Differential roles of push and pull factors on escape for travel: Personal and social identity perspectives
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Abstract

This study examines the effects of push and pull motivations linked to an individual’s personal and social identities as key antecedents to escape for travel. In terms of push factors, escape for travel is driven from a personal identity perspective by the need for evaluation of self and regression; and from a social identity perspective, by the need for social interaction but not enhancement of kinship. Cultural motives that reflect personal identity positively influence escape for travel than destination pull factors linked to social identity. Overall, the study contributes to the existing knowledge on push and pull tourist motivations.

1. INTRODUCTION

The self and identity concepts influence what people are motivated to do, how they make sense of themselves and others, and how they behave (see Baumeister, 1998; Brewer, 1991; Higgins, 1987; Oyserman, 2007). Oyserman et al. (2012, p. 73) describe the self as how ‘people can consider themselves from a number of perspectives’, i.e. individualistic vs. collectivistic, temporally near vs. temporally distal, or the immersed ‘mind’s eye’ vs. ‘eyes of others’. Whereas, identity refers to ‘a set of meanings attached to the self that serves as a standard or reference that guides behaviour in situations’ (Stets & Biga, 2003, p. 401). Although scholars tend to use the terms ‘self’ and ‘identity’ interchangeably (Swann & Bosson, 2010), however, they are mental constructs shaped by the context in which they develop and influence one’s behaviour (Oyserman et al., 2012).

Generally, identities are conceptualised as ‘unitary’ or ‘multiple’, ‘real’ or ‘constructed’, ‘stable’ or ‘fluid’, and ‘personal’ or ‘social’ (Bussey, 2011; Vignoles, 2017). In particular, Vignoles (2017) argues that identities are mainly classified as personal and social; not only in terms of content (e.g. bodily features, personal traits, relationships, group memberships), but also in processes (e.g. daily social interactions, cultural discourse) that are formed, maintained, and changed over time. Personal identity is similar to the self-concept in psychology literature that is used to explain broader perspectives such as what makes one different (individualistic) or similar to others (collective) (Oyserman et al., 2012). In contrast, social identity entails how people identify with a social group (Lee et al., 2016). It refers to ‘that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group (or
groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership’ (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Although these perspectives (i.e. personal and social) have been widely examined in other fields such as marketing, limited research efforts have been made within the tourism field to understand the role of identity, identity-related motivations in influencing tourist experiences, and how these experiences may benefit an individual (Bond & Falk, 2013).

More specifically, Nath and Saha (2017) note that research on tourist motivation, relating to push and pull factors, falls short of an identity-seeking perspective. Michael et al. (2017) argue that the need to escape is a major psychological force driven by individual-centric push motivators and external-centric pull motivators. Therefore, examining the role of identity within the push and pull framework can help destination marketers to understand tourists’ behaviour in terms of what drives people to escape for a specific value experience. Liutikas (2012) points out that holidays such as religious experiences and modern secular pilgrimages, provide personal value and deep meaning. Hence, holiday experiences provide individuals the chance to trigger one’s true self, develop new social connections, explore themselves, and improve family relationships, thereby enhancing one’s personal identity and further developing the social and self-conscious identity (Lee et al., 2019; Liutikas, 2012; Tajfel, 1981).

Research within social identity and self-categorisation theories suggests that people think of themselves in terms of personal or social identities depending on the context (Hogg, 2006; Oyserman et al., 2012; Oyserman, 2015). Further, Stets and Burke (2002) show that the self is a primary motivator of behaviour, and both perspectives of self (personal and social) play an important role in shaping behaviour. Within tourism, the implications of personal and social identities would be independent travel, group travel, backpacking, or ancestral searches (Murdy et al., 2018; Lozanski, 2010). According to Laing and Frost (2017), travel provides the opportunity to change behaviour through self-discovery, self-understanding, and thus the chance to take on a newly constructed identity. By examining oneself in another culture can result in learning a new language, upgrading one’s personal style, and even adopting a new national identity (Laing & Frost, 2017). Research argues that one’s motivation to escape for travel stems from the motivation to search for identity (Cohen, 2010a) and/or to reform one’s self (Desforges, 2000). An individual may also be motivated to travel as part of a social group for bonding,
social interaction, or identification with the familiar (Bond & Falk, 2013; Green, 2001; Shanahan, 2009). Tourists also like immersing themselves in the destination’s culture or reforming themselves in the search for ‘who am I?’ through interacting with ‘others’, which can enact a new identity (Cohen, 2010a). In addition, individual travellers seek vacations that reflect their own sociocultural context, have adventurous, natural qualities, and are different from the usual in response to ‘where do I fit in?’ helping them to enact certain behaviours (Desforges, 2000). Overall, one tourism destination can be preferred over another because it provides experiences and activities that help individuals to rediscover or reimagine themselves (Bond & Falk, 2013; Desforges, 2000).

Nevertheless, within the tourism context, considerable research has focused on the identity-related motivations of niche markets such as backpacker tourism (Bond & Falk, 2013; Maoz, 2007; Richards & King, 2003), museum visits (Falk, 2008), lifestyle travelling (Cohen, 2010b), and dark tourism (Lennon & Foley, 2006). This suggests the need for more empirical research that explores how identity-related motivations impact broader tourism decisions and outcomes. This study incorporates two theoretical views relating to personal and social identity as antecedents or push motivations that influence escape for travel. Both theoretical views suggest that different motivating factors may trigger an individual’s behaviour regarding escape for travel, especially for tourists from emerging markets. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to examine a nomological network model that positions the effects of push and pull motivations linked to an individual’s personal and social identities as key antecedents to escape for travel.

