 1985). The current study was therefore designed to address this gap using the grid–group cultural theory, which asserts that there are only four types of culture based on two fundamental dimensions of sociality: the group and the grid. The four major social types are labeled as Individualist, Fatalist, Hierarchist, and Egalitarian. Individuals with different lifestyles have distinctive personal identities and behavior. More specifically, the study aimed to achieve two research objectives: to delineate the primary tourism motivations of individuals of each social type and to identify the differences and similarities in tourism motivation among the four social types. A qualitative approach was adopted using data collected from focus group discussions conducted in China. The study results are expected to provide a culturally based understanding of tourism motivation.

Literature review

Tourism Motivation

Motivation is considered to be the cause of human behavior (Mook, 1996) and is a state of need or a condition that drives an individual to employ certain actions to satisfy these needs. The study of tourism motivation is the basis of any effort to obtain information on travel behavior and has therefore been an important topic in the leisure and tourism literature. However, why people travel is difficult to explore (Crompton, 1979) for four reasons (Dann, 1981): (a) the unwillingness of tourists to reflect on real travel motives, (b) their inability to reflect on real travel motives, (c) their unwillingness to express real travel motives, and (d) their inability to express real travel motives.

Acknowledging the difficulty in and the importance of understanding tourism motivation, many investigators have studied this topic and substantial progress has been achieved. Several theories or models have been developed to guide the empirical study of tourism motivation, such as the push-pull (Dann, 1977), allocentric-psychocentric (Plog, 1974), escape-seeking (Dunn Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991), and travel career ladder (Pearce & Lee, 2005) models. Previous studies have covered a wide range of the spectrum, including the sociology of tourism motivation as a stimulator of actual behavior (Dann, 1977; Mansfeld, 1992), the development or empirical tests of tourism motivation measurements (e.g., Crompton, 1979), tourism motivation of different niche markets (e.g., Hsu, Cai, & Wong, 2007), differences in motivation among tourists of varied nationality and cultural background (e.g., S. Kim & Prideaux, 2005), the number of visits (Lau, 1988), the destinations and origins (Kozak, 2002), the sociodemographic characteristics of the tourists (e.g., S. Jang & Wu, 2006), or their attitude toward the environment (Luo & Deng, 2008). The relationships between tourism motivation and other behavioral constructs have been extensively explored, including

expectation (Hsu, Cai, & Li, 2010), perception (Li, Cai, Lehto, & Huang, 2010), and behavioral intention (Li & Cai, 2012). Motivation was also found to be extensively used as a means of dividing the tourist market into smaller but more meaningful segments (e.g., Beh & Bruyere, 2007).

However, many of these empirical studies were based on social psychological theories, which have been blamed for their failure to explain why individuals would choose to satisfy their needs through traveling rather than by other means such as family or religion, or why they choose one destination over another (Jamal & Lee, 2003; Ryan & Glendon, 1998). To address this, many sociologists have included tourism motivation in their studies (e.g., Rojek, 1995; Wang, 2000). In contrast with psychological perspectives, which suggest that human beings are born with basic innate needs and that travel provides alternatives to satisfy these needs when they experience disequilibrium in their need systems, sociological approaches emphasize the influence of the structure of society on an individual's travel behavior (Jamal & Lee, 2003). It is argued that tourism is not something given. It is rather socially and culturally produced, constructed, and generated (Wang, 2000).

Among the sociological models of motivation, a perusal of literature indicates that the distinction between push and pull factors has generally been accepted. The push-pull model was proposed by Dann in 1977. Dann noted that the push factors and the pull factors are presented in two stages in a travel decision. Push factors are internal to individuals, instill a desire for travel, and are aimed at satisfying various psychological needs. They refer to the factors that predispose an individual to travel. Pull factors, on the other hand, are external to the individual, stress benefits of particular destinations, and determine where, when, and how that person vacations. They are the factors that attract the tourist to a given destination.

In his study in exploring the push motives, Dann postulates that the underlying desires that urge people to travel include the need for getting away from the chaos of an individual's daily life, love and affection, social interaction, recognition from others, and ego-enhancement (Dann, 1981). Those needs or desires are in line with the different needs identified by Maslow in his hierarchy of needs framework. Internal in nature, however, the concept of "push" in the push-pull model is not a pure psychological one in that it includes the cultural and structural conditions of a society that push people to travel (Jamal & Lee, 2003). People seek the satisfaction of those needs through travel not only because they are intrinsic to human beings but also because people live in a society whose norm-governing interactions have lost their integrative force; therefore, people try to transcend the feeling of isolation and anomie in everyday life and to achieve social status as well. The push-pull concept has been the guideline for many tourism motivation studies (e.g., S. Jang, Yu, & Pearson, 2003; N. Kim & Chalip, 2004; Klenosky, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990), and a number of push and pull factors have been identified by the empirical studies such as escape (e.g., G. Lee, O'Leary, Lee, & Morrison, 2002), novelty/knowledge seeking (e.g., S. Jang et al., 2003), and enhancement of kinship (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Li & Cai, 2012) for push factors and natural or ecological resources (e.g., Battour, Battor, & Ismail, 2012; G. Lee et al., 2002), entertainment or sports activities (e.g., Battour et al., 2012; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994), and shopping (e.g., Battour et al., 2012; Sirakaya & McLellan, 1997) for pull factors.

The first sociological account of tourism appeared in Germany in 1930 (Cohen, 1984). Since then, several distinctive approaches or perspectives emerged (Wang, 2000), such as the Weberian (tourism as meaningful action and motivation; Dann, 1977, 1981), the Durkheimian (tourism as ritual and myth; Graburn, 1989; MacCannell,

1976), the Marxian (tourism as false consciousness and ideology; Thurot & Thurot, 1983), the structural–functional (tourism as social therapy; Krippendorf, 1987), the structural–conflictual (tourism as the conflict of interests between the Core and Periphery; Turner & Ash, 1975), the symbolic interactionist (tourism as communication of identity and as symbolic display of status; Brown, 1992), the phenomenological (tourism as experiences; Cohen, 1979), the feminist (tourism as gender inequality; Kinnaird & Hall, 1994), and the poststructuralist (tourism as sign, discourse, and representation; Dann, 1996).

One fundamental approach that sociologists apply to tourism is the contextualism of modernity, which argues that the study of the relationships between modernity and tourism is a central task of the sociology of tourism. According to this approach, tourism is a product of the modernity, and modernity has established its norms and mechanisms to regulate, by either constraining or releasing, the biological impulses or psychological needs of tourism. The formation of tourism is, therefore, not merely an issue of bio- or psychogenesis at the level of the individual but rather a matter of sociogenesis at the levels of society and culture (Wang, 2000).

Motivation is thus framed in a broad context of global structure and social changes. Any changes in the global environment, such as modernization, urbanization, and industrialization, may influence the needs and desires of individuals and their subsequent motivations (Burns & Holden, 1995; Wang, 2000). The influence of the global structure on motivation is affected more directly by the home environment of the individual. The modernization of society greatly changes people's lifestyle in that they tend to experience more fragmentation in their daily life. Interpersonal relationships also become more fragmented and less authentic (MacCannell, 1976). These changes result in anomie in the life of individuals, which forces them to

escape from their home environment and seek authenticity and self-enhancement at destination, through the experience of the products, services, and facilities provided there (Dann, 1981).

One of the elements of the home environment—culture—has been neglected in the study of tourism motivation. The behavior of individuals is a result of their cultural value system, which is developed over time as they are socialized into a particular group, and influenced by societal culture, as well as regional subculture and familial values (Luna & Gupta, 2001). The importance of incorporating cultural elements has been widely recognized in the study of consumer behavior (e.g., Douglas, 1997; Luna & Gupta, 2001). Because of the increasingly diversified and sophisticated behavior of tourists, the incorporation of cultural elements in the study of tourism motivation is critically needed.

