

# Consumer behaviour: the influence of age and family structure on the choice of activities in a tourist destination

Slavica Tomić, Ksenija Leković & Jelena Tadić

To cite this article: Slavica Tomić, Ksenija Leković & Jelena Tadić (2019) Consumer behaviour: the influence of age and family structure on the choice of activities in a tourist destination, Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 32:1, 755-771, DOI: [10.1080/1331677X.2019.1579663](https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1579663)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1579663>



© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 16 Apr 2019.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 743



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Consumer behaviour: the influence of age and family structure on the choice of activities in a tourist destination

Slavica Tomić<sup>a</sup>, Ksenija Leković<sup>a</sup> and Jelena Tadić<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Serbia; <sup>b</sup>Tadex, Novi Sad, Serbia

## ABSTRACT

Changes in the structure of consumers' (tourists') needs that shape tourism in accordance with the modern way of life attribute greater importance to different types of consumers/tourists. Understanding consumer behaviour (tourists as consumers) is significant in terms of tourism destination management. This paper presents the results of a research conducted with the aim of identifying activities (visiting cultural and historical attractions, sport and recreation, health, fun, gastronomy, shopping, cultural entertainment events) that consumers/tourists prefer in a tourist destination depending on their age and family structure. Two hypotheses were set in this paper: H<sub>1</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the age of tourists and the activity preferences in a tourist destination; and H<sub>2</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the family structure of tourists and the activity preferences in a tourist destination. The sample included 1117 respondents from the area of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. A survey was conducted from January to March 2017. In accordance with the defined hypotheses, descriptive statistics and a statistical test of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were used.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 10 October 2017  
Accepted 10 December 2018

## KEYWORDS

Tourism; consumer behaviour; socio-demographic characteristics; activity-based segmentation; tourist destination management

## SUBJECT

### CLASSIFICATION CODES

M21; M30; Z30

## 1. Introduction

Numerous changes characterize modern tourism. Quantitatively, the changes are reflected in the increasing number of participants (tourists) in international tourism who, according to the official data of the World Tourism Organization, reached a total of 1322 million worldwide in 2017 (World Tourism Organization UNWTO). Representing an increase of close to 7%, this marks the eighth consecutive year of above-average growth following the 2009 global economic crisis. Besides, over the past few decades the tourist industry has been regarded as the key driver of growth in national economies, in both developed and developing countries (Marić,

**CONTACT** Ksenija Leković  [ksenija.lekovic@ef.uns.ac.rs](mailto:ksenija.lekovic@ef.uns.ac.rs)

© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Marinković, Marić, & Dimitrovski, 2016). According to forecasts prepared by UNWTO, international arrivals are expected to continue to grow at a sustained rate of 4% to 5% worldwide in 2018. Qualitative changes in the behaviour of tourists are reflected in a more individualized approach to selecting destinations, the development of consciousness and frequent changes of destinations (Tomić, Leković, & Dakić, 2016). As such, the modern tourist is creative, active and sophisticated, with behaviour that is unpredictable. Moreover, tourists are no longer passive in accepting the standard facilities of tourism products (Parks & Steelman, 2008).

As a result of socio-economic changes, tourist motives are changeable with the obvious emergence of new motives (new experiences that could be realized in services, health improvement and adventurism) (Mihajlović & Koncul, 2016; Parks & Steelman, 2008). The behaviour of tourists as consumers is motivated by a large number of economic, demographic, psychological, sociological, political and other factors that are almost impossible to control. Accordingly, tourist destination managers have to explore and learn about main motives that influence the behaviour of consumers/tourists in order to provide adequate marketing and management strategies and actions. Collecting and analyzing data leads to knowledge about consumers' past and current purchases as well as knowledge about the level of satisfaction with the quality of a preferred tourist destination. Furthermore, this knowledge can help the tourist destination managers to adjust an offer which is characterized by diversity, specialization, authenticity, differentiation, concern about environmental protection and technological sophistication (Bartoluci, 2013). This calls for the necessity of applying focused, aggressive marketing to specific market segments, keeping a flexible pricing policy and long term planning in the tourist destination.

The modern 'hi-tech' era is also the 'high-touch' era, which imposes the need to build and maintain superior relationships between suppliers and consumers. Consumers/tourists experience the sea, the sun, beaches and friendly staff as essential attributes of a tourist destination, the so-called 'hardware' of tourism. However, a modern tourist is seeking the 'software' of tourism – an integrated tourism product adapted to consumers' needs and requirements (Živković, 2009). The motivation of consumers/tourists is focused on specific activities at their destination (Mihajlović & Koncul, 2016). So far, motives are providing tourists with expectations for activities and, on the other hand, destinations are offering activities. Moscardo, Morrison, Pearce, Lang, and O'Leary (1996) argue that activities can be used as a connection between tourists' motivations and destinations.

