



## Adventure Tourism Motivations: A push and pull factor approach

Julia K. Giddy<sup>1</sup>, CDFMR

University of Johannesburg, School of Tourism and Hospitality, College of Business and Economics, 57 Bunting Rd, Auckland Park, Johannesburg, 2006, South Africa, phone: +27 (0)742894199, email: [juliag@uj.ac.za](mailto:juliag@uj.ac.za) (corresponding author)

How to cite:

Giddy, J., 2018: Adventure Tourism Motivations: A push and pull factor approach. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-economic Series*, 42(42), 47-58. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.2478/bog-2018-0030>.

**Abstract.** The increased growth and commercialization of adventure tourism led to a number of changes in the profile of the individuals who now engage in adventure activities. As a result, previous understandings of adventure tourism motivations may no longer be valid. This study seeks to investigate the influence of these changes by analyzing the motivations of tourists who have engaged in adventure tourism across a range of commercial adventure activities. This is done through data collected from participants in adventure tourism, throughout South Africa, using a push and pull factor approach to motivations. The results show the increasing influence of the experiences with nature in motivations, particularly in the context of pull factors. The role of risk and thrill in motivations, which has been emphasized in previous literature, is found to be relatively minimal among these respondents. Furthermore, adventure tourism experiences are found to be dynamic, with an increasing number of significant factors influencing decision-making. It also demonstrates notable differences in the motivations of participants, based on the type of activity in which they engage.

### Article details:

Received: 11 November 2017

Revised: 09 May 2018

Accepted: 18 July 2018

### Key words:

adventure tourism,  
tourism motivations,  
push factors,  
pull factors,  
South Africa

© 2018 Nicolaus Copernicus University. All rights reserved.

### Contents:

1. Introduction . . . . .	48
2. Adventure tourism motivations . . . . .	48
3. Push and pull factor approaches to tourism motivations . . . . .	49
4. Adventure tourism in South Africa . . . . .	50
5. Research methods . . . . .	51
6. Results . . . . .	51
6.1 Push factors . . . . .	52
6.2 Pull factors . . . . .	53
6.3. Landscape features . . . . .	55
7. Conclusion . . . . .	56
References . . . . .	57

## 1. Introduction

The growth of the tourism industry is well-recognized globally and is seen in a number of subsectors including adventure tourism (UNWTO, 2017). There are two specific aspects within adventure tourism which has led to the exponential growth experienced. One, which has been widely discussed in recent years, is the commodification of adventure tourism, partially a result of increasing commercialization (Bell, Lyall, 2002; Cloke, Perkins, 2002; Varley, 2006; Cater, Cloke, 2007). The second is the growth in the range of activities labelled and/or marketed as adventure tourism (Buckley, 2010). The result of these changes, in the nature of adventure tourism, as a subsector, has been a change in the type of people who participate in such activities (Pomfret, Bramwell, 2014; Giddy, 2018). Due to the changes in the characteristics of adventure tourists, it is necessary to re-evaluate the motivations of this new group of people engaging in adventure tourism as the significance of tourism motivations has been well-substantiated in literature (Chon, 1991).

There are an infinite number of ways in which tourism motivations can be assessed. One such approach is using push and pull factors (Prayag, Ryan, 2011). The push and pull factor approach investigates both internal and external motivational dimensions. In adventure tourism, this includes aspects that drive an individual to seek out adventure activities and also provides an opportunity to assess components that drive an individual to seek out adventure experiences in a specific location (Uysal, Jurovski, 1994). This is increasingly important due to the number of destinations that now offer relatively similar adventure activities. It can also play an important role in destination marketing for locations that offer adventure tourism activities. This study, therefore, seeks to re-examine the motivations of adventure tourists using a push and pull factor approach. The analysis is based on an examination of motivations for participating in adventure tourism among participants in eight different activities in South Africa.

## 2. Adventure tourism motivations

There are numerous varying definitions for what constitutes adventure tourism, which may, partially, account for the increase in activities which fall under the adventure tourism spectrum (Weber, 2001; Swarbrooke et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2013). Some researchers have argued that any touristic activity which involves some kind of risk and uncertainty of outcome could be considered adventure tourism, such as gambling and sex tourism (Swarbrooke et al., 2003). Definitions, such as these, that are too broad makes an investigation into the dynamics of the sector unmanageable. Furthermore, one could argue that almost any tourism experience might fall under this category. Therefore, the focus of the majority of literature on the topic, as well as the definition pertinent to this study, is that by Hall (1992: 143): ‘a broad spectrum of outdoor touristic activities, often commercialized and involving an interaction with the natural environment away from the participants’ home range and containing elements of risk’.

