CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter aims to review literature on travel motives and shopping behaviour of tourists’ from retail, consumer behaviour and leisure/tourism perspectives. The review of literature is organised in the following manner. Section one deals with the travel motives, followed by the second section on tourist shopping behaviour. In this section, various aspects of tourist shopping and shopping tourist are discussed followed by dimensions of tourist shopping behaviour as suggested by the extant literature. The chapter sums up by proposing a conceptual framework for the study. The purpose of literature review is twofold: 1) to understand the different motives of tourists’ travel and shopping 2) to delineate key constructs to comprehend tourists’ shopping behaviour.

2.1: Travel motivation

Motivation is an important variable in tourism research and is stated to be the starting point in studying tourist behaviour and understanding tourism consumption. While a motive, being generic in nature, is a driving force facilitating an action, motivation is the interaction between motives and situations, with the two existing simultaneously. Motives help in understanding what impels a tourist to act and motivation indicates object-specific preferences (Fodness, 1994; Gnoth, 1997). Various stimuli direct a motivated person to satisfy a need or achieve a goal (Dunn Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991; Fodness, 1994; Gnoth, 1997). Studies in various disciplines like psychology, sociology and anthropology (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Gnoth, 1997) have contributed immensely to the understanding of the concept. In the context of Tourism research, several theories such as the hierarchy of needs, allocentrism/ psychocentrism model, travel career ladder, seeking and escaping, travel career pattern, push and pull model have been used to understand travel motivation. A brief overview of the same is presented below.

One of the earliest theories to explain travel motivation has been the Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1970). The theory was modelled as a pyramid (figure 2.1) whose base consists of the physiological needs, followed by higher levels of psychological needs and the
need for self-actualization. The theory’s popularity stems from its simplicity and its applicability in areas such as psychology, marketing and tourism. The theory however has been criticized by Witt and Wright (1992), who state that needs like dominance, play and aggression, is more apt in explaining tourist behaviour and have been excluded in Maslow’s theory.

Figure 2.1: Maslow’s hierarchy of needs
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Source: Adapted from Hsu and Huang (2008)

Plog (1974) classified travellers based on their motivation and personality, wherein motivation was stated to be a function of the traveller’s personality. Accordingly, travellers who were more allocentric preferred exotic destinations, unstructured vacations and involvement with local cultures, while psychocentrics preferred familiar destinations, packaged tours and touristy destinations. High energy travellers prefer high level activity while low energy travellers prefer fewer activities (figure 2.2). His findings suggest that majority of people are midcentrics. Plog’s theory was criticized by Gilbert (1991) who stated that tourists travel with different motivations on different occasions. Dann (1977) suggested two reasons which explain why people travel. The first being anomie, a feeling of isolation from a daily life routine and the second being ego enhancement- a need for recognition and status.
Source: Adapted from Plog (2001)

The travel career ladder (TCL) theory (Pearce & Caltabiano, 1983; Moscardo & Pearce, 1986; Pearce, 1988, 1993) was based in part on Maslow’s theory. The theory posits that tourist motivation consists of five different levels, in the order of - relaxation needs, safety/security needs, relationship needs, self-esteem and development needs and self-actualisation/fulfilment needs (figure 2.3). The progress upwards through the different levels is however a function of accumulated travel experience (Lee & Pearce, 2002). The theory however has little empirical evidence and has been criticized by Ryan and Glendon (1998). His study indicates that past visits to a destination does not increase the travel motivation.

Mannel and Iso Ahola (1987) propounded a four dimensional motivational theory based on seeking and escaping elements which, according to them, are not mutually exclusive. The four dimensions (figure 2.4), namely personal seeking, personal escaping, interpersonal seeking and interpersonal escaping, explain an individual’s pursuit of recreational travel. People travel to escape their personal or interpersonal problems, and to obtain personal or interpersonal rewards.
Another conceptual framework called the travel career pattern (TCP) was proposed by Lee and Pearce (2003), according to which travel motivation can be conceptualized in three layers comprising of different travel motives (figure 2.5).
The core layer comprises of common motives (such as novelty, relationship enhancement and escape/relax), which is surrounded by travel motives which change from intrinsic to extrinsic (that is, from self-actualization to nature). The outermost layer comprises of less important travel motives like status. Travellers are influenced by both the common motive and the less important motive. However as they grow older and gain travel experience, there is a shift towards extrinsic needs.

Though there is a lack of consensus on the conceptualization of tourist motivation (Fodness, 1994), the push/pull model is widely accepted by researchers and has been often used to understand travel motivation (Yuan & Mc Donald, 1990; Uysal & Juworski, 1994; Turnbull & Uysal, 1995; You, O’Leary, Morrison & Hong, 2000; Hsu & Lam, 2003; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). The push and pull model (figure 2.6) postulates that an individual’s travel motive is divided into two forces namely the push forces and the pull forces. The push factor is intrinsic to the individual and is responsible for initiating a desire to travel whereas the pull factor represents the destination’s attraction and helps in destination choice (Crompton 1979). People travel because of their own internal forces and are simultaneously pulled by destination attractions and attributes (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994; Cha, McCleary & Uysal, 1995).
In the context of pleasure travel, researchers have built upon factor-analytical procedures to delineate various push and pull factors. Crompton (1979) identified two motives namely socio-psychological motives and cultural motives. The socio-psychological motives, perceived to be push factors, comprised of seven motives—"escape from a perceived mundane environment", "exploration and evaluation of self", "relaxation", "prestige", "regression", "enhancement of kinship relationships" and "facilitation of social interaction". Cultural motives perceived to be pull factors comprised of two factors—"novelty" and "education". Yuan and McDonald (1990) delineated push factors—"novelty", "escape", "prestige", "enhancement of kinship relationships" and "relaxation/hobbies". Pull factors—"budget", "culture and history", "wilderness", "ease of travel", "cosmopolitan environment", "facilities" and "hunting" were identified as pull factors. Uysal and Jurowski (1994) identified push factors of "escape", "novelty", "family/friends togetherness", "sports", "adventure and excitement", "familiar environment", "luxury/doing nothing" and "prestige". Pull factors were classified as "active sports environment", "unique natural environment", "sunshine", "inexpensiveness", "cultural activities", "entertainment", "sightseeing", "local culture", "different culture and cuisine" and "uniqueness of small towns/villages-mountains". Turnbull and Uysal (1995) dwelled on the interrelationship between the push and pull factors of German outbound tourists and identified push factors—"cultural experiences", "escape", re-experiencing family", "sports and prestige", and pull factors—"heritage/culture", "city enclave", "comfort/relaxation", "beach resort", "outdoor resources" and
“rural area/inexpensiveness”. Cha et al. (1995) reported six travel motives of Japanese tourists to Turkey—“relax”, “knowledge”, “adventure”, “travel bragging”, “family”, and “sports”. Hanqin and Lam (1999) isolated push factors—“knowledge”, “prestige”, “enhancement of human relationship”, “relaxation” and “novelty” and pull factors—“expenditure”, “accessibility”, “service quality and attitude”, “sightseeing variety” and “cultural links”. Jang and Cai (2002) identified push and pull travel factors of British tourists to seven destinations and reported that the motives varied across destinations. The factors delineated were “novel experience”, “escape”, “knowledge seeking”, “fun and excitement”, “rest and relaxation” “family and friend togetherness”, “natural and historic environment”, “cleanliness and safety”, “easy-to-access & economical deals”, “outdoor activities” and “sunny and exotic atmosphere”. They tended to travel to U.S. for “fun and excitement” and “outdoor activities”, to Oceania to seek “family & friend togetherness” and to Asia for “novel experience”. Klenosky (2002) used the means-end method to identify pull factors (beaches, historic/cultural attractions, scenic/natural resources, new/unique location, party atmosphere and skiing) and push factors (excitement, accomplishment, self-esteem and fun and enjoyment). Bieger and Laesser (2002) studied the travel motivation of Swiss tourists and their motivation to undertake domestic and international trips in the context of pleasure travel. Ten motivation factors namely—“nightlife”, “comfort”, “partner”, “family”, “nature”, “culture/sightseeing”, “liberty”, “body”, “sports” and “sun” were delineated. Sirakaya, Uysal and Yoshika (2003) delineated eight factors motivating the Japanese tourists to Turkey—“love of nature”, “enhancement of kinship”, “experiencing culture”, “living the resort lifestyle”, “escape”, “education in archaeology/history”, “living the extravagant lifestyle” and “travel bragging”. The act of shopping apart from shopping for local arts and crafts defined the travel motive “living the extravagant lifestyle”. Bansal and Eiselt (2004) investigated the role of travel motivation along with travel companion and destination image on the destination choice and subsequent planning. The study was conducted in the New Brunswick province in Canada. Factors such as “climate”, “relaxation”, “adventure”, “personal”, “educational”, “sites” and “festivals” were the stated reasons of tourists visiting the place. The study also revealed that travel motives varied with the destination and also influenced the choice of the destination. Yoon and Uysal (2005) investigated push and pull factors and its impact on travel satisfaction and destination loyalty. Push factors—“safety and fun”, “escape”, “knowledge
and education” and “achievement” and pull factors- “cleanliness and shopping”, “reliable weather and safety”, “different culture and water activities” were identified. Kau and Lim (2005) studied Chinese tourists visiting Singapore and reported factors such as “prestige/knowledge”, “escape/relax”, “adventure/excitement”, “exploration”, “pleasure seeking/sightseeing” and “enhance family/social relationship’. Andreu, Kozak, Avci and Cifter (2005) studied travel motives of British Tourists to Turkey on a pleasure trip. The respondents indicated five factors which were the driving force behind their visiting the destination- “enjoy tourist attractions”, “the diversity of entertainment in a value for money destination”, “different socio-cultural environment”, “ease of access-communication”, “getting away from routine”. Sangpikul (2008), based on push and pull theory, studied the Japanese senior travellers’ travel motives to Thailand. The results indicate three push factors, namely “novelty and knowledge seeking”, “rest and relaxation”, and “ego-enhancement” and four pull factors, namely “cultural and historical attraction”, “travel arrangements and facilities”, “shopping and leisure activities” and “cleanliness” to be the main travel motives of the respondents. Of the push factors, novelty and knowledge seeking and rest and relaxation, and the pull factor- cultural and historical factor, emerged to be most important travel motives. Kim (2008) studied the university students in US who had either taken a domestic trip or had travelled internationally to destinations like Bahamas, Canada, Puerto Rico, United Kingdom, Australia, England, France, and Italy. Push and pull motivation theory was employed to assess their travel motives. The study, while delineating travel motives based on push-pull theory, dwells on the mediating role of “cognitive and affective involvement” between travel motivation and satisfaction on revisit intention. Six push factors namely- “getting away”, “adventure and excitement”, “discovery and learning”, “connecting with family and friends”, “engaging nature” and “rejuvenation” and seven pull factors namely “lodging and transportation”, “convenience and value”, “recreation and entertainment”, “cultural opportunities”, “natural scenery”, “sun and beaches” and “family friendly” were delineated. The study also reported that push motives are indicators of pull motives. The pull motive is however an indicator of only the “cognitive involvement” which in turn is a predictor of both “affective involvement” and “satisfaction with travel experiences”. The latter in turn influences destination loyalty. Mohammed and Som (2010) in a study conducted in Jordan on tourists from Europe, North America and Australia delineated eight push
factors namely- “fulfilling prestige”, “enhancing relation”, “seeking relaxation”, “enhancing social circle”, “sightseeing variety”, “fulfilling spiritual needs”, “escaping from daily routine” and “gaining knowledge”. Eight pull factors were delineated- “events and activities”, “easy access and affordable”, “history and culture”, “variety seeking”, “adventure”, “natural resources”, “heritage sites” and “sightseeing variety”. Hua and Yoo (2011) studied travel motivation of Chinese Mainland tourists travelling to the US and reported factors such as “ego enhancement”, “international exposure”, “communication opportunities”, “financial incentives”, and “destination stimuli”, “natural attractions,” “to rest and relax,” “to learn new things and broaden my horizon” and “to experience a different culture and lifestyle” as motivating them. Siri, Kennon, Josiam, and Spears (2012) focused on Indian tourists travelling to Bangkok. The respondents were predominantly male, in early adulthood 20-45 years old with majority being married and possessing a bachelor’s or master’s degree. Four dimensions influencing Indian tourists’ travel decision were “novelty seeking”, “stress busting(fun”, “achievement” and “family oriented/education”.