The main contribution of this research is threefold. First, from a theoretical perspective, it attempts to understand the push and pull motivations linked to an individual’s personal and social identities that drive escape for travel. Second, in terms of practice, the research findings can be valuable evidence for government tourism departments and destination marketing organisations (DMOs) in developing policy that supports funding allocation towards marketing and publicity for their country to a wealthy, high-spending market such as the United Arab Emirates (UAE), looking to indulge in luxury experiences. Third, from a contextual perspective, this research can assist DMOs in gaining a better understanding of outbound travel behaviour from emerging markets in the Middle East, where little is known about their travel motives, experiences, and perceptions (Michael et al., 2018; Prayag & Hosany, 2014).
2. THEORY, LITERATURE REVIEW, AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Self-categorisation theory and tourist motivation

Self-categorisation theory (SCT) classifies identity as personal and social (Turner, 1999). According to Trepte and Loy (2017, p. 1), ‘the SCT posits that depending on the importance of a certain situation for social or personal identity, an individual’s behaviour is driven either by social or personal identity processes’. Hence, this study proposes that motivational behaviour regarding escape for travel may be linked to both personal and social identity-related desires (Bond & Falk, 2013; Falk, 2008).

Personal identity is what sets an individual apart from others, i.e. an individual’s conscious awareness of his/her own being (Burke & Stets, 2009). Thus, travel behaviour may be linked to one’s personal identity, which is posited to fall within the realm of push and pull motivators. Crompton (1979) argues that the need to escape for travel stems from a variety of internal push motivations such as ‘re-evaluating and discovering more about oneself or for acting out self-images’, resulting in the ‘revision of existing perceptions of self-status and enhanced feelings of self-worth’ or ‘self-discovery’ (p. 416), or engaging in regressive ‘puerile, irrational … adolescent or child–like’ (p. 417) behaviour as one can enjoy the freedom of being anonymous in a different milieu (Cohen, 2010c). The external pull motivator may stem from the need to experience another culture to integrate that culture into one’s personal identity (Gonzalez, 2008).

Social identity theory proposes that people belong to groups and evaluate themselves against these groups (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Trepte & Loy, 2017). Social identities are ‘categorisations of the self into more inclusive social units that differentiate one individual from others within a given social context’ (Brewer, 1991, p. 476). These social units (groups) may be families, reference groups, social classes, and cultures or subcultures (Mehmetoglu, 2011). An individual’s self-concept is influenced by the value and emotional significance they attach to these social units (Tajfel, 1981). In the context of travel, one’s choices and decisions may be linked to push and pull motivators that are influenced by the social unit and destination attributes. Based partly on Maslow’s (1970) hierarchy of needs, Pearce and colleagues developed the travel career ladder (TCL) motivation theory (see Moscardo & Pearce, 1986; Pearce, 1988, 1991, 1993; Pearce & Caltabiano, 1983). The TCL approach shows that as people’s travel careers expand, their experiences grow, motivations change, and to some extent,
behaviours change (Pearce & Lee, 2005). Thus, people can use travel experiences to form a self-identity and/or reconstruct that identity (Hindle et al., 2015) through communication with ‘others’, that is, social units such as travelling partners, other tourists, local hosts, and communities (Smed, 2009). For example, travelling with a social unit (e.g. family, friends, or other social groups) can improve and enrich bonds, interactions, and relationships (Crompton, 1979), thereby enhancing one’s personal and social group identity. The choice of destination may also be influenced by (i) social unit members’ recommendations for places they have travelled to before or similar places (Correia et al., 2016); (ii) fashionable or prestigious destinations (Leibenstein, 1950); and (iii) the need to boast to one’s social unit (Crompton, 1979). Travel provides individuals the opportunity to reflect on themselves through interactions with ‘others’ or unfamiliar groups such as other tourists, local hosts, or group tour companions. This reinforces a sense of self in different social contexts, which is the essence of identity construction over time (Finch, 2015).

For the purpose of this study, we incorporate some of Crompton’s (1979) theory of push and pull motivating factors. We propose that the push motivating factors that enhance one’s personal identity are evaluation of self and regression, and those that enhance one’s social identity are enhancement of kinship and social interaction. Further, we propose that pull motivating factors that enhance one’s personal identity are linked to cultural factors, and those that enhance one’s social identity are linked to destination factors. For instance, Laing and Frost (2017) found that Italy’s destination factors—food, wine, art, and lifestyle—helped to change people’s identity because they were seen by respondents as an ‘exotic other’. Nath and Saha (2017) suggest that museums as destination factors are motivation determinants in cultural experience tourism in terms of identity-seeking and identity-projection behaviour. These pull motivating factors have differential effects on an individual’s identity needs, and together, they can influence an individual’s motivation to escape for travel.

Overall, building on SCT as well as push and pull literature, this research aims to contribute to an emerging market’s (i.e. UAE) research context that is under-researched. The interrelationships examined in this study are illustrated in Figure 1.
2.2 Personal identity push motivations

2.2.1 Evaluation of self

The vacation experience of being in a different milieu offers the opportunity for self-reflection, self-evaluation, self-discovery, self-exploration (Bond & Falk, 2013; Pearce, 1982), self-construction (O’Reilly, 2005), self-development (Li et al., 2015), personal identity exploration (Kivel & Kleiber, 2000), reconstruction (Ferrero, 2002; Wearing & Wearing, 2001), and ego-enhancement (Nikjoo & Ketabi, 2015). Individuals may seek experiences beyond simple contact with cultures, people, places, or landscapes, and look to achieve a balance between mind, body, and soul, self-transformation, and better self-understanding (Rocha et al., 2016). Such experiences can enrich one’s self-worth, i.e. ‘the degree to which individuals feel positive about themselves, that is, they feel that they are good and valuable’ (Stets & Burke, 2014, p. 410).