As is the case with tourism motivations, more broadly, much research on adventure tourism has focused on the aspects that drive individuals to seek out adventure experiences (Kane, Tucker, 2004; Buckley, 2012; McKay, 2014; Pomfret, Bramwell, 2014; Naidoo et al., 2015). The majority of early research focused on the element of risk-seeking among adventure tourism participants (Robinson, 1992; Celsi et al., 1993; Shoham et al., 2000). Although inherent in the definition of what constitutes adventure tourism, most recent studies have shown that it is not actual risk that motivates participants, but rather the perceptions of risk which manifests itself as what most researchers refer to as “thrill” (Cater, 2006; Carnicelli-Filho et al., 2010; Buckley, 2012). Cater (2006) argues that, particularly in the commercial adventure tourism sector, participants seek activities which appear risky but minimize the actual danger associated with participation. Cater (2006) found that fear and thrill, rather than actual risk, are the most significant motivations for participation. These types of motivations are, therefore, linked to perceived risk, rather than real danger. In later work, Buckley (2012) concurs with Cater (2006) in that there has been no re-

search which has verified actual risk and danger are primary motivations for participation in adventure tourism activities. However, Buckley (2012) brings forth the conceptualization of “rush” as a key motivation. Buckley (2012) argues that “rush” is a product of both the adrenalin rush caused by “thrill” as well as the psychological component of achieving optimal experiences.

Other research, however, has asserted that both risk and thrill are only secondary motivations for engaging in adventure (Walle, 1997; Kane, Tucker, 2004). Although, clearly, thrill-seeking is an important motivation for adventure tourism in some cases, Walle (1997) argued the industry is much more dynamic than is typically acknowledged. Walle (1997) found that knowledge-seeking can also an important motivation factor, particularly for participants with particular cultural and psychological traits and also in the context of specific types of activities. According to Walle (1997) the narrow focus on risk has prevented the development of an adequate model of adventure tourism motivations. Kane and Tucker (2004), also argue that risk and thrill are secondary but that participants are motivated by the possibility of identity development as an “adventurer”. Their social status is elevated through the stories participants are able to tell of their experiences, where they are able to differentiate themselves from others. They are free to “play” with the stories as they reconstruct them to fit their newly developed sense of adventurer identity (Kane and Tucker, 2004). This is particularly evident in the modern context with the introduction of social media. An experience no longer appears “valid” unless it is somehow documented. And, as is the case through the story-telling discussed by Kane and Tucker (2004), social media also allows individuals the “freedom to play with reality” by choosing how to depict themselves. Kane and Tucker (2004) argue that although participants often portray these experiences as “authentic” adventure, they often occur within the safety and confines of an organized activity. Both of these studies demonstrate the fact that adventure tourism motivations are likely more complex than the risk/thrill-seeking nexus, however, more research is needed to truly elicit the other dynamics involved.

### 3. Push and pull factor approaches to tourism motivations

The motivations of tourists is one of the oldest and most widely studied aspects among tourism academics and industry stakeholders alike (Crompton, 1979; Ryan, Glendon, 1998). Understanding what drives individuals to engage in specific tourism experiences is crucial, not only for the effective development and marketing by tourism operators and organizations, but also to gain important insight into the inner workings of tourists, as a population, as well as the broader dynamics of the tourism industry as a whole (Ryan, Glendon, 1998). There have been numerous techniques used to both identify and analyze tourism motivations. The implementation of specific methodological approaches to assessing tourism motivations depends on several factors pertaining to the objective of the study at hand (McCabe, 2000). One widely used technique is the push and pull factor approach to adventure tourism motivations (Uysal, Jurowski, 1994).

The concept of ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors was first discussed in relation to tourism motivations by Dann (1977). It is based on the idea that there are certain internal factors that ‘push’ an individual to seek out a tourism experience while the decision of which experience or product to choose is based on external factors that ‘pull’ an individual to choose that specific experience.

An example of the use of the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factor approach to assess tourism motivations in the nature-based tourism context is that by Kim et al. (2003) which focuses on visitors to National Parks in Korea. Kim et al. (2003) extracted four primary ‘push’ factors: family togetherness and study; appreciating natural resources; escaping from everyday routines; and adventure and building friendship. These concepts of escapism, appreciation of nature, education, interpersonal factors and adventure are common internal motivations for tourism, particularly nature-based tourism (Beard, Ragheb, 1983; Pomfret, 2006; Luo, Deng, 2007; Buckley, 2012). ‘Pull’ factors, on the other hand, were divided into three categories: key tourist resources; information and convenience of facilities; and accessibility and transportation. Of these factors, “tourist resources” were particularly significant. Within the concept of

tourist resources, the item of “beautiful natural resources” was often a significant ‘pull’ factor which also alludes to the importance of the aesthetics of a destination in visitor motivations. Thus, the importance of environmental features emerges reasonably strongly from the above study.

