AUTONOMOUS/CONTROLLED TRAVEL MOTIVATIONS AND THEIR EFFECT ON TRAVEL INTENTIONS OF INDIAN MILLENNIALS: A MIXED METHOD APPROACH

ABSTRACT

With the self-determination theory (SDT) as grounding, the current study uses qualitative investigation with twenty-five respondents and a two-stage quantitative validation with 782 respondents, to propose seven travel motivations for Indian millennials. These motivations are knowledge-seeking, escape, sense of accomplishment, experience stimulation, social relationships, destination rewards, and social media compulsion. These motivations are mapped to specific regulations in the SDT and organized into autonomous and controlled motivations. Both autonomous and controlled motivations have a significant impact on travel intentions. A judgemental sample of Indian millennials is drawn from the eligible client-list of a prominent tourism agency used as the sampling frame. The study guides destination managers to position their destinations aligned with the motivations that drive Indian millennials to travel.

Keywords: *Indian millennials; travel motivation; self-determination theory; autonomous motivation; controlled motivation; travel intention.*

Introduction

Pew Research defines millennials as those who are between ages 22 and 38 years as of 2019 (Dimock, 2019). Recent trends indicate that global tourism increased by 6% to 1.4 billion in 2018 and rose by another 3–4% in 2019; however, is expected to fall 80% in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic (UNWTO, 2018; 2020). Millennials comprise around 23% of all global and domestic travel, contributing USD 286 billion in 2016, USD 308 billion in 2017, and USD 400 billion (estimated) in 2020[1], making them an attractive traveller segment (UNWTO, 2016; WTTC, 2019). Travel is the top priority for millennials who travel more than any other generation (Cavagnaro et al., 2018).

India is an emerging economy where tourism accounts for 9.2% of GDP and 8.1% of employment worth 42.7 million employees, including both international and domestic travel (FICCI, 2019; WTTC, 2019). Its emergence as a vibrant economy has stimulated the country's outbound travel. From 16.6 million in 2013, the international departures have risen to 26.3 million, a year-on-year growth of 9.6% (ETC, 2020), making Indians a preferred group for tourism destinations. In terms of value, the outbound tourism expenditure rose by 22% from 2017, to touch USD 21.3 billion in 2018, with Europe accounting for a 17% revenue-share (HBL, 2020). As a cohort, Indian millennials are the biggest travel group who seek novel experiences and travel for longer durations averaging 35 days a year, with their travel demand growing by 50% in 2019 (Mint, 2020). Indian millennials' travel motivations are much different from other groups since they represent a sizeable generation with substantial purchasing power and shared pro-environmental concerns (Muralidharan & Xue, 2016). They focus on their image, ethos, use of social media, and are also powerful influencers (McCormick, 2016). Given the vastness of the country and its rich heritage, many Indian

[1] These estimates were made pre-COVID-19 pandemic and may not be accurate

millennials also prefer to travel domestic (HBL, 2020). Post COVID-19, Indian millennials are expected to be leading the recovery of the Indian travel industry, with 71% eager to travel domestic (BT, 2020).

Recent studies on millennials are primarily focused on psychographic segmentation of this age-group and their travel styles, without providing a holistic typology of motivations that shape such behaviours (e.g., Giachino, et al., 2019; Han and Hyun, 2018; Richards 2015; Rita et al., 2019; Smith et al., 2018). Motivation is the primary reason for people depicting a specific intention/behaviour (Dann, 1981; Han & Hyun, 2018; Nikjoo & Ketebi, 2015), and tourism studies use motivations as part of psychological frameworks for examining the factors behind travel (e.g., Chen et al., 2019; Giachino et al., 2019). However, none of these presents a robust theory-driven motivation framework for the millennials, a gap this study aims to fulfil (Todorovic et al., 2015). Additionally, the authors could not find any such research for Indian millennials, despite abundant information in the commercial media.

This work uses SDT as a theoretical underpinning to develop and empirically validate dimensions of millennial travel motivation. Among motivation theories, SDT stands out with its multiple regulations arranged in a hierarchy that represent different levels of motivations, ranging from amotivation to intrinsic motivations (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Intrinsically motivated individuals manifest an autonomous behaviour driven by internal pleasure and satisfaction, while extrinsically motivated individuals do so for external rewards (Ryan & Deci, 2000). SDT has traditionally been used in the organizational context, and few recent studies have sought to apply this theory to tourism contexts, (e.g., Aschoff & Schwabe, 2015; Bosnjak et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2019).

The study suggests that Indian millennial motivations for travel, irrespective of domestic or international travel, can be classified as knowledge-seeking, escape, sense of

accomplishment, experience stimulation, social relationships, destination rewards and social media compulsion, with the first three proposed as autonomous and the later four proposed as controlled motivations. The travel motivations proposed in this study add to the emerging literature on SDT and millennial travel motivations by proposing a multi-dimensional framework validated through a robust empirical approach (Buffa, 2015; Giachino et al., 2019; Rasouli & Timmermans, 2017). With the proposed motivations strongly affecting travel intentions, the framework is expected to provide insights for destination/hospitality marketers to develop strategies to attract this emerging traveller segment.

Literature Review

Millennial Travel

The recent tourism research on millennials focusses on peculiarities that make them unique (Cavagnaro et al., 2018; for a review, see Giachino et al., 2019). Veiga et al. (2017) outline how the millennials possess unique digital skills, remain connected and seek gratifying experiences. Millennials ascribe enhanced importance to the internet in choosing destinations and posting pictures/reviews on social media (Șchiopu et al., 2016). Through social media, millennials co-create experiences and share good/bad experiences with others (Erdeji & Dragin, 2017). Millennial travellers create socio-economic opportunities for local communities since they tend to stimulate local tourism businesses, foster closer ties with local populations and support environmental protection (UNWTO, 2016). They depict more biospheric values, and "connecting-with-nature" is a prominent travel purpose (Bonadonna et al., 2017).

It is known that physical, social and psychosocial gratifications can serve as motivations to stimulate individuals for travel expeditions. Physical gratifications may involve exploring new foods, hotels and sexual experiences (Wiele & Tong, 2014). Social gratifications typically involve finding new friendships or a romantic partner, as well as sharing experiences on social

media (Park et al., 2009). Both physical and social gratifications may serve as extrinsic motivations. The psychosocial needs, innate intrinsic motivations, are a desire for sensation, enhanced self-worth, feel better about oneself, and extend beyond the social/physical benefits (Nesi & Prinstein, 2015).

Extant research identifies certain motivational factors for millennial travellers, albeit in a disjointed way. These factors include physical relaxation, cultural experiences, social components and cultural/historical explorations (e.g., Buffa, 2015; Park et al., 2017). Recent research has identified other motivational factors, for instance, fun, daring and adventurous activities, relaxation, drug/alcohol consumption and good weather (e.g. Njagi et al., 2017). Rita et al. (2019) discuss push travel motivations for millennials in form of relaxation, escape, and destination attractiveness, Erdeji and Dragin (2017) highlight the role of social media and adventure, while Tsai and Chen (2019) focus on willingness-to-pay, flight availability, and booking options as major travel reasons.