Cross-Cultural Research of Tourism Motivation

In cross-cultural psychology terms, culture can be defined either etically or emically. From an etic approach, culture has been defined as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another” (Hofstede, 1997, p. 5). This definition focuses on the comparison of one culture with another and is typical for cross-cultural consumer behavior research. From the emic perspective, culture is defined as *the “lens” through which all phenomena are seen. It determines how these phenomena are apprehended and assimilated . . . culture is the “blueprint” of human activity. It determines the coordinates of social action and productive activity, specifying the behaviors and objects that issue from both.* (McCracken, 1988, p. 73)

Emic approaches promote a complete understanding of culture through vast description, instead of directly

comparing two or more different cultures. Therefore, studies from an emic perspective provide culture-rich information rather than culture-free measures that can be compared directly. The choice of etic versus emic approaches depends on the nature of the research question, the researcher's resources and training, and the purpose of the study (Luna & Gupta, 2001).

In the realm of cross-cultural consumer behavior research, the assessment of culture or the identification of a valid cultural grouping, which was identified as the vital issue of cross-cultural research by Rick, Toyne, and Martinez (1990), remains largely unexplored. In recognition of this, based on a review and evaluation of current culture assessment approaches, Lenartowicz and Roth (1999) identified four basic approaches to culture assessment: ethnological description (ED), use of proxies (regional affiliation), direct values inference (DVI), and indirect values inference.

The ethnological approach is used generically to refer to qualitative approaches used as a basis for identifying and/or comparing cultures and provides a descriptive appraisal of cultures and guides emic studies of culture. The second approach—the use of proxies or validated regional affiliation—defines culture based on the characteristics that reflect and resemble it (Lenartowicz & Roth, 1999). Common proxies include nationality, place of birth, and country of residence, which are widely adopted in business studies as they can easily be identified due to clear geographical boundaries. However, this approach has been criticized for the absence of measures to test hypothesized relationships between the dependent variables and culture.

DVI reflects the concept that culture is a set of learned characteristics shared by a particular group of people. A number of different value models in the literature support the DVI approach to cultural assessment, including Hofstede's five value dimensions of culture, the Rokeach Values Survey, and the List of Values. The indirect values inference uses

secondary data to ascribe the characteristics of cultural groups. Cultural characteristics identified in other studies are extrapolated to the subjects after their culture has been classified by one of the aforementioned proxies. The most commonly used benchmark is Hofstede's cultural dimension scores. The strengths and weaknesses of the four approaches were summarized by Lenartowicz and Roth (1999) and are given in Table 1.

Table 1
Summary of Methods to Assess

Method	Measures Provided	Major Weakness	Major Strengths
ED	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative measures are not developed • Time consuming 	Theoretical support
VRA	Nominal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confounding factors • Group identification 	Group identification Convenience
DVI	Internal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling • Confounding factors • Intellectual level of subjects • Group identification 	Internal measures
IVI	Interval	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary data • Potential measurement error 	Convenience

Note: DVI = direct value inference; ED = ethnographical description; IVI = indirect value inference; N/A = not applicable; VRA = validated regional affiliation.

Source: Adapted from Lenartowicz and Roth (1999).

An extensive review of the literature on cross-cultural tourism motivation revealed 18 articles, as shown in Table 2, five of which were related to event tourism. Questionnaire survey was the most widely adopted research method. Validated regional affiliation was adopted by 15 of the 18 studies, and the proxies used included nationality and language.

Two research gaps were identified from the review. (a) Cross-cultural research on tourism motivation has been hampered by the common use of nationality as a surrogate for cultural affiliation. The use of a collective cultural proxy as a discriminating variable to explain differences in tourist behavior actually assumes cultural homogeneity within a national or ethnic boundary, while the layers of culture have been overlooked. (b) Current studies are subject to a clear manifestation of severe ethnocentrism, which assumes that

the measures used will be universally applicable to other cultures. Many measurement scales used in studies of cross-cultural tourism motivation were developed in the United States and translated into local languages to measure the construct in culturally diverse groups. Whether the measurement used was interpreted in the same way in culturally diverse groups is still questionable.

Table 2
Cross-Cultural Motivation Studies

Study	Cultural Assessment	Research Topic	Research Design
C. Lee (2000)	VRA (nationality: Korea, Japan, America, Europe)	A comparison of event motivation between Caucasian and Asian visitors	Questionnaires survey of tourists at a festival in Korea (758)
You, O'Leary, Morrison, and Hong (2000)	IVI (Hofstede's cultural dimension: individualism versus collectivism)	Tourism motivation	Secondary data
C. Kim and Lee (2000)	DVI (Hofstede's cultural dimension: individualism versus collectivism)	Differences in tourism motivation between individualists and collectivists	Questionnaire survey of tourists (374)
Dewar, Meyer, and Li (2001)	VRA (nationality: China, Jordan, United States)	Motivation to visit the Harbin Ice Lantern and Snow Festival; determine the reliability of the instrument in different cultural festival situations	Questionnaire survey; the study conducted in China was compared with one carried out in the United States and Jordan

Kozak (2002)	VRA (nationality: United Kingdom, Germany)	Differences in motivation between tourists from the same country visiting two different geographical destinations, and across those from two different countries visiting the same destination	Questionnaire survey of tourists at two different destinations (Turkey and Mallorca; 1,872)
C. Lee, Lee, and Wicks (2004)	VRA (nationality: domestic and foreign)	Festival market segmentation based on motivation and segmentation difference across nationalities	Questionnaire survey of tourists (726)

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Study	Cultural Assessment	Research Topic	Research Design
Reisinger and Mavondo (2004)	VRA (nationality: United States, Australia)	Examine the relationships between major psychographic factors such as cultural values, personality, travel motivation, preferences for activities and lifestyle	Questionnaire survey of students (952)
Laing and Crouch (2005)	VRA (nationality: United States, United Kingdom, Australia)	Motivation of frontier tourists	Interviews with tourists (6)
S. Kim and Prideaux (2005)	VRA (nationality: United States, Australia, Japan, Mainland China, and Hong Kong)	Motivation, preferred tourist resources, length of planning before travelling, information sources used, and length of stay	Questionnaire survey of tourists (838)

Funk and Bruun (2007)	IVI (Hofstede's cultural clusters: degree of cultural similarity to Australia)	Sociopsychological and cultureeducation motivation for sport tourism	Questionnaire survey of tourists (239)
Rittichainuwat (2008)	VRA (nationality: Thai, Scandinavian)	Motivation of Thanatourism and response differences to disaster	In-depth interview and questionnaire survey of tourists (251)
Park, Reisinger, and Kang (2008)	VRA (regions: United States, Canada, South America, Europe, and Asia)	Motivation to attend a giant festival event	Questionnaire survey of tourists (475)
Jonsson and Devonish (2008)	VRA (nationality: United States, United Kingdom, Canada)	Differences in motivation across nationalities, genders, ages	Questionnaire survey of tourists (163)
Kay (2009)	VRA (language: English, Japanese, Chinese)	Motivation to attend a cultural event	Questionnaire survey of tourists (961)

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Study	Cultural Assessment	Research Topic	Research Design
Xu, Morgan, and Song (2009)	VRA (nationality: China, United Kingdom)	Travel motivation and preferred holiday activities of college student tourists	Questionnaire survey of students (523)
Dejtisak, Hurd, Elkins, and Schlatter (2009)	VRA (nationality: United States and non-United States)	Comparison between U.S. and international students' travel motivation (push/pull model)	Questionnaire survey of students (205)
Chand (2010)	VRA (nationality: India, United Kingdom, United States, Canada, France)	Motivational to travel to religious centers of India	Questionnaire survey of tourists (1,000)
Hudson, Wang, and Gil (2011)	VRA (nationality: United States, Canada, Spain)	Impact of film on destination image change and the motivation to travel	Quasi-experiment

Note: DVI = direct value inference; ED = ethnographical description; IVI = indirect value inference; VRA = validated regional affiliation.