Tourism studies have investigated the concept of personal identity with different tourist types and nationalities. For example, Richards and King (2003) found that the motivation to travel was linked to the need to search for one’s self. Asçı et al. (2007) investigated the psychological profiles of 64 Turkish rock climbers and found that holiday activities involving rock climbing offered positive ‘physical self-perception’ and self-worth enhancement. Cohen (2010b) explored 13 nationalities and found that self-searching, learning about the self, and getting to know the self were important motivating factors for most lifestyle travellers. Michael et al. (2017) found that participation in recreational and outdoor activities like swimming, rock climbing, canoeing, and scuba diving and women having the chance to wear different (Western) clothing helped Emirati Islamic/Arab tourists in Australia to reflect and rediscover themselves. Park and Santos (2017) confirmed similar findings suggesting that, due to the social and cultural differences, travelling in Europe offered South Korean tourists the chance for self-development and self-discovery, helping them to broaden their global perspectives and citizenship. Given this background, it is interesting to understand the motivations to travel for self-discovery, to re-evaluate one’s lifestyle, or to enhance one’s self-worth in a different context such as the UAE. It is expected that an individual’s choice of destination is based on the need for self-evaluation in a different setting, thereby motivating one to escape for travel. Thus, the study hypothesises that:

**H1:** Evaluation of self is positively related to escape for travel.
2.2.2 Regression

Travel provides the opportunity to construct a temporary self-identity (Stein, 2011), which can be manifested through participation in regressive activities and behaviours (Crompton, 1979) driven by child–like and hedonistic motives (Selwyn, 1996). Everyday roles can be temporarily suspended on vacation, and people can behave in a ‘freer’ way, with conduct considered unacceptable within the home cultural environment (Crompton, 1979; Stein, 2011). For example, Michael et al. (2017) found Australia to be culturally relaxing for Arab/Islamic tourists as they felt free to indulge in activities normally frowned upon at home, for example, men engaging in cooking activities.

Regression as a motivating push factor also encompasses an individual’s desire to experience a simpler lifestyle (Fodness, 1994) or indulge in nostalgic experiences such as the ‘lifestyle of a previous era’ or ‘the desire to regress to a less complex, less changeable, less technologically advanced environment’ (Crompton, 1979, p. 418). Tourists from Thailand, Germany, France, Britain, Japan, the USA, and Australia were drawn to Laos for the simpler life experience e.g. friendliness and hospitality of the local people, the rural countryside, inexpensive restaurants, value for money, cleanliness, outdoor activities and easy of driving (Sirisack et al., 2014). Regression can therefore play an important role in the construction of one’s self-identity, prompting the need to escape for travel. Thus, the study hypothesises that:

H2: Regression is positively related to escape for travel.

2.3 Social identity push motivations

2.3.1 Enhancement of kinship

Vacation travel provides families an opportunity to collectively enhance its members’ social identity (Schänzel, 2010). The vacation setting reinforces family togetherness, a sense of belonging, enjoyment, the excitement of a place, and an opportunity to co-create the experience (Prebensen & Foss, 2011) through quality time spent together and the opportunity to let one’s hair down, be oneself in a different environment, and feel closer to each other (Michael et al., 2017). Family rules and routines are relaxed, which helps to build stronger family ties (M2 PressWIRE, 2015). A survey of single Americans conducted by a Dating Data poll found that during the holiday season, 50% of the sampled population spent more time with family and friends to avoid loneliness, and 18% were
motivated to seek new relationships (Burnett, 2017). British outbound travellers to the USA were motivated to visit family and friends (Jang & Cai, 2002). International tourists were pushed to travel to Mauritius for social interaction and pulled for kinship reasons (Prayag & Ryan, 2011). Visiting family is an important motive for travel as it helps to establish and reaffirm one’s social standing within family networks (Hibbert et al., 2013).

Schänzel (2010) reports that parents use holidays to create memories, reconnect with family members, develop character, learn social and life skills, and establish and build family values, which are part of generating a social identity among family members and in society in general. Social identity is reinforced and motivates an individual to escape through holiday engagement with immediate family members, travelling with extended family, and/or visiting family and friends, strengthening one’s social identity. Thus, the study hypotheses that:

**H3**: Enhancement of kinship is positively related to escape for travel.

### 2.3.2 Social interaction

Social interaction is influenced by the competition between one’s personal and social self (Spears, 2001). The social self is part of an individual’s self-concept that relates to his/her membership in social groups (Tajfel, 1981). The vacation environment is fundamentally social and, in turn, influences one’s identity development (Bond & Falk, 2013) and personal growth (Wearing & Wearing, 2001). Identity development and personal growth are achieved through social interaction with different groups of people (Noy, 2004) and participating in fun-filled tourism-related activities with people who share similar interests (Jang & Cai, 2002).

The motivation to travel for social interaction is a critical component of the tourist experience (Haldrup & Larsen, 2003). Moreover, sociological, psychological, and anthropological theories of self and identity generally view interpersonal social relations (through travel) as crucial in the formation of self and role internalisation (Cooley, 2017; Mead, 1934). Research shows that taking a vacation for social interaction provides valuable authentic cultural experiences (Chen et al., 2014) and encourages cross-cultural social interaction (Michael et al., 2017). It also promotes a better understanding of cultural differences (Reisinger & Turner, 1998), cultural and social values, rules, and interaction patterns (Reisinger & Turner, 2002). Further, Hibbert et al. (2013) claim that identity (e.g.
social identity) is influenced by physical and social connections made through interaction with others during travel. Social interaction can be an intensely rewarding cultural and learning experience (Manrai & Manrai, 2011), helping to develop one’s personal growth and identity (Wearing & Wearing, 1996), motivating one to find escape through travel. Thus, the study hypothesises that:

H4: Social interaction is positively related to escape for travel.