Studies on the interrelationship between the two factors reveal that there exists a significant relationship between them (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994; Kim & Lee, 2002; Mohammed & Som, 2010; Mehmetoglu, 2011). Pizam, Neumann and Reichel (1979) opined that pull factors only explain the tourist activities and have no role as motivators. They contended that studies which state pull factors to be motivators listed them as destination attributes and attractions (Yuan & McDonald, 1990; Turnbull & Uysal, 1995; Baloglu & Uysal, 1996; You et al., 2000). Some researchers however acknowledge only push factors to the motivators (Kim & Lee, 2002; Klenosky, 2002). Correia, Oom do Valle and Moço (2007) opined that push motives determine the pull motives. Mehmetoglu (2011) opined that push factors such as escape and socialising positively impact the length of stay at the destination. Pull factors such as image and weather also impact the duration of stay.

Nationality-based studies in tourism indicate that tourists differ on perceived destination image and attitudes, motivation, travel patterns, communication styles and satisfaction levels (Yuan & McDonald, 1990; Chadee & Mattson, 1996; Kozak & Nield, 1998; Kozak, 2001; Prayag & Ryan, 2011). Studies have evinced that tourists from different cultural background/nationalities
differ in their travel motives (Yuan & McDonald, 1990; Reisinger & Turner, 1997; Kim, 1999; Kim & Lee, 2000; Kozak, 2002, Andreu et al., 2005; Jönsson & Devonish, 2008; Mohammed & Som, 2010; Abdelnasser & Bashar, 2011; Siri et al., 2012) thereby reiterating the importance of understanding customer segments based on nationality and developing specific marketing strategies for each segment.

Kim and Lee (2000) suggested that Japanese showed greater propensity on “prestige/status” and “family togetherness” whereas Anglo-American tourists were driven by “novelty”. You et al. (2000) studied the travellers from UK and Japan and ascertained that there were differences in the travel motives and travel benefits sought by the two groups. “People-interactive activities”, “culture and heritage activities” and “outdoor sports activities” contributed to differences between the two groups. Kozak (2002) delineated travel motives as “culture”, “pleasure-seeking/fantasy” and “relaxation and physical”, and found significant differences in the motives of British and German tourists to Mallorca and Turkey. British tourists were motivated by “pleasure-seeking/fantasy” while the Germans showed higher propensity for “relaxation and physical” motives. Kim and Jogaratnam (2003) compared the travel motives of Asian and American college students in the US. Their study emphasizes that students differed on their travel motives based on their ethnicity. While the main travel motive for domestic American students was thrill/excitement, the Asian students were motivated by visiting a foreign destination. Sporting, least motivated the students; fun/entertainment motivated both the student groups. The two groups also differed on their expectation and satisfaction on the travel motives with the domestic students scoring high on both expectation and satisfaction. Kim and Prideaux (2005) reported differences in travel motives of American, Australian, Japanese and Chinese. The western tourists were strongly motivated by “culture and history”, while the Japanese were least motivated by the factor. Jönsson and Devonish (2008) conducted a study in Barbados, with the aim of assessing if tourists from different nationalities, age and gender differed in their travel motives. Respondents were British, Americans and Canadians and tourists from the Caribbean. Majority of the respondents were females. Four motivation factors were delineated from the study- “culture”, “pleasure-seeking/fantasy”, “relaxation” and “physical”. Canadian tourists were motivated by “culture” and “physical” reasons like sports, nature and the desire to be active.
They also travelled to relax. The British, American and Canadians were motivated by the weather when compared to those from the Caribbean. The British were also motivated by “seeking adventure”. Hua and Yoo (2011) reported significant difference between gender, marital status, educational background, income and travel motives. Female tourists, singles, those having higher levels of education were motivated more by “ego enhancement” and “financial incentives”. Prayag and Ryan (2011) explored the relationship between push and pull factors, comparing French, German, British, South African and Indian tourists to Mauritius, in the context of pleasure travel. Findings suggest that tourists from different nationalities differed on their travel motives. French tourists were driven by “social interaction”, “need for learning” while Germans were motivated by “social interaction and kinship” and “popularity of the destination”. British tourists were driven by “weather”, “social interaction”. South Africans visited the destination for “honeymoon” and “business/conference” while Indians were motivated by “social interaction and kinship” and “special events”.

Literature also suggests that pull factors vary with different destinations and significant difference occurred only in the push factor- “re-experiencing family” (Turnbull & Uysal, 1995). Klenosky (2002) indicated that a single pull factor can satisfy multiple push motives of travellers. The push and pull factors also impact satisfaction with travel, destination loyalty and are influenced by demographic factors and travel companions. Uysal and Juworski (1994) indicated that push motives varied among German tourists who were travelling alone and with friends as opposed to those travelling with family or as couples, indicating that travel company has a significant effect on push motives. Hanqin and Lam (1999) suggested that the higher the income, the higher the perceived importance on the travel motive “prestige” for travelling to Hong Kong. The study also indicates differences on two travel motives- knowledge and prestige with travel frequency and age. Kim et al. (2003) while studying the travel motives in visiting national parks in South Korea examined the relationship between tourists’ demographics and push and pull factors. Demographic factors such as age, occupation, gender and income significantly affected push and pull travel motives. Findings from Yoon and Uysal (2005) suggest that travel satisfaction is not influenced by push factors but is negatively impacted by pull factors. Push factors, however, positively impact destination loyalty. Jönsson and Devonish (2008) studied the impact of age and gender on travel motives. In terms of age, older tourists
(above 56 years) were motivated by culture, those in the age group 35-55 years were motivated by relaxation and the younger tourists were motivated by sporting activities. Gender did not affect the travel motivation. Sangpikul (2008) reported that the socio-demographic variables - education and gender and psychological wellbeing, positively influenced the travel motives of the travellers.

2.1.1: Studies on festival motivation

Special events and tourism have come to be one of the fastest growing areas in tourism and the importance of analyzing the motives of festival/event visitors has been emphasized by Getz (1993). It has been suggested that in international festivals/events, there may be differences in motives between the international and domestic visitors, indicating a need for different marketing strategies (Lee, Lee & Wicks, 2004).

Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993) studied the visitors’ motivations during a County Corn Festival in South Carolina and observed that visitors were motivated by “escape”, “excitement/thrills”, “event novelty”, “socialization” and “family togetherness” dimensions. Mohr, Backman, Gahan and Backman (1993) investigated the motivation during Freedom Weekend Aloft (a hot air balloon festival) in Greenville, South Carolina and stated that visitors to the festival were motivated by “socialization”, “family togetherness”, “excitement/uniqueness”, “escape”, and “event novelty”. Backman, Backman, Uysal and Sunshine (1995) used the data from Pleasure Market Survey, USA, and reported five motivational dimensions- “excitement”, “external”, “family”, “socialising” and “relaxation”. Scott (1996) studied three festivals in Northeast Ohio – Bug fest, the holiday lights festival and the Maple Sugaring festival and concluded that motivations differed across festivals and that visitors are motivated by “nature appreciation”, “event excitement”, “sociability”, “family togetherness”, “curiosity” and “escape from routine”. While comparing residents and non-residents at the Umbria Jazz Festival in Italy, Formica and Uysal (1996), delineated five motivational dimensions – “excitement and thrills”, “socialization”, “entertainment”, “event novelty” and “family togetherness”. Schneider and Backman (1996) studied the Jerash Festival for Culture and Arts in Jordan. “Family
togetherness/socialization”, “social/leisure”, “festival attributes”, “escape” and “event excitement” were stated to be reasons that motivated visitors. Crompton and McKay (1997) studied motivations of visitors to the Fiesta in San Antonio, Texas. Their study highlighted six motivational dimensions – “cultural exploration”, “novelty/regression”, “recover equilibrium”, “known-group socialization”, “external interaction/socialization” and “gregariousness”. During the Spoleto Festival in Italy, Formica and Uysal (1998), segmented visitors into two groups “enthusiasts” and “moderates” based on motivational dimensions of “socialization/entertainment”, “event attraction/excitement”, “group togetherness”, “cultural/historical”, “family togetherness” and “site novelty”. Lee (2000) stated that differences exist in motivation between the Caucasians and Asians to the 1998 Kyongju World Culture Expo and identified seven motivational dimensions – “cultural exploration”, “family togetherness”, “escape”, “novelty”, “external group socialization”, “event attractions” and “known group socialization”. The American and European tourists were more motivated on the above factors when compared to tourists from Korea and Japan. Nicholson and Pearce (2001) in comparing the motivations of visitors on four events in New Zealand (food and beverage festival, air show and country and music festival) emphasized that motivations differ across events although the motives- socialization, escape and family were common to all events. Lee et al. (2004) studied the 2000 Kyongju World Culture Expo in South Korea. Six motivation factors were extracted - “cultural exploration”, “family togetherness”, “novelty”, “escape”, “event attraction” and “socialization”. Zyl and Botha (2004) in their study of the Aardklop National Art festival delineated 10 motives, namely, “family togetherness”, “socialization”, “escape”, “event novelty”, “community pride”, “self-esteem”, “entertainment”, “food and beverages”, “information and marketing” and “transport”. Bowen and Daniels (2005) reported “discovery”, “music” and “enjoyment” as motives to a regional music festival. Yuan, Cai, Morrison and Linton (2005) while studying a wine and food festival reported “festival and escape”, “wine”, “socialization” and “family togetherness” to be the driving force behind the visitors motives in visiting the festival. Chang (2006) studied the Aboriginal cultural event in Taiwan and delineated “equilibrium recovery”, “festival participation and learning”, “novelty seeking”, “socialization” and “cultural exploration” as travel motives. Shin and Gwak (2008) studied the Gwangju Kimchi cultural festival in Korea with the aim of exploring the travel motives of
domestic tourists and extracted four factors – “novelty”, “escape”, “festival attraction” and “socialization” representing the motive of the festival goers and three factors – “event management”, “economics” and “sub facilities” representing satisfaction were extracted after factor analysis. Repeat visitors had higher satisfaction levels in comparison to first time visitors. Park, Reisinger and Kang (2008) studied the travel motives of visitors from US, Canada, South America, Europe and Asia to the South Beach Wine and Food Festival in, Florida. The motives to visit the festival were “the desire to taste new wine and food”, “enjoy the event”, “enhance social status”, “escape from routine life”, “meet new people”, “spend time with family”, and “get to know the celebrity chefs and wine experts”. The study indicated that family had a significant effect on the travel motives of the visitors. Thompson and Schofield (2009) analysed the travel motives to the Ulaanbaatar Naadam festival in Mongolia. “Cultural exploration”, “togetherness”, “socialization”, “sports attraction” and “local special events” were stated to be the travel motives of the visitors. Li, Huang and Cai (2009) studied a rural community-based festival in Indiana. “Escape”, “novelty”, “nostalgia and patriotism”, “event excitement”, “family togetherness” and “socialization” were reported to motivate visitors. Zhang (2010) investigated the travel motives of visitors to Macau, in the context of Meeting, Incentive, Conference and Exhibition (MICE) and delineated five factors – “educational benefits”, “personal attraction”, “self-development”, “convenience to participation” and “activities”. Erasmus (2012) studied the Klein Karoo National Arts Festival (KKNK), held in South Africa. Respondents were mainly female Africans. The results indicate that visitors are heterogeneous in their motives. Three motives – “festival attractiveness”, “novelty” and “escape and socialization” emerged to be factors motivating the visitors. Yolal, Çetinel and Uysal (2009) in their study on the Eskişehir International Festival in Turkey reported travel motives such as “escape and excitement”, “family togetherness”, “socialization” and “event novelty” as motivating visitors to the event. Female visitors were strongly motivated by “escape and excitement”, “family togetherness,” and “event novelty”. Significant difference was also found between age and travel motives. While the younger visitors were motivated by socialization and event novelty, family togetherness was important to older visitors. Kim and Ritchie (2012) in the context of golf tourism delineated five push motives: “business opportunity”, “benefits”, “learning and challenging”, “escape/relax”, and “social interaction/kinship factors”. Seven pull factors delineated were: “natural
environment”, “golfing-related availability and accessibility”, “golf resort/course facilities and services”, “tourism attractions”, “tourism facilities and services”, “nightlife and entertainment” and “price and ease of access”.

2.1.2: Studies on Travel motivation and segmentation

Swarbrooke and Horner (1999) opine that while segmentation divides a market into sub-groups, typology helps in consumer classification. Studies in tourism indicate that tourists have heterogeneous motivations and need to be classified into smaller homogenous groups (Kim & Ritchie, 2012). An understanding of the characteristics of these groups would enable the Destination Marketing Organizations (DMO) to market specific features of the festival/event to specific groups. Research in tourism has often used motivation as a basis of developing tourist typology in pleasure market, park market, mature travel market, dance tourism market, gambling market, sports market, fishing market and golf market (Dann, 1977; Cha et al., 1995; Galloway, 2002; Beiger & Laesser, 2002, Andreu et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2005; McCleary, Weaver & Meng, 2005; Lee, Lee, Bernhard & Yoon, 2006; Chi, 2006; Kim & Ritchie, 2012).

Baloglu and Uysal (1996) studied German travellers in the context of pleasure travel and suggested that there exists a relationship between destination attributes and travel motives. Destination attribute of sporting activity was shown to be related to push motive of physical activity, while the pull motive of increasing knowledge was related to push motive of novelty. The push motives of experiencing urban life and escape were related to the destination attributes – quality restaurants, safety, cleanliness and weather, atmosphere respectively. Four segments were obtained from the push and pull motives – “sports/activity seekers”, “novelty seekers”, “urban-life seekers”, and “beach/resort seekers” with each segment having distinct motives. Dann (1977) in the context of pleasure travel developed two tourist typologies based on travel motives, namely, “anomie” and “ego-enhancement”. Cha et al. (1995) in the context of pleasure travel reported tourist typologies as “sport seekers”, “novelty seekers”, and “family/relaxation seekers”. Oh et al. (1995) in the context of pleasure travel delineated typologies such as “safety/comfort seekers”, “culture/history seekers”, “novelty/adventure seekers” and “luxury seekers”. Formica and Uysal (1998) studied the Spoleto Festival in Italy and delineated two
groups based on their travel motives - enthusiasts and moderates who differed significantly on demographic factors such as age, income, and marital status. The enthusiasts were older, married and had high income, while the moderates were young, single and had low income. Galloway (2002) in the context of Park market reported typologies such as “higher sensation seekers”, “lower sensation seekers” and “sensation seekers”. Bieger and Laesser (2002) classified tourists into four clusters which were found to be diverse in their travel motives. “Compulsory travel” typified by trips being short, undertaken by younger people, travelling alone and being motivated by multiple factors. “Cultural hedonism” typified by people being motivated by nature/culture, travelling with a partner preferably to long-haul destination. “Family travel”, is characterized by people travelling to visit friends and relatives and aiming to spend time with family. “Me(e/a)t Marketing” is typified by people being motivated by all factors, but ascribing more importance to the motive “liberty” and tending to travel in large groups, overseas especially to destinations situated by the ocean. Results also indicate that travel behaviour is influenced by the travel profile and travel group rather than the needs or benefits sought by the travellers at the destination. Lee et al. (2004) grouped tourists to the 2000 Kyongju World Culture Expo based on the travel motives into four clusters –“culture and family seekers”, “multipurpose seekers”, “escape seekers” and “event seekers”. The study also reported differences in satisfaction level among the clusters and between foreign and domestic tourists. Foreign tourists and those tourists belonging to the multipurpose seekers being most satisfied. Andreu et al. (2005) in the context of pleasure travel developed tourists typology based on their travel motives. Their study indicated that different typologies differ on the travel motives. “Fuzzy tourists” scored high on all travel motives, while to the “active tourists” accessibility to the destination and tourist attraction were important. The “recreational type” considered recreation to be important while “escape” tourists considered getting away and accessibility to be important factors. The “relax-quiet” tourists were also motivated by getting away but scored low on accessibility, tourist attraction, entertainment and culture. Yuan et al. (2005) developed typologies: “wine focusers”, “festivity seekers” and “hangers-on” in the context of wine tourism. McCleary et al. (2005) in the context of dance/event tourism isolated the following typologies-“enthusiasts”, “dance-focused”, and “balanced”. Chang (2006) divided the visitors to the Rukai cultural festival in Taiwan based on travel motives into three clusters: “aboriginal cultural learners”, “change routine life travellers”
and “active culture explorers”. The study reported no significant difference in the demographic variables among the three clusters. Lee et al. (2006) in the context of casino market developed four tourist typologies namely “challenge and winning seekers”, “only winning seekers”, “light gambling seekers” and “multipurpose seekers”. Chi (2006) clustered tourists into “leisure anglers”, “sports anglers” and “competitive anglers” for the fishing market. Kim et al. (2008) segmented Korean golf tourists into three segments: “beginner,” intermediate” and “advanced” which differed in their motivation, preferences and choice of destination. Thompson and Schofield (2009) profiled the visitors to Naadam festival in Mongolia based on the travel motives into “multi-purpose seekers”, “indifferent”, “culture and sports seekers”, “togetherness, socialization and sports seekers”, and “socialization and local special event seekers”. Li, Huang and Cai (2009) in a study on a rural community-based festival in the US delineated the visitors into five clusters: “family travellers”, “festival enthusiasts”, “loyal festival goers”, “escapers” and “social gathering lovers”. Their study indicated no difference among the clusters on demographic characteristics and travel behaviour. Erasmus (2012) in the context of KKNK derived three clusters from the motivational factors which differed on demographic and behavioural characteristics. “Escapists” were aged around 40 years and scored low on all travel motives, “festival Junkies” were older and scored high on all factors and “culture seekers” scored the highest on the motive - festival attractiveness, spent more money and were aged around 40 years. In terms of these differences, the “escapists” and “culture seekers” are slightly younger than the “festival junkies” and want to experience shows and productions, different activities and social venues that cater to their needs and tastes. All three of the clusters were predominately female, Afrikaans-speaking, from the Western Cape Province and in high-income occupations. In terms of behavioural characteristics, the three clusters indicated that they attended the KKNK between five and six years, spending approximately five days and nights at the arts festival indicating that the visitors to the festival are repeat visitors and loyalists. Kim and Ritchie (2012) clustered golf tourists into three clusters: “golf-intensive golfers”, “multimotivated golfers” and “companion golfers”. The study suggested that the tourists are heterogeneous in their motivation.
2.1.3: Shopping and travel motives