In the context of adventure tourism Giddy and Webb (2016b) conducted an exploratory study on the influence of the environment on adventure tourism motivations also using a ‘push’/‘pull’ factor approach. The study found that push factors are complex and multifaceted, with no single factor emerging prominently. Giddy and Webb (2016b) found that participants in “hard,” adrenalin-oriented adventure activities, in this case bungee jumping, were overwhelmingly motivated by the risk/thrill factor. However, participants in activities that incorporate higher levels of emersion in the natural environment, in this case white-water tubing down a remote gorge, were most likely to be driven by environmental aspects. However, when assessing pull factors, participants primarily visited the area because of the activities rather than other attributes of the destination.

Pomfret and Bramwell (2014), in a study of independent mountaineer tourists in Chamonix, France, found that there is a wide range of motivations for mountaineering. The most notable were: socializing, challenge, attraction of the natural environment, and achievement (Pomfret, Bramwell, 2014, p. 19). Pull factors, such as the features of the natural environment of Chamonix, were particularly significant. With respect to segmentation, Pomfret and Bramwell (2014) found that there are some differences between more experienced mountaineers and novice mountaineers but, contrary to previous research, the differences are not necessarily associated with push and extrinsic pull motives as mutually exclusive fields or either having precedence according to experience levels. Both groups were found to be motivated by both intrinsic and extrinsic motives. This is an important finding because one would expect more experienced participants to be more influenced by extrinsic factors, namely, to seek out new settings in which to participate in the same activity. Novice participants, on the other hand, might be more likely to be motivated by internal factors such as novelty. However, this did not appear to be the case.

#### 4. Adventure tourism in South Africa

Although adventure tourism has grown in many locations throughout the world, some of the most notable growth in recent years has been experienced in developing countries (Adventure Travel Trade Association, 2015). South Africa, in particular, has experienced significant growth in the commercial adventure tourism subsector (Giddy, 2018) and was ranked the number one adventure destination in 2016 (Belles, Winternberg, 2015). Adventure tourism research in South Africa, however, is relatively limited (Rogerson, 2007; McKay, 2014).

The first body of research examines adventure tourism from a broad perspective of the industry’s development in South Africa (Rogerson, 2007; Giddy, 2016a; McKay, 2013, 2016). Both Rogerson (2007) and McKay (2013) highlight some of the challenges faced by adventure tourism in South Africa including training of guides, regulation of safety standards, marketing and product development, the impact on local communities as well as environmental management concerns. Product development appears to have evolved quite a bit in recent years (McKay, 2016). However, there are still significant marketing strategies which need to be considered, such as marketing South Africa as an “adventure destination” (Rogerson, 2007). South Africa holds a number of records in terms of commercial adventure tourism products (e.g. world records of highest bungee bridge, fastest zipline, tallest single abseil decent) though is not currently effectively marketed. Better understanding the motivations of what drives participants, however, could assist in this endeavor.

Other research has examined adventure tourism in South Africa within a human-environment interaction framework. This work has demonstrated the increasing role of the natural environment in the psychology of individuals engaging in adventure tourism, both in their motivations to pursue specific activities, their experiences and subsequent satisfaction. Giddy and Webb (2016a) have demonstrated that feelings of immersion in nature during adventure tourism experiences is linked to increases in overall satisfaction and future behavioural intentions to participate in adventure tourism. Research has also assessed the environmental attitudes of

both sector participants and employees using Dunlap and van Lier's (1978) New Environmental Paradigm scale (Giddy, 2016b; Giddy, Webb, 2018). Both studies found that, overall, the environmental attitudes of participants and employees are relatively low when compared with studies conducted within the tourism sector in other parts of the world.

## 5. Research methods

A quantitative approach to research was utilized in this study. Quantitative methods were deemed appropriate as exploratory research using a more qualitative approach had been conducted in previous research (Giddy, Webb, 2016b). In addition, it allowed for an examination of specific push and pull factors which influence adventure tourism motivations, using similar factors utilized in previous studies for comparative purposes. Furthermore, it takes into consideration the nature of the population, of commercial tourists largely engaging in relatively short activities.

Questionnaires were distributed to participants in eight different activities considered adventure tourism along the southern coast of South Africa. Activities were selected to represent a range of activities considered adventure tourism and convenience sampling employed. The activities are as follows: Whale Watching, Scuba Diving, Shark Cage Diving, Skydiving, Swimming with Seals, Kloofing (i.e. canyoning), one short technical hike (Harker-ville Trail) and one long distance hike (Otter Trail). The activities included in this study focused on nature-based adventure tourism experiences, in line with Hall's (1992) definition. Furthermore, recent studies have demonstrated the increasing influence of natural settings in adventure tourism experiences and this allowed for a deeper investigation of pull factors (Bell, Lyall, 2002; Pomfret, 2006; Giddy, Webb, 2016a). Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to participants upon completion of the activity.

