



www.ebscohost.com
www.gi.sanu.ac.rs, www.doiserbia.nb.rs,
J. Geogr. Inst. Cvijic. 66(2) (273–289)



Original scientific paper

UDC: 911.3:338.48(497.11)
DOI:10.2298/IJGI1602273T

MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS OF YOUTH TOURISTS VISITING BELGRADE

Nikola Todorović^{*1}, *Dobrica Jovičić*^{*}

^{*} Faculty of Geography, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia

Received: May 22, 2016; Reviewed: June 20, 2016; Accepted: August 3, 2016

Abstract: Youth tourism is characterized by diversity of participants' motivation, in which culture-related motivational factors were designated in the previous research as particularly important. Aim of the research is providing contribution to the current findings about general motivation of youth tourists and their motivation to visit Belgrade. Research was conducted via survey in which the respondents rated importance of different push and pull motivational factors on Likert scales. Results indicate that culture-related push factors were rated highly, but lower than having fun, visiting interesting places, getting away from the routine and excitement. The most important pull factors are contact with the local residents and cultural attractions sightseeing, which were rated higher than recreation and engagement in night life, confirming the important role of culture in the motivation of youth tourists. The fact that Belgrade was on the way to another destination and the perceived inexpensiveness of stay in it were rated as more important pull factors than city's attraction base, which is in accordance with the determined transit quality of the visit. By using statistical methods (t-test, ANOVA), it was established that socio-demographic characteristics and trip frequency had significant influence on general and tourists' motivation to visit Belgrade.

Key words: motivation, youth tourism, Belgrade, push factors, pull factors

Introduction

Dann (1981, p. 205) defined tourist motivation as “meaningful state of mind which adequately disposes an actor or group of actors to travel”. Iso-Ahola (1982) stated that satisfaction of needs for something that is absent or that lacks has a central role in the theories of tourist motivation. Cognition of factors motivating tourists to visit a destination may help their managers to choose an appropriate marketing strategy (Uysal & Hagan, 1993). Understanding the motivation of a certain tourist segment and motivational differences within that segment has great marketing importance (Crompton, 1979).

¹ Correspondence to: ethanmorasca@gmail.com

Youth tourism encompasses tourist movements of individuals of age 15–29, which mostly use inexpensive bus and rail transport and stay in hostels and low-budget hotels (Todorović, Apelić & Romić, 2015). According to the UNWTO estimates, in 2012 youth tourists accounted for almost a fifth of all international tourists in the world (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2013, p. 5). In 2015, Belgrade was the destination with largest individual share (33.14%) in overall number of tourists in Serbia (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2016). City's attraction base comprises cultural-historical values, natural values with recreational zones and hospitality units providing possibilities of entertainment (Stanković & Vojčić, 2007). Aside from abundant attraction base, reasons for Belgrade's dominant role in the tourist flow of Serbia are its polyfunctional and favorable geographic position (Jovičić, 2009). Characteristics of youth tourism in Belgrade are mostly in accordance with global characteristics of this tourism form (Todorović et al., 2015).

The first aim of the study is contribution to the current findings about youth tourists' motivation from the aspect of push and pull factors, whereby special emphasis was put on determining motivational differences within the researched tourist segment. The second aim is providing insight into motivation of foreign youth tourists for visiting Belgrade. Based on a review of relevant literature, a questionnaire was developed, and following that, a survey was conducted, providing results which are presented and analyzed in the paper. Based on the results, certain conclusions regarding both aims of the study were drawn.

Literature review

The concept of push and pull factors, which by acting together lead to the decision to visit a specific tourist destination (Dann, 1981), is broadly accepted in the literature about tourist motivation (Kim & Lee, 2002). Dann (1977, p. 186), stating that push factors “refer to the tourist as subject and deal with those factors predisposing him to travel”. These are desires, needs and affinities of an individual (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994; Gnoth, 1997). Dann (1977) designated two push factors — anomie (inability to satisfy affective needs) and desire for ego-enhancement (need for social advancement). Crompton (1979) designated seven socio-psychological motives — escape from everyday environment, self-evaluation, relaxation, prestige, regression, enhancement of kinship relationships and facilitation of social interactions. Iso-Ahola (1982) designated four groups of reasons for travel — escaping from personal (problems, failures) or interpersonal environment (co-workers, family, friends) and seeking for personal (learning about other cultures, rest, prestige) or interpersonal rewards (social interaction). Later research identified additional push factors, such as desire for

adventure, health preservation or improvement (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994), desire to get away from the crowd, learn and discover, feel thrilled and experience nostalgia (Botha, Crompton & Kim, 1999).