Within the millennial segment, beyond the general traveller, some novel psychographic categorizations, like the classic backpacker, the global nomad, the digital nomad and the flashpacker are also discussed (Richards, 2015). Additionally, there exist various other travel niches, including volunteer, international student (Morgan & Xua, 2009), culture traveller (Brown & Holloway, 2008), job mover (Smith et al., 2018), sports traveller (Smith et al., 2014), and language traveller (Laborda, 2009). Despite rich research on specific motives that influence millennial travel or the within-demographic/psychographic categorizations, there is a clear need to develop a structured motivation framework that explains their general travel behaviours (Todorovic et al., 2015; Veiga et al., 2017; Yousaf et al., 2018).

Travel Intention – Behaviour Gap

Behavioural intention is an individual's anticipated future action and indicates the expectancies of indulging in such behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Travel intention is deployed as a key predictor for travel behaviours, as it is assumed that an individuals' behavioural intentions determine their actual behaviour (Sheeran, 2002). However, prior works suggest that intentions have a limited role in predicting behaviours, referred to as the intention–behaviour gap (e.g., Armitage & Conner, 2001, Kah et al., 2016). This gap has been suggested to exist due to the time gap between the two (Ajzen &Fishbein, 1970); but not all researchers support this logic and argue that behaviours can occur without intentions (e.g., Randall & Wolff, 1994).

Motivation is an important factor in explaining behaviour, and travel motivations are likely to be a key determinant to shape strong travel intentions as well as actual travel behaviour (Li et al., 2010). Travel motivation, an individual's commitment to travel, represents the cognitive processes leading to behaviours and serves as a conduit to transform intentions into behaviour (Jang et al., 2009). Many consumer behaviour studies imply the strong impact of motivation on intentions/behaviours, however, similar insights in the tourism domain are limited (e.g., Jang et al., 2009; Khan et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2020). Ajzen (1991) indicates that behaviour-causing travel intention should capture the primary motivational factors that evoke such behaviour, and hence, a robust framework for travel motivations is key to 'bridging' the intention-behaviour gap.

Travel Motivations

Motivations are the internal psychological factors that drive, direct, and integrate individuals' behaviours towards the attainment of personal goals (Iso-Ahola, 1980). Motivation theory has been applied extensively in tourism/hospitality literature as a driver of individual travel, given its role in fulfilling tourists' goals, as well as self-value enhancement (Backman

et al., 1995; Beerli & Martin, 2004; Han & Hyun, 2018). As part of the early works, Hills (1965) explores vacationers' motives as a response to psychosomatic exhaustion that drives them to replenish, restore, explore and find what they need to feel enriched and regenerated. Todorovic and Jovicic (2016) find that the core reason for taking vacations was the need to take a break and achieve mental relaxation. More studies suggest that individuals are motivated to go on holiday to reduce stress, anxiety and work pressures (Han & Hyun, 2018; Kim & Ritchie, 2014; Kim et al., 2012). However, these studies examine specific motivations for travel without grounding them to any specific theory.

Among the universal structured frameworks, the intrinsic–extrinsic motivation paradigm indicates that motivations, internal and external, are dynamic psychological drives that make people travel (Fernandez et al., 2016). Swarbrooke (1996) classifies holiday decisions as influenced by factors internal to the traveller (such as motives, personality, health, family and work) and by external factors (such as destination, travel agent advice, visa availability, regulations and word-of-mouth recommendations). Later, within the push-pull paradigm proposed by Dann (1981), with pull made of extrinsic factors and push of intrinsic factors, tourists are proposed to be 'pushed' by their intrinsic needs towards a specific destination (Fodness, 1994), or 'pulled' by the destination-specific extrinsic attributes (Baniya & Paudel, 2016). These studies continue discussing the intrinsic-extrinsic motivation duality with a limited examination of the hierarchy of motivations or their sub-dimensions.

Beyond the intrinsic-extrinsic paradigm, Pearce (1988) proposes the travel career ladder (TCL), which has five levels of travel motivations: relaxation, stimulation, relationship, development of self-esteem and fulfilment. Aligned to Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs, the TCL suggests that travellers progress up the ladder of travel motives as their travel experience increases. Subsequently, Pearce and Lee (2005) propose an extension to TCL, the travel career

patterns (TCP). The TCP proposes fourteen needs: self-actualization, self-enhancement, romance, a sense of belonging, autonomy, self-development, enjoyment of nature, escape, novelty, kinship, nostalgia, stimulation, isolation and recognition. The concept of travel career is central to the TCL and TCP, as is the idea that travellers will experience changing motivational patterns over time (Pearce & Lee, 2005). However, TCL and TCP have come under criticism for the poor justification of the choice of travel motives mapped to each need, their ranking, and their lack of clear empirical evidence (Cooper, 2008). Ryan (1998) notes that the classification of motivation has not come from the respondents, rather has been imposed on them.

In the memorable tourism experiences (MTE) scale, Kim et al. (2012) suggest that individuals travel for memorable experiences which are largely driven by seven experiential dimensions: hedonism, novelty, local culture, refreshment, meaningfulness, involvement, and knowledge. However, the scale was developed with students, and later works (e.g., Chandralal et al., 2015; Coudounaris, & Sthapit, 2017; Gohary et al., 2020) challenge the validity of the scale and re-examine it in the real-world context. However, their results are non-coherent. For example, Coudounaris and Sthapit (2017) find that only hedonism, local culture, involvement, and knowledge define travel motivations, while Gohary et al., (2020) suggest that local culture may not be a significant driver of travel for memorable experiences. Millennials crave memorable experiences, including adventure and immersion in local cultures (Cavagnaro et al., 2018; Folmer et al., 2019; Haugen, 2017). With limited convergence in extant works, the generalizability of the MTE scale for millennials needs to be validated with a novel theoretic approach.

Recent works on travel motivation challenge the notion of planned travel behaviour and suggest that tourists may now be increasingly indulging in instinctive travel, facilitated by

technology (Cohen et al., 2014; Madani et al., 2020). While works that examine such motivations for unplanned visits are limited, an exploratory work by Madani et al. (2020) highlights that experiencing the thrill, learning opportunity, understanding the local culture, and breaking the routine are underlying motivations for unplanned travel. Millennials are more adventurous and unplanned than other age-groups, due to their reliance on word-of-mouth, social media, and technology (Haugen, 2017), and thus, these exploratory motivations need to be confirmed empirically for this group.