Recently researchers have started identifying shopping as a pull motive (Hanqin & Lam, 1999; Kim & Littrell, 1999, 2001; Heung & Cheng, 2000; Reisinger & Turner, 2002; Dimanche, 2003; Moscardo, 2004; Sangkipul, 2008). Researchers have acknowledged shopping as a major attraction and a motive of travellers. Rosenbaum (2009) opined that shopping is a driving force which motivates tourists to visit a particular destination which is moderated by a tourist’s country of origin. In comparing American and Japanese tourists travelling to Hawaii, Japanese tourists were motivated by shopping, while Americans were more inclined to travel to experience different cultures and ways of life.

2.2: Tourism shopping

Shopping is an accepted tourist activity (Timothy & Butler, 1995; Goeldner et al., 2000; Turner & Reisinger, 2001; Timothy, 2006). A trip to a destination is perceived as being incomplete without shopping, with tourists buying products ranging from gifts, local arts and crafts, souvenirs, items for daily consumption. It constitutes a big component of tourists’ travel expenditures, is an important leisure activity which affords benefits such as economic, social and psychological to tourists (Jansen-Verbeke 1991). With a variety of products available, tourist shopping has moved beyond a rational and utilitarian behaviour to one which is characterized by wants and desires and not by needs (Edward, 2000). It affords hedonic value and this experience is more important than the acquisition of the product itself (Babin et al., 1994).

Butler (1991) sought to differentiate between shopping tourism and tourist shopping. In the context of shopping tourism, shopping constitutes the primary motive of the trip. Tourist shopping on the other hand connotes shopping as a secondary activity during a trip, with the main aim of the travel being motives other than shopping. The tourist shoppers are characterized by utilitarian motives while shopper tourists are motivated by both utilitarian and hedonic reasons (Sundström, Lundberg & Giannakis, 2011). In the case of shopping tourism, merchandise, destination and price of the product constitute reasons for tourists to undertake the
trip (Timothy, 2006). Shopping at the border or cross-border shopping is a form of shopping tourism, wherein shopping opportunities function as an attraction. Cross-border shopping has existed between countries such as Canada-USA, European Union and Russia. Timothy and Butler (1995) while working on this premise studied the aspect of cross border shopping between Canada and USA and concluded that cross-border shopping is a leisure activity and economic activity and a motivating force for tourists to undertake cross-border trips. Working on the premise that cross border trips are seasonal and shoppers find it to be a “pleasurable experience”, a model for defining them as tourists was proposed, based on the length of stay and motivation for travel. Individuals who are motivated by pleasure or a combination of economics and pleasure should be considered as tourists. Ease of border crossing, familiarity and similarity with the place, lower prices and taxes, larger variety of goods, extensive promotion and media coverage, acceptance of Canadian dollar, availability of Sunday shopping, lack of enforcement of tax collection at the Canadian border, were factors which encourage Canadian tourists to cross borders and shop in USA. The study proposed a model for cross border shopping suggesting that the nature of purchase and frequency of cross border trips depends on the distance of residence from the border. The farther a tourist lives from the border, the less frequent is the cross border trip and more expensive are the purchases. Di Matteo and Di Matteo (1996) reported that per capita income, favourable rate of exchange and taxes were the driving force in cross border trips between Canada and the US. Functional and recreational shopping motives were stated to be reasons behind cross border shopping between Hongkong and Shenzhen (Wang, 2004). Furthermore, market characteristics of the destination such as price of products, product assortment, shopping environment, variety of stores and staff service; socio-economic characteristics and motives such as social experience, recreation, power and authority and bargaining influence cross border shopping between Hongkong and Shenzhen (Lau, Sin & Chang, 2005). Bar-Kolelis and Wiskulski (2012), studied cross border shopping at the Polish border. The study was based on inbound tourists from the neighbouring European Union and Russia. Shopping was found to be the reason for travelling to Poland for Ukranians, Russians and Byelorussian tourists. Exchange rates, flexible opening hours, similarity in the language, cultural affiliation, varied products offered by the Polish markets, quality and price of products, ease of border crossing for tourists from the European Union were contributing factors to cross
Tourist shopping has been studied extensively in the context of souvenirs. They constitute the most widely purchased products by tourists and constitute an important aspect of tourists’ experience (Wilkins, 2011; Swanson & Timothy, 2012). Gordon (1986) classified souvenirs into “pictorial images” such as postcards, “piece-of-the-rock” such as rocks, “symbolic shorthand” such as replicas and “markers” such as coffee mugs and “local products” such as handicrafts. Furthermore, ordinary products which accidentally become souvenirs and non-sale items which remind tourists of their travel and experience may also be considered as souvenirs (Swanson & Timothy, 2012). They serve as reminders of the trip; a tangible evidence of the destination visited and serves as a medium of seeking recognition from people at home (Timothy, 1998; Kim & Littrell, 1999; Wilkins, 2011). Tourists also tend to purchase souvenirs to be given as gifts to friends and relatives (Anderson & Littrell, 1995). In some cultures such as the Japanese and Korean, gift-giving is a norm, a way of strengthening relationship (Mok & Iverson, 2000; Park, 2000). While shopping for souvenirs, product attributes such as aesthetics, workmanship, linkage to the destination, quality, collectability, store attributes, value, functionality and uniqueness are perceived as being important by tourists (Littrell 1990, Littrell, Baizerman, Kean, Gahring, Niemeyer & Reilly, 1994; Anderson & Littrell, 1996; Kim & Littrell, 2001; Turner & Reisinger, 2001; Hu & Yu, 2007; Li & Cai, 2008) with product attributes impacting satisfaction with shopping (Littrell et al., 1994). Furthermore, tourists attach meaning to souvenirs, wherein they interact with artisans and are a part of the production (Anderson & Littrell, 1996). Yu and Littrell (2003) studied the relationship between travel activities and souvenir variables (such as authenticity and features of the craft) with the shopping variables (such as shopping experience) and their impact on the attitude about shopping for crafts in different shopping venues. The study was confined to the domestic tourists in USA who travelled to Iowa. Based on previous research, two typologies were chosen – spectator/recreational tourists and socially engaged tourists;
tourists belonging to these two categories were shown to have different beliefs and attitudes towards the authenticity and features of the craft. Socially engaged tourists associated the authenticity and attractiveness of the craft to the historical, cultural context and cultural and artisan linkages. The recreational activities did not influence the product-oriented belief about the craft. Intention to purchase the craft was affected by the attitude towards the shopping experience. In studying the souvenir purchase behaviour of tourists travelling for pleasure or visiting friends and relatives, in the south west of US, Swanson (2004) compared and contrasted the retailers’ and tourists’ perceptions on three dimensions of souvenir purchase-souvenir products, product attribute and store attributes. The findings suggest that tourists purchase souvenirs to remember their travel experience and place high value on souvenir products and product attributes whereas retailers considered the retail shopping environment to be important. Swanson and Horridge (2004) investigated the linkage between travel motivation and souvenir consumption and opined that travel activities or tourism styles is associated with souvenir consumption. Travel activities such as photography and events, fairs and festivals, cuisine and immersion in communities by visiting local residents were found to have a positive effect on souvenir consumption. Swanson and Horridge (2006) suggested that a tourists travel motives impact the attributes and type of souvenir purchased. Travel motives associated with seeing the destination and escape influence purchase of souvenirs such as markers, clothing and jewellery, with tourists seeking uniqueness and aesthetics. Oviedo-García, Vega-Vázquez, Castellanos-Verdugo and Reyes-Guizar (2014) suggested that factors such as “internal attraction”, “service differentiation”, “service provision” and “external attraction” impact satisfaction with souvenir purchase. Furthermore, the latter two factors additionally impact tourists’ overall satisfaction.

