The Rise of Individual Mass Tourist and Explorer: Study of Tourist Typology and Motivation for Travel
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Abstract. Different types of tourists require a diverse demand. Moving from a descriptive explanation, this study offers a further investigative dialog to understand a tourism destination impacts as well as tourist requirements particularly from Gen-Z as the future tourism consumer and succeeding demographic cohort of millennials. The aim is to recognize Indonesian Gen-Z tourist’s behavior and to some extent their motivation to travel for holiday. This study employs a qualitative research methodology which utilize 5W1H questioning technique and Keywords-in-Context (KWIC) method for data collection and analysis through the pioneer study of tourist typology by Cohen’s (Cohen, 1974) as tourism anthropologist. The current study rouses the tourist’s distinctions as an important aspect when planning for tourism destination management since ‘individual mass tourist’ and ‘explorer’ including ‘drifter’ are likely to look for inter-cultural contact with a host comparing to ‘organized mass tourist’ group. This research enhances anthropology of tourism literature, methodology and the route for establishing and maintaining tourism development at destination from the relationship of guest (tourist) and host (destination) perspectives.

1 Introduction

Worldwide, tourism is a developing and growing industry sector particularly for millennials including generation Z (Gen-Z) as new trends for tourism industry market whose demanding an experience than tangible products (Sofronov, 2018). In this sense, Gen-Z as the following millennials to be prepared for their arrival in a tourism business market. Generation Z and a future new generation can be regarded as anyone who were born from 1997 onward (Dimock, 2019). Generational or cohort differences in traits occur because the pervasive cultural values and practices change over time since Gen-Z prefer to look for more engagement within societal environment at a destination that differ from former generation in term of behavior and motivation (Dimock, 2019; Schroth, 2019) especially when planning for a holiday and consuming a tourism product. In respect of this study, although research about tourist typologies were established (Baltaci & Cakici, 2022; Chen & Huang, 2018b; Mehmetoglu, 2004; Zalatan, 2004). There is need a further conversation about tourist typology towards destination management as scholars seem to undermine different types of tourist’s behavior and motivation since they merely interested in improving business sectors such as study towards services management (Dolnicar & Ring, 2014), time scarcity and travel experience (Li, Wang, Lv, & Li, 2021), the influence from dimension of service quality (Jo, Lee, & Reisinger, 2014) and tourism distribution channel (Kontis & Skoultsos, 2022). Therefore, this study launches an empirical dialogue that benefited from anthropology of tourism discussion as it recognizes tourist behaviors that remains as the heart of tourism industry and hold the origin motivation to travel regardless marketers and professionals offering. Furthermore, while tourism defined as the occurrences of a social, cultural and economic that involve the movement of people from places outside their usual environment for purposes such as personal or business/professional (UNWTO, 2022). Anthropologist argues that people/tourist interaction lies at the heart of tourism rather than economic and business purposes (P. Burns, 2003, pp. 65-86). This means academic narrative from anthropology of tourism serves the theoretical purpose of the study that seek further analytical methodology to understand types of tourists on destination management and pay more attention on its relationship within a complex realm of behaviour, representation, and socio-economic interaction. Despite that anthropology of tourism which rooted from separately understanding of anthropology discipline, tourist definition, and culture as social phenomenon and defined in many ways (see the previous work from authors (Boissevain, 1996; Cohen, 1988; Dann, 1997; Graburn, 2012; MacCannell, 2002; Nash et al., 1981; Selwyn, 1994; Urry, 1992)). For the purpose of this study, anthropology of tourism
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understood as an interaction between host (destination) and guest (tourist) (Leite & Swain, 2015, p. 2; V. L. Smith, 2012) within primary elements of tourism industry system (P. Burns, 2003, p. 23) and component of culture (P. Burns, 2003, p. 53). The tourism industry system comprises of three primary elements of tourism such as (i) travel demand (economic, political, social, and cultural factor that enabling more travel), (ii) tourism intermediaries (travel supplier, hotels, transport, travel agents) and (iii) destination influence (historic, connections, accessibility, political and economic stability). Whilst component of culture contains both at the level of ideal norms, i.e., religion, myths, heroes, values, attitude, norms, ideological and moral systems, education and other structures for passing on knowledge and generating new knowledge, social organization including gender/age relation and working patterns, kinship, and the level of observed transactions, i.e., economic, technology and material culture, formal and informal, legal and political frameworks for social control and conflict resolution, language, categorization, perceptions of the world around and communication. Unlike the similar study that investigating and explaining tourist typology approach based on their behaviour and motivation traits (Wickens, 2002). In specific, this current research establishes an examination of behaviour and motivation from Indonesian Gen-Z tourist by utilizing Cohen’s tourist typology approach (Cohen, 1974) with the activation of conceptual W1H method (Who, When, Where, What, Why and How of questions (Yang, Hu, Long, & Guo, 2011)) to analysis and extract concepts and relations of the tourist’s domain towards their behaviour and motivation. These answers are considered as contemporary information and answering the research question pertaining the issues about tourist typology towards destination management. This research method reveals four types of Indonesian Gen-Z tourist for comprehensive understanding destination impact. The findings provide a better understanding of the Indonesian Gen-Z tourists’ behaviour and motivation that will enhance the anthropology of tourism literature and promote a solution for marketers as well as managers in managing a tourism attractions and destinations. Moreover, this empirical study sparks future studies in segmenting and profiling traveler from broader perspective. In addition, it is helpful to explain reasoning rules for inferring tourist destination knowledge and share tourist domain knowledge.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Anthropology of tourism