All questions included in the questionnaire were quantitative. Demographic information utilized nominal and ordinal responses. Motivations were assessed using statements and 5-point Likert scales. The majority of statements used to assess

push factors were extracted directly from previous scales assessing motivations or created based on existing literature such as Ryan and Glendon (1998), Fluker and Turner (2000) Shoham et al. (2000), Buckley (2012) and Pomfret (2012). The push factors included statements that both related to tourism motivations generally, and also some specific to both nature-based tourism and adventure tourism. This resulted in 28 statements which loaded into nine factors: Thrill, Risk, Physical Challenge/Skills Development, Enjoying Nature, Overcoming Nature, Environmental Education, Novelty, Escapism, and Socialization.

It is clear from literature on 'pull' factors that they relate specifically to the location of the tourism experience (Kim, Lee, 2000; Kim et al., 2003; Aref et al., 2010). A total of 20 statements were used to determine pull factors in this study which loaded into three broad categories: Environmental, Facilities and Attractions. Specific statements for the latter two were based on other assessments of pull factors (e.g., Aref et al., 2010). Due to the increasing significance of the natural environment in motivations, the author opted to assess qualities of the natural landscape in more detail. Therefore, Environmental pull factors were extracted from Tveit et al., (2006) framework for analysing visual landscape character with a focus on those relevant to the landscapes in question.

Reliability tests were conducted for all factors which resulted in satisfactory Cronbach's Alphas with all factors found to be above 0.5. Basic descriptive statistics were generated for all Likert scale data, with a focus on means and standard deviations for factors, both across the range of activities and for each individual activity. Significance levels, both statistical and practical, were generated for all factors, across the range of activities using one-sample t-tests and Cohen's d for effect size. One-way ANOVAs were also conducted to determine differences in the results for each factor between participants in different types of activities.

## 6. Results

This discussion is based on data obtained from 459 usable questionnaires which were collected from

participants in the eight different adventure tourism activities in South Africa. The respondents were largely international (55%) or from major regions in South Africa such as Gauteng and the Western Cape (26%). They were also found to be relatively young with 57% of respondents under the age of 30 years old. There was a relative split between men and women within this sample with 46% women and 54% men.

### 6.1. Adventure tourism push factors

Push factors are considered internal motivations that drive a person to seek out specific tourism experiences. The most significant pull factor found in these results is Novelty. It also has a relatively small standard deviation implying most respondents find this an important motivation factor. The result is not altogether surprising as it is often an important motivating factor for tourism experiences more broadly (Ryan, Glendon, 1999). Enjoying Nature also has a high mean and relatively low standard deviation, a component which is more specific to nature-based tourism.

Another factor with a relatively high mean is Environmental Education which is interesting as it contradicts results from Giddy and Webb (2016b) who found Environmental Education largely insignificant in previous work. It is important, therefore, to continue to test for this motivation in different adventure tourism contexts. The factor with the lowest mean is Socialization. Earlier research on repeat participation in adventure tourism and ad-

venture recreation has found that the camaraderie associated with adventure tourism is an important motivation factor (e.g. Shoham et al. 2000). In the commercial adventure tourism context, where the majority of clients are participating in the activity for the first time or in a new location, this aspect seems to be far less important.

The mean for Risk is also low, though with a relatively high standard deviation. The manner in which this variance occurs will emerge below in discussions of results of specific activities. Another adventure tourism-specific motivation which has a relatively low mean is Physical Challenge/Skills Development. This is as skills development was found to be significant early research (e.g. Ewert, Hollenhorst, 1989). However, with the transformation of adventure tourism, discussed above, and the increase in highly guided activities, there are significantly fewer opportunities to develop specific skills. Also included in this factor is the element of physical challenge. Although several of the activities do provide relatively challenging situations, this does not appear to be significant in motivations. The mediocre of importance of the Thrill factor is of particular note due to its prevalence in literature. Therefore, these results support the theory that thrill is becoming increasingly secondary in adventure tourism motivations.

As seen in Table 1, above, several push factors are found to be statistically and/or practically significant, demonstrating that there are a range of aspects that drive an individual to seek out adventure tourism. Although five factors are shown to have statistical significance, only three withstand tests of

Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and significance levels of 'push' factors using one-sample T-tests.

