

Stakeholders in the tourism industry



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

It always cross mind of stakeholders in the tourism industry of why people buy package trips to be on holiday or business trip they take, why visitors choose one particular destination instead of another. For the stakeholders, it is a challenge to learn and understand pre-requisite factors visitors take into consideration in choosing a destination. Holloway (1998) said that relatively little is known about tourist motivation and although numerous statistics are gathered which reveal a great deal about who goes where, the reasons for these choices are little understood.

These literature reviews highlights the different theories of stakeholders and the use of Network Analysis (NA) to study the link between different destination stakeholders. Stakeholder theory is a management theory which argues that the interests of all stakeholders are of intrinsic value (Donaldson and Preston, 1995). Literatures also enlightens the different theories of motivation combine with the different author's motivational factors to explain why people travel. The “ pull” and “ push” motivation factors are the theories that are the most acceptable (Yoon & Uysal 2005; you et al., 2000). The concept behind this theory is that people travel because they are pushed and pulled to travel by certain forces (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). Uysal & Jurowski, 1994 stated the push factor are socio-psychological needs related to intrinsic motivators while pull factors relates to the attractiveness and specific features of the destinations.).

LINK BETWEEN STAKEHOLDERS AND NETWORK

A tourism destination may be considered as a cluster of interrelated stakeholders embedded in a social network (Scott at al., 2008a). Such a

network of stakeholders interacts, jointly meeting visitor needs and producing the experience that the travellers consume. A stakeholder is “ any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives” according to Freeman, (1984, p. 46). Palmer, 1996; Tyler and Dinan 2001; Pforr, 2002; developed networks as an important conduit for managing public-private relationships and understanding structures of tourism governance.

Interaction of stakeholders is multifaceted. Governance is a concept used to direct the stakeholders. It refers to relationships between multiple stakeholders and how they interact with one another. It involves how stakeholders determine implement and evaluate the rules for their interaction (Beritelli et al., 2007).

The Network Analysis is an applicable method used to study the link between tourism destination stakeholders while differentiating between the public and private sector.

An individual firm’s performance depends on the behavior of others that it is directly and indirectly connected to according to Freeman (1984). The NA studies the links between tourism destination stakeholders, while distinguishing between private and public sectors. NA show in preferential order with which stakeholder they want to be in touch first.

TOURISM MOTIVATION

The question that is still asks by many authors and stakeholders are the factors that encourage tourism to travel, that is, motivation. Motivation

refers to that which directs the behavior of the individual towards goals. It is defined as the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreithner, 1995). According to S. P. Robbins (1997), motivation is the process by which activities are started, directed, and sustained to fulfill both physical and psychological needs. Whenever an individual tries to satisfy a need, it is classified as motivation; need is an objective interest. Robbins (1997) explained the motivation process as follows.

C: UsersNathaliePictures3-8cb9d53c1c.jpg

(Source: S. P. Robbins (1997), *Organization Behavior: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*, 7th Ed.

The diagram demonstrates the willingness for an individual to employ high levels of effort to reach organizational goals in order to satisfy some individual needs or self-individual needs.

As shown above, unsatisfied needs always lead an individual to be anxious. This state of mind is converted into tension, making an individual wish for something. These wishes or drives provoke a search behavior. As a result of the search behavior, an individual discovers wants that, if satisfied, will lead to a reduction in tension.

So, when an individual is under pressure, they alleviate this stress by making effort. The greater the stress, the higher will be the effort made. This effort leads towards achieving goals set, leading to satisfaction of needs. According to the understanding of Luthan (1995), this process lies in the meaning of and relationship between needs, drives, and incentives.

The following section deal with the different factors stating why visitors want to visit a destination and why they choose one particular destination instead of another. To better understand the, the concepts of “ push” and “ pull” factors are developed.

THE PUSH FACTOR A TRAVEL MOTIVATOR

“ Travel motivations” is one of the useful approaches in understanding travel needs and tourists’ behaviours (Crompton, 1979; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). After the study done by Jang and Wu(2006), they stated that there are significant differences among travellers from different countries in terms of the level of importance attached to the “ push” and “ pull” factors. Starting with the push factor, it described how people are pushed to make a travel decision by internal forces (example, to have holiday, to rest or relax...) according to Uysal & Hagan. Push factors are socio-psychological needs, which are related to intrinsic motivators. The Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs is the most influential model used and its application to tourism research. All human needs can be arranged in a hierarchy of five categories according to Maslow (1970) as shown in the figure below.