Grid–Group Theory

The present study adopted a DVI approach (Lenartowicz & Roth, 1999) to identify a valid cultural grouping by using the grid–group cultural theory. The grid–group cultural theory is also known as grid–group analysis, cultural theory, or theory of sociocultural viability. It has been developed over the past 40 years through the work of the British anthropologists, Mary Douglas and Michael Thompson, the American political scientist, Aaron Wildavsky, and many others (Mamadouth, 1999). The grid–group cultural theory makes three basic claims.

The main claim is that what people do or want is culturally biased, or culture matters. Culture has a broad influence on the many dimensions of human behavior, and cultural orientation preconditions the attitude and actual behavior of individuals. Culture researchers argue that behavior differs from culture to culture because distinct cultural groups have different values (Legoharel, Dauce, Hsu, & Ranchhold, 2009).

The second claim is that it is possible to distinguish a limited number of cultural types, or to construct a typology of cultures, which includes viable combinations of patterns of social relations and patterns of cultural biases. Social relations and cultural biases reinforce one another, in that the cultural bias justifies the social relations, which in turn confirm the expectations raised by the cultural bias. These combinations are often referred to as (sub)cultures, ways of life or rationalities, ways of organizing, social orders, solidarities, political cultures, or simply types (Mamadouth, 1999). According to the grid–group theory, culture can be classified across two dimensions of sociality: individuation and social incorporation (Douglas, 1982). These two dimensions of sociality have been named group and grid. Group stands for incorporation into a bounded group (it is

strong when the individual is a member of one corporate group and weak when an individual does not belong to such a group), whereas grid refers to “the cross-hatch of rules to which individuals are subject in the course of their interaction” (Douglas, 1982, p. 192). Personal identity is determined by individuals’ relationships to groups, and personal behavior is shaped by social prescription.

The grid–group cultural theory also claims that the typology of viable combinations is universally applied because these two dimensions address “two central and eternal questions of human existence: who am I and how should I behave” (Schwarz & Thompson, 1990). This claim is based on the presumption that people derive a great many of their preferences, perceptions, opinions, values, and norms from their adherence to a certain way of organizing social relations, which is revealed by their preference for the two basic dimensions of social life: group (incorporation or boundedness) and grid (regulation or prescription).

The nature of the two dimensions has been the topic of many discussions, especially with regard to methodological issues. Mary Douglas distinguishes four elements for grid: insulation, autonomy, control, and competition (Douglas, 1978). Mars (1982) identifies autonomy, insulation, reciprocity, and competition to assess grid in a study of work crime. Gross and Rayner (1985) present a mathematical model for grid–group analysis, which includes four grid predicates: specialization, asymmetry, entitlement, and accountability. For the dimension of group, Mars (1982) includes frequency, mutuality, scope, and boundary, whereas Gross and Rayner (1985) identify five group predicates: proximity, transitivity, frequency, scope, and impermeability. In addition, many scholars focus on specific grid and group features relevant to their topics of research and select one specific predicate of grid and group. Such examples include fettered/unfettered competition (group) and symmetrical/asymmetrical transactions (grid;

Thompson, 1997), group strength and number and variety of prescriptions (Webber & Wildavsky, 1986), or preferred amount of group loyalty and preferred amount of prescription (Verweij, 1995).

Figure 1
Grid-Group Theory (Caulkins, 1999)

High Grid	<p>B. Fatalism</p> <p>Apathy, risk-averse</p> <p>Nature capricious</p> <p>Blame fate</p>	<p>C. Hierarchy</p> <p>Bureaucracy, decisions from above</p> <p>Nature perverse/tolerant</p> <p>Blame deviants</p>
Low Grid	<p>A. Individualism</p> <p>Free exchange, competition</p> <p>Risk is opportunity</p> <p>Nature benign</p> <p>Blame incompetence</p>	<p>D. Egalitarianism/enclave</p> <p>Sharing, concern with moral purity and boundaries against outsiders</p> <p>Nature is ephemeral</p> <p>Blame the system</p>
	Low Group	High Group

The two dimensions form four major social types, as shown in Figure 1. Each of these four quadrants supports a different cultural bias (Douglas, 1978). Blame, opportunity, risk, control, nature, and human agency are all conceived differently in the various quadrants. In a high-group context, individuals interact extensively within the group with clear and strong boundaries, whereas in a low-group context, persons interact in a relatively unbounded social network. According to Gross and Rayner (1985, p. 6), high grid occurs “whenever roles are distributed on the basis of explicit public classifications, such as sex, color, position in

hierarchy, holding a bureaucratic office, descent in a senior clan or lineage, or point of progression through an age-grade system,” whereas low grid is the “classificatory distinctions only weakly limit the range of social choices or activities open to people.”

Therefore, the theoretical model predicts four major ways of life with corresponding ideologies (Caulkins, 1999): Individualist (Type A), Fatalist (Type B), Hierarchist (Type C), and Egalitarian (Type D). Mary Douglas holds that the cultural bias is a permanent characteristic of a person. It may change over time but is hegemonic and applies to all domains in life. Therefore, it is logical to investigate the cultural biases of individuals because it will predict their attitudes and behaviors in a wide range of environments.

Type A is characterized by weak group incorporation and weak regulation or role prescriptions. In this type of social configuration, boundaries are provisional and are subject to negotiation. Individuals are relatively free from external constraints, whereas their ability to control others is a measure of their position in the network. Type A is justified by the pursuit of personal rewards in a competitive environment. Fairness consists of equality of opportunity, and blame is put on personal failure (or lack of competition). This type is labeled Individualism.

Type B is featured by weak group incorporation and binding prescription. Individuals in this social pattern are strictly constrained by external factors and have little influence on the way in which they live. Fairness does not exist and blame is put on fate. This type is called Fatalism.

Type C is characterized by strong group boundaries and binding prescriptions. Division of labor, differentiated roles, and hierarchical social relations are typical of this group. Fairness consists of equality before the law and blame is put on deviants who do not respect the established procedures. This type is labeled Hierarchy.

Type D describes a culture type with strong group boundaries and few regulations. Individuals in this social group share the same opposition to the outside world and are therefore closely bound. Fairness is equality of results and blame is put on the system. This type is called Egalitarianism. The grid–group analysis has been criticized by Asad (1979) and Boholm (1996) for its alleged reductionism and determinism. Anthropologist Tom Beidelman also challenged Douglas’s interpretations of the ethnographic evidence of the model by complaining that Douglas’s argument “nowhere provides detailed, complex analyses of how any particular society works” and her analyses were supported by an unsatisfactory grasp of ethnographic materials (Beidelman, 1993, p. 1066). Despite the criticisms, the grid–group cultural theory has been widely applied by an interdisciplinary variety of scholars including in interpretation of environmentalism (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982; Grendstad & Selle, 1997), perceptions of risk (Dake, 1991a), a critique of rational choice theory (Douglas & Ney, 1998), technology policy (Schwarz & Thompson, 1990), public administration (Hood, 1996), religious communities (Atkins, 1991), high-tech- nology firms (Caulkins, 1997), and work cultures (Mars & Nicod, 1984).