This article presents the results of an empirical research conducted with the aim of identifying activities that tourists prefer during their vacation. According to Chen and Shoemaker (2014) five variables (motives, attitudes, destination selection criteria, travel activities and perceived travel barriers) have been widely used in tourism studies in order to understand tourists' decision-making processes. Similar to the concept of the family life cycle which is used to create cohorts based on age, marital status and the presence of children (Bojanić, 2011), the goal of this study was to identify different groups of consumers/tourists based on their age and family structure using activity-based segmentation. The central part of activity-based tourism segmentation

studies are tourism activities (Mumuni & Mansour, 2014). Like in other studies (Lehto, Fu, Li, & Zhou, 2017), the purpose of this paper was to improve the understanding of tourists from Vojvodina by linking 'what do they want?' to 'what do they do?' at tourist destinations.

## 2. Literature review

Changes in the structure of consumers'/tourists' needs shape tourism in accordance with the modern way of life and the values that it creates. Socio-demographic changes, such as higher life expectancy, healthier ageing, smaller family size and higher level of education, impact the development of tourism. These changes represent external factors that shape tourism demand, affecting the decisions to participate in tourist activities, the type of destination chosen, the length of a vacation, etc. (Glover & Prideaux, 2009). Furthermore, the number of activities undertaken during the vacation has not been reduced at the same rate as the duration of the vacation which leads to a conclusion that approximately the same number of activities undertaken during the previously longer vacation is nowadays fitted into one week or even a weekend (Poon, 2003). At the same time, activities are evaluated by tourists according to their ability to satisfy needs. Tourism literature points out the importance of 'push' and 'pull' factors in choosing vacation destinations and activities undertaken during the vacation. In this way 'push' factors refer to intrinsic desires of the tourists while 'pull' factors are related to the attractiveness of a destination (including activities offered in destination) (Kozak, 2002).

Modern trends in the global tourism market attribute greater importance to different types of consumers/tourists who expect different values. In order to create a value, especially a superior one, a good knowledge of the behaviour of the various tourist segments is a necessity (Đorđević & Zečević, 2015). Understanding the behaviour of consumers/tourists is significant in terms of tourism destination management. Studies that have examined consumer behaviour in tourism suggest that it is vital for destination managers to develop a better understanding of specific segments of consumers in order to accommodate their distinct needs and establish efficient and effective marketing and management strategies (Kim, Wei, & Ruys, 2003; Mykletun, Crofts, & Mykletun, 2001). To this end activity-based segmentation is a solution for developing tourist segments across different nations and cultures (Mumuni & Mansour, 2014; Choi, Murray, & Kwan, 2011; Beritelli & Boksberger, 2005). According to Pesonen (2015) activity-based segmentation is most useful for guiding destination management and marketing and according to Eusebio, Carneiro, Kastenholz, Figueiredo, and Soares da Silva (2017) it is an action-relevant destination marketing tool. Asan and Emeksiz (2018) used it as a method based on the activity in which the tourist prefers to participate. In this sense tourist destination managers must understand preferences for activities and actual participation of consumers in them. When tourists visit a destination, they often eat somewhere outside the hotel enjoying local gastronomy, visit cultural or historical places, shop, visit fun or cultural entertainment events and participate in some sports/recreation/health activities. These

activities make a contribution to the overall tourist experiences with their vacations at the destination (Kozak, 2002).

Market researchers often group consumers into generations or other socio-economic groups in order to create a general picture of the market segment. A cohort analysis is useful in the tourism industry because different cohorts are attracted to different tourist activities (Bojanić, 2011). This is important since understanding these values is necessary if one wants to meet the needs, aspirations and desires of consumers/tourists (Nordin, 2005). The segmentation of consumers into generations is based on the assumption that they share common lifestyle characteristics and a common value system. According to Swarbrooke and Horner (2006), segments in the tourism industry are often based on demographic criteria. These authors seem to assume that young people look for parties, elderly people prefer sedate activities, while parents are preoccupied with the need to keep their children happy during their vacation. Thus, for the members of the 'Baby Boom' generation (born between 1943 and 1959) vacations are seen as a way to maintain health and interrupt daily routines. According to Nimrod (2008), leisure travel appears to be taking a central role in the retirement life of seniors. Members of Generation X (born between 1960 and 1979) enjoy adventure trips. Members of Generation Y (born between 1980 and 2000) extensively use modern technology when choosing a tourist destination, and that is why this generation is characterized as the 'next generation', having a relatively high discretionary income and travelling frequently (Leask, Fyall, & Barron, 2013; Bilgihan, Okumus, & Cobanoglu, 2013). Members of this generation are gradually replacing the Baby Boomer and Generation X consumers in the workforce and are becoming the main source of visitors of some tourist destinations (Benckendorff, Moscardo, & Pendergast, 2009). The youngest segment of consumers/tourists members of Generation M (born after 2001) are directly influencing the decision-making process of the members of Generation X while choosing a tourist destination (Bartoluci, 2013; Nordin, 2005).

According to Kozak (2010), different members of one household are typically jointly involved in travel decisions with the specific dynamics due to power relations among family members. The size and composition of the family affect household preferences regarding the destination choice and participation in activities during a vacation. Smaller families with no children are more inclined to travel than large families which have more economic and physical constraints (Bernini & Cracolici, 2015). Based on the degree of interactivity, activities shared with family members are either parallel or joint (Lehto et al., 2017). Parallel activities require minimal interaction (hunting, listening to music, visiting a museum) while joint activities require significant interaction among family members (playing games, visiting friends, camping). Active, creative and goal-oriented activities enhance family interactivity more effectively (Lehto, Lin, Chen, & Choi, 2012).