2.4 Cultural factors: personal identity pull motivations

Travel provides authentic experiences, which can shape one’s personal identity through engagement with different cultures and people (Wearing et al., 2010). The need to visit a different culture may be tied to the desire to integrate another culture within one’s own personal identity. For instance, Japanese tourists attend flamenco shows in Spain for ‘a deep experience that becomes part of personal identity, giving them an opportunity for a personal expression in an impersonal environment’ (Gonzalez, 2008, p. 808). People’s motivation to escape to religious places is also linked to their identity as a religious person (Bideci & Albayrak, 2016), and they are drawn to religious destinations that provide a ‘sense of belonging’ (Poria, 2003). Other researchers (e.g. Chen et al., 2014; Chen & Huang, 2017; Ho et al., 2014) found that escape motivation for backpackers, volunteers, and those who take working holidays may also be triggered by the need to experience and interact with a different culture to develop a personal identity associated with improving self-confidence, abilities, and better emotion management (Tsaur & Huang, 2016). Moreover, the host culture presents memorable experiences contributing to tourists’ psychological well-being (Reitsamer & Brunner-Sperdin, 2017), a feeling of emotional connection, and a sense of group identity (Kim et al., 2012). Another aspect of cultural motivation is experiencing quality local ethnic food and processes (Rojas-Rivas et al., 2018), which may help individuals to (re)constitute personal identity and provide strategies to critically think about and amend certain aspects of their own existence that form part of their identity (Ferrero, 2002). Thus, the pull motivation to escape for a vacation may be triggered by the desire to explore and learn about a different culture (Prayag & Ryan, 2011).

Cultural motivations have been explored with different nationalities (e.g. Bideci & Albayrak, 2016; Park et al., 2015; Prayag & Ryan, 2011; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015). Prior
studies have found that experiencing a different culture has a significant effect on tourist motivation, behaviour, self-development (Li et al., 2015), and ego-enhancement (Nikjoo & Ketabi, 2015). This is driven by the need to learn more about other cultures, lifestyles, customs, and traditions (Michael et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2009; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). For instance, Michael et al. (2017) claim that tourists also seek new experiences because the destination offers a contrasting cultural experience to one’s home environment. Thus, this study hypothesises that:

**H5**: Cultural pull factors are positively related to escape for travel.

### 2.5 Destination factors: social identity pull motivations

Tourism motivation theory describes pull motivation as the factors that draw tourists to a destination, which motivates people to escape for travel (Crompton, 1979). These factors include attractions, features, accommodations, transport, infrastructure, hospitality, and services (Ivanovic, 2009). From a cross-cultural view, differences exist between pull motivations for tourists from different countries (Park et al., 2015). Based on TCL motivation theory, pull motivations may also differ based on travel experience, suggesting that those higher up on the TCL gravitate more towards satisfying higher-level needs, identity construction or reconstruction, and self-development. To facilitate this, the destinations must be exclusive and inaccessible; the destination pull factors must be culturally and environmentally different to those of the home country; and the destination attraction must include host-site relationship building, interactions, and nature-based trips (Michael et al., 2017; Smed, 2009). In contrast, travellers on the lower end of the TCL will look for destinations that are safe; they usually travel as a group and mainly seek self-enhancement, security, and recognition (Pearce, 2005; Pearce & Lee, 2005).

Destination attractions that act as pull factors to satisfy one’s need to escape for travel include weather, beaches, friendly locals, nature, recreational areas, theme parks, heritage sites, a different quality of life, and landscapes (Kassean & Gassita, 2013; Li et al., 2016; Liu & Cheng, 2016; Rojek, 1993). Luxury, including hotels (Xu et al., 2018), dining (Chen & Peng, 2018), and shopping (Park et al., 2010), is also an important destination pull factor, as in the case of Dubai. The motivation to indulge in luxury or to show one’s status through fashionable destination choices might be triggered by a deprivation of power, low self-esteem, a need for self-development, recognition, or
identity expression (Kock et al., 2018). Therefore, in this study, it is expected that tourists are attracted to destinations that are famous (popular), fashionable, and luxurious.

Social identity theory proposes that in a given social context, people evaluate themselves against ‘others’ and differentiate themselves within a given social context (Brewer, 1991). Bond and Falk (2013) point out that tourists’ identity-related motivations to visit a destination may be ‘curiosity-driven with a generic interest’; ‘socially motivated’; related to an individual’s ‘professional or hobbyist passion’; that ‘satisfaction is derived from having “been there and done that”’; or ‘to have a contemplative, spiritual, or restorative experience’ (p. 435). Such motivations pull tourists to certain destinations by providing them with a strong sense of attachment; a connection with which they can identify or feel proud to be a part of (Scannell & Gifford, 2010); a shared meaning, social belonging, and bond (Hay, 1998; Kyle et al., 2005); or an opportunity to improve oneself (Liu & Cheng, 2016). Tourists’ interactions and experiences with a destination’s unique architecture and characteristics provide ‘the opportunity to construct their own narratives about themselves’ (Ye & Tussyadiah, 2011, p. 2). Thus, this study hypothesises that:

H6: Destination pull factors are positively related to escape for travel.