Pull factors are attributes at destinations' disposal, which have a certain utility for the tourist (Heitmann, 2011). They are derived from the potential tourists' perception of the destination's attractive features (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). They represent the tourist's awareness regarding the key destination attributes which they want to incorporate in their experience (Gnoth, 1997). Crompton (1979) referred to them as cultural motives and stresses that they influence the decision making regarding the choice of a specific destination, i.e. that they direct and help concretizing the desire for travel. Therefore, Dann (1981, p. 191) stated that they "respond to push factor motivation". These comprise beaches and other natural values, accommodation and recreational facilities, cultural-historical and other resources (Uysal & Hagan, 1993).

Kim and Lee (2002) linked push factors to the demand and pull factors to the supply. Findings about the interaction of these factors may help destination managers to enable their successful connection on the market (Uysal & Jurowski, 1994). Dann (1977) stressed that research of push factors should precede research of pull factors. It is considered that push factors emerge first and that they have a greater influence on the decision to travel (Heitmann, 2011).

Role of certain motivational factors varies in relation to a big number of socio-demographic variables. Dann (1977) founded that anomie is more present in people of higher socio-economic status, men and young people, while desire for ego-enhancement is more present in people of lower income, women and older people. Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) stressed that women assign more importance to the needs for self-actualization, while men consider satisfaction of social needs as more important. Jönsson and Devonish (2008) did not find significant differences between men's and women's motivations. Kozak (2002) founded significant differences between motivations of British and German tourists, which were confirmed by Jönsson and Devonish (2008), who applied the same methodology on a sample of tourists from another set of countries.

Motivation of youth tourists

The needs of youth tourists were for a long time inaccurately considered not only the same as the needs of other tourists, but also that they can be satisfied with services of lower quality (Carr, 1998). One of the main motives linked to youth is the search for personal identity through travel (Clarke, 1992). Today's youth wants to present itself to the world and share experiences gained through

tourism with a broad group of people, mostly on the Internet (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2013). There are numerous research engaged in concretization of the mentioned motives. Richards and Wilson (2003) designated exploration of new cultures, feeling of excitement and gaining knowledge as main motives of youth tourists. The most popular activities of youth tourists are visiting historical sites and monuments, walking, hiking, visiting restaurants and cafés and shopping (Richards & Wilson, 2003). Research conducted by the World Youth Student and Educational Travel Confederation organization (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2013) showed that over 80% of respondents state the following motives for their trips: having a cultural experience, exploration of new cultures, learning new things and meeting local residents. According to the research by the website HostelBookers (2010), the most common travel motives are sightseeing and culture (80%), city break (47%) and visiting friends and relatives (44%) (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2013).

The stereotype that young people are mostly oriented toward coastal destinations with attractive beaches is not acceptable, because youth tourism market is characterized by great diversity regarding participants' interests (Richards & Wilson, 2003). Given the fact that visiting historical sites and monuments has emerged as one of the most common activities of youth tourists, importance of culture for the quality of their experience is clear (Moisă, 2007). Youth tourists are a significant source of demand in cultural tourism for two reasons. They not only presently travel to destinations with abundant cultural heritage, but their participation in such tourism form may also determine the patterns of their future behavior in tourism (Richards, 2007). The tourist who traveled motivated by culture in their youth will probably continue to do so in the following stages of life. Vogt (1976) designated maintenance of personal ties, prestige and satisfaction of personal desires as main traveling motives of youth tourists. Satisfaction of the second motive depends on the degree of independence and exoticness of the trip. The third motive is related to the achievement of personal growth through understanding of themselves, other people and cultures.