Self-Determination Theory

SDT examines the primary issues of an individual's 'personal development, self-regulation, universal psychological needs, life goals and aspirations, energy and vitality, non-conscious processes, the relations of culture to motivation, and the impact of social environments on motivation' (Deci & Ryan, 2008b, p. 182). SDT suggests three primary drivers that may determine the level of motivations: (a) autonomy, when people feel a sense of having chosen an activity, (b) competence, when people feel efficacious to perform an activity, and (c) relatedness, which implies the need for social interactions (Deci & Ryan, 2008a; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The higher levels of the three drivers represent a necessary condition for generating intrinsic or autonomous regulations, and self-determined behaviour. SDT conceptualizes four regulations to motivations. Amotivation, at one extreme, is a lack of motivation to participate in a specific behaviour, while intrinsic regulation, at the other extreme, is an intense intention to participate purely for hedonic outcomes. Within the two extremes, SDT encapsulates extrinsic/controlled regulation, which subsumes certain sub-regulations. Of these, external and introjected regulations are linked to an extrinsic outcome such as a reward, material or otherwise (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

External regulation generates motivation only because of inherent consequences, guiding people through rewards or punishments; for example, travel for destination benefits like food, hotel or sexual/drug/adventure experiences (Wiele & Tong, 2014). In a state of introjected regulation, people maintain their status-quo or enhance pride/self-esteem; for example, travelling for social appreciation (Cook & Artino, 2016). Individuals start to value the external reward with internal consciousness at the level of identified regulation when the award is important for attaining the belief-goals; for example, travel for religious considerations (Yu et al., 2019). Finally, when the award is united with belief systems, together they provide autotelic motivation at the integrated regulation stage; for example, travelling for subjective well-being (Bosnjak et al., 2016).

SDT has seen recent exposure in travel/tourism literature with limited coverage of the entire framework (e.g., Aschoff & Schwabe, 2015; Bosnjak et al., 2016; Chen et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2019). Bosnjak et al. (2016), leveraging SDT for sports tourism, suggest that sport-related physical activities for tourists can fulfil their autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs, and improve their subjective well-being. However, they borrow only hedonic enjoyment as a source of intrinsic motivation from SDT, with the remaining framework based on the eudemonistic identity theory. In the context of suicide travel, Yu et al. (2019) conceptually propose that extrinsic and intrinsic motivations drive such behaviours. However, the model is conceptual which does not account for all the regulations proposed by SDT.

Chen et al. (2019) argue that personal development through backpacking can explain the satisfaction of backpackers' travel motivations, through self-cognition, self-improvement, social interaction, experiencing local culture, escape and relaxation. They propose skill, emotion, capability, self-consciousness and worldview as components to backpacker personal development, which should impact their self-efficacy and self-esteem, with variations across

cultures. The proposed components were not mapped to specific regulations of SDT and did not lead to strong impact on self-efficacy and self-esteem, with only two of their hypotheses supported.

Dolnicar et al. (2012) propose that health, money, family, leisure, and spiritual life help build life-quality and well-being for vacationers. The work has only a peripheral relation to SDT with no clear adaptation of various underlying regulations. Finally, Zhang et al. (2017) deploy SDT to propose satisfactions derived from enhanced perceived autonomy, competence, and relatedness, to generate intrinsic and identified travel motivations for people with mobility challenges. While their hypotheses are supported, they do not account for other regulations inscribed in the SDT and hence, their measurement of the motivations remains partial. Thus, there is no established travel motivation framework based on all the regulation of SDT that can be adapted for Indian millennials and there is a need for an independent effort.

Methodology

The population of the current study are Indian Millennials with a frequency of one or more leisure travel every year, domestic or international or both, with the last travel within one year of the data collection period. These are people born between the years 1981 and 1996 (aged between 22-38 at the time of data collection), and well-aligned with the American definition of this group. The cohort has been a witness to major events, like the advent of colour television, end of licensing-regime, the assassination of a prime minister, and major economic reforms (Bijapurkar, 2019). The population and the chosen respondent profile remained constant throughout the study.

For the present study, the scale-development process proposed by Hinkin (1995) was deployed. This study consists of five steps: (1) item generation (2) content validity (3) exploratory factor validation, (4) psychometric property assessment, (5) measurement

invariance and (6) nomological validity. Following the process, we expect the scale to demonstrate the seven motivation regulations enshrined in SDT, as well as evoke two higher-order motivations (autonomous and controlled), followed by a significant impact on travel intention. Pearce and Lee (2005) suggest that individual characteristics, age, and type of travel (domestic/international) impact the tourists' travel experiences. Since this study already focusses on a specific age group, we conducted the empirical analyses not only for the overall data but also separately for domestic (only domestic travel) and international travellers (only international/domestic+international) to check for the stability of the motivation scale (Kim, 2007).

For item generation, a combination of inductive and deductive methods was used with qualitative insights to generate items which were mapped to those from similar constructs in the literature (Tanwar & Prasad, 2017). For this stage, in-depth semi-structured interviews were carried out with 25 eligible respondents, selected conveniently, from a prominent Indian business school in February 2019. The people interviewed were post-graduate students (12), faculty members (4), and remaining comprised of office staff (3), PhD scholars (3), and executive participants (3). Each interview lasted for approximately 60 minutes with the respondents probed about their domestic/international travel motivations, travels within the last one year, destinations visited, reasons for travelling, accomplices in specific travels, and highlights of a specific trip.

The generated items were integrated into a structured questionnaire to collect data at two different points of time. First, the items were evaluated for psychometric properties starting with the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) followed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and examination of the nomological validity of the scale. EFA is the first step in the empirical validation of the scale and tests the factor structure of the proposed dimensions of a scale.

Unlike a CFA, it is less restrictive and allows the items to load not only on their respective factors, but also to cross-load with others, and serves as a robustness check for the scale (Marsh et al., 2014). In an EFA, cross-loadings of items with conceptually adjacent dimensions are expected, but their primary loading should be highest for the proposed dimension.

The data collection for exploratory factor validation through EFA was conducted with a questionnaire made of the items generated from the interviews, along with consumer information like gender, age, education, travel preferences, and type of travel undertaken in the last 1 year. In terms of available population characteristics, research shows that 36 per cent of Indian millennials use a fitness app, 60 per cent resent smoking and 21 per cent resent drinking (Jain, 2017)[2]. To check if the sample drawn reflects these population characteristics qualitatively, three questions related to these habits were added to the questionnaire. The items were rated on a 7-point agree-disagree Likert scale, where 1 was 'completely disagree' and 7 was 'completely agree'.

The data collection was facilitated by a major specialized tourism agency which organizes tours in India and abroad and is the biggest travel-service provider for Indian millennials in the country[3]. This is a multi-national agency headquartered in the UK and India (Mumbai), with offices based in ten major cities in India. Hence, the agency was judgementally chosen by the researchers and the data collection was supported by the top management of the firm in India to encourage academic research. The firm personnel helped the researchers electronically float the questionnaire with their clients. Since there is no published data available for Indian Millennials, the clients of the agency who fit the population description were considered as the sampling frame. There were 7043 such people in the agency's list. For this stage, 700 of the agency's eligible clients were randomly approached by email in July-

[2] The article reports numbers from a sample-based study, which cannot be considered as a census
[3] No reference for protecting the firm identity

August 2019. Of those, 527 showed interest and were sent a link to the online questionnaire. After data screening, 250 responses were retained, as they were complete in all respects and had no missing values, giving an overall response rate of 47.4%.

Scale development protocols require EFA to be followed by a CFA and nomological validity evaluation on different datasets (Hinkin, 1995). The CFA was conducted with the covariance-based structural equation modelling (CBSEM) tool, AMOS20, as it is efficient to test a theory involving latent constructs (Hair et al., 2017). The same questionnaire, used in the EFA stage, was deployed after dropping the poorly loading items. Additionally, three items of travel intention were added to evaluate the nomological validity of the scale (discussed in step 6 of results).