Literature also indicates that souvenirs are purchased more frequently by women tourists, although there was no difference in the meanings attached to souvenirs by male and female tourists (Littrell, Anderson & Brown, 1993). Wilkins (2011) however reported that women tourists are likely to purchase all categories of souvenirs with men purchasing more of discounted and branded products. Studies also reported that demographics do not influence souvenir consumption (Swanson & Horridge, 2004; Hu & Yu, 2007).
Tourism shopping is different from shopping at home. Tourist shopping is considered a leisure activity and this sense of excitement and adventure may be derived from shopping in a different environment characterized by the shopping centre attributes and ambient cues providing sensory stimulation. Tourist cannot preplan their shopping as they are exposed to various stimuli such as the elements of the shopping environment and hence tourist shopping behaviour can be perceived as being irrational and spontaneous, thus necessitating the study of tourist shopping behaviour in terms of its meaning, expectations, structure and preference patterns (Jansen-Verbeke, 1991, 1998; Yu & Littrell, 2003; Oh et al., 2004; Meng & Xu, 2012). Jansen-Verbeke (1990) suggested that indicators such as “tourists’ characteristics”, “trip companions”, “motives” and “time of the year” are useful in analysing tourist shopping. Keown (1989) suggested that “culture”, “family and individual characteristics” be considered in assessing tourists’ shopping behaviour. Mok and Iverson (2000) proposed four dimensions to study tourists’ shopping behaviour—demographics, tripographics, destination attributes and situational variables.

Tourists from nationalities such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Taiwanese have an inclination to shop. Shopping is a popular activity with all Japanese tourists. This may be in part because of social norms and cultural traditions, desire for branded products, high quality products, prestige, social status and gift giving (Hobson & Christensen, 2001). The Korean shopping behaviour is also influenced by gift giving and quest for quality bargains (Park, 2000). Chinese tourists’ propensity to shop can be explained by their need to convey social identity, reliability of foreign retailers and enjoyment of the shopping experience (Wang, Doss, Gou & Li, 2010). Lehto et al. (2004) compared Taiwanese outbound travellers based on the trip purpose. Leisure travellers spent more on shopping followed by visiting friends and relatives (VFR) and business travellers. Rosenbaum and Spears (2006) studied the tourists shopping behaviour of the Japanese leisure tourists to Hawaii. Results indicate that tourists’ activities differ with nationality. While Japanese tourists, aged less than 35 years engage in shopping, American tourists engage in non-shopping activities.
2.2.1: Tourist shopping style typologies

Various scholars have attempted to classify tourists into shopping typologies to analyse tourist shopping behaviour. Tourist shopper typologies have been developed based on souvenir shopping and travel activities.

Souvenir tourist typologies have been developed by researchers based on meanings of souvenirs, trip planning and souvenir purchasing style and craft selection criterion. Littrell (1990) developed five typologies based on the meaning of souvenirs. Tourists were classified into “Shopping oriented tourists”, “authenticity seeking tourists”, “special trip tourists”, “textile for enjoyment tourists” and “apparel oriented tourists”. Littrell et al. (1993) reported four tourist types based on souvenir purchases: “ethnic”, “arts and people style”, “history and parks style”, “urban entertainment style” and “active outdoor style”. The tourists varied in the product preferences. Anderson and Littrell (1996) clustered tourists based on trip planning and souvenir purchasing style into “goal attainment travellers”, “low involvement travellers”, “eclectic travellers”, “centrist travellers” and “laid-back travellers”. Kim and Littrell (1999) profiled female tourists into “ethic” and “recreational”, based on travel activities. The two groups differed in their perception of souvenir attributes such as uniqueness, aesthetics and portability. Hu and Yu (2007) developed typologies based on crafts selection criterion. Three typologies, namely “shopping enthusiasts”, “shopping lovers” and “indifferent shoppers” were extracted. The preference for type of souvenirs varied with the typology.

Paige and Littrell (2003) focused their study on domestic tourists in USA. Based on different travel activities, three groups of tourists were identified namely- “outdoor tourist”, “culture, arts and crafts tourist”, “sports tourist”. Outdoor tourism included activities like visiting national parks, wilderness areas, and rural countryside camping, hiking, backpacking, and bicycling. Visiting Galleries, museums, heritage sites attending cultural and ethnic festivals were activities which the second category of tourists participated in, while Sports tourists preferred winter sports extreme sports, golf or tennis and attended sporting events. Each group was further subdivided into high and low preference groups based on the importance of various activities in the group. These groups were compared and contrasted on shopping variables. The shopping variables
chosen for the purpose of study were shopping venue, mall characteristics and product characteristics. Within each group, significant differences were found in the shopping preferences. Based on the experience sought by the tourists, Oh et al. (2004) developed seven trip typologies—“people and setting”, “urban entertainment”, “intimacy and romance”, “active outdoor”, “history and parks”, “social with friends” and “relax with families”. The typologies were positively related to shopping or browsing for antiques. Fairhurst, Costello and Holmes (2007) developed typologies based on travel activities. Tourists were grouped into “city”, “historical”, “active”, “alone” and “tour groups”. Tourists categorized as “city” tended to spend most on souvenirs. Tourists categorized as “active” tended to buy small items while those categorized as “alone” spent least time shopping. Reisinger and Park (2009) studied the concept of luxury shopping behaviour and identified different types of tourist shoppers based on frequency and importance attached to shopping. Tourist shoppers were classified as “infrequent shoppers”, “sometime shoppers” and “frequent shoppers”. These groups differed significantly in their luxury purchasing behaviour in terms of choice of luxury product, shopping destination and shopping venue.

2.3: Shopping motive

In the context of shopping, motivation may be thought of as the driving force within consumers which makes them shop. It is a key construct in the study of shopping behaviour (Wagner, 2007). Shopping, has been described as a multidimensional activity, involving utilitarian, recreational activity or a combination thereof (Jarboe & McDaniel, 1987) and is no longer perceived as acquiring daily necessities and serving a utilitarian function. This shift has been caused by variations in the social, cultural and economic trends world over, resulting in new consumption and behaviour patterns, and new demands (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980; Michalkó & Timothy, 2001; Timothy, 2006).

In the seminal work on shopping motives, Tauber (1972) identified two types of psycho-social needs namely “personal” and “social”. The personal motives comprised of “role-playing”, “diversion”, “self-gratification”, “and learning about new trends”, “physical activity and sensory
stimulation”. The social motives encompassed “needs for social experiences”, “communication with others”, “peer group attractions”, “status and authority”, and “pleasure in bargaining”. Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) suggested that rational shopping does not explain entirely the consumption behaviour and introduced “hedonic consumption” encompassing multi-sensory and emotive aspects of consumer’s experiences with products. Building on Tauber’s (1972) work, Bellenger and Korgaonkar (1980) reported two shopper typology: “recreational shoppers” and “convenience shoppers”. Westbrook and Black (1985) reported seven dimensions of shopping motives in shopping centres and malls, namely: “anticipated utility”, “role enactment”, “negotiation”, “choice optimization”, “affiliation”, “power and authority” and “stimulation”. Likewise, Arnold and Reynolds (2003) identified hedonic motives such as “adventure shopping”, “social shopping”, “gratification shopping”, “idea shopping”, “role shopping” and “value shopping” and developed five typologies of shoppers: “minimalists”, “gatherers”, “providers”, “enthusiasts” and “traditionalists”. The hedonic and utilitarian motives may coexist among consumers. Furthermore, one of the above mentioned motives (hedonic or utilitarian) may be dominant in some consumers (Thompson, Locander & Pollio, 1990). Rohm and Swaminathan (2004) reported “retail shopping experience” and “enjoyment of shopping’ as two dimensions of retail shopping motives. Kim (2006) identified two dimensions of utilitarian shopping: “achievement” and “efficiency” and clustered shoppers based on hedonic and utilitarian shopping motives into five groups- “alpha shopper”, “economic shopper”, “beta shopper”, “functional shopper” and “mission specialist”. Wagner (2007) postulated four motivational patterns namely: “shopping pleasure”, “frictionless shopping”, “value seeking” and “quality seeking”. Within the four motivational patterns are encompassed social, experiential, and utilitarian aspects of shopping.

Buttle (1992) replicated Tauber’s study in the context of shopping as a travel activity and suggested that shopping on a vacation was different from shopping at home. Motives for tourist shopping stated were: “more time to browse”, “more relaxed social interaction with family and friends” indicating the hedonic aspect of shopping and “more money for spending”. Keown (1989) suggested a model to explain tourists’ shopping motives. He opined that product variety, import duty and taxes, price/value and quality of goods and retail strategies will impact tourists
shopping behaviour. Travel Industry Association of America (2001) reported ten shopping motives of tourists—“Something to do”, “Wanted to buy something for other people”, “Had an event or holiday for which needed to buy something”, “Wanted a souvenir of the trip”, “Like to shop/always shop on trips”, “Friends/relatives took me shopping”, “Lower prices/save money”, “Wanted to buy items unique to the destination/authentic goods” and “Different selection of stores than those at home”. Moscardo (2004) suggested that shopping is a popular activity among tourists, even though it may not be an important factor in the choice of a destination. The study suggested that tourist shopping is related to two shopping motives: “expressive motives” and “instrumental motives”. While expressive motives pertain to shopping for relaxation, escape, socialization and status, instrumental motives pertain to shopping for necessities, meeting cultural obligations and experience the local culture. Shopping outcomes such as product choice, importance of attributes (product and service) are influenced by the two motives, namely expressive and instrumental. Tourist attributes, travel attributes, destination attributes, and situational attributes have been widely stated as motives for shopping in literature (Butler, 1991; Mok & Lam, 1997; Hobson & Christensen, 2001; Kim & Littrell, 2001; Kinley et al., 2003; Paige & Littrell, 2003). Research also indicates that unavailability of products at home, uniqueness of the products with respect to the destination, quality, design of products and brands influence the purchase decision of the tourists (Littrell et al., 1994; Costello & Fairhurst, 2002; Reisinger & Turner, 2002; Paige & Littrell, 2003; Xu & McGehee, 2012).

