Tourism Management 30 (2009) 99–108

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Tourism Management

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/tourman

Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study

Duk-Byeong Park [a], Yoo-Shik Yoon [b,*]

[a] Rural Resource Development Institute, 88-2 Seodun-Dong, Suwon 441-853, South Korea
[b] Department of Convention Management, College of Hotel and Tourism Management, Kyung Hee University, 1 Hoekidong Dongdaemunku, Seoul 130-701, South Korea

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 8 August 2006
Accepted 23 March 2008

Keywords:
Rural Tourism
Segmentation
Motivation

ABSTRACT

Tourism as a rural growth tool has to adapt to current market mechanisms, which are becoming extremely competitive and which are dominated by communication and promotion strategies and techniques. We need to know the causative factors and influences by which tourists in rural areas are motivated to become included in various market segments. The primary purpose of this study is to segment and profile the motivations of tourists, so as to enable a better understanding of rural tourism in Korea. A self-administered survey in four languages was collected from 252 tourists in the study area. A factor-clustering method identified four distinct segments: family togetherness seeker, passive tourist, want-it-all seeker, and learning and excitement seeker.

1. Introduction

Rural communities in Korea are facing serious problems including depopulation, disproportionate aging of the rural population, a reduced labor force, and the Government's open market policy on agriculture. These problems have caused the stagnation of the rural economy, as well as the degradation of the quality of rural life.

Just as in many other countries, rural tourism offers opportunities for generating and diversifying revenues for Korean farmers. Since 2000, the Korean tourist's demand for rural tourism facilities has been increasing due to factors such as higher disposable income, a more mature travel market, changing tastes and preferences, and increased leisure time resulting from the introduction of the 5-day work-week system in Korea. This increasing demand, coupled with large Government investment, creates a definite need to study rural tourism and thus to optimize any strategies to utilize these opportunities.

Since 2002, the Korean Government has been playing a leading role in the development of rural tourism (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 2002, 2006a). The Rural Traditional Theme Village (RTTV) and the Green Rural Experience Village (GREV) are two main projects that have focused on rural tourism development to encourage 'bottom-up' development revolving around the development of local cultural resources. The number of tourism villages recognized by Government projects increased rapidly from 27 nominees in 2002 to 98 in 2006 (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, 2006b). A total of 279 villages were designated by the Government Program on Rural Tourism Development since its launch in 2002. In 2006, the number of accommodation units available as tourist accommodation, according to the Rural Resources Development Institute (2006), was estimated to be 8500 rooms in 2500 farm-stay households. There are several types of tourist accommodations. Many are known as "rural houses." These are restored old houses or newly constructed houses that use traditional architecture and materials. There are also wooden houses, former mills, and inns. All this accommodation has several communal rooms and one or more bedrooms. Catering and activities offered add to the confusing diversity of what constitutes rural accommodation. Meal delivery, traditional folklore, and farm-based activities are provided or offered by these establishments. As tourism has been considered as a tool for promoting the development of a number of economically and socially depressed rural areas in Korea, Government-based rural tourism has emerged as one of the main economic activities in most rural areas since 2002. Korean Government agencies have recognized that rural tourism development should be expanded and also be promoted in a sustainable manner. The main driving force behind rural tourism in Korea has been the development of various institutionally supported projects in different areas and regions.

Tourism in rural areas accounts for about 10–25% of all forms of tourism activity (EuroBarometer, 1998 as cited in Hall, Mitchell, & Roberts, 2003). However, most Korean tourists in rural areas are excursionists with a 25.8% rate of overnight stays and a 27.3% rate of revisitation (Rural Resources Development Institute, 2006).

Effective tourism marketing and management require an understanding of the existing market segments. Identification of a clearly defined market segment permits specifically directed promotion programs. A number of research reports and theoretical

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +82 2 961 0823; fax: +82 2 964 2537.
E-mail address: ysyn@khu.ac.kr (Y.-S. Yoon).

0261-5177/$ – see front matter © 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2008.03.011

essays published over the years have directly or indirectly dealt with tourist motivation, but much of the previous research was focused on the attitudes of locals and residents to tourism development-related issues, rather than tourist behavior and demand in Korea. In this regard, issues such as visitation patterns, visitor behavior, visitor motivation, and benefits sought have largely been overlooked in the current empirical rural tourism literature. Of particular interest is the identification of unique market segments on the basis of the different motivations of tourists in rural areas. So far, demographic and socio-economic characteristics have mainly been used as the basis of segmentation. However, the predictive power of age, gender, and wealth to affect purchasing behavior is markedly situation-dependent, because they are only indirectly related to purchase intentions. Therefore, marketers have increasingly pointed out that the most effective predictor of tourist behavior should be the behavior itself, including benefits and motivations (Goeldner & Ritchie, 2003; Johns & Gyimothy, 2002; Kotler, Bowen, & Makens, 2003). In this connection, the profiles of different rural tourism motivational market segments provide detailed information on the niche markets of rural tourism, and the information on these tourists can be used to develop marketing strategies for rural tourism.

Tourist motivations have also been studied extensively in the literature (Bansal & Eiselt, 2004; Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Hanqin & Lam, 1999; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Josiam, Mattson, & Sullivan, 2004; Kozak, 2002; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Oh, Uysal, & Weaver, 1995; Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). However, few studies have specifically considered motivation in rural tourism, and the resulting segmentation. This study aims to segment and profile the needs of rural tourists, so as to provide a better understanding of rural tourism, by using a cluster market segmentation approach. This study aims at providing tourism marketers with insights into the travel behavior of people living in Korea and helping them in planning appropriate marketing strategies. For researchers, one particular aim of the study is to contribute to the discussion of appropriate market segmentation criteria and the use of multivariate statistical methods in marketing research.

2. Related literature

2.1. Motivations

The literature on consumer behavior argues that motivations represent individual internal forces that lead to action (Schiffman & Kanuk, 1978). Investigating reasons or motivations for travel contribute to an understanding of tourism as a social and psychological phenomenon (Cohen, 1974) and offer practical managerial insights (Wight, 1996; Young, 1999).

In this respect, the motivation to travel refers to a set of needs that cause a person to participate in a tourism based activity. In this sense motivational factors are defined as the psychological needs that play a significant role in causing a person to feel psychological disequilibrium that may be corrected through a travel experience (Crompton, 1979; Kim, Crompton, & Botha, 2000). Tourist motivations are characteristics of individuals that influence the choice of destinations, and the effects of motivational influences of this nature on an individual have also been labeled as push factors (Gartner, 1993; Kim & Lee, 2002; Moutinho, 1987; Sirakaya, 1992; Sirakaya, McLellan, & Uysal, 1996). These factors are largely intangible and origin-related, and they motivate or create a desire to satisfy a need (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977, 1981; Uysal & Hagan, 1993). Lundberg (1971) published one of the earliest studies on what motivates people to travel. He developed a bundle of 18 motivations assumed to influence travel. Crompton (1979) later identified nine motivations on the basis of several in-depth interviews, seven of which were classified as "socio-psychological" and two as "cultural."

These motivations have been classified according to the following typology by Goeldner and Ritchie (2003):

(i) physical, such as relaxation;
(ii) cultural, such as discovering new geographical areas;
(iii) interpersonal, such as socializing and meeting new people; and
(iv) prestige, such as self-esteem and self-actualization.