According to a survey conducted (between 24 and 30 January 2013.) by the TNS Political & Social network (with 30,628 respondents from different social and demographic groups) in 27 Member States of the European Union and Croatia, Turkey, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Iceland, Norway, Serbia and Israel, respondents aged 55+ are most likely to mention wellness/spa/health treatments,

nature and culture as main reasons for visiting a tourist destination. On the other hand, 25–54-year-olds prefer the sun/the beach, while 15–24-year-olds are most likely to say that a specific event is the main reason for visiting a tourist destination. (Flash Eurobarometer, 370). Authors Bel, Lacroix, Lyser, Rambonilaza, and Turpin (2015) identified different groups of tourists according to their age and family structure. Using activity-based segmentation ‘water-based activities’ were found to suit families with children, ‘outdoor pursuits’ suit adults while ‘natural and cultural heritage discovery’ and ‘gastronomy’ were found to suit adults over 50. In their study authors Mumuni and Mansour (2014) have identified three clusters: (1) conservative cluster (knowledge-seeking activities – visiting historical and cultural attractions); (2) cluster of fun seekers (entertainment – nightclubs, music concerts, movies, shopping, amusement parks, beaches); and (3) cluster of variety seekers (knowledge-seeking activities and entertainment). Depending on their age and family structure, the conservative cluster is dominated by relatively older and married respondents while the cluster of fun seekers is young and single respondents.

### 3. Research methodology

The aim of this study was to identify activities that tourists prefer during their vacation depending on their age and family structure (as socio-demographic determinants of respondents). For this purpose, a convenience sample of 1117 respondents from the area of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina was used. According to Mumuni and Mansour (2014), convenience sampling is widely used in tourism studies. Likewise, people who live in a certain region often share the same values and have similar needs which differ from the needs of people who live in other regions (Đeri, Armenski, Tešanović, Bradić, & Vukosav, 2014). The characteristics of respondents that participated in the research are presented in Table 1.

What is evident from Table 1 is that most of respondents were female respondents (55.7%). Most of respondents were within the age group of 45+ (35.1%). The average age of respondents was 38.02 years ( $SD = 14,487$ , range 16–84), of which the average age of male respondents was 38.22 years ( $SD = 14,462$ , range 16–84), and the average age of female respondents 37,86 years ( $SD = 14,515$ , range 17–84). Besides, most respondents (54.9%) have completed secondary school. Within the family structure,

**Table 1.** The demographic structure of the sample (n = 1117).

Total		n	%
Gender	Male	495	44,3
	Female	622	55,7
Age	16–29	390	34,9
	30–44	335	30,0
	45+	392	35,1
Education	Elementary school	40	3,6
	Secondary school	613	54,9
	Faculty	464	41,5
Family structure	Single	364	32,6
	Family without children	130	11,6
	Family with one child	215	19,2
	Family with two or more children	408	36,5

Source: Author's calculation.

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics of activity preferences in a tourist destination by age of tourists ( $n = 1067$ ).

Activity preferences in a tourist destination	Age of tourists	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Visiting cultural and historical attractions	16–29	4.50	2.125	380
	30–44	4.62	2.179	324
	45+	4.64	1.941	363
Sport and recreation	16–29	3.83	1.971	380
	30–44	3.89	1.987	324
	45+	3.78	2.017	363
Health	16–29	3.45	1.832	380
	30–44	4.36	1.971	324
	45+	5.18	1.901	363
Fun	16–29	5.01	2.110	380
	30–44	3.90	2.162	324
	45+	3.25	2.124	363
Gastronomy	16–29	3.49	1.825	380
	30–44	3.63	1.878	324
	45+	4.00	1.780	363
Shopping	16–29	3.93	1.880	380
	30–44	3.67	1.899	324
	45+	3.23	1.849	363
Cultural entertainment events	16–29	3.99	1.818	380
	30–44	4.12	1.775	324
	45+	3.97	1.620	363

Source: Author's calculation, SPSS output table.

the majority of respondents was living in a family with two or more children (36.5%).

Face-to-face and web survey techniques were used in order to collect data. The survey was conducted from January to March 2017, including the pilot test. The questionnaire was composed of three parts: (1) questions related to basic sociodemographic characteristics of respondents; (2) questions related to respondents' general vacation preferences; (3) questions related to preferred activities during a vacation. The list of activities was compiled from a review of the activity-based segmentation literature (Mumuni & Mansour, 2014; Lehto, O'Leary, & Morrison, 2004). In order to indicate how necessary each activity is a 7-point response scale was used (1–most; 7–least).

Descriptive statistics of activity preferences in a tourist destination by age of tourists is presented in Table 2. The analysis was conducted on a reduced sample of 1067 respondents, since 50 respondents did not provide answers to the questions relevant to the analysis.

Descriptive statistics of activity preferences in a tourist destination by family structure of tourists is presented in Table 3. The analysis was conducted on a reduced sample of 1045 respondents, since 72 respondents did not provide answers to the questions relevant to the analysis.