Bae-Haeng (1998) performed a segmentation of youth tourists in Korea based on their ratings of gains they expected from their trip to Australia (push factors) and activities in which they wanted to partake in the destination (pull factors). Based on factor analysis, three segments were identified — cultural and ecotourism seekers, activity seekers and entertainment seekers. All three segments gave highest ratings to experiencing new things. Second most important motivational factor for first two segments was self-development and for the third segment it was escape from the routine. The most important activities for the first segment were meeting local residents and experiencing local lifestyles. For the second

segment these activities were meeting local residents and visiting historical sites. The third segment considers spending time near the ocean as most important.

Bourkas (2013) researched motivation of youth tourists for visiting archeological site Delphi in Greece. The respondents rated the importance of specific reasons for visiting on 5-degree Likert scale. The highest rated reasons were desire of tourists to see the site and the museum, educational reasons and the fact that the visit was included in the package tour. General importance of culture as a motive for travel was rated with the score of 3.82.

Arcodia, Cavlek and Abreu-Novais (2014) studied the motivation of students for participation in a field trip in Croatia. Results showed that students were mostly motivated by the fact that it was a new and unique experience, meeting new people and learning. The fact that 58% of the respondents stated more than one reason for participation confirms the multidimensionality of tourist motivation. Undergraduates stated experiencing new and unique things more often than graduate students did. The age of the respondents had smaller influence on motivation, but older than 25 were more motivated by learning new things, while younger were more motivated by the mere opportunity to travel.

Cited studies provide a detailed insight into youth tourists' motivation for visiting specific destinations, while their general motivation is not comprehensively researched. Motives identified in these studies may be adapted and used in research of youth tourists' general motivation. The theory of push and pull motivation provides an adequate framework for such research, given the fact that it comprises both tourists' needs and destination attributes.

Research methodology

Questionnaire design

Questionnaire was chosen as instrument for the research conduction. Given the fact that foreign youth tourists are the focus segment, the questionnaire was composed in English. Tourists make the decision to travel based on a large number of motivational factors, whereby importance of each of them differs. Therefore, use of diverse motivational factors and Likert scale is recommended in tourist motivation research (Pyo, Mihalik & Uysal, 1989). The first group of questions is related to basic socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, characteristics of their current trip and number of international trips taken in the current year. The majority of questions in this group were designed based on the survey used for research of youth tourism by Todorović et al. (2015), thereby providing comparability of the results.

The second group of questions is related to general motivation of youth tourists and their motivation to visit Belgrade. Respondents rated importance of motivational factors, drafted on the basis of the analyzed literature, on 5-degree Likert scale. First question comprises 12 reasons for making a tourist trip (push factors), which were adapted according to Crompton (1979), Iso-Ahola (1982), Bae-Haeng (1998), Botha, Crompton and Kim (1999) and Richards and Wilson (2003). Second question comprises six activities in which tourist take part on trips (pull factors) and was drafted based on factors used by Iso-Ahola (1982), Bae-Haeng (1998) and WYSETC (Tourism Research and Marketing, 2013). Third question provides nine reasons for visiting Belgrade (pull factors). They were based on motives used by Bae-Haeng (1998), Richards and Wilson (2003) and Bourkas (2013), which were adapted to the specific destination features.

Sample and research conduction

In order to participate in the survey, a potential respondent had to fulfill three criteria: to have actually visited Belgrade in the tourism manner, to be 15–29 years old and to not have permanent residency in Serbia. The reason for the application of the first criterion was elimination of tourists who had a train layover in Belgrade, whereby they did not leave the train station. The second and the third criterion limited the sample on the focus segment of the research. Due to unfulfillment of criteria, 28 individuals were not surveyed.

Previous research (Dann, 1977; Kozak, 2002) showed that the moment in which tourists rate their motivation (before or after the trip), does not influence the results. In accordance with that, research of motivation may be conducted on departure terminals in the destination (Kozak, 2002). The Main Railway Station in Belgrade was chosen as the location of survey conduction based on high presence of foreign youth tourists (Todorović et al., 2015), as well as on easier access and clear-sightedness in comparison to the main bus station. The survey was conducted from 4th to 9th July of 2015. Total number of respondents participating in the survey is 157. Analysis of the data collected through questions with Likert scale was performed in the SPSS 17 software, while the analysis of the remaining data was performed in Microsoft Excel.