Variable	Mean	Std Dev.	p (df=458)	Cohen's d
Novelty	4.27	0.75	<0.0005	1.16
Enjoying Nature	4.18	0.71	<0.0005	1.10
Environmental Education	3.70	0.88	<0.0005	0.34
Escapism	3.58	0.92	<0.0005	0.20
Thrill	3.50	0.96	0.022	0.11
Overcoming Nature	3.46	0.92	0.166	n/a
Physical Challenge/Skills Development	3.22	0.97		
Risk	3.07	1.18		
Socialization	3.06	0.94		

Source: Author

practical significance: Novelty, Enjoying Nature and Environmental Education. The elimination of Thrill, in the overall significance of adventure tourism is striking.

Due to the wide range of activities included in this study, it is also relevant to discuss pull factors in the context of specific activities; the ANOVAs for the push factors found that there is significant variation in the results of all push factors between different types of activities with sufficiently low p-values ( $p < 0.01$ ).

The means of push factors linked to specific activities are also shown in Table 2.

Although not found to be a significant motivating factor, when the results are examined as a whole, the cause of the high standard deviation found for Risk emerges when the results are distributed by activity. The means for Risk among participants in Kloofing and Skydiving participants are notably high as are means for Overcoming Nature and Thrill. These are all factors that are often associated, specifically, with adventure activities but only emerge strongly in the results of these two activities, demonstrating clear differences when compared to the other activities. These activities are highly commercialized and marketed strongly towards their

adventure elements which could account for these results.

Another result that emerged is a relatively high mean found for Socialization among Scuba Diving participants. Scuba Diving requires extensive training and participants were found to have high instances of previous participation. This could mean that motivations for Scuba Diving align more closely to those found in studies on adventure recreationists. In addition, findings for the Otter Trail and Harkerville Trail demonstrate relatively high means for Escapism, higher than even Novelty. Both activities are limited in terms of accessibility and group number and take participants to relatively remote locations which could account for the strength of this factor amongst participants in these activities. In addition, they are quite long, which might allow for an increased possibility of feelings of escapism.

## 6.2. Adventure tourism pull factors

As mentioned above, pull factors are analyzed on two levels. The first is broad generalizations of different types of pull factors. The second delves deep-

Table 2. Means of Adventure Tourism Push Factors by Activity.

Activity Type	Enjoying Nature	Environmental Education	Overcoming Nature	Thrill	Risk	Challenge/Skills	Novelty	Socialization	Escapism
Whale Watching	4.22	3.90	3.10	3.10	2.82	2.82	4.09	2.92	3.44
Skydiving	3.85	3.42	3.30	4.46	4.05	3.39	4.71	3.66	3.43
Harkerville Trail	4.22	3.49	3.48	3.05	2.43	3.69	3.79	2.83	4.04
Otter Trail	4.54	3.92	3.89	3.36	2.84	3.80	4.28	3.04	4.33
Kloofing	4.14	3.56	3.93	3.95	3.64	3.58	4.43	3.24	3.51
Swimming with Seals	4.14	3.61	3.25	3.40	2.72	2.74	4.47	2.78	3.27
Scuba Diving	4.23	3.94	3.33	3.44	3.03	3.45	4.06	3.20	3.62
Shark Cage Diving	4.08	3.76	3.35	3.58	3.29	2.58	4.41	3.07	3.10
<b>Overall</b>	<b>4.18</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.07</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>4.27</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>3.58</b>

Source: Author

er into environmental pull factors by analyzing the influence of specific qualities of the landscape. Three general aspects of the destination were assessed. The first, Environment, deals with features of the physical landscape. The second is called Attractions and focuses primarily on attractions of the destination, such as the adventure activities, events and heritage sites. The third is Facilities, which includes aspects such as accessibility, accommodation and food.

The means and significance levels of the various pull factors are highlighted in Table 3 below. Overall, means were found to be lower for the pull factors than those of the push factors. This indicates a possibility that push factors weigh more heavily for participants than pull factors. Participants appeared to find the Environment most significant in their decision-making process, though there was also moderate attention given to Attractions. With a mean below 3, it is clear that very little emphasis is given on the Facilities of the destination among these respondents. However, when assessing significance, the results are quite clear. The Environment is the only pull factor that is both statistically and practically significant, having the requisite p-value and a reasonably high Cohen's d score.

Both Attractions and Facilities are not significant, according to these findings. This is interesting as one of the items related to Attractions was a statement on the activities offered by the destination. It is, therefore, noteworthy that although all respondents participated in at least one activity, it was the environment that drove them to the destination, while the activities appear to be secondary. This supports the notion that participation in adventure activities is a mechanism by which tourists are experiencing nature. The natural environment is the primary attraction, while the activities are a means of experiencing it. These results, therefore,

demonstrate the strength of environmental elements in attracting adventure tourism participants to the destination. It also demonstrates a new and interesting dynamic in the context of both adventure tourism and nature-based tourism motivations more broadly.