The data collection was conducted with the support of the same agency in the months of November-December of 2019, after removing the respondents who had been approached for the previous stage. A larger dataset was acquired to enable the authors to split this dataset in two, with the first part used for CFA and the second part for nomological validity. From the 6343 remaining entries, 1500 were approached randomly, of whom 1408 agreed to participate. Of those, 532 filled the questionnaire in all respects with no missing values, giving an overall response rate of 37.8%. This data was then randomly split in two datasets of 266 responses each, with the first used for CFA and the second for evaluating nomological validity.

Results

Step 1: Item Generation

Of the 25 people interviewed, 13 were males, 12 were graduates, 7 had a diploma, and 4 were postgraduates. In terms of age, 12 were in the age group 22-30 and remaining in the group 30-38. In terms of travel preference, 10 of respondents preferred to travel with family,

friends or groups while the remaining 15 travelled alone. Finally, 18 respondents had only done domestic travel while the other 7 had a mix of domestic and international trips.

As an outcome of the depth interviews, a total of thirty items were generated, and manual axial coding of these items was followed by categorization into seven dimensions aligned with those of SDT, with the support of two professors with prior publications on SDT. The inter-rater reliability, calculated using Cohen's Kappa, was 86.6% with both reviewers agreeing on the allocation of 28 items to one of the seven dimensions (SHT, n.d.). In case of disagreement on the remaining two items, they were resolved by mutual consensus. The items generated were also mapped to the items from pre-existing works for enhanced face validity, as shown in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 here

Step 2: Content Validity

The items in Table 1 were checked for face validity, relevance, representativeness and clarity of meaning with the help of nine experts, including four senior managers of a major hospitality group, three tour operators, and two doctoral candidates. For each item, the content validity ratio (CVR)[4] was calculated and was found to be ranging between 0.79 and 1.00 with no less than 8 experts terming an item essential for any item, which makes the scale items acceptable (Almanasreh et al., 2019).

Step 3: Exploratory Factor Validation

[4] CVR = $(N_e\text{-}N/2)/(N/2)$; N_e: Experts considering an item essential; N: Number of experts

From the 250 completed responses received for this stage, 48% were students (post-graduation and above), 54% were males, 46% were in the age group 22-30 years, 50% were graduates, 32% had a diploma, and 18% were postgraduates. In terms of travel preference, 39% of respondents preferred to travel with family, 23% with friends and 20% in groups; the remaining 18% were solo travellers. Finally, 59% (147) travelled only domestic with the rest (103) having both domestic and international, or only international travels. Further, in our sample, 48% used a fitness app, 78% did not smoke, and 36% did not drink. A one-sample t-test[5] for the equivalence of sample and population proportions for the last three characteristics indicated that the sample proportions were significantly higher than the corresponding population ones, reported in Jain (2017).

The data for EFA, including the sub-samples, was tested for univariate normality, with skewness values lying within −2 and +2, and kurtosis values within −7 and +7 for all groups (Hair et al., 1998). Next, EFA was conducted using principal component analysis in SPSS 18 with varimax rotation. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin value of 0.81, well above the cut-off level of 0.50, suggested that the sample size was adequate. Bartlett's test of sphericity, which reflected significant χ^2 value, also indicated that the data was suitable for factor analysis. Eigenvalues of factors were used to confirm the initial solution, suggesting a seven-factor solution with an eigenvalue greater than 1, with 58.63% of the total variance explained. Using the criteria of Field (2005) and Hair et al. (1998), items with factor loadings greater than 0.35 on other factors, as well as those with communalities less than 0.50, were dropped. This led to the removal of items DSR1, DSR5 and KNL5 for the overall data, as well as for domestic and international travellers. The EFA was conducted again on the remaining 27 items, and the results, as shown in Table 2, supported the seven-factor solution. Table 2 also incorporates EFA results for

[5] T-test was conducted for each proportion and the estimated t-values were evaluated at 95% level of significance

domestic and international travellers.

Insert Table 2 here

The total variance explained by these seven factors was 63.58% for the overall sample, 63.49% for domestic travellers, and 61.77% for international travellers. Three items, namely KNL5, DSR1, and DSR5, were dropped from further analysis.

Step 4: Psychometric Property Evaluation

For the 532 responses received for the CFA and nomological validity stages, 52% were students (post-graduation and above), 57% were males, 50% were in the age group 22-30 years, 52% were graduates, 31% had a diploma, and 19% were postgraduates. In terms of travel preference, 42% of respondents travel with family, 21% with friends, 19% in groups and 18% solo. Domestic-only travellers comprised of 54% (288) and the rest (244) were international travellers. In this sample, 42% used a fitness app, 66% did not smoke, and 24% did not drink.

For this sample, in the one-sample t-test[5], the sample proportions for the last three characteristics were not found to be significantly different from the population ones, as reported in Jain (2017). Additionally, we conducted an independent sample t-test[6] to check for equivalence of proportions of respondent education, gender, age, travel preferences, type of travel, and the three specific characteristics from Jain (2017), across the EFA sample and this one. Except for the last three characteristics (using a fitness app, smoking, drinking), which were higher for the EFA sample, the proportion of each characteristic was not found be

[6] The independent sample t-test was conducted for each proportion and the estimated t-values were evaluated at 95% level of significance.

significantly different across the two samples. This indicates that the two samples were largely homogenous.

For CFA, the first split of this data, comprising 266 respondents, was used. The corresponding numbers were 144 and 122 for domestic and international travellers.

First-Order Model

Initial tests for univariate normality for the overall as well as the sub-sample data indicated that all skewness values were within the prescribed limits of −2 and +2, and all kurtosis values were within the suggested limits of −7 and +7 for all groups (Hair et al., 1998). Table 3 gives the composite reliability (CR), C-α, average variance extracted (AVE), and maximum shared variance (MSV) for each construct. It also includes the analysis results for domestic and international travellers.

Insert Table 3 here

The indices used to measure overall model fit were the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), the comparative fit index (CFI), the Tucker–Lewis index (TLI) and the incremental fit index (IFI). The model fit obtained was satisfactory, with χ^2=517.725, df=303, χ^2/df =1.709, GFI=.92, IFI=.91, CFI=.91, TLI=.90 and RMSEA=.05. The corresponding values were χ^2=380.951, df=303, χ^2/df=1.257, GFI=.91, IFI=.92, CFI=.92, TLI=.93 and RMSEA=.04 for domestic travellers, and χ^2=441.774, df=303, χ^2/df=1.458, GFI=.90, IFI=.91, CFI=.90, TLI=.91 and RMSEA=.06 for international travellers. The values of CR and C-α for all constructs were above the threshold value of .70, suggesting satisfactory reliability. All construct AVEs in the model scored higher than .50, and most of the loadings were above .70, which provides

sufficient evidence of convergent validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). Further, the discriminant validity of constructs was established by comparing the MSV with the AVE for each construct from Table 3. In each case, the MSV values were found to be lower than the AVE values, which gives sufficient evidence of discriminant validity (Fornell and Larcker, 1981).