Starting from the basic subject and issues as well as the research goal of this study, and taking into account recent scientific research on this topic, two hypotheses were tested:

H<sub>1</sub>: There is a statistically significant difference between the age of tourists and the activity preferences in a tourist destination.

**Table 3.** Descriptive statistics of activity preferences in a tourist destination by family structure of tourists ( $n = 1045$ ).

Activity preferences in a tourist destination	Family structure of tourists	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Visiting cultural and historical attractions	Single	4.59	2.089	351
	Family without children	4.53	2.155	118
	Family with one child	4.50	1.991	195
	Family with two or more children	4.59	2.106	381
Sport and recreation	Single	3.84	1.951	351
	Family without children	3.81	2.013	118
	Family with one child	3.83	2.022	195
	Family with two or more children	3.83	2.009	381
Health	Single	3.58	1.903	351
	Family without children	4.23	1.997	118
	Family with one child	4.68	2.021	195
	Family with two or more children	4.83	1.962	381
Fun	Single	4.77	2.221	351
	Family without children	4.38	2.059	118
	Family with one child	3.50	2.164	195
	Family with two or more children	3.65	2.226	381
Gastronomy	Single	3.61	1.822	351
	Family without children	3.86	2.001	118
	Family with one child	3.86	1.871	195
	Family with two or more children	3.71	1.775	381
Shopping	Single	3.73	1.936	351
	Family without children	3.36	1.861	118
	Family with one child	3.65	1.850	195
	Family with two or more children	3.54	1.899	381
Cultural entertainment events	Single	4.16	1.766	351
	Family without children	3.90	1.717	118
	Family with one child	4.12	1.786	195
	Family with two or more children	3.89	1.705	381

Source: Author's calculation.

$H_2$ : There is a statistically significant difference between the family structure of tourists and the activity preferences in a tourist destination.

In accordance with the defined hypotheses, statistical test of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used. In the first part of the research, MANOVA was carried out in order to explore the differences between the age of tourists and activity preferences in the tourist destination. In the second part of the research, MANOVA was carried out in order to explore the differences between the family structure of tourists and activity preferences in the tourist destination. Statistical package SPSS IBM Statistics Version 20 was used for data processing.

## 4. Results and discussion

### 4.1. Testing the hypothesis 1

As defined in the research plan, the first hypothesis testing was enabled by applying a statistical test of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The test of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was carried out before the application of MANOVA. This test was performed by applying the Box test in accordance with the SPSS procedure. It was observed that the data passed the test of homogeneity of covariance matrices (Box test =  $0.044 > 0.001$ ). The results of MANOVA test are shown in Table 4:



**Table 4.** Multivariate tests.

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.994	24947.973	7.000	1058.000	.000	.994
	Wilks' Lambda	.006	24947.973	7.000	1058.000	.000	.994
	Hotelling's Trace	165.062	24947.973	7.000	1058.000	.000	.994
	Roy's Largest Root	165.062	24947.973	7.000	1058.000	.000	.994
Age of tourists	Pillai's Trace	.203	17.054	14.000	2118.000	.000	.101
	Wilks' Lambda	.798	18.000	14.000	2116.000	.000	.106
	Hotelling's Trace	.251	18.950	14.000	2114.000	.000	.112
	Roy's Largest Root	.245	37.121	7.000	1059.000	.000	.197

Source: Author's calculation, SPSS output table.

One-way multivariate analysis of variance was used in order to explore the differences between the age of tourists (16–29, 30–44, 45+) and activity preferences in the tourist destination. Seven dependent variables were used as activities in the tourist destination: visiting cultural and historical attractions, sport and recreation, health, fun, gastronomy, shopping, cultural entertainment events. The independent variable was the age of tourists. The preliminary examination verified the assumptions of normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate atypical points, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrix, and multicollinearity (Green & Salking, 2014). Violation of assumptions were not detected. There was a statistically significant difference between the age of tourists and the combination of the dependent variables,  $F(14, 2116) = 18.00$ ,  $p = .000 < 0.05$ ; Wilks' lambda = 0.798; partial eta squared (the proportion of variance in the dependent variable) = 0.106 (large impact) (Cohen, 1988, 284–287) (Table 5).

Following the analysis of the results of separate dependent variables (Table 4), a difference that reached a statistical significance (after Bonferroni correction<sup>1</sup> alpha level is 0.01) was health,  $F(2, 1064) = 77.126$ ,  $p = .000$ , partial eta squared = 0.127, fun,  $F(2, 1064) = 44.319$ ,  $p = .000$ , partial eta squared = 0.108, gastronomy,  $F(2, 1064) = 7.547$ ,  $p = .001$ , partial eta squared = 0.014, shopping,  $F(2, 1064) = 43.087$ ,  $p = .000$ , partial eta squared = 0.024.