Results

Respondents in the age group of 15–25 have absolute majority (91.72%) (Table 1). Based on educational level, respondents may be divided into those who completed secondary or lower (43.13%) and those who completed some level of tertiary education (56.87%). From the aspect of annual income, categories of those earning less than (respondents without income included) and more than

5,000 U.S. dollars annually may be distinguished. Little over a quarter of respondents (26.11%) did not make an overnight stay in Belgrade (Table 2). Remaining surveyed tourists in average made 2.91 overnight stays. If two tourists who made 60 overnight stays were to be excluded from the sample, average number of overnight stays would be 1.91.

Table 1. Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

Indicator	Category	Results in %	Sample
Age	15–20	41.40	157
	21–25	50.32	
	26–29	8.28	
Country of residence	European countries	88.54	157
	Non-European countries	11.46	
Gender	Male	67.52	157
	Female	32.48	
Education	Bachelor's degree	31.37	153
	Master's degree	11.76	
	Secondary education	55.56	
	Other	1.31	
Occupation	Student	76.60	141
	Employed	23.40	
Personal annual income	Less than 5,000 \$	70.70	157
	5,000–10,000 \$	8.28	
	More than 10,000 \$	21.02	

A valid response to the question regarding the duration of overall trip was provided by the total of 144 respondents. Average duration of their overall trip was 32.30 days. If three tourists whose overall trips lasted for a year were to be excluded from the sample, average number of overnight stays would be 25.12.

Table 2. Characteristics related to respondents' travel and stay

Indicator	Category	Results in %	Sample
Stay	Overnight	73.89	157
	Transit	26.11	
Duration of stay	1 overnight stay	49.14	116
	2 overnight stays	25.86	
	3 overnight stays	17.24	
	4 overnight stays and more	7.76	
Accommodation type	Hostel	71.55	116
	Hotel	8.62	
	Other	19.83	
Primary destination	Belgrade	3.82	157
	Some other destination	96.18	
Repeated visit	Yes	11.46	157
	No	88.54	
First visit in 2015	Yes	31.85	157
	No	68.15	

Average ratings given by the respondents regarding certain motivational factors as general reasons for traveling are presented in the Table 3. Having fun was the highest rated reason for traveling, being also the only one with the ratings above 4.50. The lowest rated reason was visiting places that friends did not visit.

Table 3. Importance of reasons for traveling

Reason	Importance (x)	σ	Sample
Having fun	4.53	0.813	157
Visiting interesting places	4.18	0.951	157
Getting away from the routine	4.16	0.937	157
Excitement	4.14	0.923	157
Learning about local way of life	3.97	1.071	157
Visiting cultural attractions	3.71	1.099	157
Rest from studying or work	3.62	1.318	157
Improving relationships with friends	3.61	1.259	157
Visiting as many as possible countries	3.55	1.347	157
Learning about local history	3.54	1.129	157
Making new friendships	3.45	1.195	157
Visiting places that friends did not visit	2.54	1.337	157

Average ratings of the importance of certain activities for the quality of respondents' tourist experience are presented in the Table 4. Contact with the local residents was rated as the most important activity, while visiting museums was rated as the least important one.

Table 4. Importance of activities on trips

Activity	Importance (x)	σ	Sample
Contact with the local residents	3.74	1.056	153
Cultural attractions sightseeing	3.68	1.104	153
Recreation	3.25	1.131	153
Engaging in nightlife	3.22	1.352	153
Visiting events	2.92	1.249	153
Visiting museums	2.79	1.151	153

Average importance ratings of certain motivational factors as reasons for tourist visit to Belgrade are presented in the Table 5.