3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 Research setting

We situated our study in the context of the UAE to investigate how personal and social identity motivations influence escape for travel. In the past decade, the UAE has presented itself as a viable research context and attracted significant research interest (e.g. Hammad et al., 2019; Michael, 2014; Michael et al., 2011; Prayag & Hosany, 2014). Because tourism is an international phenomenon, Hammad et al. (2019, p. 64) reiterates, ‘…therefore, it is worth exploring different parts of the world to understand the perceptions of residents towards the various impacts of tourism.’ The Middle East is one of the world’s fastest growing outbound travel markets, with the UAE being the second biggest outbound travel market after Saudi Arabia (Staff Reporter, 2015). The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, comprising Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE, account for 64% of the outbound international market (Sreenivas, 2018). Nevertheless, there has been minimal research on the GCC market, especially
concerning drivers of travel behaviour (see Michael et al., 2011; Michael et al., 2017; Prayag & Hosany, 2014). The council is one of the world’s fastest growing tourism markets and is targeted by many destinations since GCC tourists are high-spenders, prefer longer holidays, and carry large amounts of cash on international trips (Abbas, 2018). Their average airfare expenditures make up 260% of the average for those emanating from other parts of the world and 430% of accommodations (Arabian Travel Market, 2012). Particularly, UAE travellers spend about $3,430 per trip, higher than the global median amount of $2,443 (Abbas, 2018). From 2016 to 2017, UAE residents took an average of 4.8 international trips, and this is expected to reach 5.4 by 2020 (Abbas, 2018). Given the scale of these expenditures, the need to understand the motivations of Arab tourists from the GCC region and the UAE in particular is evident and warranted.

3.2 Sample and data collection

A survey was administered via email using Qualtrics and utilised to collect data from local Emiratis and expatriates across the UAE. The three-month survey (i.e. from May to July in 2015), was conducted to assess outbound tourists’ motivations and behaviours when taking international holidays. In this study, we only focused on international (outbound) travel as: (i) most people in the UAE (expatriates, in particular) tend to travel back home for vacation during the summer (Hanif, 2013); (ii) the UAE’s geographic location is proximal to other international destinations (Lohmann et al., 2009); and (iii) travellers are on the lookout for unique scenery, history, culture, entertainment, quality tourist facilities and infrastructure, as well as cool weather (Prayag & Hosany, 2014).

Several measures were undertaken to improve the response rate, as suggested by studies on survey research (e.g. Dillman et al., 2014). For instance, because it was found to have a positive effect on response rate, the questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter indicating the purpose of the study and potential contributions as well as assuring respondents of complete confidentiality (Bryman, 2016; Dillman et al., 2014). Follow-up reminder emails were sent out three weeks and six weeks after the start of the survey to encourage participation from non-respondents.

A total of 471 responses were received, of which 80 responses were discarded from respondents who said they ‘have not taken holidays to any international destination’. An additional 65 responses were removed due to incomplete key sections, leaving 326 valid
responses for subsequent analysis. As shown in Table 1, the majority were females (68.4%), and age groups included 18–30 years old (54%), 31–40 years old (12.6%), 41–60 years old (31.3%), and 65 years and older (2.1%). In the past two years, most respondents had taken 1–3 holidays (52.8%), followed by 3–5 holidays (25.2%), and 6 or more (19.3%). The positively skewed distribution towards female travellers is not surprising, as evidence shows that more and more of the Middle East’s female millennials are exploring the world’s trendiest tourist spots (EyeForTravel, 2018).

3.3 Measurements

Multi-item measures using a five-point scale from ‘1’=extremely disagree to ‘5’=extremely agree were adapted from prior studies and modified to suit this study’s context. The 24 measurement items synthesised from the literature, underlying each of the seven constructs, were first contextualised and adapted to the UAE context (see Table 2). To measure both personal identity motivations (evaluation of self and regression) and social identity motivations (enhancement of kinship and social interaction) as well as destination and cultural pull factors, this study adapted measures from previous research (Crompton, 1979; Michael, 2014; Schänzel, 2010). Regression was assessed using three items from Crompton (1979) and Dann (1977); escape for travel was measured using four items adapted from Michael (2014); evaluation of self was assessed using three items from Crompton (1979); enhancement of kinship was measured using three items from Crompton (1979) and Schänzel (2010); and social interaction items were adapted from Crompton (1979) and Fodness (1994). To assess destination factors, three items were adapted from Prayag and Hosany (2014), whilst five items were adapted from Gray (1970), Wu et al. (2009), and Yoon and Uysal (2005) to measure cultural factors. The psychometric properties for all constructs and measurements are provided in Table 2.

Content validity in the form of face validity was established by academic experts who assessed how well the measures represented the constructs under study. In addition, a pretest was undertaken with a small sample of respondents before the survey’s final
launch. The pretesting phase involved a review of the survey instrument by three academics and three industry practitioners in the UAE with a sound knowledge of the tourism sector to facilitate contextualisation to the research context. The review involved checking the general adequacy of each item and construct in representing the concept, evaluating the readability/choice of terminology, and assuring clarity/ease of understanding and the items’ relevance in real-world business situations. Based on their feedback, minor modifications were made. For example, to ensure the items’ relevance, the following were worded to reflect circumstances familiar to UAE residents: travel to fashionable, luxurious locations (destination pull factors), experience a different scenery (cultural pull factors), and escape from cultural restrictions and family bonds (escape for travel). Next, a pilot survey was conducted to identify and address issues that might affect completion of the final questionnaire during the main study. The pilot results (based on 28 complete responses) proved useful in the final planning of the survey as they gave insights on response rate, average completion time, and respondent dropout rate.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Preliminary analysis

To facilitate hypothesis testing using structural equation modelling (SEM), preliminary checks were conducted to examine if the data distribution met the assumptions of the multivariate analysis (Hair et al., 2010). First, to check for non-response bias issues, a test suggested by Armstrong and Overton (1977) was used in which the underlying assumption is that late respondents are likely to behave in the same manner as non-respondents. A t-test was used to determine any statistically significant differences between early and late respondents for all 24 items on the survey. The early respondents included the 206 responses received before the first reminder email, whereas the late respondents included the 120 responses obtained after the first and second follow-up emails. The results of the t-tests between the two groups yielded no statistically significant differences at the $p < 0.05$ level, suggesting that non-response bias was not a problem in this study (Armstrong & Overton, 1977).