Two types of approach can be distinguished in dealing with measurement concepts for the cultural types. The first approach focuses on the analyses of small organizations or cultural groups (e.g., Gross & Rayner, 1985), using a combination of observational methods of concrete social behavior and attitude measures, and records a highly comprehensive picture of a social unit. This approach, however, is not applicable to large populations. Therefore, in the second approach, cultural aspects can be inferred in two ways by various cultural products or by aggregating individuals’ attitudes and value priorities (Rippl, 2002). The second approach dominates quantitative research on cultural theory today (e.g., Coughlin & Lockhart, 1998; Dake, 1991a,

1992), and among all the measurement scales developed, probably Dake's scale is the most widely adopted one (Rippl, 2002). Taking items from several instruments that were originally developed for measuring personal attitudes such as confidence in institutions, patriotism, authoritarianism, and law and order, Dake's measurement scale and its modified version has been used by several studies, including by Marris, Langford, and O'Riordan (1996); Peters and Slovic (1996); Palmer (1996); and Grendstad and Selle (1997).

Very limited applications were also found in the hospitality and tourism literature. On this basis, Houghton (1994) explained the organizational diversity in the hospitality industry by the cultural attributes of the markets to be catered for. Various domestic and outbound markets contrasted in terms of their cultural attributes, and strategies for product development, organizational structure, and branding were proposed.

Duval (2006) applied the grid-group cultural theory to explore the relationship between migration and tourism. A structured model was presented to suggest that this theory can be linked to the concept of temporary mobility and migration as a means to examine migrant behavior. The characteristics of four different types of migrant were described.

Fisher (2009) used the grid-group cultural theory to illustrate how a given individual can exhibit different behavioral patterns in a variety of situations within the context of tipping. The cross-cultural differences between tourists and host cultures at the destination area were also examined. The study suggested that it is more advantageous to use one typology that is applicable to both the hosts and guests. Because they were descriptive in nature, previous studies were only able to portray the characteristics of tourists in each dimension, but failed to validate the description by empirical data.

Methodology

For the purpose of this study, a focus group was selected as the most appropriate methodology, as it is “particularly useful for exploratory research where rather little is known about the phenomenon of interest” (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990, p. 15). Since the usefulness and validity of focus group data are affected by the extent to which participants feel comfortable sharing their ideas, views, or opinions, it is imperative to maintain pleasant group dynamics. The wealth of literature on group dynamics suggests that variables that influence participants’ comfort zone can be categorized as (a) the intrapersonal factor, which includes demographic, physical, and personality characteristics; (b) the interpersonal factor, which refers to the characteristics of group members relative to one another; and (c) the environmental factor, which represents the general pleasantness of the focus group setting.

To build a positive rapport among the participants and encourage participation, the focus group discussions were conducted in a congenial environment. Before focus groups were launched, a moderator’s guide was developed containing both semistructured and open-ended questions to encourage free expressions of participants’ thoughts and feelings. The moderators applied probing and paraphrasing to facilitate recalls and allow delayed responses. Questions were organized in two categories of participants’ actual travel behavior and their views and motivation of leisure travel.

Lenartowica and Roth (1999) proposed a framework for culture assessment suggesting a multimethod approach composed of Ethnological Description, Validated Regional Affiliation, and Direct Values Inference. According to the framework, qualitative anthropological and sociological studies should be used to provide “descriptive data that

delineate and detail cultural groupings and cultural characteristics” (Lenartowicz & Roth, 1999, p. 783). Therefore, China was selected as research site, because prior research in human geography provided strong evidence of the existence of distinct subcultures within the country (Eberhard, 1965; Hu, 2006; Morgan, 2000; Muensterberger, 1951).

The Validated Regional Affiliation method was followed to screen subjects for culture inclusion, and individuals living in the southern part of the country were selected. A total of 46 part-time students pursuing a master’s degree in Hospitality and Tourism Management in Hangzhou, Zhejiang province, were part of this study. This particular group of respondents was selected for four considerations:

(a) to control the effect from personality as previous studies proclaimed that there is a strong relationship between personality and vocational behavior including career choice (Tokar, Fischer, & Subich, 1998), (b) to control the socioeconomic variables of educational level, (c) to control previous travel experience as due to the nature of the profession most of the individuals in hospitality and tourism industry have extensive travel experience, and (d) the availability of the data as the researchers’ home university offers a master program in the city.

The Direct Value Inference was then adopted to assess the values. To ensure that respondents with similar social cultural type were placed into the same group, the grouping was made based on the survey results conducted before the focus group. The British edition of Dake’s cultural bias questionnaire was adopted to capture the participants’ cultural traits (Table 3). Although Dake’s scale does not provide direct measurement of grid and group, it has been widely employed by many studies (e.g., Marris, Langford, & O’Riordan, 1998) for grouping. The coding method of Caulkins (1999) was adopted to decide the relative positions of respondents in the matrix. The participants were first

asked to evaluate each of the 20 statements on a 1 to 7 Likert-type scale, in which 1 represented extremely disagree and 7 represented extremely agree. For each social type, participants' ratings were summed up and the participants were then grouped into the category in which they rated the highest.

The focus groups were conducted in China in 2010 by experienced researchers based on a preprepared research agenda that was distributed to the participants before the interviews. The participants were informed of the purpose of the study and were assured of confidentiality. The focus groups were conducted in Chinese. The moderators frequently reaffirmed answers from the participants. Each focus group took approximately 45 minutes. Summaries of the focus group interviews were transcribed from digital sound records.

Although the respondents were selected by convenient sampling, they had extensive travel experience in China. Each respondent was allowed to share his/ her opinion on each question, and other respondents could provide supplementary information. Discussions on a particular topic continued until no further new opinions were expressed, after which the interviewers proceeded to the next question. The combination of qualified respondents, experienced qualitative researchers, and valid interview questions, together with the depth of the data gathered, ensure the reliability, validity, and credibility of the interview results. The analysis and interpretation of the focus group transcripts were based on the grounded theory approach, which "uses a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 24). These procedures included the concurrent collection and analysis of data, the enhancement of theoretical sensitivity, three phases of coding, and the constant comparison of data chunks and emerging interpretations. The data were analyzed by two researchers separately. One researcher used the qualitative data analysis

software Atlas.ti5. Tools within the software enabled the creation of different categories, for which the relationships between them could be illustrated and consequently identified.

Another researcher began the data analysis by reading the transcript line by line as suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Theoretical sensitivity allowed the identification of substantive codes based on empirical data. Connections between the codes were identified through the process of theoretical coding and ultimately resulted in the production of major themes or categories. Coding lists were then compared after independent assessment to identify both similarities and differences. Discussions ensued and codes and categories were modified, trimmed, deleted or merged, elevated or demoted, and were finally agreed on. A record was kept of all coding levels to create an unbroken chain of evidence.

Findings

The coding method of Caulkins identified 16 Individualists, 9 Hierarchists, and 21 Egalitarians, who were divided into five groups: two representing Individualism (8 respondents each), one for Hierarchy, and two for Egalitarianism (10 and 11 respondents, respectively). According to Caulkins and Peters (2002), although all four types of cultural bias may be present in every sizable social organization or group, the types need not to be equal in strength or number of members. Therefore, the respondents can be considered as a group that is pre-dominantly, but not entirely, Egalitarians.

Twenty-seven of the participants were women and 19 were men; 19 were aged 25 to 34 years, 17 were aged 35 to 44 years, 5 were aged 20 to 24 years, and 3 were aged 45 to 54 years. Among the 33 participants who reported their monthly taxable income, 13 claimed to earn RMB 10,000 (US\$1,600) or above, three earned RMB 8,000-9,999 (US\$1,280-1,599), and the remainder (17) earned less than RMB 7,999

(US\$1,279). The respondents' profile is shown in Table 4. Chi-square tests were conducted to examine the single-dimensional relationship between respondents' cultural bias and their sociodemographic characteristics. There is no particular pattern for each cultural group, as indicated by the nonsignificant chi-square in Table 4.

Results of the analysis were categorized into 10 themes: Escape and Relax, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences, Business, Child Education, Knowledge, Relationship and Family Togetherness, Natural Scenery, Self-development, Shopping, and Nostalgia. The motivations as well as the number of times they were mentioned are shown in Table 5.