Body of knowledge for anthropology of tourism has gained popularity since 1977 and provided theoretical perspectives for greater understanding of the tourism industry and the impact within the structure of society and culture (V. L. Smith, 2012, p. ix). Since then, anthropology of tourism studied by scholars to discuss issues related to the truth of tourism knowledge from several perspectives. Using theoretical perspective from anthropology of tourism, anthropologists including tourism and hospitality scholars have asked many questions surrounded political, economy, social change and development, natural and organized resource management, and cultural identity and expression (Boissevain, 1996; G. L. Burns, 2004; Dann, 1997; Errington & Gewertz, 1989; Halkier, Kozak, & Svensson, 2014; MacCannell, 2002; Stronza, 2001). As mentioned in the introductory paragraphs, anthropology of tourism described as an interaction between host (destination) and guest (tourist) within primary element of tourism industry system and component of culture. Therefore, an empirical exploration, and conversation through anthropology of tourism lens provides an argument for greater understanding of issue and growing interface between industry and academia. In this sense, McNaughton (2006) exposed a violence and exploitation from local landlord at tourism center in India as the study investigate the relationship between the host (the outsider status of handicraft traders) and guest (international tourist) and suggest a mutual understanding in establishing good interaction and management at the destination on promoting international tourism business. In the area of tourism teaching and learning, Forristal (2012) argued that anthropology of tourism subject balance economic or business of tourism discussion in the curriculum within sociocultural context. As such, study the nature of tourist’s motivation and behavior through anthropology of tourism may lead to a formulation and/or supplementary direct application on management and marketing strategy. A comprehensive understanding of tourist typology and detachment will help a mitigation approach to resolve conflict between host/guest, national/ international manager, employee/ non-employee that would provide a clear solution for complexity of tourist motivation and expectation both as individual and/or group.