Since Crompton's initial empirical effort, many studies have attempted to find push and pull motivational factors in different settings, such as by nationality (*e.g.*, Cha, McCleary, & Uysal, 1995; Yuan & McDonald, 1990; Zhang & Lam, 1999), destinations (*e.g.*, Jang & Cai, 2002), satisfaction and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005), senior citizens (Jang & Wu, 2006), and events (*e.g.*, Lee, Lee, & Wicks, 2004; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001).

Other researchers, such as Iso-Ahola (1982), looked at motivations in terms of seeking escape, while Pearce (1996) distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Cha et al. (1995) studied the travel motivation of Japanese overseas travelers and identified six motivational factors: relaxation, knowledge, adventure, travel bragging, family, and sports. Based on these, three marketing segments were identified: sports seekers, novelty seekers, and family and relaxation seekers.

Pearce and Lee (2005) noted that a core of travel motivation factors including escape, relaxation, relationship enhancement, and self-development seemed to comprise the central backbone of motivation for all travelers. Jang and Wu (2006) suggested that common push factors found in most of the studies included knowledge-seeking, relaxation, and family togetherness, while the most frequently seen pull factors were natural and historic environments, cost, facilities, safety, and accessibility.

2.2. Tourist segmentation

Market segmentation has become a valuable instrument in planning appropriate marketing strategies. Market segmentation is a technique used to subdivide a heterogeneous market into homogeneous subgroups. It is based on the idea that a market is composed of subgroups of people and that each subgroup has different, specific needs and motivations in defining quality perception, since it is ideal to align delivered quality with anticipated quality (Berry, Parasuraman, & Zeithaml, 1991; Mok & Iverson, 2000). According to Middleton (2002), segmentation may now be defined as the process of dividing a total market such as all visitors, or a market sector such as holiday travel, into subgroups or segments for marketing management purposes. Its purpose is to facilitate more cost-effective marketing through the formulation, promotion, and delivery of purpose-designed products that satisfy the identified needs of target groups. In other words, segmentation is justified on the grounds of achieving greater efficiency in the supply of products to meet identified demand and increased cost-effectiveness in the marketing process. The primary bases for segmentation include demography, geography, behavior, lifestyle, personality, and benefits sought.

The literature on tourism and hospitality is replete with studies that have used several segmentation variables with different approaches. Numerous methods of tourist segmentation exist, including *a posteriori* or factor-cluster segmentation, *a priori* or criterion segmentation and, recently, neural network models (Mazanec, 1992). *A priori* market segmentation can be less time-consuming and more effective for separating markets at less cost.

Target market selection is an important step in establishing a marketing strategy. The usefulness of market segmentation in

travel literature has long been recognized (Bryant & Morrison, 1980; Cha et al., 1995; Davis, Allen, & Cosenza, 1988; Davis & Sternquist, 1987; Jang, Morrison, & O'Leary, 2004; Jurowski, Uysal, & Noe, 1993; Loker-Murphy & Perdue, 1992; Mo, Havitz, & Howard, 1994; Mudambi & Baum, 1997; Shih, 1986; Yüksel, 2003).

In today's tourism literature, a very large number of studies use different descriptors and discriminating variables to segment a market, including attributes for vacation (Crask, 1981), benefits sought by travelers (Gitelson & Kerstetter, 1990; Loker-Murphy & Perdue, 1992), motivations (Cha et al., 1995; Loker-Murphy, 1996; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994), behavioral characteristics (Formica & Uysal, 1998), and product bundles (Oh et al., 1995).

Loker-Murphy (1996) identified a motivation-based segmentation by addressing domestic and foreign backpackers in national parks of Australia. Among the motivational factors examined, the primary factors were 'excitement/adventure' and 'meeting local people.' Results of a cluster analysis using the motivational factors gave four clusters: achievers, self-developers, socializing/excitement seekers, and escapers/relaxers. The motivation clusters were significantly different by age and educational level, destinations visited, preferred experience or activity, and use of word-of-mouth promotion. According to Crompton (1979), Schewe (1990), and the above-mentioned authors, segmenting travelers on the basis of motivations are one of the most effective methods.

There has been limited research on rural tourism segments. In the case of Portugal, Kastenholz, Davis, and Paul (1999) pointed out that a factor-clustering method identified four distinct segments: want-it-all ruralist, independent ruralist, traditional ruralist, and environmental ruralist. Also, Frochot (2005) considering the Scottish perspective indicated that segments of tourists were actives (39%), relaxers (13%), gazers (35%), and rurals (13%). In the UK, a survey on public attitudes to the countryside (Countryside Commission, 1995) also indicated that the benefits derived from visiting the countryside were mostly of a psychological nature, such as relaxation/well-being (45%), fresh air (24%), peace and quiet (22%), and fitness and good health (14%). Equally, a study conducted in France (FNSEA, 1989) identified factors distinguishing the countryside images in order of importance: calm and tranquility, relaxation, greenery, and pure air. These studies indicate that environmental assets and differentiation from urban lifestyle are key dimensions of tourism in rural areas, whilst the role of agriculture and its associated culture seems to be fairly irrelevant.

Previous research by Song (2005) on segmenting Korean tourists in rural areas showed that the major motivational clusters influencing visits to Korean rural tourism villages were 'escape from everyday life,' 'family togetherness and learning,' 'self-actualization,' 'accessibility,' 'refreshment,' and 'activity.' Kim (2005) identified three different motivational market segments: rural-centric tourists, passive rural tourists, and visiting friends and relatives (VFR) tourists. The primary purpose of rural-centric tourists is to participate in rural-centric activities, such as eco-experience, nature experience, or farm stays. This segment comprises 28.9% of all rural tourists. Passive rural tourists, the largest segment (39.5%), participate in more classic tourism activities, such as relaxing in nature and visiting recreational forests or historic sites. VFR rural tourists take trips to rural areas for the purpose of visiting friends or family members and/or attending a special event, such as a wedding or family reunion. This segment makes up 31.6% of rural tourists. In several of these studies, the relative importance of the motivational forces differs across gender, age, occupation, expenditure per person per day, and income group (Kim, 1993; Kim, 2005; Jeong, 1997; Song, 2005).

According to Frochot (2005), the results found that the sample studied in two Scottish rural locations could be divided into four clusters according to benefits sought. Consequently, as indicated above, the first cluster was named the actives (39%), who had a general positive interest in the active sports/outdoor dimension. The second cluster was named the relaxation dimension (13%). The third cluster, the gazers (35%), grouped together visitors who had an interest in the outdoors aspect of their holiday, mixed with an aspiration to relax. Finally, the fourth cluster, the rurals (13%) were exclusively interested in the rural dimension of their holiday, such as experiencing rural life and a different culture.

In summary, visitors to rural tourist villages were found to be influenced by a number of motivation factors including 'challenge or adventure,' 'enjoyment,' and 'social interaction.' The relative importance of these motivational forces varies as a function of the visitors' socio-demographic and tourism behavioral characteristics. In this study, market segmentation by push motivation factors seemed to be an acceptable approach, since marketing segments also appeared to be increasingly determined by situational motivations, rather than by belonging to a certain socio-demographic or lifestyle group (Poon, 1998; Popcorn, 1996).