A review of the average value of the results showed that tourists aged 45+ have a stronger preference for activities related to health ( $M = 5.18$ ,  $SD = 1.901$ ) compared to tourists aged 29 or under ( $M = 3.45$ ,  $SD = 1.832$ ). Tourists aged 29 and under showed a stronger preference for fun ( $M = 5.01$ ,  $SD = 2.110$ ) compared to tourists aged 45+ ( $M = 3.25$ ,  $SD = 2.124$ ). Tourists aged 45+ expressed a stronger preference for gastronomy ( $M = 4.00$ ,  $SD = 1.780$ ) compared to tourists aged 29 or under ( $M = 3.49$ ,  $SD = 1.825$ ). Tourists aged 29 or under showed a stronger preference for shopping ( $M = 3.93$ ,  $SD = 1.880$ ) compared to tourists aged 45+ ( $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = 1.849$ ).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis  $H_1$  is confirmed: *there is a statistically significant difference between the age of tourists and activity preferences in the tourist destination.*

#### 4.2. Testing the hypothesis 2

As defined in the research plan, the second hypothesis testing was enabled by applying a statistical test of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The test of the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices was carried out before the

**Table 5.** Tests of between-subjects effects.

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Corrected Model	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4.272	2	2.136	.493	.611	.001
	Sport and recreation	2.274	2	1.137	.287	.751	.001
	Health	556.035	2	278.018	77.126	.000	.127
	Fun	583.986	2	291.993	64.319	.000	.108
	Gastronomy	50.347	2	25.173	7.547	.001	.014
	Shopping	92.087	2	46.043	13.087	.000	.024
	Cultural entertainment events	4.506	2	2.253	.744	.475	.001
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	22327.317	1	22327.317	5153.982	.000	.829
	Sport and recreation	15595.574	1	15595.574	3931.519	.000	.787
	Health	19899.482	1	19899.482	5520.408	.000	.838
Age of tourists	Fun	17442.732	1	17442.732	3842.209	.000	.783
	Gastronomy	14592.761	1	14592.761	4374.644	.000	.804
	Shopping	13837.350	1	13837.350	3933.166	.000	.787
	Cultural entertainment events	17197.426	1	17197.426	5682.485	.000	.842
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4.272	2	2.136	.493	.611	.001
	Sport and recreation	2.274	2	1.137	.287	.751	.001
	Health	556.035	2	278.018	77.126	.000	.127
	Fun	583.986	2	291.993	64.319	.000	.108
	Gastronomy	50.347	2	25.173	7.547	.001	.014
	Shopping	92.087	2	46.043	13.087	.000	.024
Error	Cultural entertainment events	4.506	2	2.253	.744	.475	.001
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4609.303	1064	4.332			
	Sport and recreation	4220.682	1064	3.967			
	Health	3835.414	1064	3.605			
	Fun	4830.312	1064	4.540			
	Gastronomy	3549.248	1064	3.336			
	Shopping	3743.280	1064	3.518			
	Cultural entertainment events	3220.081	1064	3.026			
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	27015.000	1067				
	Sport and recreation	19870.000	1067				
Total	Health	24240.000	1067				
	Fun	23116.000	1067				
	Gastronomy	18252.000	1067				
	Shopping	17756.000	1067				
	Cultural entertainment events	20465.000	1067				
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4613.575	1066				

*(continued)*

**Table 5.** Continued.

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Corrected Total	Sport and recreation	4222.956	1066				
	Health	4391.449	1066				
	Fun	5414.298	1066				
	Gastronomy	3599.595	1066				
	Shopping	3835.366	1066				
	Cultural entertainment events	3224.587	1066				

Source: Author's calculation, SPSS output table.

application of MANOVA. This test was performed by applying the Box test in accordance with the SPSS procedure. It was observed that the data passed the test of homogeneity of covariance matrices (Box test =  $0.032 > 0.001$ ). The results of MANOVA test are shown in Table 6:

One-way multivariate analysis of variance was used to explore the differences between the family structure of tourists (single, a family without children, a family with one child, a family with two or more children) and activity preferences in a tourist destination. Seven dependent variables were used as activities in the tourist destination: visiting cultural and historical attractions, sport and recreation, health, fun, gastronomy, shopping, cultural entertainment events. The independent variable was the family structure. The preliminary examination verified the assumptions of normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate atypical points, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrix, and multicollinearity (Green & Salking, 2014). Violation of assumptions were not detected. There was a statistically significant difference between the family structure of tourists and the combination of the dependent variables,  $F(21, 2972.5) = 6.271, p = .000 < 0.05$ ; Wilks' lambda = 0.883; partial eta squared (the proportion of variance in the dependent variable) = 0.041 (medium impact) (Cohen, 1988) (Table 7).

Following the analysis of the results of separate dependent variables (Table 6), a difference that reached a statistical significance (after Bonferroni correction<sup>2</sup> alpha level is 0.01) was health,  $F(3, 1041) = 27.482, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = 0.079, fun,  $F(3, 1041) = 21.905, p = .000$ , partial eta squared = 0.059.

A review of the average value of the results showed that families with two or more children have a stronger preference for health ( $M = 4.83, SD = 1.962$ ) compared to single tourists ( $M = 3.58, SD = 1.903$ ). Single tourists ( $M = 4.77, SD = 2.221$ ) and families without children ( $M = 4.38, SD = 2.059$ ) expressed a stronger preference for fun compared to families with one child ( $M = 3.50, SD = 2.164$ ) and families with two or more children ( $M = 3.65, SD = 2.226$ ).