2.2 Tourist typology

The literature demonstrates that tourist’s typology discussion, with or without benefited from anthropology of tourism theoretical lens, argues, and proposes a model for tourist typology as follow. Decade ago, five typology of cultural tourists was identified and introduced to understand the cultural tourism segmentation market based on the motives and the decision to visit a destination as well as the depth of experience such as casual cultural tourists, incidental cultural tourists, purposeful cultural tourists, serendipitous cultural tourists, and sightseeing cultural tourists (McKercher, 2002). Hence, recent study improved the later five typology of cultural tourists into four distinction by unification of the ‘incidental’ and ‘casual’ types into one segment ‘casual’ based on the dichotomy nature of the measurement of cultural centrality (Chen & Huang, 2018a). From industrial perspectives, the understanding of (i) allocentric and (ii) psychocentric types of tourists helped airlines and travel companies to expand their business (Plog, 1974). Next, classification tourist by purpose of travel introduced five
typology of tourist such as recreational tourist, cultural tourist, health tourist, sport tourist, and conference tourist (Wahab, 1975). Furthermore, from social and cultural perspective, there were seven tourists to be recognized namely (i) explorers, (ii) elite tourists, (iii) off-beat tourist, (iv) unusual tourists, (v) incipient mass tourist, (vi) mass tourist, and (vii) charter tourist (V. Smith, 1977). Other works, look the distinction of tourist to help tourism planner on marketing decision and strategy based on an ex-ante approach to introduce five tourists namely social tourist, conventional tourist, marketing tourist, planning tourist, and impulsive tourist (Zalatan, 2004). At this stage, from the academic narrative, the current study recognizes Cohen’s typology of tourist (Cohen, 1974) purposively open the research investigation to move away from descriptive to analytical approach. The work of Cohen’s on tourist typology known as the earliest and pioneer findings among academic scholars. Cohen’s discussed that the key to understand tourist’s behaviour and to some extent their motivation to travel. That is means to investigate to what extent a tourist’s being institutionalised or in other words how far a tourist applies tourism industry system ((i) travel demand (economic, political, social, and cultural factor that enabling more travel), (ii) tourism intermediaries (travel supplier, hotels, transport, travel agents) and (iii) destination influence (historic, connections, accessibility, political and economic stability). Importantly, this is to examine that different intersection of tourism system will determine tourist’s behaviour and motivation on the destination. Therefore, through case study from Chalkidiki, a region in Northern Greece (Wickens, 2002), Cohen’s theoretical framework of tourist typology underlined the recent study which proposed five micro types of tourist based on their behaviour ((i) the cultural heritage type, (ii) the raver types, (iii) the Shirley Valentine type, (iv) the heliolatrous type, (v) the lord Byron types) and three micro types of tourist based on their motive of travel ((i) the need to escape, (ii) the desire for pleasure, (iii) ontological security). Similar but different, the current study also drawing from the origin of four philosophical Cohen’s typology tourist model as portrayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organized mass</td>
<td>Highly dependent on tourism industry system and component of culture. Characterised by all-inclusive package of tourism products and offering at a destination. Demand full services at that highly controlled by industrial tourism operator or provider. They aware of the component of culture existences but tend to ignore or disregard it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual mass</td>
<td>These types of tourists use or apply tourism industry system but customised the offering based on their own preferences and demands. The combination between all-inclusive and personal demand of tourism products are satisfying their tourism experience. They understand the benefit of component of culture to enrich their experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explorer tourist</td>
<td>These tourists follow tourism industry system but create their own system with a possibility to change their arrangement plan to the default if something going as not as their planned. The keyword is “off track” since they tend to create/ develop their own tourism experience and actuate the component of culture as part of their tourism products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Drifter tourist</td>
<td>These special tourists will totally follow their own way with limited or without guidance from tourism industry system. Their aim is to seek uniqueness and create novelty experience from their tourism journey. They often avoid contact with other types of tourists and highly look for more engagement with local resources rather than sourced from the industrial system. Therefore, they highly understand and appreciate component of culture as critical factor to create uniqueness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Cohen (1974)

3 Methods

Qualitative research often understood as field oriented in nature, away from generalizability result and often uses nonprobability samples (Flick, 2014). Therefore, to achieve the aim of this study, qualitative research inquiry is suitable to collect a ‘rich’ information from total 35 Indonesian Gen-Z pertaining their behavior and motivation at destination as well as factors influencing their decision to travel. The 5W1H method uses to collect the primary data in describing a given drawback by answering 5 questions beginning with the W letter (What, Where, When, Who, Which) and 1 query beginning with the H letter (How). The 5W1H questions are designed as an effective way to collect and analyze tourist’s experience within six pieces of information such as ‘When’ this experience happens, ‘Where’ this experience took place, ‘What’ and ‘Why’ this experience occurred, and ‘How’ this experience happened, and completely ‘Who’ caused this experience (Jinks, 2019, p. 41). Due to the fact that all questions are open, i.e., none YES or NO answer, but show different “sides of the coin” of perception, expectation and consciousness Indonesian Gen-Z as tourist before travelling and at destination. Keywords-in-Context (KWIC) with color coding approach was employed by using Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet Software for analyzing the data since the goal is to
reveal how words are used in context with other words (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2008, p. 574). The method illustrates in Figure 1.

Fig. 1. Research Method

4 Data Collection

Data collection took place during the two odd calendar academic in a private higher education institution in Jakarta, Indonesia. The 5W1H questionnaires which encircle a holiday activity were given as part of student’s individual assignment in the Anthropology of Travel class’s subject. Students who attend the class were studied at their 1st year in the university. Total of 42 respondents were regarded as purposively sampling to serve this study’s research data until empirical saturation is reached (Baker & Edwards, 2012, p. 8). The qualitative research data collection differs from quantitative approach. Therefore, the purposively sampling criteria on this qualitative research tradition may be extremely valuable and represent adequate numbers of respondent for this research project. Baker and Edwards (2012, p. 8) stated the epistemology of 30 numbers regarded as medium size respondents when researchers faced with time constraints. The 42 selected respondents were applied as this nature of study represents a deep and profound relationship between the respondent and the researchers as well as the presence of participant-selection where applicable. Additionally, the data that has been collected was transformed to a worksheet for research analysis purpose on tourist typology classification by Cohen (1974) approach as well as finding their motivation to travel. Due to a reason, there are only 35 of respondent’s data that can be processed to produce result and discussion. The 35 respondents were renamed by numerical code for an ethical research purpose.