3. Methodology

3.1. Data collection

This investigation was designed to further understand the rural tourism market in the Korean countryside. The data were collected from rural tourists who visited rural tourism villages in Korea over a period of 12 months between September 2004 and August 2005. These villages, which were funded by the Rural Traditional Theme Village (RTTV) and Green Rural Experience Village (GREV) programs to stimulate rural tourism, were chosen nationwide to ascertain general rural visitors' behavior. A random sample of 1-year-round visitors to eliminate seasonality was employed and 24 rural tourism villages out of 71 were selected by a stratified sampling method to avoid site-specific bias based on the location and carrying capacity of rural tourism visitors. In terms of seasonal variations, approximately 70% of questionnaires were collected during spring and summer, 20% of questionnaires were collected during the fall season, and 10% of questionnaires were collected during the winter season. Targets were visitors aged 18 years and above.

The selected villages are comparatively well developed and provided similar rural tourism resources and activities for rural visitors. In cases where the village owner or manager agreed to collect the data for the study, the survey questionnaires were distributed to the survey sites, and respondents freely participated in answering the survey questionnaire after they had stayed in the village for at least one night. Then, researchers visited and collected the survey questionnaires from each village.

Data were collected by using a five-page self-administered questionnaire primarily designed to gather information on the subjects' general motivations for travel. From the 320 self-administered questionnaires distributed in the villages, a total of 252 usable questionnaires were obtained from rural visitors who traveled to rural destinations for at least one night during the survey (78.8% response rate).

3.2. Measurement

The assessment of motivations involves analyzing internal aspects and lifestyles. The questionnaire was formulated based on a comprehensive review of travel motivation literature (Cha et al., 1995; Fodness, 1994; Jang & Cai, 2002; Lang, O'Leary, & Morrison, 1997; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). In the questionnaire, the subjects were specifically asked to rate the importance of 24 general travel motivational statements in relation to trips that they had taken for pleasure. A Likert-type scale (from 1: not at all important to 5: very important) was provided to the subjects for them to use in

indicating the importance of each of the 24 general travel motivational statements. The clustering of motivations proved to be a valuable means for segmenting markets.

3.3. Analysis

Data were analyzed in three stages. First, descriptive-statistics analysis was applied to the collected data to explore the overall sample profile. Principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation, as the appropriate choice amongst estimation methods of factor analysis, was then used to identify the underlying motive dimensions. In fact, factor analysis has been widely used in visitor segmentation research (Cha et al., 1995; Formica & Uysal, 1998; Johns & Gyimothy, 2002; Kastenholz et al., 1999; Loker-Murphy & Perdue, 1992; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; Shoemaker, 1994). In this study, data reduction by means of factor analysis was particularly useful in cluster analysis, because it eliminated correlation among the variables (which would have been problematic in cluster analysis). Furthermore, factor analysis helped to identify the constructs that underlie the variables, providing a global view of the most substantive motivations using such constructs.

This study used the criteria suggested by Hair, Black, Babin, and Tatham (2005, p. 122, 129): (1) factor loading equal to or above 0.50, (2) eigenvalues equal to or above 1.0, and (3) results of the factor analysis explaining at least 61.2% of the total variance. Factor analysis was used to decompose a correlation matrix of the 24 items into its constituent factors. Afterwards, the factor scores for each respondent were saved and consequently used in stage 2 for clustering into market segments. A reliability α (Cronbach's α) was computed to check the internal consistency of items with each dimension.

Individuals were clustered in such a way that those within each cluster were more similar to each other than to those in other clusters, thereby creating a situation of homogeneity within clusters and heterogeneity between clusters. Hierarchy cluster analysis was used to identify the number of clusters by an agglomeration schedule on the cluster analysis. Then, *K*-means cluster analysis was used to classify the samples according to their travel experience parameters that best discriminated them. Specifically, the *K*-means cluster method, which is common used in tourist segmentation research, was implemented (*e.g.*, Cha et al., 1995; Formica & Uysal, 1998; Kau & Lee, 1999; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994). The *K*-means clustering method produces results that are less susceptible to outliers in the data, the distance measure used, and the inclusion of irrelevant or inappropriate variables (Hair et al., 2005). A chi-square test was employed to profile the clusters demographically with regard to their tourism behavior.

During the third stage, segment characteristics were delineated by various univariate and multivariate statistical procedures. Specifically, the differences among clusters in demographics, travel behavior, and the various personality and interest dimensions were assessed by suitable analyses including ANOVA and chi-square. These analyses typically entail cluster analysis for the purposes of validation and segment profiling (Formica & Uysal, 1998; Madrigal & Kahle, 1994; May, Bastian, Taylor, & Whipple, 2001). Different statistical tests were conducted according to the characteristics (metric, non-metric data) of the variables. ANOVA was used to identify whether there were any differences among the clusters, as measured by a comparison of mean ratings (for metric variables). Discriminant analysis was used to provide information as to which of the travel motivational items were driving the differences and to assess the accuracy level of classification of segment membership. Finally, chi-square analysis was used to explore the differences between clusters in terms of categorical variables, such as demographics and travel behavior.

4. Results

4.1. Sample profile

The socio-demographic characteristics of the Korean rural travelers in the sample are presented in Table 1. Descriptive analysis of the sample showed that there were more female respondents (64.5%) than male. They are found in less than 39 (46.4%) and 40–49 (41.3%) age groups, with at least a college degree (68.6%). A total of 39.5% were housewives and 24.2% were white-collar workers. Nearly half (45.4%) of the 252 respondents earn between US$20,000 and US$40,000. Very few respondents (8.0%) earned more than US$80,000, while only 7.1% of the respondents earned less than US$20,000. By looking at the results of the demographic analysis, it can be said that respondents reflected general demographic information and provided similar results to a previous study (Park, Lee, & Kim, 2004).

4.2. Principal components analysis

Principal components analysis (PCA) was performed on the importance ratings of the 24 push motivation factors identified in the instrument development process. The first run produced a seven-factor solution with eigenvalues greater than 1, accounting for 58.3% of the total variance. However, four variables with low factor loading (below 0.5) were observed. These variables were deleted from the analysis, and a new factor solution was obtained using eigenvalues greater than 1 and varimax rotation that resulted in a six-factor solution accounting for 61.2% of the total variance. A Kaiser–Mayer–Olkin measure yielded 0.889, demonstrating that the distribution of values in the initial measure of motivation dimensions was adequate for conducting factor analysis.

Factor loadings of all relevant variables in the rotated factor matrix were clearly related to only one factor each. Cronbach's α's for the six factors ranged from 0.615 to 0.854. These results point to the fact that tourism in rural areas is an extremely diverse sector leading to a wide range of visitors' needs and expectations. The resultant six factors represent specific dimensions of the motivation for participating in rural tourism. The final solution is presented in Table 2.