Escape and Relax was mentioned most frequently by participants in all five groups ($n = 30$). Tourism was considered as a means of relaxation, refreshment, and escape from the usual environment/crowds/work pressure. This motivation was mentioned 12 times by Egalitarians, 11 times by Hierarchists, and 7 times by Individualists. Differences between respondents were identified for various cultural traits: Individualists treat tourism more as a means to relieve pressure, Hierarchists travel more for relaxation, whereas Egalitarians regard tourism as a means to escape from work and crowds. This can be best illustrated by the following responses.

Table 4
Profile of Respondents ($N = 46$)

	Individualists	Hierarchists	Egalitarians	Chi-Square
Gender				0.581
Male	8 (50.0%)	4 (44.4%)	7 (33.3%)	
Female	8 (50.0%)	5 (55.6%)	14 (66.7%)	
Age (years)				0.623
20-24	1 (6.3%)	2 (22.2%)	2 (4.8%)	
25-34	8 (50.0%)	2 (22.2%)	9 (42.9%)	
35-44	6 (37.5%)	5 (55.6%)	6 (28.6%)	
45-54	1 (6.3%)	0	2 (9.5%)	
Monthly income				0.391
<US\$1,279	7 (43.8%)	3 (33.3%)	7 (33.3%)	
US\$1,279-1,599	1 (6.3%)	0	2 (9.5%)	
>US\$1,600	2 (12.5%)	5 (55.5%)	6 (28.6%)	

Table 5
Tourism Motivations Identified From
Focus Group discussions

Motivation	Individualist	Hierarchist	Egalitarian	Total
Relax and Escape	7a	11a	12a	30
Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences	6a	6a	9a	21
Business	10a	3	2	15
Child Education	4	3	5a	12
Knowledge	2	4	5a	11
Relationship and Family Togetherness	3	6a	1	10
Natural Scenery	2	3	2	7
Self-development	3	2	0	5
Shopping	1	2	1	4
Nostalgia	3	0	0	3

a. Top three motivations.

Travel helps to give me relief from the pressures of work and family. (Individualism)

I like destinations that make me relax. This is the primary reason why I travel. (Hierarchism)

I just want to be in a very quiet place, such as a small bamboo forest or a little thatched cottage that is only equipped with basic facilities, for me to maintain my life. I want to be isolated from people. (Egalitarianism)

Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences was mentioned 21 times by all respondents: 9 Egalitarians, 6 Individualists, and 6 Hierarchists. Four subthemes were identified in this category: different landscapes, mystery, exploration and adventure, and visiting places never visited before. Most respondents in the Individualism group travel to places with different natural landscapes (“To experience the thrill brought about by diverse natural landscapes,” “To experience completely different natural landscapes”). Respondents in the Hierarchism group tend to travel for mysterious experiences, or to explore

I yearn for mysterious places such as Tibet or Xinjiang where I can explore. For me, tourism is a way to explore the world, regardless of whether or not the destination is famous. Besides the thrills of natural scenery, I can also meet people who are completely different from those in my daily life.

For respondents in the Egalitarianism group, mysterious experiences as well as visiting places they have never been are important motivations (“I want to travel to places I have never been”).

The third most frequently mentioned tourism motivation was Business (n = 15). Most of the participants mentioned that due to the tight work commitment they can hardly schedule

any trip for pure pleasure purposes therefore can only travel during business trips (“I traveled a lot last year . . . for business”) or to the peripheral areas of business trip destinations (“I did not travel much last year, except for some business trips to Shenzhen, Zhuhai, and Foshan. I only visited some attractions after work”). This motivation was mentioned by more participants in the Individualism group (n = 10) than in the Hierarchism (n = 3) and Egalitarianism (n = 2) groups.

Another tourism motivation that was repeatedly invoked by participants was Child Education (n = 12). Many respondents travel to places where their children wish to go (“We went to Harbin last year because my daughter wanted to go. She went to ski and the whole family accompanied her”) or travel to provide their children with opportunities of exposure (“I have taken my kid traveling every year since he was five. It was not intended to entertain him, but to expose him to different environments and give him more chance to learn”). This motivation was mentioned five times by Egalitarians, four times by Individualists, and three times by Hierarchists. Respondents in the cultural group of Egalitarianism treat tourism more as an opportunity for their children to learn and to gain experience than those in other groups.

Knowledge was another tourism motivation mentioned frequently by participants (n = 11). Respondents exhibit some differences, in that Egalitarians travel to widen their horizons and to increase their knowledge in general (“I travel to widen my horizon . . . and to experience other people’s lives”); Hierarchists travel to experience other cultures and customs (“I want to visit Yunnan because I am interested in the ethnic culture there”); and Individualists travel for religious reasons (“I like the peaceful and solemn feeling of the sacred mountain”) or to understand the current state of the country (“Because I want to know more about the current

state of our country, to see with my own eyes how people live in the western part of the country”).

Another tourism motivation raised by 10 respondents was Relationship and Family Togetherness. Participants in all three types indicated that travel was a means of strengthening family ties or networking. This motivation was mentioned three times by Individualists, six times by Hierarchists, and twice by Egalitarians. This can be best illustrated by the following responses.

I normally travel with my family to enhance the kinship, because we are all very busy and travel provides us with an opportunity to be together. (Hierarchism)

I like being a backpacker because I can make more friends when I travel. (Egalitarianism)

Seven participants mentioned that they travel to appreciate the beauty of nature (Natural Scenery). Although Individualists are more likely to be attracted by seaside destinations (“I like blue sky and blue sea”), Hierarchists and Egalitarians tend to travel to remote and unspoiled areas such as Tibet and Xinjiang (“I am always thrilled by natural scenery. I feel human beings are extremely frail in nature”). This motivation was mentioned twice by Individualists, three times by Hierarchists, and twice by Egalitarians.

Shopping was mentioned by some female respondents as a tourism motivation to travel to a metropolis such as Shanghai or Hong Kong: “There were several women in the group, so we went to Hong Kong to do some shopping.” One respondent in the Individualism, two in the Hierarchism, and one in the Egalitarianism groups referred to this motivation during the focus group discussion.

Three respondents in Individualism and two in Hierarchism groups indicated Self-development as their tourism motivation. However, the two groups differed, in that Individualists travel for educational purposes (“Because I

was a major in English . . . I thought that, as Shanghai is the most developed metropolis in China, the travel experience would benefit my career, so I decided to visit Shanghai”), whereas Hierarchists travel to enrich themselves (“Life is short. I want to travel to as many places as possible to gain experience and to enrich my mind”).

Nostalgia was identified as a unique tourism motivation by participants in the Individualism group ($n = 3$). This can be illustrated by the following response: “Taiwan is very attractive to us because there are a lot of people from my home town who now live in Taiwan. So I want to see what Taiwan really looks like.”

Discussion

A total of 10 motivational factors were identified from the above analysis. They are in general consistent with most previous empirical studies on tourism motivation (e.g., Devesa, Laguna, & Palacios, 2010; S. S. Jang, Bai, Hu, & Wu, 2009) and can be categorized along the push–pull dichotomy with 7 push factors (Escape and Relax, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences, Child Education, Knowledge, Relationship and Family Togetherness, Self-development, and Nostalgia) and three pull factors (Business, Natural Scenery, and Shopping). Among the 10 motivations, Child Education was identified as a unique tourism motivation by the participants. This motivation was mentioned a total of 12 times and ranked fourth among the 10 motivations. Respondents in all three cultural groups expect that tourism will expand their children’s knowledge base and broaden their horizons.