Although they all take place in the same general region, the activities are relatively widely spread throughout it. This creates the need to examine the aspects that drew participants towards those specific locations. In addition, examining the differences in results between different types of activities clarifies what aspects of the destination attract specific types of adventure tourism participants. The results from ANOVAs show significant variation in the results between types of activities for all three pull factors.

For all activities, means for Environment were higher than those for both Attractions and Facilities, see Table 4. The Otter Trail has by far the highest mean for Environment, while the Shark cage Diving has the lowest. The results also stand out when considering important push factors for Skydiving participants, who seemed less motivated by interactions with the environment in the decision to participate in the activity. However, these results demonstrate that in terms of the decision to visit this *destination*, participants in the Skydiving seem to put more weight on environmental elements. Attractions have moderate means across the range of activities, though the Skydiving, Kloofing and Scuba Diving have higher means and the Harkerville Trail, Otter Trail and Swimming with Seals have rather low means.

This implies that the latter group of participants did not necessarily visit the area for the activities, specifically. Rather, they selected the destination for other reasons, while the decision to participate in adventure tourism activities was secondary.

Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations and Significance Levels of Pull Factors.

Variable	Mean	Std Dev.	p (df=458)	Cohen's d
Environment	3.83	0.60	<0.0005	0.72
Attractions	3.31	0.74		
Facilities	2.97	0.87		

Source: Author



### 6.3. Landscape features

Now that the strength of environmental pull factors has been established, it is important to establish which specific landscape qualities attracted participants in different types of activities and to the destination, more broadly. This step is important in understanding what exactly about the environment motivated participants to visit these areas. When examining the means of specific landscape qualities, shown in Table 5, the item that emerges the strongest is the “natural beauty” which emphasizes the aesthetic value of the environment.

This corresponds to results found for push factors, in which the item with the highest mean was Enjoying Nature. Other important landscape qualities are the “grandeur of the landscape,” the “uniqueness” of the environment, and “richness and variety.” The quality with, by far, the lowest mean is that of “starkness/emptiness.” The low result for “starkness/emptiness” could be related to the contrast between the coastal area, in which all activities take place and the region, called the Karoo, to the north which has less development and is also rather arid. In addition, the quality of “remoteness” is not considered a significant landscape quality in this context of these commercial adventure tourism

Table 4. Mean Values of ‘Pull’ Factors.

Activity Type	Environment	Attractions	Facilities
Whale Watching	3.78	3.26	3.15
Skydiving	3.80	3.66	3.09
Harkerville Trail	3.79	3.14	2.79
Otter Trail	4.13	3.18	2.79
Kloofing	3.90	3.52	3.32
Swimming with Seals	3.83	3.19	2.91
Scuba Diving	3.81	3.51	3.37
Shark Cage Diving	3.66	3.25	2.67
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.83</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>2.97</b>

Source: Author

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of Landscape Qualities.

Landscape Quality	Mean	Std Dev.
Natural beauty	4.35	0.78
Grandeur of the landscape	4.16	0.95
Richness and variety	4.12	0.84
Wildlife/animals.	4.03	0.95
Uniqueness	4.03	0.85
Tranquil and relaxing	4.01	0.93
Different/other worldly.	3.86	0.92
Relatively pristine environment	3.83	0.93
Weather/climate	3.78	0.97
Untamed/wild	3.75	1.00
Spacious	3.72	1.10
Remote	3.29	1.05
Stark/empty	2.84	1.12

Source: Author

participants, though they both have relatively high standard deviations. The remaining qualities are all quite high, with means over 3.70. Two additional factors that should be mentioned, however, are the qualities of “spaciousness” and the “untamed/wild” nature of the landscape. Although these both have relatively low means, they have high standard deviations, indicating a lack of consensus amongst respondents.

## 7. Conclusion

The changes caused by the growth in adventure tourism are clear. In addition, the significance of investigating adventure tourism motivations using a push and pull factor approach has been substantiated. These findings demonstrate some interesting trends in the context of previous research which focused on adventure tourism motivations. Most notable have been the increase in the importance of environmental factors. The overwhelming significance of the natural environment in the pull factors of respondents, or the external motivations, demonstrates the increasing importance of unique natural environments in validating adventure tourism experiences. It is now possible to engage in many of these activities in a number of different locations. However, respondents opted to participate in these activities in these specific locations for a reason. Most often, it appears, the “uniqueness” of the natural settings in which these activities took place was most significant in this decision process.

The overall findings, across the range of activities, support some of the previous research which asserts that both risk and thrill are secondary motivations for adventure tourists, particularly in the commercialized context (Kane, Tucker, 2005; Varley, 2006; Walle, 1997). However, the findings here do not necessarily align with those found in the above mentioned studies. Social value and socialization were not found to be important motivating factors, as asserted by Kane and Tucker (2004). The motivations found here might more closely align with Walle’s (1997) ideas of insight-seeking, due to the significance found in motivations such as Environmental Education. Furthermore, they support Walle’s (1997) notion that adventure tourism moti-

vations are more varied and diverse than the simplistic risk/thrill approach taken by the majority of previous studies.