5 Results and Discussion

5.1 Indonesian Gen-Z Tourists Typology

The result from 5W1H method alone will not satisfy the aim of the study, but it creates the conditions for the proper identification of the research problem under analysis, particular to identify the types of tourists and discover their motivation to travel for this study result as below. The age demography information on the respondent’s date of birth confirms that the 35 respondents are Gen-Z since they were born between year 1999 and 2004. Furthermore, although most Gen-Z were regarded as ‘organized mass tourist’ type (40%) that choose to have a full service and all-inclusive package of tourism products which offered by most of industrial tourism operator or provider while planning for their holiday. But the interesting fact is Indonesian Gen-Z type of tourist of both ‘individual mass tourist’ (31%) and ‘explorer’ (22%) were outnumbered the mainstream choices as showed in Table 2.

Table 2. Indonesian Gen-Z on Cohen’s Tourists Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist Typology</th>
<th>Count of Name on Tourist Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organised Mass Tourist</td>
<td>14 (40 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Mass Tourist</td>
<td>11 (31 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explorer</td>
<td>8 (22 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drifter</td>
<td>2 (7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35 (100 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Indonesian Gen-Z Motivation to go for Holiday

Table 3 informed nine reasons for Indonesian Gen-Z to go for holiday. The result revealed that going to a
nature destination place were the main reason for a holiday such as going to a mountain and beach. Appeared 24 times in total, in specific, S-202010 said that

“I love going to a nature tourist destination since it will give me a natural view... I like doing natural adventure since it will make me calm when I see a natural place such as beach, jungle, and forest”.

This opinion also strengthened by both S-202013 who expressed that

“I choose a nature destination because I like the quiet atmosphere and nature can give me an inspiration. I like drink coffee and talk with people so if nature and cafe are combined into 1, it will be special for me”.

And S-202111 also said “I like going to the beach or anything related to nature. Because I like to hear the sound of calm waves and see the beauty of nature”.

Follow with the curiosity about a culture in a destination as the second most motivation for going to travel since it counted for 12 times. S-202116 strongly expressed the reason of knowing and learning a different culture as the motivation to travel as quoted as below

“The feeling of going to a new place and seeing people live, look, and speak differently is exhilarating to keep me fresh and feel alive. It’s my escape from reality and reminds me that the world is much more than that”.

The other main reasons to go for holiday were acknowledged as having a relaxing moment and spending their free time as well as looking for an adventure while doing their journey. The rest of the Indonesian Gen-Z motivation to travel were noted as learning about historical place, visiting family and wanting to try a culinary product. Thus, seeking a new knowledge such as language and local people attitude and seeing an animal at the destination were also recorded. The details of travel motivation for Indonesian Gen-Z to go for holiday is displayed as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Key Word on Motivation to Go for Holiday</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nature (Mountain, Beach)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowing about Culture</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relaxing and Free time</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Learning about History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seeking an Adventure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Going with or visiting Family</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Try Local Culinary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Seeking a new knowledge and learning about language as well as their social behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Seeing a local animal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Count</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Conclusion

The result and discussion of this study revealed the distribution and distinction of four tourist types for Indonesian Gen-Z. The rise of both types of ‘individual mass tourist’ and ‘explorer’ give this study’s a comprehensive understanding on the Indonesian Gen-Z as the guest that apply and select tourism industry organization and products based on their own preferences and need. Furthermore, they tend to tailor a combination between all-inclusive offerings to satisfy their demand such as the need for tickets, transports, accommodation. Hence, as they are more and more interest, perceive and understand about benefit of component of culture to enrich their holiday experience, this prove a strong relationship between Indonesian Gen-Z as the guest and host (local community) during and consuming product at the destination such as learning about their norms, i.e., religion, values, attitude, ideological and moral systems, for passing on knowledge exchange at their level of observed transactions of the world around. Moreover, the findings proposed the Gen-Z psychological perspectives on their reality towards holiday consciousness and experience particularly from their behavior and motivation to travel. In addition, this provided tourism stakeholders for a way to understand how different holiday’s formative experiences (such as world events and technological, economic, and social shifts) interact with a life cycle and the tourism industry system as well as component of culture to shape and formulate a tourism package that tailored based on touris’ behaviour, expectation, and motivation at the destination. In this sense, Destination Management Organization (DMO) and/ or those whose primary job is to attract visitors for the purpose of enhancing the local economy through purchase of room nights, food and beverage, retail items, transportation, or visitor services, can deliver a better package. Despite the limitation of the research such as selected respondents and generation cohort, in short, this study informs that travel package which offered a generic attraction may not fascinating the Indonesian Gen-Z. Therefore, a further study needs to do for example an investigation study with more population that cover a complete market segmentation as well as an in-depth discussion from marketing discipline study such as theory planned behaviour (TPB).
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