Child Education was regarded as an important tourism motivation for two reasons. First, according to Hofstede (1980), the Chinese are considered to be highly orientated toward the long term and emphasize the dimensions of learning within leisure behavior; as the old Chinese saying states, “In order to attain wisdom, it is not enough merely to read

books, you must be well traveled as well” (du wan juan shu xing wan li lu). The second reason is that due to the family control policy implemented in 1979, and also the constantly increasing cost of child rearing, many couples choose to have only one child and investment in child education is deemed necessary by many parents.

Some differences were detected between the three types of subculture, in that the top three motivations for Individualists are Business, Escape and Relax, and Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences; those for Hierarchists are Escape and Relax, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences/Relationship and Family, and Knowledge; while those for Egalitarians are Relax and Escape, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences, and Child Education/Knowledge. There is also one unique motivation for Individualists—Nostalgia—which depicts the willingness to return to where their elders lived.

Further investigations into each motivation dimension (Table 6) found that participants were relatively consistent with regard to the tourism motivations of Business, Child Education, Relationship and Family Togetherness, and Shopping. Some differences were identified in those of Escape and Relax, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences, Knowledge, Natural Scenery, and Self-development between respondents of different cultural groups.

Table 6
differences in Tourism Motivation by
Cultural Type

Motivation	Individualist	Hierarchist	Egalitarian
Escape and Relax	Relieve pressure	Relax	Escape
Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences	Natural landscape	Mysterious experience Exploration and adventure	Mysterious experience New destination

Knowledge	Religion	Culture and custom	Broaden horizons
	Get to know the country		Increase knowledge
Natural Scenery	Seaside scenery	Remote and unspoiled area	Remote and unspoiled area
Self-development	Education	Self-enrichment	

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, respondents in the Hierarchism and Egalitarianism groups are more similar in terms of tourism motivation than those in the Individualism group. More specifically, for individuals in Hierarchism and Egalitarianism, tourism represents more of an escape-oriented activity because respondents in both cultural groups rated *Escape and Relax* highest. This finding furthers the understanding of Iso-Ahola's Escape-Seeking theory in that it partially answers the central question of "their (seeking and escaping) relative importance for certain groups of individuals and for certain conditions remains to be determined" (Iso-Ahola, 1982, p. 259) through empirical results.

Moreover, individuals in Hierarchism and Egalitarianism also show similarities in the subdimensions of Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences and Natural Scenery. While Individualists are more likely to be motivated by the urge to visit different landscapes, Hierarchists and Egalitarians are more strongly attracted by mysterious/adventurous experiences at a destination where they have never been. With respect to the motivation of appreciating natural scenery, Individualists prefer seaside scenery, whereas Hierarchists and Egalitarians favor unspoiled places in remote areas.

The above findings imply that in the grid-group dichotomy of cultural types, the dimension of group exerts greater influences on an individual's tourism motivation than the dimension of grid, as both Hierarchism and Egalitarianism are in the high-group continuum. According to the grid-group cultural theory, the dimension of group relates to the

degree of “emphasis on boundaries between the society and outsiders” (Kemper & Collins, 1990). Individuals in the high- group context interact more extensively within the group with clear and strong boundaries than individuals in the low-group context. It can therefore be inferred that individuals in a high-group context experience more contradictions and conflicts within themselves and others than individuals in a low-group context. Such contradictory conditions contribute to the feeling of fragmentation and disingenuous events in everyday life (Iso-Ahola, 1982), which motivates individuals to escape from this hypocrisy, and to experience spiritual emotions in remote and unspoiled areas.

The dimension of grid is only found to be influential on the tourism motivation of Relationship and Family Togetherness, which includes both kinship and networking. Respondents in Hierarchism ranked this as the second most important tourism motivation, and the number of Hierarchists who mentioned this motivation was greater than that of Individualists and Egalitarians, despite the fact that there were fewer participants in this cultural group.

In the grid–group cultural theory, grid is indicated by the degree to which an individual’s life is circumscribed by externally imposed prescriptions. High grid is equivalent to “caste-like rigidity” (Caulkins, 1999), and the extent of the scope of the prescriptions is proportional to the extent to which life is open to individual negotiation. Because individuals in Hierarchism are highly confined by externally imposed prescription, and at the same time are in a group with strong boundaries, they are more likely to feel comfortable traveling with in- group members (friends and relatives) and consider tourism as a means to enhance relationships with family and friends. However, because this study was unable to recruit participants in Fatalism, it is difficult to determine the relative importance of the two dimensions on the motivation of Relationship and Family

Togetherness. This remains a limitation of the present study and provides a direction for future studies.

Conclusions

Based on the grid–group cultural theory, this study compared tourism motivation among different cultural groups in the context of China. Three types of subculture were identified among the 46 participants. The tourism motivations of individuals in each social type were identified and the differences/similarities were compared through five focus groups. A total of 10 motivations identified from focus group discussions, in descending order, are the following: Escape and Relax, Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences, Business, Child Education, Knowledge, Relationship and Family Togetherness, Natural Scenery, Self-development, Shopping, and Nostalgia. Escape and Relax and Fulfillment of Unprecedented Experiences were identified as the most important tourism motivations by the focus group participants. This finding is in general consistent with most previous empirical studies on tourism motivation (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Pearce & Lee, 2005; Yuan & McDonald, 1990).

This study contributes to existing knowledge of cross-cultural tourism motivation. Although research on generic marketing and consumer behavior has shifted significantly over the past decade toward global or international topics, cross-cultural consumer research in hospitality and tourism has been largely neglected in scientific journals, despite the fact that travel and tourism are international phenomena. This is especially true for the study of tourism motivation. A review of previous literature revealed that the first study of cross-cultural tourism motivation was only published in 2000 and that 18 articles have been published since, contributing to a very small percentage of publications on tourism motivation overall. The current study contributes to

academia by examining tourism motivation in a cross-cultural context.

The second contribution of the present study is the culture assessment variables used. Despite their contribution to the understanding of tourism behavior in a cross-cultural context, previous studies have been hampered by their use of nationality as a single surrogate for cultural affiliation. The use of collective cultural proxies as discriminating variables to explain differences in tourism motivation assumes that cultural homogeneity exists within national boundaries. Such operationalization, however, neglects the layers of culture and diminishes the depth of the cultural concept. As culture is no longer a phenomenon defined by geographical or political boundaries, because the world is becoming increasingly deterritorialized and penetrated by elements from other cultures (Craig & Douglas, 2006), it is suggested that research move beyond the boundaries of national culture. In this sense, the current study contributes to the literature by employing the grid–group cultural theory as the discriminating variable to explain differences in tourism motivation.

The cultural theory of Douglas and her colleagues has been applied to a wide spectrum of cross-cultural topics (Dake, 1991b), including risk perception (Marris et al., 1998), political science (McLeod, 1982), and environmental issues (Lima & Castro, 2005). The findings from this study demonstrate that cultural theory can also be assessed at the individual level of analysis. This also adds a powerful tool to the study of how individual, social structure, and cultural biases influence one another in the context of tourism.

The findings from the study also have some merits for the industry. To serve a diverse market profitably, the destination managers must have complete and accurate information about the individuals who make up each segment. Demographic and geographic information has been the most widely adopted variables to identify the market, and

the addition of information about cultural values will greatly enhance the effectiveness of any effort, from destination planning to marketing. Destination managers may develop a better understanding of how a destination fits with an individual's social type or cultural value system. Hence, the findings from this study could be translated into marketing programs. For example, destination marketers could emphasize the possibility of achieving values through travel to a destination or even use particular value items in their advertisement campaigns to certain evoke travel motivation. Another practical implication lies in its study context. With one fifth of the world population and only less than 10% of the population has travelled overseas, China has been recognized as the market with the greatest buying potential in travel and tourism industry in the global market. Building on the previous studies in understanding tourists' cultural background through nationality, geographic location, and political boundaries, the current study was able to add one more dimension to the understanding of the tourists by classifying them into three types: Individualism, Hierarchy, and Equalitarianism. The study findings also revealed that most of the participants were of the Individualism and Equalitarianism types. The destinations should therefore be creative in designing relevant hospitality and tourism product to meet the value ends of individuals of these two social types.