Second-Order Model

As suggested by Bagozzi and Heatherton (1994), the proposed motivation sub-dimensions were tested for the presence of a higher-order factor explaining most of the common variance. A second-order factor model is more parsimonious and constrained than a first-order factor model, and it gives deeper meaning to the commonalities across the primary motivations (Hair et al., 1998). In this context, autonomous and controlled motivations were taken as higher-order latent constructs. Based on the continuum proposed by SDT, external and introjected regulations were taken as controlled motivations, while identification, integrated and intrinsic regulations were taken as autonomous regulations. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4, along with those for domestics and international travellers.

Insert Table 4 here

The model shows an overall adequate fit, with χ^2=602.97, df=316, χ^2/df=1.908, GFI=.92, IFI=.92, CFI=.92, TLI=.91 and RMSEA=.06. The fit indices for domestic travellers were χ^2=419.363, df=316, χ^2/df =1.327, GFI=.91, IFI=.91, CFI=.91, TLI=.91 and RMSEA=.06 and for international travellers were χ^2=366.783, df=316, χ^2/df=1.161, GFI=.92, IFI=.91, CFI=.92, TLI=.90 and RMSEA=.05. All the items, first order and second order, were found to be loading significantly with values higher than .70. These results validate the theory that

controlled and autonomous motivations, as envisaged in SDT, are two broad latent motivations that drive the first-order motivations for Indian millennial's travel.

Step 5: Measurement Invariance

Tables 3 and 4 depict that the factor structures for the CFA models are not different for domestic and international travellers. However, they do not necessarily imply that the measurement model is invariant across the groups. To empirically establish the stability of the scale, a measurement invariance test was executed. While the configural and loading invariances are already established from Tables 3 and 4 (same measurement model and similar loadings across the groups), for the variance/covariance invariance, the measurement weights, structural covariances and the measurement residuals were sequentially constrained in the multi-group analysis protocol of AMOS20. Such a variance is established if the fit indices, especially CFI, changes by is .01 or less, and RMSEA changes by .015 or less (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). Table 5 presents the invariance test both the first order and the higher-order models.

Insert Table 5 here

Not only did the models fit well for all the constraints, but the fit indices also did not change more than .01 across the groups, implying satisfactory measurement invariance.

Step 6: Nomological Validity: Predicting Travel Intention with Motivation

To establish the scale's nomological validity, the second part of the dataset, with 266 respondents (144:domestic; 122:international), was used to examine the associations between the proposed motivation framework and travel intention. Travel intention is an outcome of the

cognitive processing that culminates in travel behaviour (Jang et al., 2009). Millennial travellers are keen to visit destinations that provide new cultural experiences, scenic values, adventures and quality of service at the destination, and share their experiences with others in their referent groups (Mohsin et al., 2017). These physical and social gratifications provide external/controlled motivations for such people to undertake that travel (Hamouda &Yacob, 2018; Hosany et al., 2019). Millennial travel intention is also an outcome of the autonomous motivations that are innate personal needs, which are routes for achieving internal satisfaction from travel (Kim & Kwon; 2018; Yoon & Uysal, 2005). As discussed earlier, motivations are important for strengthening the travel intentions as well as actual travel behaviour (Jang et al., 2009). Hence, we propose:

$$Y_{TI} = \beta_1\{f_{AM}(X_{KNL}, X_{ESC}, X_{SOA})\} + \beta_2\{f_{CM}(X_{SCR}, X_{EXP}, X_{DSR}, X_{SMC})\}^7$$

with the corresponding hypotheses being:

H1: Autonomous travel motivations will positively affect Indian millennial's travel intentions

H2: Controlled travel motivations will positively affect Indian millennial's travel intentions

Travel intention was measured with items adapted from Abubakar and Ilkan (2016) who developed a three-item scale for hospital visit intention. The adopted items modified as: "I would like to travel again soon" (TRI1), "I predict I will be travelling somewhere in the future" (TRI2), and "If I crave travelling, I will do it soon in the future" (TRI3). Once univariate normality of the overall data as well the sub-sample data established, a fully disaggregated

[7] Y: Dependent Variable; X: Independent Variable; TI: Travel Intention; KNL: Knowledge Seeking; ESC: Escape; SOA: Sense of Accomplishment; SCR: Social Relationships; EXP: Experience Stimulation; DSR: Destination Rewards; SMC: Social Media Compulsion; β: Standardized regression coefficient; AM: Autonomous Motivation; CM: Controlled Motivation.

model was run in AMOS20 to which provides higher robustness to the overall framework, presented in Figure 1 (Bagozzi & Heatherton, 1994).

Insert Figure 1 here

The overall model fit was acceptable, with χ^2=1479.86, df=396, χ^2/df=3.737, RMSEA=.06, GFI=.91, CFI=.91, TLI=.90 and IFI=.91. Further, both the hypotheses, H1 and H2, are supported. The structural model was also evaluated separately for domestic and international travellers. The fit indices for the domestic travellers were χ^2=555.438, df=396, χ^2/df=1.402, RMSEA=.07, GFI=.91, CFI=.91, TLI=.91 and IFI=.91, and for international travellers were χ^2=1582.812, df=396, χ^2/df=3.997, RMSEA=.06, GFI=.92, CFI=.91, TLI=.91 and IFI=.91. Further, the two structural models were found invariant as the fit indices did not change by more than 0.01 after sequentially constraining measurement weights, covariances, and residuals (Chen, 2007). Finally, the paths for H1 and H2 were found to be .21 (p<.05) and .89 (p<.05) respectively for domestic travellers, and .25 (p<.05) and .91 (p<.05) respectively for international travellers. These results suggest that the proposed travel motivation scale is robust with satisfactory reliability and convergent, discriminant and nomological validities while remaining invariant for the two types of travellers.

Conclusions and Implications

The study uses the scale development protocol by Hinkin (1995), using a mixed-method approach comprising of qualitative and quantitative stages, to propose a twenty-seven item seven-dimension travel motivation scale for Indian millennials. The seven first-level motivation constructs mapped to regulations of SDT are knowledge-seeking (intrinsic regulation), escape (integrated regulation), a sense of accomplishment (identified regulation),

experience stimulation (introjected regulation), social relationships (introjected regulation), social media compulsion (external regulation) and destination rewards (external regulation). Of these, the first three are further classified as autonomous motivations, and the remaining four as controlled motivations (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The items for the scale were generated with in-depth interviews with 25 respondents, which were then validated through rigorous multi-stage empirical validation with 782 respondents, sampled judgementally, using structural equation modelling. The measurement models (first order and second order), as well as the structural model relating autonomous/controlled motivations to travel intention, were found to be invariant for domestic and international travellers.

Within the autonomous motivations, the prominence of knowledge-seeking indicates that Indian millennial's primary motivation to expand their awareness by experiencing other cultures (domestic or foreign), exploring new lifestyles and increasing their knowledge about other countries (e.g., Njagi et al., 2017; Richards & Wilson, 2006; Todorovic & Jovicic, 2016). Next, escape, energizes millennial travellers with the idea of relaxation, getting away from daily routines, and travelling for exclusivity (Michael et al., 2017; Mohsin et al., 2017; Riley, 1995; Rita et al., 2019). Sense of accomplishment gives Indian millennials a feeling of pride with their acquaintances (Doran et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2007). This motivation arises from the travellers' desire to identify with and achieve goals that are of personal importance to them (Erdeji & Dragin, 2017; Preko et al., 2019).