Table 5. Importance of reasons for visiting Belgrade

Reason	Importance (x)	σ	Sample
Belgrade was on the way to another destination	3.91	1.339	153
Belgrade is an affordable destination	3.32	1.296	153
Learning about local way of life	3.25	1.258	153
Learning about local history	3.10	1.307	153
Specific places of interest	2.75	1.189	153
Learning about Belgrade's socialist past	2.65	1.329	153
Specific cultural attractions	2.63	1.157	153
Learning about the NATO bombing	2.26	1.356	153
Visiting friends	1.31	0.935	153

The fact that Belgrade was on the way to another destination was rated as the most important reason for visiting, while visiting friends received the lowest ratings.

Motivational differences within the sample

Ratings of motivational factors (Tables 3, 4 and 5) were analyzed in SPSS 17 software package in relation to several variables — gender, age, education, occupation, income and whether the current international trip was the first one in 2015. Depending on the number of categories in a variable, in order to determine if responses from respondents in those categories differed in a statistically significant manner (p), t-test or ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) were used. Established statistically significant differences in ratings are presented in the Tables 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

Table 6. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to respondents' gender

Motivational factor	Gender	N	x	σ	t	Sig.
Learning about local history	M	106	3.35	1.113	-3.164	0.002**
	F	51	3.94	1.066		
Rest from studying or work	M	106	3.43	1.366	-2.739	0.007**
	F	51	4.00	1.311		
Engaging in nightlife	M	105	3.37	1.346	2.132	0.035*
	F	48	2.88	1.315		

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*); $p < 0,01$ level (**).

Male and female respondents assigned statistically significantly different importance ratings to two general reasons for traveling, which were assigned with higher ratings by female respondents, and to one activity (engaging in nightlife), which was rated as more important by male respondents (Table 6).

Table 7. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to respondents' occupation

Motivational factor	Occupation	N	x	σ	t	Sig.
Visiting as many countries as possible	Student	108	3.76	1.260	2.306	0.023*
	Employed	33	3.15	1.523		
Belgrade was on the way to another destination	Student	105	3.98	1.263	2.199	0.030*
	Employed	32	3.33	1.661		

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*).

Ratings assigned by students and employed respondents differ in a statistically significant manner regarding one general reason for traveling and one reason for visiting Belgrade (Table 7). Respondents' annual income level had statistically significant influence on ratings of one general reason for traveling and one reason for visiting Belgrade (Table 8).

Table 8. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to respondents' income

Motivational factor	Income	N	x	σ	t	Sig.
Improving relationship with friends	< 5,000 \$	111	3.75	1.202	2.131	0.035*
	> 5,000 \$	46	3.28	1.344		
Visiting friends	< 5,000 \$	110	1.20	0.739	-2.445	0.016*
	> 5,000 \$	43	1.60	1.275		

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*).

Statistically significant differences in motivation of respondents of different age were established regarding four general reasons for travel (Table 9). Difference was determined between three age categories (values in brackets). Via post hoc ANOVA test exact pairs of age categories whose ratings differed in a statistically significant manner were determined. Names of these categories, level of statistical significance of differences in their ratings and difference in means of their ratings are provided in bold.

Table 9. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to years of age

Motivational factor	Years of age	N	x	σ	F	Sig.	Difference in means
Visiting interesting places	15–20	65	4.03	0.901	3.422	0.028* (0.035)	-0.738
	21–25	79	4.20	1.018			
	26–29	13	4.77	0.439			
Learning about local way of life	15–20	65	3.75	1.076	3.993	0.021* (0.020)	-0.862
	21–25	79	4.04	1.079			
	26–29	13	4.62	0.650			
Learning about local history	15–20	65	3.25	1.061	5.997	0.005** (0.003)	-1.062
	21–25	79	3.66	1.131			
	26–29	13	4.31	1.032			
Having fun	15–20	65	4.77	0.553	5.120	0.006** (0.007)	0.415
	21–25	79	4.35	0.948			
	26–29	13	4.38	0.768			

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*); $p < 0,01$ level (**).

In relation to educational level, ratings differed in a statistically significant manner in cases of seven motivational factors (Table 10). Respondents with secondary or lower education gave higher ratings to the nightlife, while in other cases higher ratings were assigned by respondents with higher education.