Factor 1 exhibited most of the variance (26.87%) with a reliability coefficient of 0.854 in the data (Table 2). This factor incorporated seven items of motivation (get refreshed, escape from a busy job, relax away from the ordinary, relax daily tension, be physically active, feel at home away from home, and not have to rush). The relatively large proportion of the total variance for this factor leads us to conclude that among rural tourists, relaxation represents a central distinguishing motivational theme. This factor reflects

Table 1
Socio-demographic profile of the respondents ($N = 252$)

	Frequency (%)		Frequency (%)
Gender		*Occupation*	
Male	89 (35.5%)	Housewife	98 (39.5%)
Female	162 (64.5%)	Professional	31 (12.5%)
Age		Blue-collar worker	46 (18.5%)
18–29	20 (07.9%)	White-collar worker	60 (24.2%)
30–39	97 (38.5%)	Others	13 (05.2%)
40–49	104 (41.3%)	*Educational level*	
More than 50	31 (12.3%)	High school graduate	79 (31.3%)
Annual income (US$)		College	52 (20.6%)
Up to 20 000	17 (07.1%)	University graduate	105 (41.7%)
20 001–40 000	108 (45.4%)	Graduate school	16 (06.3%)
40 001–60 000	64 (26.9%)	*Life cycle*	
60 001–80 000	30 (12.6%)	No children	41 (16.5%)
80 001–100 000	10 (04.2%)	Children in elementary	103 (41.4%)
More than 100 000	9 (03.8%)	Children in middle	105 (42.2%)

Table 2
Factor analysis of motivation of Korean rural tourists

Factor	Mean	S.D.	Factor loading	Eigen-value	Variance explained	Cronbach's α
Relaxation	3.61	0.760		6.449	26.87	0.854
Get refreshed	3.69	1.090	0.791			
Escape from a busy job	3.76	0.982	0.741			
Relax away from the ordinary	4.07	1.016	0.709			
Relax daily tension	3.29	1.137	0.692			
Be physically active	3.69	1.000	0.681			
Feel at home away from home	3.31	1.087	0.658			
Not have to rush	3.45	1.004	0.647			
Socialization	3.02	0.775		2.778	11.41	0.759
Share a familiar place with others	3.08	1.042	0.727			
Inspire community consciousness	3.11	1.062	0.709			
Meet people with similar interests	2.91	1.068	0.698			
Go to places friends haven't been	3.04	1.171	0.609			
Personal safety, even when traveling alone	2.94	1.070	0.586			
Learning	3.62	0.788		1.702	7.09	0.749
Explore new places	3.68	1.026	0.798			
Experience new and different lifestyles	3.98	0.965	0.780			
Learn new things, increase knowledge	3.42	1.020	0.713			
Travel to historical heritage sites	3.39	1.153	0.613			
Family togetherness	3.42	0.868		1.482	6.17	0.615
Experience traditional culture for their kids	3.89	1.187	0.804			
Be together as a family	3.64	1.154	0.656			
Visit places family came from	2.73	1.157	0.586			
Novelty	2.09	0.908		1.290	5.38	0.623
Experience solitude	2.20	1.102	0.767			
Indulge in luxury	1.98	1.050	0.725			
Excitement	3.19	0.864		1.025	4.27	0.725
Do exciting things	3.42	1.043	0.771			
Find thrills and excitement	2.67	1.094	0.667			
Have fun, be entertained	3.48	1.106	0.585			
Total variance extracted (%)					61.20	
Cronbach's α of all items						0.877

Note: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important. Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy = 0.839. Chi-square = 2127.996. Bartlett's test of sphericity, $p < 0.001$.

a rather intrinsic emotional element and is best described as *relaxation*.

Factor 2 identified *socialization*, focusing on the socialization components of a society. This factor accounted for approximately 11.41% of the variance in the data. Factor 3 (7.09% of the variance) was also rather straightforward. *Explore new places*, *experience new and different lifestyles*, *learn new things*, *increase knowledge*, and *travel to historical heritage sites* are the focus of this motivation for countryside travelers. As a result, this factor is aptly named *learning*.

Factor 4 identified *family togetherness*, which focused on family togetherness components of motivation. This factor accounted for approximately 6.17% of the variance in the data. Factor 5 (5.38% of the variance) is *novelty*, which included *experience solitude* and *indulge in luxury*.

Find thrills and excitement, *do exciting things*, and *have fun, be entertained* are plainly related to the final factor (4.27% of variance), *excitement*, of rural tourism. This factor reflects a strong push motive away from urban living conditions, but also a pull towards the countryside at the same time.

4.3. Segmenting tourists in rural areas

Segmenting tourists based on their motivation can be a useful tool that enables farmers operating farm stays and rural village leaders to identify effective promotion and business strategies. To this end, this study also conducted a cluster analysis based on the delineated motivation factors. The six factors identified above were used as composite variables for the identification of segments of respondents looking for similar motivations in rural tourism. Since the *a priori* number of segments was not known beforehand, hierarchical cluster analysis was undertaken. The data were analyzed by using a hierarchical clustering procedure with Euclidean distance as a similarity measure between cases. Since the main interest was concerned with the relative importance ratings of the mentioned principal components, the Ward method was used to maximize within-cluster homogeneity, because it is a frequently used cluster algorithm known to produce stable and interpretable results (Hair et al., 2005). In addition, this method was found to produce the best cluster solution in this study, when compared to

Table 3
Motivation factor means among clusters

Factor	Cluster I family togetherness ($n = 90/37.0\%$)	Cluster II passive tourists ($n = 47/19.3\%$)	Cluster III want-it-all ($n = 61/25.1\%$)	Cluster IV learning and excitement ($n = 45/18.5\%$)	Total mean	*F*-value
Relaxation	3.58M	2.83L	4.18H	3.66M	3.61	41.06*
Socialization	2.84M	2.32L	3.85H	2.97M	3.02	68.00*
Learning	3.58M	3.00L	4.07H	3.71M	3.62	20.49*
Isolation	1.55L	1.54L	2.98H	2.52M	2.09	75.08*
Relaxation with family	3.79M	2.57L	4.09H	2.68L	3.42	89.65*
Excitement	3.00M1	2.22L	3.99H	3.53M2	3.19	80.82*

Note: 1 = not at all important, 5 = very important. *$p < 0.001$.

Table 4
Summary of discriminant analysis results

Function	Eigenvalue	Percent of variance explained by function	Canonical correlation	Wilks' lambda	Chi-square	df	Sig.
1	3.74	78.78	0.89	0.10	542.57	18	0.000
2	0.93	19.50	0.69	0.48	173.83	10	0.000
3	0.08	1.71	0.27	0.92	18.53	4	0.001
Discriminant loading			Function 1	Function 2	Function 3		
Relaxation			0.37	0.16	0.49		
Socialization			0.44	−0.06	−0.48		
Learning			0.25	0.08	0.39		
Isolation			0.54	−0.48	−0.42		
Relaxation with family			0.22	0.89	−0.23		
Excitement			0.53	−0.29	0.44		

Note: 95.7% of original grouped cases correctly classified; 95.7% of cross-validated grouped cases correctly classified.

other solution algorithms. 'Best' in this case relates to the identification of the most meaningful, interpretable, and distinguishable segments, tested by alternative solution methods.