Therefore, it can be concluded that the hypothesis  $H_2$  is confirmed: *there is a statistically significant difference between the family structure of tourists and activity preferences in the tourist destination.*

Finally, in terms of seven vacation activities used in this study (visiting cultural and historical attractions, sport and recreation, health, fun, gastronomy, shopping, cultural entertainment events) authors conclude that older, married respondents with two or more children prefer health among all activities. On the other hand, younger, single respondents without children prefer fun among seven vacation activities. These

**Table 6.** Multivariate tests.

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.992	19257.324	7.000	1035.000	.000	.992
	Wilks' Lambda	.008	19257.324	7.000	1035.000	.000	.992
	Hotelling's Trace	130.243	19257.324	7.000	1035.000	.000	.992
	Roy's Largest Root	130.243	19257.324	7.000	1035.000	.000	.992
Family structure of tourists	Pillai's Trace	.118	6.076	21.000	3111.000	.000	.039
	Wilks' Lambda	.883	6.271	21.000	2972.511	.000	.041
	Hotelling's Trace	.131	6.461	21.000	3101.000	.000	.042
	Roy's Largest Root	.121	17.873 <sup>c</sup>	7.000	1037.000	.000	.108

Source: Author's calculation, SPSS output table.



Table 7. Tests of between-subjects effects.

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Corrected Model	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	1.590 <sup>a</sup>	3	.530	.122	.947	.000
	Sport and recreation	.051 <sup>b</sup>	3	.017	.004	1.000	.000
	Health	315.937 <sup>c</sup>	3	105.312	27.482	.000	.073
	Fun	316.543 <sup>d</sup>	3	105.514	21.905	.000	.059
	Gastronomy	10.432 <sup>e</sup>	3	3.477	1.032	.377	.003
	Shopping	14.514 <sup>f</sup>	3	4.838	1.342	.259	.004
	Cultural entertainment events	17.364 <sup>g</sup>	3	5.788	1.907	.127	.005
Intercept	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	17374.841	1	17374.841	3997.140	.000	.793
	Sport and recreation	12293.544	1	12293.544	3096.958	.000	.748
	Health	15723.150	1	15723.150	4103.118	.000	.798
	Fun	13935.568	1	13935.568	2893.065	.000	.735
	Gastronomy	11846.903	1	11846.903	3517.160	.000	.772
	Shopping	10690.231	1	10690.231	2966.282	.000	.740
	Cultural entertainment events	13534.103	1	13534.103	4459.902	.000	.811
Family structure of tourists	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	1.590	3	.530	.122	.947	.000
	Sport and recreation	.051	3	.017	.004	1.000	.000
	Health	315.937	3	105.312	27.482	.000	.073
	Fun	316.543	3	105.514	21.905	.000	.059
	Gastronomy	10.432	3	3.477	1.032	.377	.003
	Shopping	14.514	3	4.838	1.342	.259	.004
	Cultural entertainment events	17.364	3	5.788	1.907	.127	.005
Error	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4525.038	1041	4.347			
	Sport and recreation	4132.307	1041	3.970			
	Health	3989.112	1041	3.832			
	Fun	5014.379	1041	4.817			
	Gastronomy	3506.416	1041	3.368			
	Shopping	3751.677	1041	3.604			
	Cultural entertainment events	3159.038	1041	3.035			
Total	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	26318.000	1045				
	Sport and recreation	19474.000	1045				
	Health	23752.000	1045				

(continued)

**Table 7.** Continued.

Source	Dependent variable	Type III sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Partial eta squared
Corrected Total	Fun	22746.000	1045				
	Gastronomy	17975.000	1045				
	Shopping	17331.000	1045				
	Cultural entertainment events	20097.000	1045				
	Visiting cultural and historical attractions	4526.628	1044				
	Sport and recreation	4132.358	1044				
	Health	4305.049	1044				
	Fun	5330.922	1044				
	Gastronomy	3516.848	1044				
	Shopping	3766.191	1044				
	Cultural entertainment events	3176.402	1044				

Source: Author's calculation, SPSS output table.

results correspond with earlier study of Swarbrooke and Horner (2006) who assumed that young people look for parties, elderly people prefer sedate activities. Research results also show that tourists aged 45+ – the silver market (Branchik, 2010) – have a stronger preference for activities related to health and gastronomy compared to younger tourists whose preferences are fun and shopping. Furthermore, it was observed that families with two or more children prefer health, while single tourists and families without children prefer fun during their vacation. These results correspond to the Gallup typology of tourists that distinguishes, among others, tourists traveling for hedonism, tourists traveling for medical reasons and tourists traveling for active leisure (Đorđević & Zečević, 2015). Furthermore, the obtained results are consistent with the results of the research conducted by the TNS Political & Social network, in which respondents aged 55+ are most likely to mention wellness/spa/health treatments, nature and culture as main reasons for visiting a tourist destination. On the other hand, 25–54 year-olds prefer the sun/the beach.