The results also highlight the need to more carefully assess the generalizability of motivations across the range of activities now considered adventure tourism. Although pull factors appear relatively consistent, push factors varied significantly based on the type of activity in which participants engaged. Specific activities, particularly high-adrenalin activities such as Kloofing and Skydiving, appear to adhere more closely with traditional conceptualizations of adventure tourism motivations such as thrill and sometimes even risk. However, many of the remaining activities demonstrated other significant motivation factors, such as enjoying nature and novelty.

Given the relatively strong role the natural environment appears to play in motivations, it could be argued that these findings indicate a transformation in nature-based tourism, more broadly. Bell and Lyall (2002) have previously argued that tourists are no longer satisfied with passive appreciation of nature. Instead, they seek to actively engage with interesting natural environments. Therefore, the increased significance of the natural environment among this group of respondents could be indicative of the change in the ways in which tourists seeking out nature experiences choose to interact with those natural environments.

It is clear, from the above discussion, that more research is needed into some of these dynamics. Previous studies have substantiated the transformation of the adventure tourism industry, however little has examined the repercussions of this transformation. There is, therefore, a need to further investigate what these changes really mean in terms of adventure tourism planning, development and management. This study begins to address some of the ways the industry appears to be transforming, but it is limited in a number of ways. It is important, now, to continue this work in other geographic contexts and possibly using other research approaches.

## References

- Adventure Travel Trade Association.**, 2015: Adventure Tourism Development Index 2015. Seattle, WA.
- Aref, B., Mohammad, M. A., Puad, A., and Som, M.**, 2010: An analysis of push and pull travel motivations of foreign tourists to Jordan. In: *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12): 41–50.
- Beard, J. G., and Ragheb, M. G.**, 1983: Measuring leisure motivation. In: *Journal of Leisure Research*, 15(3): 219 – 228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1983.11969557>
- Bell, C., and Lyall, J.**, 2002: The accelerated sublime: Thrill-seeking adventure heroes in the commodified landscape. In Coleman, S. and Crang, M. (Eds.) *Tourism: between place and performance*. Berghahn Books, New York: 21-37.
- Belles, M. E., and Winternberg, L.**, 2015: *2016 Virtuoso Luxe Report*. New York. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Buckley, R.**, 2010: Adventure Tourism Management. Butterworth-Heinemann, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- Buckley, R.**, 2012: Rush as a key motivation in skilled adventure tourism: Resolving the risk recreation paradox. In: *Tourism Management*, 33(4): 961–970. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.10.002>
- Carnicelli-Filho, S., Schwartz, G. M., and Tahara, A. K.**, 2010: Fear and adventure tourism in Brazil. In: *Tourism Management*, 31(6): 953–956. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.07.013>
- Cater, C. I.**, 2006: Playing with risk? participant perceptions of risk and management implications in adventure tourism. In: *Tourism Management*, 27(2): 317–325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.10.005>
- Cater, C. I., and Cloke, P.**, 2007: Bodies in Action: The performativity of adventure tourism. In: *Anthropology Today*, 23(96): 13–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00548.x>
- Celsi, R. L., Rose, R. L., and Leigh, T. W.**, 1993: An exploration of high-risk leisure consumption through skydiving. In: *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(1): 1–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/209330>
- Chon, K.-S.**, 1991: Tourism destination image modification process. In: *Tourism Management*, 12(1): 68–72. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(91\)90030-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(91)90030-W)
- Cloke, P., and Perkins, H. C.**, 2002: Commodification and adventure in New Zealand Tourism. In: *Current Issues in Tourism*, 5(6): 521–549. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500208667939>
- Crompton, J. L.**, 1979: Motivations for pleasure vacations. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4): 408–424. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(79\)90004-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(79)90004-5)
- Dann, G.**, 1977: Anomie, Ego-Enhancement and Tourism. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4: 184–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(77\)90037-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(77)90037-8)
- Dunlap, R. E., and Van Liere, K. D.**, 1978: The “New Environmental Paradigm”. In: *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 40(1): 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEE.40.1.19-28>
- Fluker, M. R., and Turner, L. W.**, 2000: Needs, motivations, and expectations of a commercial whitewater rafting experience. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(4): 380–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750003800406>
- Giddy, J. K.**, 2016a: Adventure tourism in South Africa: Challenges and prospects. In: *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 64(4): 451-455. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/170581>
- Giddy, J. K.**, 2016b: Environmental Values and Behaviours of Adventure Tourism Operators : The case of the Tsitsikamma, South Africa. In: *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(4): 1–19.
- Giddy, J. K.**, 2018: A profile of commercial adventure tourism participants in South Africa. In: *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 29(1): 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2017.1366346>
- Giddy, J. K., and Webb, N. L.**, 2016a: The influence of the environment on adventure tourism: From motivations to experiences. In: *Current Issues in Tourism*: 1-16.
- Giddy, J. K., and Webb, N. L.**, 2016b: The influence of the environment on motivations to participate in adventure tourism: The case of the Tsitsikamma. In: *South African Geographical Journal*, 98(2): 351-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2015.1028990>
- Giddy, J. K., and Webb, N. L.**, 2018: Environmental attitudes and adventure tourism motivations. In: *Geo-Journal*, 83(2): 275-287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-017-9768-9>
- Hall, C.**, 1992: Adventure, sport and health tourism. In: C. M. Hall and B. Weiler (Eds.), *Special Interest Tourism*. Belhaven Press, London.
- Kane, M. J., and Tucker, H.**, 2004: Adventure tourism: The freedom to play with reality. In: *Tourist Studies*, 4(3): 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797604057323>