Within the controlled motivations, experience stimulation represents Indian millennial's motivation to appreciate, enjoy and experience nature as well as culturally/historically significant heritage sites for self-ego enhancement (Nesi & Prinstein, 2015; Shi et al., 2012; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2015). Further, to stay connected, Indian millennials travel to develop or revive social relationships, bond either with residents at the destination or

with friends/family (Fernandez et al., 2016; Staffieri et al., 2018). Development of social relationships is a mechanism for enhancing self-esteem with validation from family and friends (Njagi et al., 2017). Social media compulsion motivates millennial travellers to comply with their referent group values by posting content related to travel on social media (Virgilio et al., 2017). Finally, destination rewards are the external benefits gained by the traveller by visiting a specific destination: for example, good food, shopping opportunities, financial savings, and a clean/hygienic environment (Pearce & Lee, 2005; Rita et al., 2019).

Theoretical Implications

This work adds value to the literature highlighting either multiple disjointed individual motives or to those using intrinsic/push and extrinsic/pull motives for Indian millennial travel. In this way, it complements other theories which propose a multi-dimensional perspective to travel, though not necessarily for millennials. Previous studies, mostly in general tourism/hospitality contexts and discussing the intrinsic–extrinsic or push-pull motivation paradigms (e.g., Fernandez et al., 2016; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Yousaf et al., 2018) focus on these two motivation categories as theoretical foundations. Across the literature, it has been proposed that the push/intrinsic motivations and the pull/extrinsic motivations consist of a variety of individual motivations that do not necessarily fit into a specific theme (Baniya & Paudel, 2016; Rita et al., 2019; Swarbrooke, 1996). Further, beyond the extrinsic/intrinsic dichotomy, there has been a lack of a robust framework that can categorize the constructs into more meaningful sub-dimensions. The autonomous and controlled motivations, akin to pull and push motivations, provide more meaning to these frameworks.

The findings of this work also add value to the two travel motivation theories which are more relevant to millennials: unplanned travel and memorable travel experiences (MTE; Haugen, 2017). For evoking unplanned travel motivations, Madani et al. (2020) suggest

experiencing the thrill, learning opportunity, understanding the local culture, and breaking the routine as underlying motivations. Our work empirically supports these four motivations in form of experience stimulation, knowledge-seeking (including learning about local culture), and escape from the routine. From the MTE scale perspective, there is partial mapping of certain dimensions of MTE with that of our scale: knowledge seeking (knowledge, local culture), escape (refreshment), sense of accomplishment (novelty, meaningfulness), and stimulation (involvement). The other dimensions, destination rewards, social relationships, and social media compulsions, emerge as novel travel intention characteristics for the Indian millennials.

SDT comes across as a comprehensive theory of motivations but with limited implementation in the travel/tourism/hospitality domain. There are few applications of SDT to the travel/tourism contexts like sports tourism (Bosnjak et al., 2016), suicide travel (Yu et al., 2019), online travel communities (Aschoff & Schwabe, 2015) and backpacking (Chen et al., 2019). Yet, the underlying regulations on offer in SDT have not been completely implemented. In the current study, the SDT underpinning enables us not only to categorize motivations broadly into controlled and autonomous motivations but also to align the individual motivations evoked from consumer voices to specific regulations which are indicators of the hierarchy of motivations (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Further, Gagne and Deci (2005) argue that feelings of autonomy, competence and relatedness are important sources of motivations, which are represented in the findings of this work. For example, knowledge-seeking and escape supply a sense of autonomy to millennial travellers; the sense of accomplishment and experience stimulation are measures of competence, while social relationships enhance relatedness. Motivations such as social media compulsion and destination rewards are external motivations and diminish the three sources of internal motivations (Baumeister & Leary, 1995;

Ryan & Deci, 2000). This is established by the relatively small effect size of autonomous motivation on travel intention.

The present study, by mapping the evoked motivations to levels of regulations that are themselves in a hierarchy, is in alignment with the theory of the hierarchy of motivations. For example, Pearce and Lee (2005), identified fourteen factors that represent different stages in Maslow's hierarchy, and some of those are confirmed in the present study: escape, relationship, stimulation and recognition. However, whereas Pearce and Lee (2005) suggested that travel experience determines the level of motivation relevant for travel, and in turn indicates a dynamic movement of motivations with travel experiences, the present study proposes a set of static regulations that serve simultaneously as motivations. In line with the tenets of SDT, our study findings indicate that travel motivation is a simultaneous interplay of motivations, both autonomous and controlled, which create the overall drive for millennial travel (Ryan & Deci, 2000). While the studies proposing TCL/TCP are criticized for their methodology, which is largely qualitative; this work, however, uses empirically robust process, aligned with scale-development protocols.

Managerial Implications

The proposed scale guides the destination/hospitality marketers to focus on specific motivations that get Indian millennials to visit a specific location. However, since the study proposes that the seven travel motivations act simultaneously, the destination image should be communicated to impact some or all of these factors effectively. First, for such travellers who want to explore and who travel to seek knowledge of a destination, managers should market their resources, both natural and man-made, as being worthwhile locations to know about. Experience-based learning should be highlighted to the millennials in various marketing campaigns. Heritage and cultural sites should be depicted as important components of the

world and regional history, which many millennials may not appreciate, to arouse their curiosity and learning drives (e.g., Varanasi, Athens). Besides history, a destination can also be made attractive to millennial travellers by portraying it as having a unique lifestyle in terms of style, fashion or activities, a need which millennials have much more than other demographics (e.g., Dubai, Miami).

Second, to appeal to millennial travellers looking for an escape, destination/hospitality managers should promote their destinations as offering maximum relaxation opportunities through various activities that take their minds off daily routines and stresses (e.g., Goa, Ibiza). The experiences which detach the millennial travellers from their monotonous routines like attending college/office, spending hours on a computer/smartphone, and enable them to explore the "real-world" should be emphasized.

Third, to activate the motivation of a sense of accomplishment, a message of rarity or uniqueness should be associated with specific locations, by building in experiences, such as adventures, that few travellers attempt; this secures the traveller the 'right to brag' (e.g., Ladakh, Amazon). Fourth, every destination needs to offer its millennial tourists experiences and memories which can be promoted in the form of amazing weather, a wide range of activities, luxurious accommodation and high-quality food, all at a reasonable price (e.g., Bangkok, Kuala Lumpur, Paris). The focus should be on value-for-money, given the limited budgets, especially backpackers, may have while travelling.

Fifth, destination marketers can also promote a location as great to visit with family/friends, enabling the development of bonds through shared travel; this can be done by promoting group travel and group activities and adventures (e.g., Lapland, Darjeeling). Sixth, a destination seeking to attract millennial travellers should not only offer a great experience but also promise various rewards in terms of financial savings, recreation/entertainment

options, shopping opportunities, value-for-money food and accommodation, and general/environmental cleanliness (e.g., Glasgow, Bern). Millennials have been well-researched to have higher biospheric values than other age groups and hence, that can be a special focus of destination/hospitality marketers. Finally, given the heavy reliance of millennials on social media, managers should be active in sharing original or shared content on social networking platforms to produce a positive influence on the minds of such travellers (e.g., Tourism Australia).