## 5. Conclusion

Modern tourism market is characterized by the increasing number of tourist destinations and a competitive battle for consumers/tourists. The possibility of substituting one tourist destination with another is very high and therefore tourist destination managers are trying to diversify their offer by developing tourism products tailored to suit different segments of consumers/tourists (youth, elderly, singles, families). According to forecasts, more than half of the population in the developed countries will be 50+ by the year 2040, and it will result in changes of marketing and management strategies of tourist destinations (Smith, 2001). Since many tourist destinations rely on the activities taken by consumers/tourists during their vacation, it is of prime interest for destination managers to gain more knowledge about each segment (Karim & Geng-Qing Chi, 2010). It also seems clear that, in order to remain competitive, tourist destination managers have to design and implement marketing and management strategies in order to achieve the desired product positioning in target markets (Hawkes & Kwortnik, 2006). In future, the focus on the ‘I’, as a particular person, will increase. Consumers/tourists will seek ‘custom’ solutions tailored to correspond to their personalities (Popesku, 2011). Therefore, the main task for the tourist destination managers will be an attempt to link the needs of consumers/tourists and megatrends that appear on the market. In accordance with the results of the research, one of the megatrends that is necessary to pay attention to is a favorable development trend of wellness and spa tourism products. On the other hand, the gastronomic offer – as an integral part of tourism experience – often plays a vital role when choosing an adequate tourist destination (Ryu & Jang, 2006).

The main purpose of this study was to improve the understanding of tourists from Vojvodina by identifying activities that tourists prefer during their vacation. The data analysis identified different segments of consumers/tourists to whom it is necessary to adjust an offer of tourist destination in order to reduce the risk that is constantly present during marketing and management decision-making. In other words it can be

concluded that the outbound tourist market of Vojvodina is not one homogeneous market that can be reached with only one offering and promotion.

Although there were some important findings in this study, there were some limitations as well. First, the sample included only respondents (tourists) from Vojvodina. According to Kozak (2002) undertaken tourist activities may vary according to countries of origin. The second limitation is related to the selection of destination. Namely, there is a lack of data about specific destinations visited by respondents. Finally, the time of travel is also uncertain because the sample did not show when (what season) respondents were travelling to the destination.

This study provided a first look at the outbound tourist market of Vojvodina. A future step could be to expand the sample with respondents from other countries in the region. Also, future research might be related to the specific destination or specific activity undertaken in it.

Adapting to a new system of market values and changes in consumer/tourist preferences causes an abandonment of the traditional offer. In this sense, segmentation is important because it provides the actors in the value chain with the opportunity to identify consumer/tourist segments. Furthermore, this allows them to create and deliver a value as a precondition for achieving a competitive advantage and making profit.

## Notes

1.  $\alpha$ /number of tests (Coakes, 2013, p. 180).
2.  $\alpha$ /number of tests (Coakes, 2013, p. 180).

## References

- Asan, K., & Emeksiz, M. (2018). Outdoor recreation participants' motivations, experiences and vacation activity preferences. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 24(1), 3–15. doi:10.1177/1356766716676300
- Bartoluci, M. (2013). *Upravljanje razvojem turizma i poduzetništva*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga d.d.
- Bel, F., Lacroix, A., Lyser, S., Rambonilaza, T., & Turpin, N. (2015). Domestic demand for tourism in rural areas: Insights from summer stays in three French regions. *Tourism Management*, 46, 562–570. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.07.020
- Benckendorff, P., Moscardo, G., & Pendergast, D. (2009). *Tourism and Generation Y*. School of Business. Townsville, Australia: James Cook University.
- Beritelli, P., & Boksberger, P. (2005). Activity-based market segmentation: A behavioural approach. *Tourism*, 53(3), 259–266.
- Bernini, C., & Cracolici, M. (2015). Demographic change, tourism expenditure and life cycle behaviour. *Tourism Management*, 47, 191–205. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2014.09.016
- Bilgihan, A., Okumus, F., & Cobanoglu, C. (2013). Generation Y travelers' commitment to online social network websites. *Tourism Management*, 35, 13–22. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2012.05.005
- Bojanić, D. (2011). The impact of age and family life experiences on Mexican visitor shopping expenditures. *Tourism Management*, 32, 406–414.
- Branchik, B. J. (2010). Silver dollars: The development of the US elderly market segment. *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing*, 2(2), 174–189. doi:10.1108/17557501011042542
- Chen, S., & Shoemaker, S. (2014). Age and cohort effect: The American senior tourism market. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 48, 58–75. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2014.05.007