Next, although all the measurement scales used in this study were adapted from existing literature, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify the
underlying factor structure; subsequently, all items loaded well onto their respective constructs. EFA results demonstrated that unidimensionality existed; that is, the measured variables were explained by only one underlying construct, which is important when more than two constructs are involved in a study (Hair et al., 2010). Then, normality of distribution tests were employed to assess the univariate skewness and kurtosis of the variables and were found to be within acceptable levels as there were no values of skewness > 3 or kurtosis values > 10 (Kline, 2005). Outliers and extreme values were examined using histograms and boxplots, and no significant issues were identified, thus indicating data validity (Hair et al., 2010).

4.2 Common method bias

Due to the nature of the cross-sectional data and the self-administered collection method used in this study, common method variance (CMV) may have influenced the structural estimates of the model (Malhotra et al., 2006). To mitigate the impact of CMV, several measures were initially incorporated during the questionnaire design. First, respondents were required to complete the questionnaire anonymously, the questionnaire was kept short (10 minutes), and the measurement items were carefully formulated using validated measures to reduce ambiguity and vagueness (Malhotra et al., 2006). Second, the threat of common method bias was tested during data analysis using two statistical techniques recommended by Podsakoff et al. (2003). We first employed Harman’s one-factor analysis by linking each item of the seven factors to a single factor (Podsakoff et al., 2003), which revealed poor model fit as reflected by the following indices: ($\chi^2_{252} = 2356.052, \chi^2/df = 9.349, p < .001, NFI = .447, IFI = .475, TLI = .422, CFI = .472, RMSEA = .160$), suggesting that CMV was unlikely to bias the study results.

We then assessed CMV using the ‘marker variable’ approach suggested by Lindell and Whitney (2001). Thus, a theoretically unrelated construct was included in the analysis as a proxy for common method bias. Williams et al. (2010) recommend selecting a marker variable that is not theoretically related to the model variables but can simultaneously capture sources of bias when measuring certain phenomena. As a result, all correlations with the marker variable were found to be below the suggested .20 cut-off for problematic method bias (Malhotra et al., 2006). Using the more conservative bias estimate, the CMV-adjusted correlations were compared to the unadjusted matrix, and the correlations
remained unchanged after adjusting for CMV (Lindell & Whitney, 2001). This analysis suggested that CMV was unlikely to be a serious concern in this study.

4.3 Measurement model

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to assess the reliability and validity of the measurement model using AMOS 23.0. Measurement models were used to assess the overall model fit; goodness-of-fit and indices could be used to assess whether the theoretical model fit the data (Schumacker & Lomax, 1996). Table 2 shows the standardised factor loadings (SFLs) for each item, Cronbach’s alpha scores, construct reliability (CR), and average variance extracted (AVE) values. The SFLs of all measurement items were above the .50 cut-off point, confirming adequate item reliability. Cronbach’s alpha scores ranged between .684 and .909, providing evidence for convergent validity (Hair et al., 2010). AVE values in conjunction with the high construct reliability (> .70) provided evidence for good reliability and convergent validity. Overall, the measurement model showed acceptable fit ($\chi^2_{225} = 413.349$, $\chi^2$/df = 1.837, $p < .01$), normed fit index [NFI] = .903, incremental fit index [IFI] = .953, Tucker-Lewis index [TLI] = .942, confirmatory fit index [CFI] = .953, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .051). Although the Chi-square value was statistically significant—usually the case with sample sizes above 200 (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012)—all other statistics remained within acceptable ranges (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 3 provides the means, standard deviations, and interconstruct correlations as well as an assessment of discriminant validity. In examining the internal consistency of the constructs, CR was assessed using the procedures outlined by Fornell and Larcker (1981), which include examining parameter estimates and their associated t-values as well as assessing the AVE value for each construct. CR estimates greater than .70 and most AVE values greater than .50 are considered to support internal consistency (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair et al., 2010). As shown in Table 3, the calculated estimates met the stipulated criteria, evidencing internal consistency. Discriminant validity was then tested using two approaches. As shown in Table 3, all interconstruct correlations are significantly less than one at the $p = .001$ level, showing discriminant validity (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Discriminant validity was examined by comparing the AVE value and each calculated pairwise shared variance (SV) between the constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).
According to Voorhees et al. (2016), the AVE-SV comparison provides the best assessment of discriminant validity in marketing studies. As shown in Table 3, the square roots of the AVE values for each construct along the diagonal exceed the correlation coefficients for all other constructs, supporting adequate discriminant validity.

--- {Insert Table 3 about here} ---

4.4 Data analysis and results

To test the hypothesised relationships, a structural model using SEM analysis in AMOS 23.0 was tested. The SEM approach was considered the most appropriate in this study as it reduces standard errors due to the simultaneous estimation of all parameters in a single model (Iacobucci et al., 2007). The structural model revealed acceptable fit ($\chi^2_{219} = 392.948, \chi^2/df = 1.794, p < .001, \text{NFI} = .908, \text{IFI} = .957, \text{TLI} = .945, \text{CFI} = .956, \text{RMSEA} = .049$), as all indices were within acceptable ranges. The results of the structural model are shown in Table 4.