This procedure led to a four-cluster solution that was supported by the criterion of the relative increase of the agglomeration coefficient and the dendrogram. The results of ANOVA tests also reveal that all six factors contributed to differentiating the four rural tourism motivation clusters ($p < 0.01$). In addition, the Scheffe *post hoc* tests were employed to examine any differences between clusters with respect to each of the factors. The results of the Scheffe tests show that statistically significant differences were found between clusters, thus supporting the fact that distinct clusters had indeed been identified: *family togetherness*, *passive tourist*, *want-it-all*, and *learning and excitement seeker* (Table 3).

Three canonical discriminant functions were calculated by using discriminant analysis on all six motivation factors. The resulting discriminant functions were subjected to a chi-square test to determine the significance of the functions. The functions are statistically significant, as measured by the chi-square statistic. The results of the discriminant analysis are summarized in Tables 4 and 5.

A Wilks's lambda test and a univariate *F* test were conducted to determine the significance of each of the six motivation factors. The results showed that all of the six motivational factors made a statistically significant contribution to the discriminant function.

Standardized structure coefficients were used to interpret the function. In principle, standard coefficients represent the relative contribution of the associated variable to the discriminant function. Three canonical discriminant functions were significant, indicating that the models explained a significant relationship between the functions and the particular dependent variable.

The classification matrix of respondents was used to determine how successfully the discriminant function could work. Almost all (97.5%) of the 243 grouped cases were correctly classified, representing a very high accuracy rate. Specifically, family togetherness (100%), passive tourists (93.6%), want-it-all (98.4%), and learning and excitement seekers (95.6%) were correctly classified into their respective groups.

In order to further identify the profile of the four clusters, each cluster was cross-tabulated with external variables such as the tourists' socio-economic characteristics and tourists' behavioral characteristics. The results of the chi-square tests indicated that all clusters were found to be statistically significantly different with respect to rural tourists' socio-economic characteristics and tourists' behavioral variables (see Table 6).

4.4. Family togetherness (37%)

When compared to the other segments, the *family togetherness* (37.0% of sample) cluster valued relaxation with family. This is the largest segment of people whose primary purpose for visiting rural areas is to participate in more classic tourism activities, such as relaxing in nature and visiting recreational forests or historic sites. However, compared to other clusters, this group does not appreciate isolation and excitement as much as their counterparts. Instead, they seem to prefer experiencing traditional culture for their kids, being together as a family, and visiting places that the family came from, hence the name *family togetherness*.

In terms of demographic and tourism behavioral characteristics of this segment, the *family togetherness* cluster is generally educated (70% with at least a college degree, the same level of education as the *passive tourists* and *learning and excitement* clusters), relatively poor (earning less than US$40,000), and artistic hobbyist. The annual expenditure per person is more than US$1000, with more than US$100 per day. They travel to tourism villages two or three times annually and prefer multi-destinations, as does the *learning and excitement* cluster.

4.5. Passive tourists (19.3%)

The *passive tourists* cluster (19.3% of sample) exhibited low motivation in all six factors (see Table 7). This group is generally educated (*i.e.*, possessing at least a college degree) and wealthy (*i.e.*, earning US$40,000 or more). They have an annual expenditure of more than US$500–1000 per person or less than US$50 per day. This cluster preferred sports and games as leisure activities. They visited rural tourism villages two or three times a year and preferred single to multi-destinations, as for the *want-it-all* cluster.

4.6. Want-it-all tourists (25.1%)

The *want-it-all* cluster (25.1% of the sample) valued all six factors. Overall, this segment desired all types of motivation. This group was less educated (*i.e.*, high school graduate or less) and

Table 5
Evaluation of cluster formation by classification results

Cluster case	Predicted group membership				
	Family togetherness	Passive tourist	Want-it-all	Learning and excitement	Total
Family togetherness	90 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	90 (100.0%)
Passive tourist	3 (6.4%)	44 (93.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	47 (100.0%)
Want-it-all	1 (1.6%)	0 (0.0%)	60 (98.4%)	0 (0.0%)	61 (100.0%)
Learning and excitement	2 (4.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	43 (95.6%)	45 (100.0%)

Table 6
Profile of the four clusters of rural tourism in Korea ($N = 252$)

Rural tourist's profile	Family togetherness (37.0%)	Passive tourists (19.3%)	Want-it-all (25.1%)	Learning and excitement (18.5%)	Total (100%)	Statistics
Educational level						Chi-square = 9.21, $p < 0.05$
High school graduate or less ($n = 76$)	27 (30.0)	11 (23.4)	28 (45.9)	10 (22.2)	76 (31.3)	
At least a college graduate ($n = 167$)	63 (70.0)	36 (76.6)	33 (54.1)	35 (77.8)	167 (68.7)	
Income						Chi-square = 8.14, $p < 0.05$
Up to US$40,000 ($n = 121$)	49 (59.0)	16 (36.4)	28 (48.3)	28 (62.2)	121 (52.6)	
More than US$40,000 ($n = 109$)	34 (41.0)	28 (63.6)	30 (51.7)	17 (37.8)	109 (47.4)	
Preferred leisure activities						Chi-square = 22.18, $p < 0.05$
Watch TV or sleep ($n = 72$)	24 (26.7)	15 (33.3)	17 (29.3)	16 (35.6)	72 (30.3)	
Artistic hobbies (movie and painting) ($n = 32$)	15 (16.7)	6 (13.3)	3 (5.2)	8 (17.8)	32 (13.4)	
Sports and games ($n = 30$)	10 (11.1)	9 (20.0)	2 (3.4)	9 (20.0)	30 (12.6)	
Travel ($n = 49$)	18 (20.0)	7 (15.6)	18 (31.0)	6 (13.3)	49 (20.6)	
Housework ($n = 55$)	23 (25.6)	8 (17.8)	18 (31.0)	6 (13.3)	55 (23.1)	
Annual expenditure						Chi-square = 16.79, $p < 0.05$
Up to US$500 ($n = 91$)	27 (35.1)	9 (24.3)	31 (55.4)	24 (55.8)	91 (42.7)	
US$501–1000 ($n = 77$)	28 (36.4)	20 (54.1)	18 (32.1)	11 (25.6)	77 (36.2)	
More than US$1000 ($n = 45$)	22 (28.6)	8 (21.6)	7 (12.5)	8 (18.6)	45 (21.1)	
Number of visits to tourism villages p.a.						Chi-square = 14.37, $p < 0.05$
Once ($n = 108$)	39 (43.8)	18 (38.3)	30 (49.2)	21 (48.8)	108 (45.0)	
2–3 times ($n = 103$)	42 (47.2)	26 (55.3)	17 (27.9)	18 (41.9)	103 (42.9)	
Four times or more ($n = 29$)	8 (9.0)	3 (6.4)	14 (23.0)	4 (9.3)	29 (12.1)	
Type of travel						Chi-square = 10.50, $p < 0.05$
Single destination ($n = 148$)	52 (57.8)	36 (76.6)	40 (66.7)	20 (45.5)	148 (61.4)	
Multi-destination ($n = 93$)	38 (42.2)	11 (23.1)	20 (33.3)	24 (54.5)	93 (38.6)	
Expenditure per person per day						Chi-square = 12.03, $p < 0.05$
Up to US$50 ($n = 89$)	29 (34.9)	21 (52.5)	23 (39.0)	16 (39.0)	89 (39.9)	
US$51–100 ($n = 83$)	28 (33.7)	10 (25.0)	29 (49.2)	16 (39.0)	83 (37.2)	
More than US$100 ($n = 51$)	26 (31.3)	9 (22.5)	7 (11.9)	9 (22.0)	51 (22.9)	

Note: The percent of the cell having expected count less than five in all cases analysis is less than 25.0%.

wealthy (*i.e.*, earning US$40,000 or more). They preferred to travel and do housework. Annual expenditure per person was less than US$500, or $50–100 per day. They preferred single destinations and visited the rural tourism village four times or more. This cluster preferred agricultural experience (31.0%), followed by ecological activity (19.0%) and rural life experience (13.8%).