- Kim, S. S., Lee, C.-K., and Klenosky, D. B.**, 2003: The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. In: *Tourism Management*, 24(2): 169–180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(02\)00059-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00059-6)
- Kim, S. S., and Lee, C.**, 2000: Push and pull relationships. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1): 257–260. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(01\)00043-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00043-3)
- Luo, Y., and Deng, J.**, 2007: The New Environmental Paradigm and nature-based tourism motivation. In: *Journal of Travel Research*, 46(4): 392–402. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507308331>
- Mccabe, A. S.**, 2000: Tourism Motivation Process. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(4): 1049–1052. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00130-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00130-9)
- McKay, T.**, 2013: Adventure tourism: opportunities and management challenges for SADC destinations. In: *Acta Academica*, 45(3): 30–62. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/2923>
- McKay, T.**, 2014: White water adventure tourism on the Ash River, South Africa. In: *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 20(1): 52–75.
- McKay, T.**, 2016: The geography of the South African adventure tourism industry. In: *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(3): 1–21.
- Naidoo, P., Ramseook-Munhurrun, P., Seebaluck, N. V., and Janvier, S.**, 2015: Investigating the motivation of baby boomers for adventure tourism. In: *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 175: 244–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1197>
- Pomfret, G.**, 2006: Mountaineering adventure tourists: a conceptual framework for research. In: *Tourism Management*, 27(1): 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.08.003>
- Pomfret, G.**, 2012: Personal emotional journeys associated with adventure activities on packaged mountaineering holidays. In: *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 4: 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2012.08.003>
- Pomfret, G., and Bramwell, B.**, 2014; The characteristics and motivational decisions of outdoor adventure tourists: a review and analysis. In: *Current Issues in Tourism*: 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.925430>
- Prayag, G., and Ryan, C.**, 2011: The relationship between the ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors of a tourist destination: the role of nationality – an analytical qualitative research approach. In: *Current Issues in Tourism*, 14(2): 121–143. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683501003623802>
- Robinson, D. W.**, 1992: A descriptive model of enduring risk recreation involvement. In: *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24(1): 52–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1992.11969871>
- Rogerson, C. M.**, 2007: The challenges of developing adventure tourism in South Africa. In: *Africa Insight*, 37(2): 228–244. DOI: [10.4314/ai.v37i2.22506](https://doi.org/10.4314/ai.v37i2.22506)
- Ryan, C., and Glendon, I.**, 1998: Application of leisure motivation scale to tourism. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1): 169–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)00066-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00066-2)
- Shoham, A., Rose, G. M., and Kahle, L. R.**, 2000: Practitioners of risky Sports : A quantitative examination. In: *Journal of Business Research*, 47: 237–251. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(98\)00093-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(98)00093-9)
- Tveit, M., Ode, Å., and Fry, G.**, 2006: Key concepts in a framework for analysing visual landscape character. In: *Landscape Research*, 31(3): 229–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426390600783269>
- UNWTO, 2017: United Nations World Tourism Organization Annual Report 2016, 74. Retrieved from [http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/annual\\_report\\_2016\\_web\\_0.pdf](http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/annual_report_2016_web_0.pdf)
- Uysal, M., and Jurowski, C.**, 1994: Testing the push and pull factors. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21: 844–846. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(94\)90091-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(94)90091-4)
- Varley, P.**, 2006: Confecting adventure and playing with meaning: The adventure commodification continuum. In: *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 11(2): 173–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080601155217>
- Walle, A. H.**, 1997: Pursuing risk or insight: Marketing adventures. In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2): 265–282. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(97\)80001-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(97)80001-1)