With regard to push factors, the results supported H1, as the relationship between evaluation of self and escape for travel was statistically significant ($\beta = .299, t = 3.794$). In support of H2, the results showed that the need for regression was also positively related to escape for travel ($\beta = .236, t = 2.524$). However, the analysis found the link between enhancement of kinship and escape for travel to be significant but negatively related ($\beta = -.402, t = -4.865$). Thus, H3 was not supported. Social interaction was found to be positively related to escape for travel ($\beta = .160, t = 2.283$), supporting H4. In terms of pull factors, a positive relationship emerged between cultural motives and escape for travel ($\beta = .211, t = 3.576$) in support of H5. However, the results failed to support H6, as destination pull factors did not influence escape for travel ($\beta = -.024, t = -.348$).

--- {Insert Table 4 about here} ---

5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine a nomological network model that positions the effect of push and pull motivations linked to an individual’s personal and social identities as key antecedents to escape for travel. The study provides valuable theoretical
and empirical evidence for the differential effects between push and pull motivations associated with one’s personal and social identities and the need to escape for travel.

The effects of personal identity push (evaluation of self and regression) and pull motivations (cultural factors) on escape for travel are supported. Therefore, this study supports and builds on the extant literature within the context of an under-researched emerging market such as the UAE as the findings indicate evaluation of self, regression, and cultural factors as important antecedents to and drivers for escape for travel (e.g. Michael et al., 2017; Park & Santos, 2017; Sirisack et al., 2014). Further, the results of this study are consistent with previous literature showing that push and pull motivations may even overlap each other (Ottevanger, 2007) to influence tourist behaviour. Thus, this study suggests that tourists seeking evaluation of self and regression are more likely to choose destinations that offer a unique cultural holiday experience coupled with the opportunity to experience and learn from a different culture. Different cultural settings may also provide the chance to reinvigorate alternate identities or take on a temporary identity (Crompton, 1979) and explore personal identity (Kivel & Kleiber, 2000). Overall, the above result is not surprising, as escaping from one’s home or mundane environment provides a relaxing cultural context, thus becoming a reflective project.

Escape for travel was also examined using push and pull motivations linked to an individual’s social identity. Push motivations include the need for social interaction and enhancement of kinship as well as the destination factors that pull people to a destination. It is surprising that the only social identity-based push motivation that triggers escape for travel is the need for social interaction, suggesting that within the UAE context, social interaction is positively related to escape for travel. For example, Michael (2014) found that vacations in Australia facilitated social interaction between Emiratis and local Australian hosts in restaurants, hotels, and attractions. Further, a vacation provides expatriates with the chance to socialise and interact with other people. As in existing literature, the present study posits that the vacation environment stimulates social identity construction, provides personal growth through valuable authentic experiences, and encourages cross-cultural social interaction (Bond & Falk, 2013; Chen et al., 2014; Michael et al., 2017; Wearing & Wearing, 1991). In addition, positive social relationships with travel companions bring life satisfaction, thus highlighting the importance of shared travel experiences and activities (Rook, 1987). Through socially motivated contexts like
tourism, individuals are able to enhance their well-being, improve key character strengths, and grow socially (Nyaupane et al., 2008).

Holidays provide an opportunity for family bonding, a sense of belonging, enjoyment, excitement, and co-creation of an experience (Bruyere & Rappe, 2007; Prebensen & Foss, 2011). However, from a social identity perspective, although family travel provides a chance to create and share memories and cement relationships (Hibbert, 2013), this study found that the push motivations related to enhancement of kinship do not influence escape for travel for Emiratis and expatriates in the UAE. This is possibly due to the amount of family time and bonding that Emiratis and expatriates in the UAE already have; thus, their push motivations may differ from other study contexts. In the case of Emiratis, this result is not surprising as families live together, and most celebrations and entertainment mainly include family members (Michael, 2014). In the case of expatriates, families are now spending long summer vacations together in the UAE, as the country now has many theme parks and other activities for children and parents that encourage family bonding (Aldroubi, 2017). Therefore, expatriates are not always pushed to leave for a family-bonding holiday.

Another surprising result is that destination pull factors do not positively influence escape for travel. This finding is tangential to other studies identifying that destination pull factors are key drivers of escape for travel (e.g. Wu et al., 2009; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015). Although destination characteristics may engender and strengthen internal push motivations, the results of this study suggest that they do not play an important role in affecting escape for travel to fulfil social identity motives. This might be because UAE residents do not see vacations to luxurious, fashionable destinations as helping to build social identity or as a means of self-development, recognition, or identity expression (Kock et al., 2018).

5.1 Theoretical and managerial implications

This study contributes to both theory and practice. In terms of academic implications, a nomological network model anchored on two theoretical perspectives was tested to examine what drives escape for travel and showed that UAE tourists’ motivations linked to personal and social identities play a crucial role in influencing travel behaviour. In essence, the study contributes to the existing knowledge on push and pull tourist
motivations by providing an understanding of the link between identity as a construct influencing behavioural motivation. This research tested the relationships between identity-related motivations classified as personal (i.e. push motivations: evaluation of self and regression; pull motivations: cultural factors) and social (i.e. push motivations: enhancement of kinship and social interaction; pull motivations: destination factors) acting as antecedents to escape for travel. The study also contributes to knowledge by showing the differential effects of these identity-related motivating factors that trigger and/or promote the need to escape for a vacation. In addition, this research indicates the role these factors play and the extent to which they influence the destination choice.