C: UsersNathaliePictures450px-Maslow’s_Hierarchy_of_Needs_svg. png

According to Maslow, the human need follow these steps in an ascending manner. The most basic need is the physiological one which satisfied the basic needs of individual. Once the basic need is fulfilled, human upgrade their needs and look forward for the next level to be satisfied. However, there are cases where individuals want to satisfy a higher level though the lower level is not accomplished.

<https://assignbuster.com/stakeholders-in-the-tourism-industry/>

Pearce (1982) suggests that travel motivation has the properties of an approach-avoidance paradigm. He developed the ' Travel Career Ladder (TCL) in accordance with the Maslow's hierarchy of needs as a conceptual framework. The aim of the TCL is to show how people's needs change as experience increase. Pearce classified the TCL into five steps starting with the lowest;

Relaxation

Stimulation

Relationship

Self-esteem and development

Fulfillment

TLC proposes that people progress upwards through motivational levels with accumulated travel experiences (Lee and Pearce, 2002). The TLC demonstrates how individual start their travel career at a low level, that is, Relaxation. As individuals become more experienced travelers, they advance for higher goals until they reach high level of fulfillment.

E: 070360103001. png

It is recognized that the push factors contribute in the study of tourism behavior and understand a wide variety of needs that can be influential motivator to tourist behavior. Cohen (1972, 1979a, 1979b) contended that what tourists want is not merely to satisfy their psychological needs but authenticity of the destination. So, the other factor which could motivate <https://assignbuster.com/stakeholders-in-the-tourism-industry/>

people to travel must be taken into consideration. The following section will focus on the external motivator.

THE PULL FACTOR

The pull factor focus on another aspect of tourism behavior. Pull factors are external and related to the attractiveness and specific features of the destination (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). They are the general features of tourism regions that people recognize as touristically agreeable and attractive, such as culture, traditions and heritage, nature, amusement among others (Peters, 1969). After the study on travel motivators of Yuan & Mc Donald, Jang & Wu (2006), Mohammad & Mat Som (2010), Jang & Wu (2006) asserted that common pull factors found in most studies were natural and historical environments, safety, cost, ease of access, and facilities.

A destinations attractiveness pulled individuals in their travel decision. Dann (1981) asserted that it is comprehensible that researchers focus attention on the pull factors of tourist behavior, since they symbolize the specific attractions of the destination, which tempt once the decision has been made. Dann(1981) also claimed that the pull factors of the resort such as sunshine, relaxed tempo and friendly natives , both respond to and strengthen push factor motivation.

DIRECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PUSH AND PULL FACTOR

People's motivation to travel has been discussed on a multidisciplinary basis since the

aftermath of the Second World War, when mass tourism began to thrive. It is not only a

matter of explaining, from a psychological perspective, why some people travel and others do not (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Plog, 1974).

Plog's (1974) "travel personality," P. L. Pearce's (1988) "travel career ladder" (TCL), and Cohen's (1972) concept of "strangeness-familiarity," try to show the possible factors that drive people to travel. Plog uses the travel personality model to study why some people do not travel. He based himself on psychological impetus.

Push-Pull framework a motivational paradigm

Moreover, Plog (2001) uses the Travel Personality model to study why some people do not travel. Plog (1974) concluded that nontravelers are indeed nonadventurous and proposed the notion of travel personality in this sense; dependable, near dependable, mid-centric, near venturer, and venturer types. In his model, emphasis is laid on psychological impetus.

Cohen (1972, 1979a, 1979b, 1984), from a sociological perspective, set his model in a broader social context, arguing that tourism is essentially a social phenomenon. Tourists therefore should be analyzed by underscoring their relationships with both business establishments such as tour operators and the destination (Cohen, 1972). Highlighting social relationships in the tourism system remains the most remarkable distinction of Cohen's (1972) model, which is represented by the concept of strangeness-familiarity. This concept is constructed by breaking down Boorstin's (1964) holistic image of "the

tourist” into more specific and empirically identifiable types, namely, the “organized mass tourist,” “individual mass tourist,” “explorer,” and

122 Yong Chen, Barry Mak, and Bob McKercher “drifter” (Cohen, 1972).

As Plog, Pearce and Cohen focus in the same field of study, they all use their model to represent an integrated motivation framework. The aim behind is to show the possible linkages among the three models.

Diagrams + Explanations

(It is

taken for granted in this framework that the destination represents the pull factors of

tourist motivation, whereas characteristics of individual tourists represent the push

factors (Crompton, 1979). However, at a destination such as in a city with a complex

of economic, cultural, and historical attractions and heritages, tourist behavior may

demonstrate a pattern other than those indicated by, for example, the distance decaying

effect from the origin to the destination.)