Table 10. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to educational level

Motivational factor	Educational level	N	x	σ	t	Sig.
Visiting interesting places	Secondary and lower	87	4.03	1.039	-2.349	0.020*
	Tertiary	66	4.39	0.782		
Visiting cultural attractions	Secondary and lower	87	3.52	1.130	-2.574	0.011*
	Tertiary	66	3.95	0.968		
Learning about local history	Secondary and lower	87	3.34	1.129	-2.735	0.007**
	Tertiary	66	3.83	1.046		
Rest from studying or work	Secondary and lower	87	3.46	1.388	-2.296	0.023*
	Tertiary	66	3.92	1.114		
Learning about the NATO bombing	Secondary and lower	84	2.02	1.222	-2.389	0.018*
	Tertiary	66	2.56	1.469		
Contact with the local residents	Secondary and lower	84	3.56	1.090	-2.298	0.023*
	Tertiary	66	3.95	0.983		
Engaging in nightlife	Secondary and lower	84	3.42	1.338	2.160	0.032*
	Tertiary	66	2.95	1.329		

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*); $p < 0,01$ level (**).

In relation to traveling frequency, statistically significant differences are present regarding the ratings of two general reasons for traveling and two reasons for visiting Belgrade (Table 11).

Table 11. Differences in motivational factors ratings in relation to traveling frequency

Motivational factor	First trip in current year	N	x	σ	t	Sig.
Making new friendships	Yes	49	3.16	1.124	-1.996	0.048*
	No	107	3.57	1.206		
Learning about local history	Yes	49	3.24	1.283	-2.095	0.039*
	No	107	3.68	1.033		
Learning about Belgrade's local history	Yes	48	2.73	1.512	-2.150	0.035*
	No	104	3.26	1.174		
Learning about Belgrade's socialist past	Yes	48	2.31	1.355	-2.154	0.033*
	No	104	2.81	1.300		

Note: Sig. — statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ level (*).

Results from the Table 11 showed that respondents who travel more frequently assigned higher ratings to all stated motivational factors.

Discussion

Results from the Tables 1 and 2, except respondents' income, are comparable with the results reported by Todorović et al. (2015). Except the gender category, regarding which the current research reported smaller share of women, socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are approximately same. Regarding the characteristics of the trip, smaller discrepancies are present. The structure of the respondents by number of overnight stays differs, whereby the current study reported shorter tourist stay. Both studies showed that Belgrade was not the primary destination of the majority of respondents, but respondents whose primary destination was Belgrade had smaller share in the current study.

Trip index (TI), developed by Pearce and Elliott (1983) may be used as an indicator of level of the transit quality of the tourist visit. The Trip index is calculated based on the number of nights spent in the destination (D_n) and the overall number of nights spent on the trip (T_n). In this regard, $TI = (D_n) \cdot 100 / (T_n)$ formula is used (Lohmann & Pearce, 2010, p. 268). Calculated result is interpreted on a scale from 0 (transit visit) to 100 (sole destination). Large share of transit tourists (26.11%), small average number of overnight stays (1.91) and low value of the Trip index (7.48) confirm previously determined transit quality of stay of Belgrade's youth tourists (Todorović et al., 2015).

In the analysis of average ratings of general reasons for making a tourist trip (Table 3), several observations may be made. Four motivational factors have ratings higher than 4. High ratings of the getting away from the routine factor may be explained by more frequent presence of this motive in tourists during summer (Kozak, 2002). Respondents also attach great importance to the

motivational factors specifically related to cultural tourism (visiting cultural attractions, learning about local way of life and learning about local history), which confirms the importance of culture for the quality of experience of youth tourists (Moisă, 2007). Similar importance is also attached to interpersonal reasons — improving relationships with friends and making new friendships. The lowest ratings were those given to the reason regarding visits to places that friends did not visit, which means that respondents attach small importance to prestige reasons. Relatively high ratings of the reason regarding visits to as many as possible different countries confirm that youth tourists are “thirsty” for new trips (Richards & Wilson, 2003).

The analysis of ratings of general pull factors (Table 4) established that none of the six suggested activities scored average ratings higher than 4, whereby the highest ratings are attached to the contact with the local residents and cultural attraction sightseeing, which further stresses the importance of the cultural component in this segment's tourist motivation. However, visiting museums received lowest average score, which indicates that, although they are mostly motivated by culture, they attach greater importance to the less formal forms of cultural experiences.