Moscardo (2004) identified four types of shoppers namely “serious shoppers”, “not-so-serious-shopper”, “arts and crafts shopper” and “non shoppers” based on the importance of shopping in destination choice and their actual participation in shopping activities, and suggested shopping behaviour is indeed a part of a tourist experience. Comparison of the four groups on the demographic variables indicated significant differences on age, place of residence and travel party details. Comparison on travel behaviour variables also indicated significant differences. In the retail and shopping mall setting, Kinley et al. (2003) clustered tourists based on their motivation for patronizing mall into “shopping tourists” to whom shopping is important, “experiential tourists” to whom shopping is entertainment and “passive tourists” to whom shopping is least important. In a similar vein, Josiam, Kinley and Kim (2005) delineated
shopping motives of tourists at a mall using the push-pull theory, with the strongest push motivators being personal motives such as “to buy gifts”, “to treat myself” and “to enjoy the vacation”. The push motives delineated were “boredom buster” who go to malls to pass time, “shoppertainment seeker” to whom shopping is entertainment, “socialising shopper” to whom shopping is a form of socialising, “gift/souvenir shopper” who shop for gifts, souvenirs, “shopping connoisseur”, who want to buy finer things and “functional shopper”, who are pushed by utilitarian motives. Park, Reisinger and Noh (2010) based on the frequency and importance of shopping during a vacation, identified the following typologies- “infrequent shoppers”, “sometimes shoppers”, “frequent shoppers”, “non-shoppers”, “neutral shoppers” and “great shoppers”. The shopping pattern for luxury services differed among the different typologies. Luxury activities such as yachting, jet tours, adventure travel, cruises and shopping venues were important to tourists who shopped frequently and to those who considered shopping as an important activity while on a vacation. Sundström et al. (2011) classified shopper tourists and tourist shopper into “follow the plan” and “go with the flow” respectively, based on their shopping motives. Follow the plan tourists are motivated by shopping at the destination, lower prices of merchandise and their shopping is characterized by planned purchases. Go with the flow tourists are also motivated by lower prices but perceive shopping as being fun at the destination.

2.4: Shopping experience

Tourists’ behaviour differs from their everyday life and therefore their shopping experience will also differ from that of home (Oh et al., 2004). They experience unique environment and stimuli, different from the one at home. Tourism experiences also differ from other service experiences. The leisure experience of tourists on a holiday is characterised by temporal importance, emotional involvement and a long period of interaction with various stakeholders. It also entails a tourist being a part of the service delivery and therefore a source of satisfaction (Ryan, 1999). The aforementioned characteristics indicate that tourist shopping experience differs from their regular shopping experience.
A tourists’ attitude and feeling towards a destination is impacted by various factors such as the destination’s environment and its service infrastructure. These factors merge to constitute a tourist’s experience (Mo, Howard & Havitz, 1993; Tosun, Temizkan, Timothy & Fyall, 2007). Services such as shopping at a destination influence the destination experience (Murphy, Pritchard, & Smith, 2000). Shopping is an important activity on a tourist’s itinerary, with shopping in a diversified and attractive environment creating a leisure experience, even for tourists who have access to comparable shopping centres and malls at home (Kinley et al., 2003).

Tourism shopping experiences entails interactions between tourists, and shopping environment, product attributes and services; and is the sum of tourist satisfaction or dissatisfaction gained from the individual attributes of products and services purchased (Jansen-Verbeke, 1991; Pizam & Ellis, 1999). Shopping experience is a function of intrinsic factors such as demographics, psychographics and motives; and extrinsic variables such as shopping environment, destination characteristics, customer service and product attributes (Timothy, 2006). Service and merchandise provided by retailers constitute an important part of the destination experience (Murphy et al., 2000), with malls and shopping centres being tourist attractions (Kinley et al., 2003). In destinations where retail/shopping is a main attraction, merchandise, service quality and shopping itself can influence a tourist’s satisfaction with his/her shopping trip (Timothy, 2014). Tourists’ judgment of the service quality in a shopping environment is often based on the cues provided by the environment itself, with their patronage intention being strongly influenced by the service quality rather than merchandise (Yüksel, 2013). Yüksel, 2004 compared domestic and international tourists who differed on the perception of their shopping experience on dimensions such as “service quality”, “price”, “staff knowledge”, “personal attention”, “ease of communication”, “the respectfulness of shop assistants” and “shop appearance”. Studies on tourist shopping experience indicate that shop attributes such as opening hours and cleanliness, staff service quality, product attributes such as price, variety, quality, reliability affect satisfaction with shopping (Heung & Cheng, 2000; Wong & Law, 2003; Tosun et al., 2007; Choi, Liu, Pang & Chow, 2008). Wong and Wan (2013) suggested additionally that destination facilities like transportation, safety and cleanliness impact a tourist’s satisfaction with the shopping experience. Yeung, Wong and Ko (2004) compared the shopping experience of
international tourists to Hong Kong and Singapore and opined that shopping experience varied with the destination. Product attributes such as reliability and variety, and shop attributes such as opening hours and cleanliness were stated to be important shopping attributes whereas window display and lighting, physical setting of shop, language ability of staff and availability of sales label were least important shopping attributes. A tourist’s impression about the products (variety and quality) and satisfaction is positively moderated by a service-oriented selling behaviour. A product-oriented selling behaviour negatively impacts satisfaction and impression about the products (Chang, Yang & Yu, 2006). Shopping opportunities, staff service, merchandise variety, quality and value for money, uniqueness of products, accessibility in the destination, accommodation and government initiatives are important parameters for a destination to develop shopping tourism (Henderson, Chee, Mun & Lee, 2011). Wu, Wall and Pearce (2014) evaluated the shopping experience of tourists to Beijing’s Silk Market on Price, Fun, and Bargaining wherein Price was an important factor which impacted the shopping experience. The colour of the store exterior and crowdedness impacts tourists’ assessment of store’s service and product quality (Yüksel, 2009). Shopping facilities and other attributes such as décor, service quality, assortment of stores and merchandise, safety, reasonable prices, pleasant environment, entertainment are attributes considered important by tourists when selecting a mall (Kinley et al., 2003, Littrell, Paige & Song, 2004; Josiam et al., 2005; Magablih, Darabseh & Abdul Hameed, 2012). LeHew and Wesley (2007) studied tourist and resident shoppers across four malls in USA and opined that tourist shoppers and resident shoppers differed on their satisfaction on mall and store attributes, with resident shoppers being more satisfied. Christiansen and Snepenger (2002) studied shopping experience in terms of shopping value, novelty derived from shopping in a different mall and encouragement of social interaction. Value derived from the shopping trip is impacted by the occasion of shopping (at home or at the destination) and the mall where the tourist shops. Tourists derive hedonic, utilitarian, novel and social experience when shopping at a tourist mall leading to increase in money spent, impulse purchase and an increase in the time spent shopping. Kinley, Kim and Forney (2002) concluded that environmental elements such as friendliness, comfort, safety and convenience impact the shopping experience of tourist shoppers and focusing on them will help build a brand presence in the minds of the customers. Howard (2007) while working on leisure shopping proposed shopping is a leisure activity and dwelled on
the relationship between leisure and retailing. Consumers expect the time spent on shopping to be pleasant and rewarding, utilizing shopping time as family time with purchases being an expression of their lifestyle and personality and demanding more experience during the process. This has resulted in proliferation of shopping centres seeking to maximize on the synergy between leisure and retailing. Presence of leisure activities like catering, entertainment and sporting activities in shopping centres were thought to encourage visitors to stay longer, encourage more spending, and attract the target customer. The researcher also distinguished leisure shopping from leisure retailing. While leisure retailing caters to leisure shopping trips, leisure shopping is dependent on an individual’s characteristics - demographics and psychological factors, trip motivation, the social setting of the trip and nature of the destination, retail and leisure mix with different shopping experiences being a result of the combination of these elements. The geographical setting of the shopping venue, physical characteristics, facilities are considered attractive by tourists (Jansen-Verbeke, 1987; Getz, 1993). Shopping venues conceptualized on themes such as “Bavarian theme of Frankenmuth, Michigan” contribute to the shopping industry of the community (Timothy, 2006). Kemperman, Borgers and Timmermans (2009) investigated the tourists’ shopping behaviour in historic downtown area and opined that tourists prefer shopping streets which are physically attractive and are pedestrianised, with hedonic shoppers spending more time in the shopping area than utilitarian shoppers. Shopping as a destination attribute, increases destinations competitiveness. Time spent in the mall, excitement and involvement impact repatronage intentions of tourists (Kinley, Forney & Kim, 2012).