This study is not without limitations. The analysis was based on focus group discussions with 46 participants in China. Because of the small sample size, the reliability and the validity of the measurement scale of cultural bias cannot be tested with this particular group of respondents. As such, the interpretations of the findings are only confined in the context of the study and cannot be generalized. Although it represents a concrete step toward the understanding of tourism motivation in a cross-cultural context, future studies are deemed necessary to empirically test the validity and

adequacy of the findings in other cultures, and with other types of travel decision, such as the type of accommodation chosen. In addition, the current study prescribed that the respondents had extensive travel experience to link motivation with actual travel behavior. How can the grid-group theory explains the reasons of not traveling remain unexplored, which suggests another possible topic for future investigation.

References:

- Asad, T. (1979). Anthropology and the analysis of ideology. *Man*, 14, 607-627.
- Atkins, R., Jr. (1991). *Egalitarian community: Ethnography and exegesis*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama.
- Battour, M. M., Battor, M. M., & Ismail, M. (2012). The mediating role of tourist satisfaction: A study of Muslim tourists in Malaysia. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 29, 279-297.
- Beh, A., & Bruyere, B. (2007). Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1464-1471.
- Beidelman, T. O. (1993). Review of Mary Douglas, risk and blame: Essays in cultural theory. *American Anthropologist*, 95, 1065-1066.
- Boholm, A. (1996). Risk perception and social anthropology: Critique of cultural theory. *Ethnos*, 61(1-2), 64-84.
- Brown, G. (1992). Tourism and symbolic consumption. In P. Johnson & B. Thomas (Eds.), *Choice and demand in tourism* (pp. 57-71). London, England: Mansell.
- Burns, P., & Holden, A. (1995). *Tourism: A new perspective*. London, England: Prentice Hall.
- Caulkins, D. D. (1997). Is small still beautiful? Low growth firms and regional development in Scotland's Silicon Glen. In J. Andelson (Ed.), *Anthropology matters: Essays in honor of Ralph Luebben* (pp. 53-63). Grinnell, IA: Grinnell College.
- Caulkins, D. D. (1999). Is Mary Douglas's grid/group analysis useful for cross-cultural research. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 33, 108-128.
- Caulkins, D. D., & Peters, C. (2002). Grid-group analysis, social capital, and entrepreneurship among North American ethnic groups. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 36, 48-72.
- Chand, M. (2010). A cross-national study of motivational determinants among non-resident Indian visitors to

- religious centers in India. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 11(1), 22-38.
- Cohen, E. (1979). A phenomenology of tourist experiences. *Sociology*, 13, 179-201.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: Approaches, issues, and findings. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10, 373-392.
- Coughlin, R. M., & Lockhart, C. (1998). Grid-group theory and political ideology. A consideration of their relative strengths and weaknesses for explaining the structure of mass belief systems. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 10, 33-58.
- Craig, S., & Douglas, S. (2006). Beyond national culture: Implications of cultural dynamics for consumer research. *International Marketing Review*, 23, 322-342.
- Crompton, J. (1979). Why people go on a pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6, 408-424.
- Dake, K. (1991a). Orienting dispositions in the perception of risk: An analysis of con- temporary worldviews and cultural biases. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22, 61-82.
- Dake, K. (1991b). Orienting dispositions in the perception of risk: An analysis of con- temporary worldviews and cultural biases. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 22, 61-82.
- Dake, K. (1992). Myths of nature: Culture and the social construction of risk. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48(4), 21-37.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4, 184-194.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8, 187-219.
- Dann, G. (1996). *The language of tourism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Wallingford, England: CAB International.
- Dejtisak, M., Hurd, A. R., Elkins, D. J., & Schlatter, B. E. (2009). A comparison of travel decisions between U.S.

- and international students. LARNet: The Cyber Journal of Applied Leisure and Recreation Research. Retrieved from <http://larnet.org/2009-02.html>
- Devesa, M., Laguna, M., & Palacios, A. (2010). The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism. *Tourism Management*, 31, 547-552.
- Dewar, K., Meyer, D., & Li, W. (2001). Harbin, lanterns of ice, sculptures of snow. *Tourism Management*, 22, 523-532.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). *Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Douglas, M. (1978). *Cultural bias*. London, England: Royal Anthropological Institute.
- Douglas, M. (1982). *In the active voice*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Douglas, M. (1997). In defense of shopping. In P. Falk & C. Campbell (Eds.), *The shopping experience* (pp. 15-31). London, England: Sage.
- Douglas, M., & Ney, S. (1998). *Missing persons: A critique of personhood in the social sciences*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dunn Ross, E., & Iso-Ahola, S. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18, 226-237.
- Duval, D. (2006). Grid/group theory and its applicability to tourism and migration. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(1), 1-14.
- Earley, P., & Singh, H. (1985). International and intercultural management research: What's next. *Academy of Management Review*, 38, 327-340.
- Eberhard, W. (1965). Chinese regional stereotypes. *Asian Survey*, 5, 596-608.

- Fisher, D. (2009). Grid-group analysis and tourism: Tipping as a cultural behavior. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 7(1), 34-47.
- Funk, D. C., & Bruun, T. J. (2007). The role of socio-psychological and culture-education motives in marketing international sport tourism: A cross-cultural perspective. *Tourism Management*, 28(3), 806-819.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.
- Goodenough, W. (1971). *Culture, language, and society*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Graburn, N. (1989). Tourism: The sacred journey. In V. Smith (Ed.), *Host and guests: The anthropology of tourism* (2nd ed., pp. 21-36). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grendstad, G., & Selle, P. (1997). Culture theory, postmaterialism and environmental attitudes. In R. J. Ellis & M. Thompson (Eds.), *Culture matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Gross, J., & Rayner, S. (1985). *Measuring culture: A paradigm for the analysis of social organization*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Hood, C. (1996). Control over bureaucracy: Culture theory and institutional variety. *Journal of Public Policy*, 15, 207-230.
- Houghton, J. (1994). The structure of hospitality: A cultural explanation of industrial diversity. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 13, 327-346.

- Hsu, C., Cai, L., & Li, M. (2010). Expectation, motivation, and attitude: A tourist behavioral model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49, 282-296.
- Hsu, C., Cai, L., & Wong, K. (2007). A model of senior tourism motivation—Anecdotes from Beijing and Shanghai. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1262-1273.
- Hu, Z. (2006). *国之南北* [Northern China and Southern China]. Publishing Consult.
- Hudson, S., Wang, Y., & Gil, S. (2011). The influence of a film on destination image and the desire to travel. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 177-190.
- Iso-Ahola, S. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9, 256-262.
- Jamal, T., & Lee, J. H. (2003). Integrating micro and macro approaches to tourist motivations: Toward an interdisciplinary theory. *Tourism Analysis*, 8, 47-59.
- Jang, S., & Wu, C. (2006). Senior's travel motivation and the influential factors: An examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Management*, 27, 306-316.
- Jang, S., Yu, L., & Pearson, T. (2003). Chinese travelers to the United States: A comparison of business travel and visiting friends and relatives. *Tourism Geographies*, 5(1), 87-108.
- Jang, S. S., Bai, B., Hu, C., & Wu, C. M. E. (2009). Affect, travel motivation, and travel intention: A senior market. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 33, 51-73.
- Jonsson, C., & Devonish, D. (2008). Does nationality, gender, and age affect travel motivation? A case of visitors to the Caribbean Island of Barbados. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25(3-4), 398-408.
- Kay, P. (2009). Cultural experience tourist motives dimensionality: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 18, 329-371.