- Choi, H. S. C., Murray, I., & Kwan, K. (2011). Activity-based segmentation of Canadian domestic pleasure travelers to New Brunswick. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 12(3), 202–224. doi:10.1080/15256480.2011.590736
- Coakes, S. (2013). *SPSS 20.0 for Windows: Analysis without anguish*. NJ: Wiley Publishing.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral science*. Hillsdale, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Deri, L., Armenski, T., Tešanović, D., Bradić, M., & Vukosav, S. (2014). Consumer behaviour: Influence of place of residence on the decision-making process when choosing a tourist destination. *Economic Research – Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 27 (1), 267–279. doi:10.1080/1331677X.2014.952108
- Dorđević, A., & Zečević, B. (2015). *Kreiranje vrednosti u turizmu*. Centar za izdavačku delatnost, Ekonomski fakultet u Beogradu.
- Eusebio, C., Carneiro, M., Kastenzholz, E., Figueiredo, E., & Soares da Silva, D. (2017). Who is consuming the country side? An activity-based segmentation analysis of the domestic rural tourism market in Portugal. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 31, 197–210. doi:10.1016/j.jhtm.2016.12.006
- Glover, P., & Prideaux, B. (2009). Implications of population ageing for the development of tourism products and destinations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(1), 25–37. doi:10.1177/1356766708098169
- Green, M., & Salking, N. (2014). *Using SPSS for windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data*. New York, NY: Pearson Education.
- Hawkes, E., & Kwortnik, R. J. (2006). Connecting with the culture: A case study in sustainable tourism. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 47(4), 369–381. doi:10.1177/0010880406289992
- Karim, S., & Geng-Qing Chi, C. (2010). Culinary tourism as a destination attraction: An empirical examination of destinations' food image. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 19 (6), 531–555. doi:10.1080/19368623.2010.493064
- Kim, J., Wei, S., & Ruys, H. (2003). Segmenting the market of west Australian senior tourists using an artificial neural network. *Tourism Management*, 24(1), 25–34. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00050-X
- Kozak, M. (2010). Holiday taking decisions – the role of spouses. *Tourism Management*, 31 (4), 489–494. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2010.01.014
- Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23(3), 221–232. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00090-5
- Leask, A., Fyall, A., & Barron, P. (2013). Generation Y: Opportunity or challenge – strategies to engage Generation Y in the UK attraction's sector. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 16 (1), 17–46. doi:10.1080/13683500.2011.642856
- Lehto, X., Fu, X., Li, H., & Zhou, L. (2017). Vacation benefits and activities: Understanding Chinese family travelers. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 41(3), 301–328. doi:10.1177/1096348013515921
- Lehto, X., Lin, Y., Chen, Y., & Choi, S. (2012). Family vacation activities and family cohesion. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 29(8), 835–850. doi:10.1080/10548408.2012.730950
- Lehto, X., O'Leary, J., & Morrison, A. (2004). The effect of prior experience on vacation behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 801–818. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2004.02.006
- Marić, D., Marinković, V., Marić, R., & Dimitrovski, D. (2016). Analysis of tangible and intangible hotel service quality components. *Industrija*, 44 (1), 7–25. doi:10.5937/industrija1-8437
- Mihajlović, I., & Koncul, N. (2016). Changes in consumer behavior—The challenges for providers of tourist services in the destination. *Economic Research – Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 29 (1), 914–937. doi:10.1080/1331677X.2016.1206683
- Moscardo, G., Morrison, A. M., Pearce, P. L., Lang, C.-T., & O'Leary, J. T. (1996). Understanding vacation destination choice through travel motivation and activities. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2(2), 109–122. doi:10.1177/135676679600200202

- Mumuni, A., & Mansour, M. (2014). Activity-based segmentation of the outbound leisure tourism market of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 20(3), 239–252. doi: [10.1177/1356766714522258](https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766714522258)
- Mykletun, R. J., Crotts, J. C., & Mykletun, A. (2001). Positioning an island destination in the peripheral area of the Baltics: A flexible approach to market segmentation. *Tourism Management*, 22(5), 493–500. doi:[10.1016/S0261-5177\(01\)00004-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00004-8)
- Nimrod, G. (2008). Retirement and tourism themes in retirees' narratives. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35 (4), 859–878. doi:[10.1016/j.annals.2008.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.06.001)
- Nordin, S. (2005). *Tourism of tomorrow – travel trends & forces of change*. Sweden: European Tourism Research Institute.
- Parks, K. M., & Steelman, L. A. (2008). Organizational wellness programs: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(1), 58–68. doi:[10.1037/1076-8998.13.1.58](https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.13.1.58)
- Pesonen, J. A. (2015). Targeting rural tourists in the internet: Comparing travel motivation and activity-based segments. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 32(3), 211–226. doi: [10.1080/10548408.2014.895695](https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2014.895695)
- Poon, A. (2003). A new tourism scenario—key future trends, *The Berlin Report*. Germany: Tourism Intelligence International.
- Popesku, J. (2011). *Menadžment turističke destinacije*. Belgrade, Serbia: Univerzitet Singidunum.
- Ryu, K., & Jang, S. (2006). Intention to experience local cuisine: The modified theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30, 507–516. doi:[10.1177/1096348006287163](https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348006287163)
- Smith, G. (2001). Tourism trends and issues: The big picture for education and training. *TedQual*, 4, 13–15.
- Swarbrooke, J., & Horner, S. (2006). *Consumer behaviour in tourism*. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Tomić, S., Leković, K., & Dakić, S. (2016). Kvantitativna analiza lojalnosti potrošača turističkoj destinaciji. *Economic Outlook – Magazine for Economic Theory and Practice Matters*, 18(4), 1–10.
- Živković, R. (2009). *Ponašanje i zaštita potrošača u turizmu*. Belgrade, Serbia: Univerzitet Singidunum.
- UNWTO. Retrieved from <http://media.unwto.org/press-release/2018-01-15/2017-international-tourism-results-highest-seven-years>
- Flash Eurobarometer 370. Attitudes of Europeans towards tourism. Retrieved from [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/flash/fl\\_370\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/flash/fl_370_en.pdf)