Further, this study considers personal and social identity motivations as two dimensions to measure motivation in a context, which has not been sufficiently explored in previous research. The push and pull theory of tourist motivations describes the push as relating to an individual’s own internal interest(s) in a destination, and the pull relates to the attractiveness/attractions of the destination itself (Baloglu & Uysal, 1996). However, research evidence claims that this theory falls short of more granularly examining individual motivations from an identity-seeking perspective (Nath & Saha, 2017). Therefore, this research contributes to knowledge by investigating/classifying the extent to which escape is driven by individual personal and social identity motivations. Further, Nath and Saha (2017) show that identity is postulated to be a construct in motivating behaviour. Smed (2009) also points out that tourist motivation can change as people progress in their travel careers with different experiences and become a significant part of whom one is perceived and desires to be, thus contributing to the construction and reconstruction of both personal and social identities. Tourism provides the opportunity to explore new contexts.

In terms of managerial implications, an understanding of personal and social identity in tourism can help differentiate and position destinations to attract tourists. For example, in the UAE, Dubai is marketed as a modern city, whilst Sharjah is branded and marketed as the Islamic cultural capital of the nation and within the broader GCC region. Destination marketers are often challenged with little to no space remaining in a perceptual map to show their differentiation. This research can practically demonstrate that new concepts, such as personal and social identity linked to tourism motivations, can be used to differentiate a destination. For instance, ‘nostalgia’ is connected to tourism,
but the term is often ignored in tourism literature (see Metod, 2018). According to Fodness (1994), a nostalgic experience is a ‘search for the lifestyle of a previous era’. Therefore, destinations can position themselves as nostalgic and attract tourists who want to ‘regress’ on vacation and experience the lifestyle of a previous era that was much less of a ‘hustle and bustle’. Indeed, as tourism destinations have become de-differentiated with the effect of globalisation and modernisation, it has become ever more important to be perceived as different from other tourism destinations (Pike, 2008). Therefore, tourism marketers and practitioners should understand the interplay and relationships between identity-related motivations to better recognise the needs of potential visitors, aim to fulfil those needs, and target those visitors accordingly.

5.2 Limitations and future research directions

The first limitation relates to the cross-sectional nature of the data, which was collected in one specific country. Although the results can be generalised to other countries due to the ubiquitous nature of tourists’ travel, elements such as the economic development, geographic location, and cultural make-up of the UAE should be considered upon interpretation because the key drivers of tourist motivation for citizens of one country may be different from those in other locations. Future research could extend the present study to other countries, particularly in developed markets, which could help to generalise the results of this study’s conceptual model as well as compare developed versus developing markets and collectivistic versus individualistic nations. Further, because peoples’ motivations to travel change over time, a longitudinal study design examining the dynamic interactions of these drivers and outcomes could also extend the generalisability of this study’s findings.

Next, tourists’ perceptions towards travel are contextual, varying from community to community and generation to generation, suggesting that there are other potential push and pull factors that can influence the motivation to escape. Thus, an opportunity to identify and integrate additional drivers that may influence tourists’ motivations into the proposed model exists. Such variables could range from market variables (country/place reputation or image) to socio-demographics (lifestyle stage, household size), generational cohorts, and psychosocial variables. Future research could also examine boundary conditions (e.g. income levels) that could moderate the specified relationships in the
model. Lastly, this study examined travel behaviour that occurred in the last two years, which might have a potential impact on the responses’ reliability. To capture recent travel experience, future research might consider travel taken within the last 12 months.
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Table 1 Respondents’ demographic profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic details</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emiratis</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expatriates</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–30</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–60</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International trips in the last 2 years as a tourist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average duration of tourist travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 week</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 weeks</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4 weeks</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 weeks</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 Measurement properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>SFLs</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To discover oneself</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-evaluate one’s lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance feeling of self-worth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regression</strong></td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience a less complex and less technological environment</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To indulge in child-like behaviour</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience past memories</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement of kinship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help bring the family together</td>
<td>.888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy doing family activities together</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To connect with extended family and close friends</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To make new friends</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have fun with new people</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To indulge in social parties and events</td>
<td>.718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination pull factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to fashionable, luxurious locations</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a place my friends would like to go</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To talk about the trip when returning home</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural pull factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enjoy local cuisine</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience a different culture</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn about a new culture and customs</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience different scenery</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience historical sights</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Escape for travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from the general residential place</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from the lack of social interaction in the home environment</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from the pressures of daily life</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from the cultural restrictions and family bonds</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\alpha$–Cronbach’s alpha coefficient, SFLs–standardised factor loadings from CFA, CR–construct reliability, AVE–average variance extracted.
Table 3  **Interconstruct correlations and discriminant validity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regression</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Escape for travel</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhancement of kinship</td>
<td>3.662</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social interaction</td>
<td>3.081</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Destination pull factors</td>
<td>3.119</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>.568</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural pull factors</td>
<td>4.194</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD—standard deviations. Square root of AVE is the diagonal number in **bold**.
### Table 4 Structural model results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesised relationship</th>
<th>→ Escape for travel</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Evaluation of self</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.794</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Regression</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Enhancement of kindship</td>
<td>-.343</td>
<td>-.402</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>-4.865</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Social interaction</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Cultural pull factors</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Destination pull factors</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant at **p < .001 (2-tailed test); β = standardised coefficients; b = unstandardised coefficients; S.E. = standard error

Note: *Not supported because a positive relationship was hypothesised.