4.7. Learning and excitement cluster (18.5%)

Segmentation by frequency of visits to rural tourism villages provides information on the degree of participation in rural tourism. *Learning and excitement seekers* are less likely to visit rural tourism villages than *family togetherness*, *passive tourists*, and *want-it-all tourists*. *Family togetherness* and *learning and excitement seekers* are more likely to have multi-destination choices, compared to the other clusters.

The *learning and excitement* cluster (18.5% of sample) valued socialization, learning, and social excitement. This segment is generally educated (*i.e.*, at least a college graduate) and relatively poor (*i.e.*, earning US$40,000 or less). They preferred leisure activities such as sports, games, and watching TV. Annual expenditure per person is less than $500, or $50–100 per day. They visited rural tourism villages once a year, and prefer multi-destinations.

In Table 8, the most-preferred activities are based on the responses of 10% or more of the respondents. Some of the activities found attractive by all segments included ecological activity, agricultural experience, and gastronomy.

Whereas ecological activity is very popular among *family togetherness seekers* (31.5%), *passive tourists* (29.8%), and *learning and excitement* (18.2%), *want-it-all* mostly prefer agricultural experience (31.0%). The least-preferred activities included sports, hunting, visiting a museum, handicraft making, and visit to a historic site. *Passive tourists* and *want-it-all* clusters showed the least preference for handicraft activity.

Table 7
Segments according to motivations

Prominent socio-demographic and travel profiles	Family togetherness	Passive tourists	Want-it-all	Learning and social excitement
Education	At least college graduate	At least a college graduate	High school graduate or less	At least a college graduate
Income (US$)	40,000 or less	More than 40,000	More than 40,000	40,000 or less
Preferred leisure activity	Artistic hobbies	Sports, games	Travel, housework	Sports, games, watching TV
Expenditure per person	More than $1000	$501–1000	Less than $500	Less than $500
Frequency of visits	2–3 times	2–3 times	4 times or over	1 time
Type of travel	Multi-destination	Single destination	Single destination	Multi-destination
Expenditure per person per day (US$)	More than 100	Less than 50	50–100	50–100

Table 8
Activities that would make rural tourism more attractive

Family togetherness ($n = 90$/37.0%)	Passive tourists ($n = 47$/19.3%)	Want-it-all ($n = 61$/25.1%)	Learning and excitement (18.5%)
Most-preferred activities (mentioned by 10% or more of respondents)			
Ecological activity 31.5%	Ecological activity 29.8%	Agricultural experience 31.0%	Ecological activity 18.2%
Agricultural experience 21.3%	Agricultural experience 21.3%	Ecological activity 19.0%	Rural life experience 18.2%
Gastronomy 13.5%	Gastronomy 19.1%	Rural life experience 13.8%	Agricultural experience 11.4%
	Rural life experience 14.9%		Gastronomy 15.9%
Least-preferred activities (least mentioned)			
Sports 0%	Hunting 0%	Hunting 0%	Hunting 0%
Visit museum 0%	Festival/Events 0%	Sports 0%	Visit museum 0%
Hunting 1%	Visit museum 0%	Handicraft making 1%	Sports 1%
	Handicraft making 1%	Health care 1%	Health care 1%
	Sports 1%	Visit museum 1%	
	Visit historic site 1%		

5. Conclusion and implication

Rural tourism development in Korea is an effective strategy for revitalizing rural communities that have experienced serious structural and economic problems. Rural communities and the Korean Government have recognized the need to revitalize rural communities' economies. In particular, people in Korea are able to have more leisure time, due to the introduction of a 5-day-week work system, and this will affect the development of leisure and tourism behavior.

The clustering of rural tourists' motivations proved to be a valuable means of segmenting markets. Since 2002, rural tourism has risen to become one of the main economic activities in the majority of rural areas in Korea. However, this is a quite different result from the experience gained in European and other countries. Whereas rural tourists in European countries tend to be attracted by a peaceful atmosphere and nostalgia for old ways of life, as evidenced by the independent ruralists segment identified by Kastenholz et al. (1999) in Portugal and the relaxers and gazers segments identified by Frochot (2005) from the Scottish perspective, Korean rural tourists are more likely to be interested in the role of agriculture and its associated culture, such as the agricultural experience and rural life (see Table 8). This is so firstly from the demand side, as most Korean parents in urban areas lived previously in rural areas, and want their children to share in agricultural activities in order to gain educational experience. Secondly, the supply side is not well developed for tranquil and calm tourists, because Korean rural tourism in the initial stages was focused on farm-based activities.

The results of the factor analysis showed that the six dimensions of motivation among these rural tourists included "relaxation," "socialization," "learning," "family togetherness," "novelty," and "excitement." The "relaxation" dimension had the largest proportion of the total variance, at 26.87%. From this, we conclude that most tourists are strongly motivated by "relaxation," which serves as the main distinguishing theme for a substantial part of the rural visit. However, mean values indicated that the primary motivation for rural tourists was 'learning' (mean value = 3.62), which included exploring new places (3.68), experiencing new and different lifestyles (3.98), learning new things, increasing knowledge (3.42), and traveling to historical heritage sites (3.39). These findings are consistent with previous studies, that cited 'relaxation' as the most important motivation for rural tourists (Butler, Hall, & Jenkins, 1998; Embacher, 1993; Kim, 2005; Krippendorf, 1989; Roberts & Hall, 2001; Sharpley & Sharpley, 1997; Song, 2005). Other prominent dimensions of motivation were "learning," "excitement," and "family togetherness." These findings are thematically similar to those reported in previous research (Butler et al., 1998; Kim, 2005; Roberts & Hall, 2001; Sharpley & Sharpley, 1997; Song, 2005).

The findings suggest that the market can be divided into four segments based on tourists' motivations: "*family togetherness*," "*passive tourists*," "*want-it-all*," and "*learning and excitement*." Significant differences in the characteristics of rural tourists were observed. These findings were also thematically similar to the previous research of Kim (2005), which showed a uniquely Korean tourist segmentation. The profiles of these four motivational market segments showed significant differences in socio-economic characteristics, holiday behavior, and activity preferences. '*Novelty*' seekers, or those in the pursuit of a tranquil atmosphere, common in western countries, were not observed. The majority of rural tourists are '*family togetherness*' seekers, who comprise 37.0% of the respondents. Those who engage in '*family togetherness*' and '*learning and excitement*' earn a higher average income than the '*passive*' and '*want-it-all*' rural tourists. The '*family togetherness*' segment is more likely to prefer artistic hobbies and multi-destinations. They also visit rural tourism villages about 2–3 times a year.