Limitations and Future Directions

The study has certain shortcomings. First, the study examines the travel motivations for Indian millennials, so the results cannot be generalized to all millennials globally. Hence, future studies should validate the framework with a diverse sample from across the globe to allow a generalization of the results. Second, a comparison of such millennial travel motivations with those of other age groups is lacking. Future studies can provide a typology of such travel motivations for young people (aged 16–22) and older adults (aged 38+) and examine commonalities and differences with millennials.

Third, social media compulsion was found to be one of the significant motivators influencing Indian millennials' intention to travel. However, social media comprises a variety of channels, and a deeper investigation is needed to understand its impact, in its various formats, on such people's travel motivations. Fourth, the study involved judgemental sampling as the sampling frame of the study was the database of a tourism agency, which implies that our respondents were travellers who planned their travel through an agency. Independent travellers are expected to have motivations aligned to the scale proposed by us, but it needs to be revalidated by future researchers with respondents who plan their travel themselves, chosen through probabilistic sampling methods. Finally, the work's analysis is based on data which is

an outcome of self-reported behaviour with the possibility of social desirability, which was not measured. Future researchers can include a social desirability scale (e.g. Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) to check if the primary scale is confounded with social desirability.

Indian millennials, aged 22-38 years and an emerging traveller segment, have enhanced India's contribution to the global travel industry. With unique characteristics like pro-environment beliefs, image-consciousness, experience-driven, social media embeddedness, substantial purchasing power and unique physical, social and psychosocial needs, this group's travel motivations remained a research gap, and are examined in the current work (McCormick, 2016; Muralidharan & Xue, 2016). Seven such motivations, aligned with the SDT, were proposed and empirically validated: knowledge-seeking, escape, sense of accomplishment, experience stimulation, social relationships, social media compulsion, and destination rewards (Gagne & Deci, 2005). The first three motivations, serving as autonomous motivations, and the last four motivations, serving as controlled motivations, are found to have a strong influence on the travel intentions of Indian millennials. This work not only provides a robust theory-driven motivation framework for an under-studied traveller group, but also adds to existing works in the travel/tourism domain for bridging the classic intention-behaviour gap (e.g., Jang et al., 2009; Khan et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2020).

Data Availability Statement: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, [AM], upon reasonable request.

References

Abubakar, A. M., & Ilkan, M. (2016). Impact of online WOM on destination trust and intention to travel: A medical tourism perspective. *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, *5*(3), 192-201.

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *50*(2), 179-211

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1970). The prediction of behavior from attitudinal and normative variables. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *6*(4), 466-487.

Almanasreh, E., Moles, R., & Chen, T. F. (2019). Evaluation of methods used for estimating content validity. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, *15*(2), 214-221.

Anonymous (2020). How millennials are shaping India's travel space. *Mint*. Available at: https://www.livemint.com/news/india/how-millennials-are-shaping-india-s-travel-space-11580112521863.html.

Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*(4), 471-499.

Aschoff, F. R., & Schwabe, G. (2015). Online Travel Communities: A Self-Determination Theory Approach. In *Virtual Communities: 2014* (pp. 65-80). Routledge.

Backman, K. F., Backman, S. J., Uysal, M., & Sunshine, K. M. (1995). Event tourism: An examination of motivations and activities. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, *3*(1), 15-24.

Bagozzi, R. & T. F. Heatherton (1994). A General Approach to Representing Multifaceted Personality Constructs: Application to State Self-Esteem. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *1*(1), 35-67.

Baniya, R., & Paudel, K. (2016). An analysis of push and pull travel motivations of domestic tourists in Nepal. *Journal of Management and Development Studies*, *27*, 16-30.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(3), 497-529.

Beerli, A., & Martin, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *31*(3), 657-681.

Bijapurkar, R. (2019). Why India needs its own definition of what it means to be a 'millennial'. *Mint*. Available at: https://www.livemint.com/news/india/why-india-needs-its-own-definition-of-what-it-means-to-be-a-millennial-11577809636255.html.

Bizirgianni, I., & Dionysopoulou, P. (2013). The influence of tourist trends of youth tourism through social media (SM) & information and communication technologies (ICTs). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *73*, 652-660.

Bonadonna, A., Giachino, C., & Truant, E. (2017). Sustainability and mountain tourism: The millennial's perspective. *Sustainability*, *9*(7), 1219.

Bosnjak, M., Brown, C. A., Lee, D. J., Yu, G. B., & Sirgy, M. J. (2016). Self-expressiveness in sport tourism: Determinants and consequences. *Journal of Travel Research*, *55*(1), 125-134.

Brown, L., & Holloway, I. (2008). The adjustment journey of international postgraduate students at an English university: An ethnographic study. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *7*(2), 232-249.

Buffa, F. (2015). Young Tourists and Sustainability Profiles, Attitudes, and Implications for Destination Strategies. *Sustainability, 7*, 14042-14062.

BT (2020). 71% millennials willing to travel within India in next 6 months. *Business Today*. Available at: https://www.businesstoday.in/current/economy-politics/71-millennials-willing-to-travel-within-india-in-next-6-months/story/417200.html.

Cavagnaro, E., Staffieri, S., & Postma, A. (2018). Understanding millennials' tourism experience: values and meaning to travel as a key for identifying target clusters for youth (sustainable) tourism. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *4*(1), 31-42.

Chandralal, L., Rindfleish, J., & Valenzuela, F. (2015). An application of travel blog narratives to explore memorable tourism experiences. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *20*(6), 680-693.

Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *14*(3), 464-504.

Chen, G., Huang, S., & Hu, X. (2019). Backpacker Personal Development, Generalized Self-Efficacy, and Self-Esteem: Testing a Structural Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, *58*(4), 680-694.

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*(2), 233-255.

Cohen, S. A., Prayag, G., & Moital, M. (2014). Consumer behaviour in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *17*(10), 872-909.

Cook, D. A., & Artino Jr, A. R. (2016). Motivation to learn: an overview of contemporary theories. *Medical Education*, *50*(10), 997-1014.

Cooper, C. (2008). *Tourism: Principles and Practice*. Pearson education (UK).

Coudounaris, D. N., & Sthapit, E. (2017). Antecedents of memorable tourism experience related to behavioral intentions. *Psychology and Marketing*, *34*(12), 1084-1093.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *24*(4), 349.

Dann, G. M. S. (1981). Tourist motivation: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research 8*(2), 187-219.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008a). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology, 49*(3), 82-185.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2008b). "Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains." *Canadian Psychology*, *49*(1), 14 –23.

Dimock, M. (2019). Defining generations: Where Millennials end and Generation Z begins. *Pew Research Centre*. Available at: https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins.

Dolnicar, S., Yanamandram, V., & Cliff, K. (2012). The contribution of vacations to quality of life. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *39*(1), 59-83.

Doran, R., Larsen, S., & Wolff, K. (2018). Comparison between own and others' travel motives: A research note. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *18*(2), 260-265.

Erdeji, I., & Dragin, A. (2017). Is cruising along European rivers primarily intended for seniors and workers from Eastern Europe? *Geographica Pannonica*, *21*(2), 115-123.