Retail literature states that the physical environment wherein shopping takes place in addition to the service itself, place plays a significant role in the consumer’s experience and influences purchase behaviour (Bitner, 1990; Smith & Burns, 1996; Spies, Hesse & Loesch, 1997). Jones (1999) emphasized that between intrinsic factors and extrinsic factors, the intrinsic factors play a larger role in influencing the shopping experience; and in the wake of a negative shopping experience, extrinsic factors can influence the shopping experience. Extrinsic factors such as the shopping environment and shopping involvement arouse emotions such as pleasure in the shopper, which in turn leads to a positive experience (Wakefield & Baker, 1998). In-store atmospheric cues (music, lighting, colour, design, and digital signage), shopping centre atmospheric cues (architecture, variety of stores) and tenant mix impact shopping behaviour in
various retail settings (Wakefield & Baker, 1998; Summers & Hebert, 2001; Leo & Philippe, 2002; Babin, Hardesty & Suter, 2003; Garlin & Owen, 2006). Prus and Dawson (1991) suggested that retail setting as an extrinsic factor encompasses products, salespersons, store location, layout and design. Shopping venues which offer wide variety of stores and assortment of products provide positive shopping experience (Jones, 1999). Furthermore, atmospherics such as atmosphere, décor, spatial organization, cleanliness and merchandise layout and visual content and architectural design result in positive experience (Bellenger & Korgaonkar, 1980; Wakefield & Baker, 1998; Jones, 1999; Christiansen & Snehenger, 2002; Kinley et al., 2003). Sales personnel attitudes such as their helpfulness and courteousness positively impact the shopping experience, while aggressive staff creates negative experience (Jones, 1999). Mall and shop exteriors such as size, accessibility, lighting, and signage are important factors which attract consumers. Researchers have cautioned against them being flamboyant, as store entry decisions are based on their appearance (Schroeder, 2002, p.56). Furthermore, the interiors should facilitate browsing and socialising, thus making shopping pleasurable, which is the key to increasing the time spent by consumers in the stores and increasing the likelihood of sales (Donovan, Rossiter, Marcoolyn & Nesdale, 1994; Sherman, Mathur & Smith, 1997; Underhill, 1999). Store attributes such as displays, signs, lighting and temperature affect customers’ perception, approach behaviour and impulse buying (Mohan, Sivakumaran & Sharma, 2013). In addition to the store environment, the mall environment also impacts perception of product/service quality which in turn impacts approach/avoidance behaviour (Michon, Chebat & Michon, n.d.). Retail density is also an important aspect of retail atmospherics which impacts the perception of the shopping environment which in turn impacts the perception of product quality (Michon, Chebat & Turley, 2005).

Shopping satisfaction is derived when various elements such as atmospherics, product attributes and sales person work in tandem to create positive shopping experience. Heung and Cheng (2000) identified shopping attributes- tangible quality, service quality, and product attributes-value and reliability as impacting satisfaction. While the factor tangible quality did not influence satisfaction, the latter two positively impacted tourist’s level of satisfaction with shopping. Turner and Reisinger (2001) reported that tourists shopping satisfaction is a function of the
product attribute. Shopping satisfaction is also impacted by shoppers’ demographic characteristics, societal norms and values (Kozak, 2001; Turner & Reisinger, 2001). Christiansen and Snepenger (2002) studied tourists and locals at the Park Meadow mall in Colorado, during the summer vacation to assess the impact of the shopping experience on shopping value and shopping outcome. The two situational factors namely mall experience and trip experience affected the shopping experience of tourists. Demographics and personality did not influence the shopping experience, while being away from home and the mall itself did have a bearing on the shopping attitude and shopping behaviour. Reisinger and Turner (2002) studied shopping satisfaction of Japanese tourists visiting Hawaii and the Gold Coast using the following dimensions – shop (presentation and attractiveness), product range and service. The results of their study indicated that the products considered to be important by the tourists determined the importance of their attributes, and thus tourist satisfaction indicating that evaluation of satisfaction with shopping should be based on specific product types available in the shopping destination. Wong and Law (2003) opined that product attributes, service, tourist’s characteristics and environment determine shopping satisfaction. In his study on the level of satisfaction with the shopping experience, Asian and Western tourists differed in their preferences and patterns in shopping and on their expectation and perception towards the shopping experience. Littrell et al. (2004) reported shopping as an important activity for senior travellers often integrated with other travel interest, including recreational pursuits. The study suggested that senior travellers were influenced by mall pull factors of merchandise, ambience, entertainment, convenient location, cleanliness, appearance and authenticity. Yüksel (2004) focused on shopping experience while studying the service, shop related attributes and products purchased by Dutch, Yugoslavian and domestic visitors in Kusadasi, Turkey. A comparison of domestic and international visitors revealed that differences exist in the products purchased and evaluation of services. Service related attributes such as knowledge of product, communication skills of the shop assistants, attention and respect shown to the tourists and shop related attributes such as appearance, product variety, and price showed considerable differences between the shoppers because of cultural differences. During a trip, an international tourist tends to become more tolerant and less critical, while a domestic tourists still expects high levels of service. Chang, Yang and Yu (2006) reported that the interaction between the tourist and the sales person
influences product purchase and satisfaction. Yüksel (2007) studied the effect of internal and external risk on the tourist emotions. The study conducted in the Southwest of Turkey suggests that the emotional states of pleasure and arousal affect the tourists’ shopping satisfaction and expressed loyalty intention. The perception of shopping risk was found to be negatively related to shopping satisfaction and loyalty intentions. Lesser perceived shopping risk was associated with greater shopping satisfaction; repurchase intention and positive word-of-mouth communication. Pleasure was positively related to shopping satisfaction and loyalty intentions implying more pleasure lead to greater satisfaction. Arousal was also positively related to both shopping satisfaction and loyalty intention. The magnitude of these risks on emotions and satisfaction were different. Internal risk affected arousal level more strongly while external risk had a weaker effect on satisfaction. Luo and Lu (2011) analysed the shopping environment during the Canton fair. Variables such as the location of shops, accessibility to the shopping location and availability of range of products affected the shopping experience and shopping patterns. Language barrier has a negative effect on the shopping experience and satisfaction. Demographic factors like income and personal experience affect the shopping experience. Income influences the shopping behaviour in terms of choice of shops, products, expenditure, and perception of shopping environment and transportation whereas personal experience during shopping has a direct relation to shopping behaviour. Chinese tourists to the US reported language barrier, limited payment options and sales staff attitude as negatively influencing their shopping experience. Product attribute in terms of place of production of branded products was an important factor in their assessment of shopping experience. In shopping for products, they preferred products which were “made in US” and the non availability of the same resulted in negative shopping experience (Xu & McGehee, 2011). Hurst and Niehm (2012) reported differences in shopping behaviour of residents and tourists in Iowa. In comparison to residents, tourist shoppers were more satisfied with the quality of service, staff service, products and the level of fun.
2.5: Promotion

Shopping malls are business centres that attract a large section of urban customers who experience the pleasure of modern shopping (Rajagopal, 2009) and the shopping centres and retail industry place a great deal of emphasis on leisure shopping and tourism (LeHew & Wesley, 2007). Shopping malls face stiff competition, characterized by over capacity, declining customers (LeHew & Fairhurst, 2000), similar store mix and product offerings (Wakefield & Baker, 1998). Faced with stiff competition, the malls use promotional activities to differentiate themselves through image communication, increased footfall, and stimulate merchandise purchases (LeHew & Fairhurst, 2000). Sales promotions are an important part of marketing campaign. They are a collection of incentive tools, mostly short term, designed to stimulate quicker or greater purchase of products or services by consumers (Kotler & Keller, 2005). There are three types of sales promotion strategies: Push, Pull, or a combination of the two (Dolak, 2010). Beyond monetary savings, sales promotions provide customers with hedonic benefits such as entertainment, exploration, self expression and utilitarian benefits such as added value, increased quality, and convenience, (Chandon, Wansink & Laurent, 2000). Various promotions employed by malls are “price-based promotions” such as “mall-wide sales”, “discount once minimum purchase value is reached”, “gift with purchase” and “gift voucher once minimum purchase value is reached”; “entertainment based promotions such as “stage shows”, “performances”, “market days” and “product displays”; educational promotions and community events such as “displays” and “campaigns” (Alexander & Muhlebach, 1992; Peattie, 1998; Wakefield & Baker, 1998; LeHew & Fairhurst, 2000). Promotional activities employed by malls affect sales and number of shoppers (Parsons, 2003). Price-based promotions increase sales and entertainment-based promotions increase customer visits (Wakefield & Baker, 1998). While price-based promotions increase sales in malls, non-price based promotions such as competition/lottery and gift-with-purchase impact the hedonic value of shoppers; general entertainment and community displays increase visits to the malls (Nicholls, Li, Mandokovic, Roslow & Kranendock, 2000; Parsons, 2003).
Tourist shoppers are pulled by factors like assortment of stores, merchandise, quality, variety, pleasant atmosphere, safety to the malls. The mall operators should treat tourist shoppers as distinct groups (Josaim et al., 2005), should tailor services and products to cater to this segment (LeHew & Wesley, 2007).