Average importance ratings of the reasons for tourist visit to Belgrade (Table 5) further confirmed previously stated observations regarding the dominant transit quality of foreign youth tourists' stay. The sole motivational factor rated higher than 3.50 is the fact that Belgrade was on the way to another destination while the belief that Belgrade is an affordable destination had second highest ratings. The remaining two factors, with average ratings higher than 3 are in direct relation to cultural tourism. These factors are learning about the local way of life and learning about the local history, which received lower ratings regarding Belgrade than they did regarding general reasons for travel. More exemplified reasons, such as visiting specific places of interest and gaining knowledge about Belgrade's socialist past and the NATO bombing, received much lower ratings.

By gender as a variable (Table 6), the largest difference is noted regarding learning about local culture as a reason for travel, whereby women's average ratings were significantly higher. The fact that they assigned higher ratings to rest and male respondents to engaging in nightlife, is in accordance with the findings that the tourists who wanted noisy, active and interactive experiences in the destination were mostly male (Ryan & Glendon, 1998). Students attached greater importance to the reason regarding visiting as many countries as possible than employed youth tourists did (Table 7). Based on it, the conclusion may be

drawn that the “thirst for travel” as a characteristic of youth tourists (Richards & Wilson, 2003) is more present in those still attending university.

Youth tourists older than 25 assigned statistically significantly higher ratings to learning about local way of life and local history than respondents of age 15–20 did (Table 9). That is in accordance with findings of Arcodia et al. (2014) that respondents older than 25 are more motivated than younger respondents to learn new things. Respondents of age 15–20 assigned statistically significantly higher ratings to having fun as the reason for travel, than respondents of age 21–25 did. Tourists with higher education assigned higher ratings to the reasons related to cultural tourism, while respondents with secondary or lower education assigned higher ratings to the nightlife (Table 10).

In the ratings of the reasons for visiting Belgrade, several statistically significant differences may be detected. Respondents with lower income (Table 8) in comparison to the respondents with higher income assigned higher ratings to the fact that Belgrade was on the way to another destination. Tourists whose current trip was not the first one in 2015 assigned higher ratings to learning about local history of Belgrade and its socialist past than tourists whose trip was their first one (Table 11). Respondents with higher education in comparison to the respondents with lower education assigned higher ratings to learning about NATO bombing as a reason for visiting (Table 10). It may be concluded that the youth tourists who travel more often and are of higher education are to a greater extent motivated by the more precisely defined destination attributes.

Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that youth tourists primarily travel to have fun, visit interesting sites, get away from the routine and feel excitement. Although the culture-related motivation is placed behind these reasons by its importance, results regarding the importance of general pull factors show that informal cultural activities have the key role in their trips. Contact with local residents and cultural attractions sightseeing were rated as more important activities than going out at night and visiting events, which are traditionally perceived as fun and exciting for youth. Such results indicate that, from the perspective of youth tourists, pull factors which may satisfy their inner motivation in the most adequate way are exactly these cultural activities.

Research of the motivational differences within the segment offered insight into the influence of different socio-economic and behavioral factors on the motivation of youth tourists, confirming certain previous findings and laying ground for more comprehensive research of the issue. The biggest limitation of

this part of the study is the size of sub-segments within the sample, whereby a larger sample would allow a more detailed analysis of the influence of certain variables on motivational factors ratings.

Results indicating the conspicuously transit quality of tourist visits by this segment are directly linked to the fact that the highest rated reasons for visiting Belgrade are not related to the city's attraction base. Its importance is rated much lower than the motivational factors related to the favorable geographic position and the perceived inexpensiveness of stay in Belgrade. A potential cause of such state is Belgrade's individual attractions, which are not recognizable on the tourist market. Therefore, foreign youth tourists could perceive the quality of city's offer as insufficient for them to spend more time in it. This is further linked to shorter stay and automatically to the transit quality of their visits, which largely reduces the possibilities of realization of bigger economic effects.