Results specific to the Korean rural context show that, whereas rural tourists in western countries tend to be older and seek aesthetically pleasing and tranquil countryside environments (Cavaco, 1995; Sharpley, 1996), most Korean rural tourists tend to be middle-aged with children and are more likely to prefer agricultural experiences. This is because Korean rural tourists generally consider rural tourism as a means to educate their children, rather than to enjoy the countryside itself.

The '*want-it-all*' segment shows that rural tourists who possess a high school degree or less are more likely to be motivated by all kinds of factors, whereas '*passive tourists*', who are more educated and earn a higher income, are less motivated. This shows that '*want-it-all*' rural tourists have strong push motivations. We suggest the development of marketing strategies aimed at '*want-it-all*' tourists for communities with agricultural activities, and '*passive tourists*' for communities with abundant natural resources.

These results have important implications for governments, rural communities, and private agencies engaged in rural tourism marketing and development. The profiles of rural tourists can be used to develop marketing strategies for rural tourism. In particular, profiles of the different rural tourism motivational market segments provide detailed information on the niche markets for rural tourism.

If a local government plans to develop rural tourism with low investment by using rural resources such as outstanding and distinctive natural environments, they can target '*passive tourists*', who primarily visit rural areas to enjoy rural settings with relatively low expectations from their trips.

On the other hand, in regions where natural resources are insufficient to attract tourists, rural tourism can focus on rural activities different from those offered in other areas. Promoters of

these regions can target '*want-it-all*' tourists, whose primary purpose in visiting rural areas is to participate in rural recreation activities. In this case, the results of this study showed that they were more likely to participate in agricultural activities, such as planting and harvesting crops.

Rural tourism in Korea is still at an introductory stage, and there is no established definition of rural tourism. Discrepancies in definition may be one reason why results vary considerably across studies. The segmentations proposed in this paper could be helpful in understanding why different people participate in rural tourism. They also provide information (*e.g.*, demographic profile and trip behaviors) which can be used to develop and target niche marketing strategies. Understanding tourists' motivations for participating in rural tourism can ultimately help communities effectively design and market their product lines and experience. Therefore, continuous research on rural tourism is needed, to monitor the changing demands and preferences of rural tourists and to assess present and future marketing strategies.

Particularly, the findings presented in this paper may indeed be significant on an international scale, as it is certainly possible that visitors from Europe, USA, and other countries and continents may feel attracted to rural tourism facilities in Korea. One operative factor in this connection is that rural areas in Korea are able to offer a subtle mix of agricultural technology, environmental engineering, historical charm, and popular friendliness which is generally not to be found elsewhere. The strong family ties which bind generations together in Korea are usually not in evidence in many other parts of the world, and accordingly there are many segments of the population in other countries that are undoubtedly amenable to the influence of an adventurous concept. If the latter can be presented on an international scale with the application of a coherent and cogent marketing concept, then it is foreseeable that rural tourism in Korea may become a dominant force in service exports from this country.

Lastly, the primary limitations of this study need to be addressed. The study population comprised Korean rural visitors who were over 18 years old. A proportionate sampling method was employed to allocate the number of samples across the country. Though location samples were randomly selected in each region, non-respondent bias and refusal bias were evident in this study, due to the methodology of conducting an on-site survey among rural visitors.

References

Bansal, H., & Eiselt, H. (2004). Exploratory research of tourist motivations and planning. *Tourism Management, 25*, 387–396.

Berry, L. L., Parasuraman, A., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1991). *Quality service*. New York: Free Press.

Bryant, B., & Morrison, A. (1980). Travel market segmentation and the implementation of market strategies. *Journal of Travel Research, 18*(4), 2–8.

Butler, R., Hall, C. M., & Jenkins, J. M. (1998). Introduction. In R. Butler, & C.M. Hall. (Eds.), *Tourism and recreation in rural areas* (pp. 3–16). London: Wiley.

Cavaco, C. (1995). Rural tourism: the creation of new tourist spaces. In A. Montanari, & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *European tourism* (pp. 125–149).

Cha, S., McCleary, M., & Uysal, M. (1995). Travel motivations of Japanese overseas travelers: a factor-cluster segmentation approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*(2), 33–39.

Cohen, E. (1974). Who is a tourist? A conceptual clarification. *Sociological Review, 6*, 408–424.

Countryside Commission. (1995). *Public attitudes to the countryside*. Northampton (HPI Research Group): Countryside Commission. pp. 145–153.

Crask, M. R. (1981). Segmenting the vacationer market: identifying the vacation preferences, demographics, and magazine readership of each group. *Journal of Travel Research, 29*(3), 29–34.

Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivation for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*, 408–424.

Dann, G. M. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 4*(4), 184–189.

Dann, G. M. (1981). Tourism motivations: an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research, 8*(2), 189–219.

Davis, D., Allen, J., & Cosenza, R. (1988). Segmenting local residents by their attitudes, interests and opinions towards tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*(3), 2–8.

Davis, D., & Sternquist, B. (1987). Appealing to the elusive tourist: an attribute cluster strategy. *Journal of Travel Research, 25*(4), 25–31.

Embacher, H. (1993). Marketing for agri-tourism in Austria: strategy and realization in a highly developed tourist destination. In B. Bramwell, & B. Lane (Eds.), *Rural tourism and sustainable rural development. Proceedings of the second international school on rural development, 28 June–9 July 1993* (pp. 61–92). Ireland: University College Galway.

FNSEA (Fédération Nationale des Syndicats d'Exploitants Agricoles. (1989). *Les Touristes Français en Espace Rural. Analyse Qualitative*. Paris: FNSLA.

Fodness, D. (1994). Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(3), 555–581.

Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (1998). Market segmentation of an international cultural-historic event in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research, 36*(4), 16–24.

Frochot, I. (2005). A benefit segmentation of tourists in rural areas: a Scottish perspective. *Tourism Management, 26*, 335–346.

Gartner, W. C. (1993). Image formation process. In M. Uysal, & D. R. Fesenmaier (Eds.), *Communication and channel systems in tourism marketing*. New York: The Haworth Press.

Gitelson, R. J., & Kerstetter, D. L. (1990). The relationship between socio-demographic variables, benefit sought and subsequent vacation behavior: a case study. *Journal of Travel Research, 28*(4), 24–29.

Goeldner, C. R., & Ritchie, J. R. (2003). *Tourism: principles, practices, philosophies*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Hair, J. H., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Tatham, R. L. (2005). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, D., Mitchell, M., & Roberts, L. (2003). Tourism and the countryside: dynamic relationships. In D. Hall, L. Roberts, & M. Mitchell (Eds.), *New directions in rural tourism* (pp. 3–15). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Hanqin, Z., & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of Mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management, 20*, 587–594.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Towards a social psychology theory of tourism motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 9*, 256–262.

Jang, S., & Cai, L. (2002). Travel motivations and destination choice: a study of British outbound market. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 13*(3), 111–133.

Jang, S., Morrison, A. M., & O'Leary, J. T. (2004). A procedure for target market selection in tourism. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 16*(1), 17–31.