2.6: Shopping value

Value is "an interactive relativistic preference experience . . . characterizing a subject's experience of interacting with some objects. The object may be anything or event" (Holbrook & Corfman, 1985). Shopping value is the benefit derived from the shopping experience which offers both hedonic and utilitarian value. Utilitarian shopping value is work oriented and is the cognitive outcome of shopping. Hedonic shopping value reflects the entertainment and emotional aspect of shopping, derived from the shopping experience and may not be associated with task related activities of shopping. It is subjective in comparison to utilitarian value and is indicated by increased arousal, heightened involvement, perceived freedom, fantasy fulfilment, escapism and perceived enjoyment. Babin et al. (1994) developed a shopping value scale with the aim of capturing utilitarian and hedonic value of shopping. Utilitarian value indicates that products have been purchased in a rational manner during shopping. However, without the purchase of a product, utilitarian value may also be achieved by obtaining product information. Hedonic value, on the other hand, is reflective of the emotional or psychological worth of the shopping experience. Shoppers, who view shopping as a means of escaping, enjoy bargaining and exploring new products, in essence seek hedonic value from their shopping experience (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982). Woodruff (1997) proposed the “customer value hierarchy” model which stated that a customer’s value has two dimensions, that of desired value and received value. Following a hierarchical order, the lowest level encompasses value associated with products (attributes and performances) followed by the middle level which is associated with consequences and the last level, which is associated with the customer’s purpose and goal. Stoel et al. (2004) reported a positive relationship between mall attributes and hedonic and utilitarian shopping values. Various store attributes such as staff interaction, product value and accessibility positively influence hedonic shopping values and store attributes such as product
assortment and physical aspects positively influence utilitarian value (Olsen & Skallerud, 2011). Research indicates that both utilitarian and hedonic values can be attained by customers during a shopping experience (Babin et al., 1994; Babin & Attaway, 2000; Michon & Chebat, 2004; Stoel et al., 2004; Carpenter et al., 2005). Shopping value influences satisfaction, word of mouth, repatronage intention and loyalty (Jones et al., 2006).

Value derived by tourists during their shopping trip has been assessed based on tourists’ overall assessment of product quality, price and services (Heung & Cheng, 2000; Reisinger & Turner, 2002; Yüksel, 2004; Yu & Littrell, 2005). Christiansen and Snepenger (2002) opine that tourists derive value from their trip and the mall they visit at the destination. Tourist shoppers attributed more hedonic, utilitarian, novelty and social value to their shopping experience in comparison to shopping at their home mall, which lead to an increase in satisfaction, impulse purchase, spending and time spent shopping. Yüksel (2007) stated that the shopping environment creates a positive impact on shopping emotions and shopping value, which influences revisit, enjoyment and shopping expenditure. Hirschman and Holbrook (1982) opine that assessments based on price or functional utility provided by an object does not encompass values provided by consumption experiences. Shopping is a leisure activity (Babin et al., 1994) and this leisure aspect of consumption denotes shopping as being distinct from buying. Store, merchandise related attributes and staff service work in unison to create shopping experiences and satisfied tourists (Timothy, 2006). Hence measuring shopping value should go beyond just functional utility (Bloch, Sherrell & Ridway, 1986). Tourists who have high degrees of hedonic shopping values tend to be influenced by impulse behaviour and tourists who seek utilitarian value tend to be influenced by planned behaviour. High level of satisfaction with the travel experience may induce impulse purchase and low levels of satisfaction will induce rational shopping behaviour (Meng & Xu, 2012).

2.7: Products purchased
Many destinations have become well-known for their retail offerings. Knowledge about how tourists shop is imperative to researchers and retailers (Rosenbaum & Spears, 2005). Existing literature suggests that there is a change in the pattern of goods purchased by the tourists. It has
moved beyond souvenirs, crafts and destination specialty products and has extended to a range of products (Turner & Reisinger, 2001, Timothy, 2006). Meng and Xu (2012) in a conceptual research proposed that a tourist’s intention to purchase a product is influenced jointly by planned, impulsive and experiential factors. Experiential factors such as hedonic shopping value and satisfaction with travel influence the relationship between planned and impulsive factors.

Tourists purchase items such as local food, cigarettes, clothing, souvenir, local arts and crafts books, photographs, toys, cosmetics, medicine, clock/watches, camera/optical goods, electrical equipments, jewellery, leather, perfume, wine and postal goods (Heung & Qu, 1998; Turner & Reisinger, 2001; Oh et al., 2004, Lehto et al., 2004)

National culture of tourists impacts their shopping preferences (McCleary et al., 2006). The products purchased vary according to the cultural background and visit status (Mak et al., 1999; Hobson & Christensen, 2001; Reisinger & Turner, 2002; Moscardo, 2004; Rosenbaum & Spears, 2005; Park & Reisinger, 2009). Tourists from Asian countries tended to spend more time and money on shopping in comparison to those from Europe and North America (Heung & Qu, 1998). Yüksel (2004) reported the products purchased by Dutch, Yugoslavian and domestic visitors in Kusadasi, Turkey. A study conducted by Rosenbaum and Spears (2005) in Hawaii indicates the products purchased by Japanese, South Korean, Chinese, Australian, New Zealanders, American and Canadian tourists. Chinese, Japanese and South Koreans displayed similar affinity towards shopping. The Japanese showed a high propensity to shop with a desire to purchase leather handbags and accessories, with a tendency to shop in department stores, designer boutiques, and mall stores. Only 41 percent of Japanese showed interest in buying Hawaiian souvenirs. Tourists from the US preferred to shop for souvenirs rather than other products. The Japanese tend to buy designer merchandise in Hawaii (Rosenbaum & Spears, 2006). The type of product purchased varied with the typology of tourists in Tennessee. Crafts, books, maps and postcards were purchased by tourists belonging to the typologies-“city” and “historical”. Locally made products were additionally purchased by “city” tourists. Products such as jewellery, antiques, baskets, sporting goods and regional wines were not purchased by tourists (Fairhurst et al., 2007). Chinese tourists on their visit to the US preferred to buy products which
were manufactured in the US. Products purchased included antiques, watches, cosmetics, shoes, vitamins. Customs regulation played an important role in their product purchase decision (Xu & McGehee, 2012).

Demographics such as gender, age and tripographies such as type of tourists, trip typologies, also impact products purchased (Oh et. al., 2004, Lehto et. al., 2004). Female tourists tended to spend more on shopping items while male tourists spent on dining (Jansen-Verbeke, 1987). Oh et al. (2004) suggested that female travellers were more likely to shop or browse for clothes, shoes and jewellery but showed lower interest in antiques. Age also impacted the type of store visited. Senior travellers over 61 years were not interested in books and music store, whereas people over 51 to 60 years were interested in books and music store. Tourists younger than 30 had lowest propensity to shop/browse for antiques and gourmet foods, local arts and crafts whereas travellers aged 51 to 60 had the highest propensity to shop for antiques, gourmet foods, and local arts and crafts. The youngest travellers (less than 30 years) showed higher interest in shopping/ browsing for clothes, shoes and jewellery. Lehto et al. (2014) compared domestic and international tourists on the products purchased and reported differences between the two groups on the products purchased. While domestic tourists tended to purchase more of carpets, the Dutch preferred imitation products and jewellery, Yugoslavians purchased readymade garments, leather products and jewellery.

2.8: Section summary

In conclusion, theories on travel motivation state that a travel motive is a function of a tourist’s need. The push and pull model offers insights into the destination choice by taking into consideration a tourists’ internal forces and destination attributes. Such studies have largely been conducted in the context of pleasure travel. Studies on festival motivation have taken into account events/festivals which are community based, entertainment based, cultural, celebratory in nature and in specific areas like business and convention and sports. In these events, motives like socialization, kinship, entertainment, escape and novelty explain a tourist’s need to travel. Research on tourists’ shopping motives is restricted to souvenir shopping and shopping as a travel activity, which suggests that tourists shop because they are motivated by product
attributes, by customs such as gift giving and by keepsakes. Above mentioned literature on retail suggests that shopping experiences involve more than the purchase of goods and encompass experiences resulting from the interaction with the shopping environment. Studies on tourist shopping experience have been few and far between and have been conducted in the context of shopping as a travel activity. Service, merchandise, price differentials and cultural background were stated to be the reasons influencing tourists’ shopping experience.

Shopping festivals are being promoted by destinations as a tourism product, and they are a recent phenomenon. However, there has been no study to understand the travel motives and tourists’ typology. This study therefore seeks to understand the motives of tourists visiting a shopping festival and develop their typology. Shopping Festivals are staged events, where shopping constitutes the core of the festival with malls and retailers participating in the festival. Various constructs like the mall attributes, sales promotions, shopping attributes, staff service and product attributes work in conjunction to create a shopping experience. These constructs are key concepts in retailing which constitute the shopping experience from which the hedonic and utilitarian value is derived. Hence this study contends that shopping value is a complex construct and involves more than the assessment of utility. Since shopping is the central theme of the festival, tourist shopping is likely to be affected by the shopping habitat, products, promotions and the value tourists derive from shopping.

2.9: Conceptual framework

The proposed conceptual framework of the travel motives and shopping behaviour of international tourists to a shopping festival is based on extant, reviewed literature in retail, leisure/tourism and consumer studies on shopping.

A tourists’ travel motive is conceptualized as a function of Sign-Gestalt paradigm, also known as the “push-pull factor” compendium theory (Dann, 1977). Subsequently, the segmentation motives have been used in developing a typology using the posteriori or factor-cluster method (Mazanec, 1992). The shopping behaviour of tourists to a shopping festival is conceptualized as a representation of: travel motives, shopping motives of tourists, destination characteristics such as the shopping environment and promotions, travellers’ characteristics, tripography, products
purchased and shopping value. Travellers’ characteristics include respondents’ age, gender, education, employment and household income. Tripography included travel company and visit status.

Figure 2.9.1: Conceptual framework for the study
2.10. Chapter conclusion

Extant literature on travel motives and shopping behaviour was reviewed. Constructs such as shopping motives, shopping experience, shopping value and product purchase pattern were determined to affect the shopping behaviour of tourists. Hence a conceptual framework encompassing the travel motives and shopping behaviour was formulated.