- Kemper, T., & Collins, R. (1990). Dimensions of micro interaction. *American Journal of Sociology*, 96, 207-230.
- Kim, C., & Lee, S. (2000). Understanding the cultural differences in tourist motivation between Anglo-American and Japanese tourists. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 9(1/2), 153-170.
- Kim, N., & Chalip, L. (2004). Why travel to the FIFA World Cup? Effects of motives, background, interest, and constraints. *Tourism Management*, 25, 695-707.
- Kim, S., & Prideaux, B. (2005). Marketing implications arising from a comparative study of international pleasure tourist motivations and other travel-related characteristics of visitors to Korea. *Tourism Management*, 26, 347-357.
- Kinnaird, V., & Hall, D. (1994). *Tourism: A gender analysis*. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Klenosky, D. (2002). The "pull" of tourism destinations: A means-end investigation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40, 385-395.
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23, 221-232.
- Krippendorf, J. (1987). *The holiday maker: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel* (V. Andrassy, Trans.). London, England: Heinemann.
- Laing, J., & Crouch, G. (2005). Extraordinary journeys: An exploratory cross-cultural study of tourists on the frontier. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 11, 209-223.
- Lau, S. (1988). The value orientations of Chinese university students in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Psychology*, 23, 583-596.
- Lee, C. (2000). A comparative study of Caucasian and Asian visitors to a cultural expo in an Asian setting. *Tourism Management*, 21, 169-176.

- Lee, C., Lee, Y., & Wicks, B. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management, 25*(1), 61-70.
- Lee, G., O'Leary, J., Lee, S., & 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*, 89-104.
- Lee, Y., Kim, S., Seock, Y., & Cho, Y. (2009). Tourists' attitudes towards textiles and apparel-related cultural products: A cross-cultural marketing study. *Tourism Management, 30*, 724-732.
- Legohérel, P., Dauce, B., Hsu, C., & Ranchhold, A. (2009). Culture, time orientation, and exploratory buying behavior. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing, 21*, 93-107.
- Lenartowicz, T., & Roth, K. (1999). A framework for culture assessment. *Journal of International Business Studies, 30*, 781-798.
- Li, M., & Cai, L. (2012). The effects of values on travel motivation and behavioral intention. *Journal of Travel Research, 51*, 473-487.
- Li, M., Cai, L., Lehto, X., & Huang, Z. (2010). A missing link in understanding revisit intention: The role of motivation and image. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 27*, 335-348.
- Lima, M., & Castro, P. (2005). Cultural theory meets the community: Worldviews and local issues. *Environmental Psychology, 25*, 23-35.
- Luna, D., & Gupta, S. F. (2001). An integrative framework for cross-cultural consumer behavior. *International Marketing Review, 18*(1), 45-69.
- Luo, Y., & Deng, J. (2008). The new environmental paradigm and nature-based tourism motivation. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*, 392-402.

- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Schocken.
- Mamadouth, V. (1999). Grid-group cultural theory: An introduction. *GeoJournal*, 47, 395-409.
- Mansfeld, Y. (1992). From motivation to actual behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 399-419.
- Marris, C., Langford, I., & O'Riordan, T. (1996). *Integrating sociological and psychological approaches to public perceptions of environmental risks: Detailed results from a questionnaire survey*. Norwich, England: University of East Anglia.
- Marris, C., Langford, I., & O'Riordan, T. (1998). A quantitative test of the cultural theory of risk perceptions: Comparison with the psychometric paradigm. *Risk Analysis*, 18, 635-647.
- Mars, G. (1982). *Cheats at work, an anthropology of workplace crime*. London, England: George Allen & Unwin.
- Mars, G., & Nicod, M. (1984). *The world of waiters*. Sydney, New South Wales, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- McCracken, G. (1988). *Culture and consumption: New approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- McLeod, M. (1982). The political culture of warring states in China. In M. Douglas (Ed.), *Essays in the sociology of perception* (pp. 132-161). London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mook, D. (1996). *Motivation: The organization of action*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Morgan, S. (2000, July). Richer and taller: Stature and living standards in China, 1979-1995. *The China Journal*, 44, 1-39.
- Muensterberger, W. (1951). Orality and dependence: Characteristics of southern Chinese. In G. Roheim (Ed.), *Psychoanalysis and the social sciences* (Vol. 3,

- pp. 37-69). New York, NY: International Universities Press.
- Otaki, M., Durrett, M., Richards, P., Nyquist, L., & Pennebaker, J. (1986). Maternal and infant behavior in Japan and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 17, 251-268.
- Palmer, C. G. S. (1996). Risk perception: An empirical study of the relationship between worldview and risk construct. *Risk Analysis*, 5, 717-723.
- Park, K., Reisinger, Y., & Kang, H. (2008). Visitors' motivation for attending the South Beach Wine and Food Festival, Miami Beach, Florida. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25, 161-181.
- Pearce, P., & Lee, U. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 226-237.
- Peters, E., & Slovic, P. (1996). The role of affect and worldviews as orienting dispositions in the perception and acceptance of nuclear power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 5, 1427-1453.
- Pizam, A., Jansen-Verbeke, M., & Steel, L. (1997). Are all tourists alike regard- less of nationality? The perceptions of Dutch tour-guides. *Journal of International Hospitality, Leisure & Tourism Management*, 1(1), 19-40.
- Plog, S. (1974). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Quarterly*, 14(4), 55-58.
- Reisinger, Y., & Mavondo, F. (2004). Modeling psychographic profiles: A study of the U.S. and Australian student travel market. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 28(1), 44-65.
- Rick, D., Toyne, B., & Martinez, Z. (1990). Recent developments in international management research. *Journal of Management*, 16, 219-253.

- Rippl, S. (2002). Cultural theory and risk perception: A proposal for a better measurement. *Journal of Risk Research*, 5, 147-165.
- Rittichainuwat, N. (2008). Responding to disaster: Thai and Scandinavian tourists' motivation to visit Phuket, Thailand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4), 422-432.
- Rojek, C. (1995). Decentring leisure: Rethinking leisure theory. London, England: Sage.
- Ryan, C., & Glendon, I. (1998). Application of leisure motivation scale to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25, 169-184.
- Schwarz, M., & Thompson, M. (1990). *Divided we stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sirakaya, E., & McLellan, R. (1997). Factors affecting vacation destination choices of college students. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 8(3), 31-44.
- Stewart, D., & Shamdasani, P. (1990). *Focus group: Theory and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, M. (1997). Cultural theory and integrated assessment. *Environmental Modeling & Assessment*, 2, 139-150.
- Thurot, J., & Thurot, G. (1983). The ideology of class and tourism: Confronting the discourse of advertising. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 10, 173-189.
- Tokar, D., Fischer, A., & Subich, L. (1998). Personality and vocational behavior: A selective review of the literature, 1993-1997. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 115-153.
- Turner, L., & Ash, J. (1975). *The golden hordes: International tourism and the pleasure periphery*. London, England: Constable.

- Uysal, M., & Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 844-846.
- Verweij, M. (1995). Cultural theory and the study of international relations. *Millenium*, 24(1), 87-111.
- Wang, N. (2000). *Tourism and modernity: A sociological analysis*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Webber, C., & Wildavsky, A. (1986). *A history of taxation and expenditure in the western world*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Xu, F., Morgan, M., & Song, P. (2009). Students' travel behaviour: A cross-cultural comparison of UK and China. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(3), 255-268.
- You, X., O'Leary, J., Morrison, A., & Hong, G. (2000). A cross-cultural comparison of travel push and pull factors: United Kingdom vs. Japan. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1(2), 1-26.
- Yuan, S., & McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinants of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24, 42-44.