Jang, S., & Wu, C.-M. E. (2006). Seniors' travel motivation and the influential factors: an examination of Taiwanese seniors. *Tourism Management, 27*, 306–316.

Jeong I. (1997). *A study on attributes of attractions of the Bukhansan National Park and visitors' attitudes*. Hanyang University Masters thesis, Seoul: Hanyang University.

Johns, N., & Gyimothy, S. (2002). Market segmentation and the prediction of tourist behaviour: the case of Bornholm, Denmark. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*(3), 316–327.

Josiam, B., Mattson, M., & Sullivan, P. (2004). The historaunt: heritage tourism at Mickey's dining car. *Tourism Management, 25*, 453–461.

Jurowski, C., Uysal, C., & Noe, F. (1993). U.S. Virgin Islands National Park: a factor-cluster segmentation study. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 1*(4), 3–31.

Kastenholz, E., Davis, D., & Paul, G. (1999). Segmenting tourism in rural areas: the case of North and Central Portugal. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*, 353–363.

Kau, A. K., & Lee, J. (1999). Determining tourist role typologies: an exploratory study of Singapore vacationers. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(4), 382–390.

Kim M.-K. (2005). *Determinants of rural tourism and modeling rural tourism demand in Korea*. Michigan State University unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Lancing, MI: Michigan State University.

Kim, S., Crompton, J. L., & Botha, C. (2000). Responding to competition: a strategy for Sun/Lost City, South Africa. *Tourism Management, 21*, 33–41.

Kim, S., & Lee, C. (2002). Push and pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(1), 257–260.

Kim, Y. (1993). The analysis of visitors' behaviour in Sobaeksan National Park. *Applied Ecosystem Studies in Korea, 6*(2), 218–228.

Kotler, P., Bowen, J., & Makens, J. (2003). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourism motivations by nationality and destination. *Tourism Management, 23*, 221–232.

Krippendorf, J. (1989). *The holiday makers. Understanding the impact of leisure and travel*. Oxford: Heinemann Professional Publishing.

Lang, C.-T., O'Leary, J. T., & Morrison, A. M. (1997). Distinguishing the destination choices of pleasure travelers from Taiwan. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 6*(1), 2–40.

Lee, C., Lee, Y., & Wicks, B. E. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management, 25*, 61–70.

Loker-Murphy, L. (1996). Backpackers in Australia: a motivation-based segmentation study. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 5*(4), 23–45.

Loker-Murphy, L., & Perdue, R. (1992). A benefit-based segmentation of a non-resident summer travel market. *Journal of Travel Research, 31*(2), 30–35.

Lundberg, D. E. (1971). Why tourists travel. *Cornell HRA Quarterly, February*, 75–81.

Madrigal, R., & Kahle, L. (1994). Predicting vacation activity preferences on the basis of value system segmentation. *Journal of Travel Research, 13*(3), 22–28.

May, J. A., Bastian, C. T., Taylor, D. T., & Whipple, G. D. (2001). Market segmentation of Wyoming snowmobilers. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(3), 292–301.

Mazanec, J. (1992). Classifying tourists into market segments: a neural network approach. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 1*(1), 39–60.

Middleton, V. T. C. (2002). *Marketing in travel and tourism*. Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). (2002). *Agricultural and rural policy*. Technical report. Gwachen: MAF.
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). (2006a). *Directions for agricultural and rural policy*. Technical Report. Gwachen: MAF.
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF). (2006b). *Situations of the rural integrated development projects*. Technical Report. Gwachen: MAF.
Mo, C., Havitz, M., & Howard, D. (1994). Segmenting travel markets with the international tourism role (ITR) scale. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*(2), 24–30.
Mok, C., & Iverson, T. J. (2000). Expenditure-based segmentation: Taiwanese tourists to Guam. *Tourism Management, 21*, 299–305.
Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer behavior in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing, 21*(10), 1–44.
Mudambi, R., & Baum, T. (1997). Strategic segmentation: an empirical analysis of tourist expenditure in Turkey. *Journal of Travel Research, 36*(1), 29–35.
Nicholson, R., & Pearce, D. (2001). Why do people attend events: a comparative analysis of visitor motivations at four south island events. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*, 449–460.
Oh, H., Uysal, M., & Weaver, P. (1995). Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivations: a canonical correlation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 6*, 195–197.
Park, B., Lee, M., & Kim, J. (2004). Rural tourism market segmentation. *Journal of Tourism Studies, 28*(2), 193–212.
Pearce, D. G. (1996). Analyzing the demand for urban tourism: issues and examples from Paris. *Tourism Analysis, 1*, 5–18.
Pearce, P., & Lee, U. L. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*, 226–237.
Poon, A. (1998). *Tourism, technology and competitive strategies*. Wallingford: CAB International.
Popcorn, F. (1996). *Clicking: Der neue Popcorn Report: Trends für die Zukunft*. München: Heyne.
Roberts, L., & Hall, D. (2001). A sideways look at tourism demand. *Rural tourism and recreation: principles to practice*. New York: CABI Publishing. 128–146.
Rural Resources Development Institute (RRDI). (2006). *Plans for short and long term research*. Technical report. Suwon: RRDI.
Schewe, Ch. (1990). Get in position for the older market. *American Demographics, 12*(6), 38–44.
Schiffman, L. G., & Kanuk, L. L. (1978). *Consumer behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Sharpley, R. (1996). *Tourism and leisure in the countryside* (2nd ed.). Huntington: ELM Publications.
Sharpley, R., & Sharpley, J. (1997). *Rural tourism: an introduction*. London: Thomson Business Press.
Shih, D. (1986). VALS as a tool of tourism market research: the Pennsylvania experience. *Journal of Travel Research, 24*(4), 2–11.
Shoemaker, S. (1994). Segmenting the U.S. travel market according to benefits realized. *Journal of Travel Research, 32*(3), 8–21.
Sirakaya E. (1992). *Modeling vacation destination choice decisions: development of an instrument*. Clemson University Masters thesis, South Carolina: Clemson University.
Sirakaya, E., McLellan, R. W., & Uysal, M. (1996). Modeling vacation destinations decisions: a behavioral approach. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 5*(1/2), 57–75.
Song, D. Y. (2005). Why do people visit the countryside? Push & pull factors. *Journal of Green Tourism, 12*(2), 117–144.
Uysal, M., & Hagan, L. R. (1993). Motivation of pleasure to travel and tourism. In M. A. Khan, M. D. Olsen, & T. Var (Eds.), *VNR's encyclopedia of hospitality and tourism* (pp. 798–810). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
Uysal, M., & Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research, 21*(4), 844–846.
Wight, P. A. (1996). North American ecotourism markets: motivations, references, and destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 35*(1), 3–10.
Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management, 26*, 45–56.
Young, M. (1999). The relationship between tourist motivations and the interpretation of place meaning. *Tourism Geographics, 1*(4), 387–405.
Yuan, S., & McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinates of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research, 29*(1), 42–44.
Yüksel, A. (2003). Market segmentation based on customers' post-purchase performance valuation: a case of tourist diners. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 15*(1), 1–18.
Zhang, H. Q., & Lam, T. (1999). An analysis of Mainland Chinese visitors' motivations to visit Hong Kong. *Tourism Management, 20*, 587–593.