This study is one of the first studies of youth tourism in Belgrade. Obtained results may represent a basis for future research and planning of improvement of the focus segment's tourist flow. Limitation of this part of the study is absence of the respondents from former republics of Yugoslavia. Gaining an insight into the motivation of youth tourists from these countries requires research conducted on alternate locations.

Acknowledgements

The research was supported by a scholarship awarded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (project 176017).

References

- Arcodia, C., Cavlek, M. & Abreu-Novais, M. (2014). Factors influencing motivations and expectations of field trip attendance. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(10), 856–861.
- Bae-Haeng, C. (1998). Segmenting the Younger Korean Tourism Market: The Attractiveness of Australia as a Holiday Destination. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 7(4), 1–19.
- Botha, C., Crompton, J. L. & Kim, S. (1999). Developing a Revised Competitive Position for Sun/Lost City, South Africa. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37, 341–352.
- Bourkas, N. (2013). Youth Visitors' Satisfaction in Greek Cultural Heritage Destinations: The Case of Delphi. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 10(3), 285–306.
- Carr, N. (1998). The Young Tourist: A Case of Neglected Research. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(4), 307–318.
- Clarke, J. (1992). A marketing spotlight on the youth 'four S's' consumer. *Tourism Management*, 13(2), 321–327.

- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408–424.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184–194.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourism Motivation: An Appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 8(2), 187–219.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 283–304.
- Heitmann, S. (2011). Tourist Behaviour and Tourism Motivation. In P. Robinson S. Heitmann & P. Dieke (Eds.), *Research Themes for Tourism*, (pp. 31–44). Wallingford: CAB International.
- HostelBookers (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.hostelbookers.com/>
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward A Social Psychological Theory of Tourism Motivation: A Rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 9(2), 256–262.
- Jovičić, D. (2009). *Turistička geografija Srbije*. Belgrade: Faculty of Geography.
- Jönsson, C. & Devonish, D. (2008). Does nationality, age, and gender affect travel motivations? A case study of visitors to the Caribbean island of Barbados. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 25(3–4), 398–408.
- Kim, S. & Lee, C. (2002). Push and Pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 257–260.
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23, 221–232.
- Lohmann, G. & Pearce, D. G. (2010). Conceptualizing and operationalizing nodal tourism functions. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(2), 266–275.
- Moisă, C. (2007). The Global Importance of the Youth Travel. *Journal of the Faculty of Economics — Economic Science Series*, 1, 443–446.
- Pearce, P. L. & Caltabiano, M. L. (1983). Inferring Travel Motivation from Travelers' Experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(2), 16–20.
- Pearce, D. G. & Elliott, J. M. C. (1983). The trip index. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(1), 6–9.
- Pyo, S., Mihalik, B. J. & Uysal, M. (1989). Attraction attributes and motivations: A canonical correlation analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16(2), 277–281.
- Richards, G. & Wilson, J. (2003). *Today's Youth Travellers: Tomorrow's Global Nomads*. Amsterdam: International Student Travel Confederation.
- Richards, G. (2007). *Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Hospitality Press.
- Ryan, C. & Glendon, I. (1998). Application of leisure motivation scale to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 169–184.

- Stanković, S. M. & Vojčić, V. (2007). Mesto turizma u privredi Beograda. *Zbornik radova – Geografski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu*, 55, 95–104.
- Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia. (2016). *Turistički promet u Republici Srbiji, decembar 2015. (UT10)*. Belgrade: Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia.
- Todorović, N., Apelić, J. & Romić, G. (2015). Characteristics of foreign youth tourism in Belgrade. *Glasnik Srpskog geografskog društva*, 95(3), 1–16.
- Tourism Research and Marketing. (2013). *New Horizont III*. Amsterdam: WYSE Travel Confederation.
- Uysal, M. & Hagan, L. (1993). Motivations of pleasure travel and tourism. In M. Khan, M. Olsen & T. Var (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of hospitality and tourism*, 798–810. New York, NY: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Uysal, M. & Jurowski, C. (1994). Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(4), 844–846.
- Vogt, J. W. (1976). Wandering: Youth and Travel Behaviour. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(1), 25–41.