ETC (2020). Research snapshot on the Indian outbound travel market. *European Travel Commission.* Available at*:* https://etc-corporate.org/news/etc-publishes-research-snapshot-on-the-indian-outbound-travel-market/

Fernández, G. A. M., Pérez-Gálvez, J. C., & López-Guzmán, T. (2016). Tourist motivations in a heritage destination in Spain. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, *7*(3), 226-235.

FICCI (2019). Indian Tourism to reach ₹35 trillion by 2029: FICCI-Yes Bank Tourism Report. *Federation on Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry*. Available at: http://www.ficci.in/ficci-in-news-page.asp?nid=17188.

Field, A. (2005). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. 2nd Edition. SAGE: London.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*, (p. 578), Addison-Wesley (UK).

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

Folmer, A., Tengxiage, A. T., Kadijk, H., & Wright, A. J. (2019). Exploring Chinese millennials' experiential and transformative travel: a case study of mountain bikers in Tibet. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *5*(2), 142-156.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal Of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39-50.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *26*(4), 331-362.

Giachino, C., Truant, E., & Bonadonna, A. (2020). Mountain tourism and motivation: Millennial students' seasonal preferences. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *23*(19), 2461-2475.

Gohary, A., Pourazizi, L., Madani, F., & Chan, E. Y. (2020). Examining Iranian tourists' memorable experiences on destination satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *23*(2), 131-136.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis*, *5*(3), 207-219. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice hall.

Hair Jr, J. F., Matthews, L. M., Matthews, R. L., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: Updated guidelines on which method to use. *International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis*, *1*(2), 107-123.

Hamouda, M., & Yacoub, I. (2018). Explaining visit intention involving eWOM, perceived risk motivations and destination image. *International Journal of Leisure and Tourism Marketing*, *6*(1), 65-82.

Han, H., & Hyun, S. S. (2018). College youth travelers' eco-purchase behavior and recycling activity while traveling: An examination of gender difference. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *35*(6), 740-754.

Haugen, J. (2017). Marketing and selling adventure travel to millennials. *Adventure Travel News*. Available at: https://www.adventuretravelnews.com/marketing-and-selling-adventure-travel-to-millennials.

Hills, J. M. M. (1965). *The Holiday: A study of social and psychological aspects with special reference to Ireland*. The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations (UK).

HBL (2020). Millennials prefer Indian heritage destinations to foreign visits: Survey. *Hindu Business Line.* Available at: https://www.thehindubusinessline.com/news/variety/millennials-prefer-indian-heritage-destinations-to-foreign-visits-survey/article27237324.ece.

Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of Management*, *21*(5), 967-988.

Hosany, S., Buzova, D., & Sanz-Blas, S. (2020). The influence of place attachment, ad-evoked positive affect, and motivation on intention to visit: imagination proclivity as a moderator. *Journal of Travel Research*, *59*(3), 477-495.

Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1980). *The social psychology of leisure and recreation*. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Jain, H. (2017). What the millennial Indian wants: Not cars & houses, just fun & convenience. *Economic Times*. Available at: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/markets/stocks/news/what-the-millennial-indian-wants-not-cars-houses-just-fun-convenience/articleshow/61452052.cms.

Jang, S., Bai, B., Hu, C., & Wu, C. M. E. (2009). Affect, travel motivation, and travel intention: A senior market. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, *33*(1), 51-73.

Kah, J. A., Lee, C. K., & Lee, S. H. (2016). Spatial–temporal distances in travel intention–behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *57*(1), 160-175.

Khan, M. J., Chelliah, S., & Ahmed, S. (2017). Factors influencing destination image and visit intention among young women travellers: role of travel motivation, perceived risks, and travel constraints. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *22*(11), 1139-1155.

Kim, K. (2007). Understanding differences in tourist motivation between domestic and international travel: The university student market. *Tourism Analysis*, *12*(1-2), 65-75.

Kim, S. B., & Kwon, K. J. (2018). Examining the relationships of image and attitude on visit intention to Korea among Tanzanian college students: The moderating effect of familiarity. *Sustainability*, *10*(2), 360.

Kim, Y. E., Pearce, P. L., Morrison, A. M., & O'Leary, J. T. (1996). Mature vs. youth travelers: The Korean market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *1*(1), 102-112.

Kim, J. H., & Ritchie, J. B. (2014). Cross-cultural validation of a memorable tourism experience scale (MTES). *Journal of Travel Research*, *53*(3), 323-335.

Kim, J. H., Ritchie, J. B., & McCormick, B. (2012). Development of a scale to measure memorable tourism experiences. *Journal of Travel Research*, *51*(1), 12-25.

Laborda, J. G. (2009). Interface architecture for testing in foreign language education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 2754-2757.

Li, M., Cai, L. A., Lehto, X. Y., & Huang, J. (2010). A missing link in understanding revisit intention—The role of motivation and image. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *27*(4), 335-348.

Madani, F., Gohary, A., & Chan, E. Y. (2020). Motivations behind visiting unplanned tourist attractions: an Iranian context. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *23*(8), 947-951.

Marsh, H. W., Morin, A. J., Parker, P. D., & Kaur, G. (2014). Exploratory structural equation modeling: An integration of the best features of exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *10*, 85-110.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review, 50,* 370- 396.

McCormick, K. (2016). Celebrity endorsements: Influence of a product-endorser match on Millennials attitudes and purchase intentions. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *32*, 39-45.

Michael, N., Wien, C., & Reisinger, Y. (2017). Push and pull escape travel motivations of Emirati nationals to Australia. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, *11*(3), 274-296.

Mohsin, A., Lengler, J., & Chaiya, P. (2017). Does travel interest mediate between motives and intention to travel? A case of young Asian travellers. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 31*, 36-44.

Morgan, M., & Xu, F. (2009). Student travel experiences: Memories and dreams. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, *18*(2-3), 216-236.

Muralidharan, S., & Xue, F. (2016). Personal networks as a precursor to a green future: a study of "green" consumer socialization among young millennials from India and China. *Young Consumers*, *17*(3), 226-242.

Nesi, J., & Prinstein, M. J. (2015). Using social media for social comparison and feedback-seeking: Gender and popularity moderate associations with depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *43*(8), 1427-1438.

Nikjoo, A. H., & Ketabi, M. (2015). The role of push and pull factors in the way tourists choose their destination. *Anatolia*, *26*(4), 588-597.

Njagi, C. W., Ndivo, R. M., & Manyara, G. (2017). Understanding the travel motivation among youth travellers in Kenya: the 'push' and 'pull' paradigm. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 6(1), 1-16.

Park, N., Kee, K. F., & Valenzuela, S. (2009). Being immersed in social networking environment: Facebook groups, uses and gratifications, and social outcomes. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior*, *12*(6), 729-733.

Park, S. H., Hsieh, C. M., & Lee, C. K. (2017). Examining Chinese college students' intention to travel to Japan using the extended theory of planned behavior: Testing destination image and the mediating role of travel constraints. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, *34*(1), 113-131.

Pearce, P. L. 1988. The Ulysses factor: Evaluating tourists in visitor's settings. *Annals of Tourism Research, 15*(1), 1-28.

Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. I. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research, 43*(3), 226-237.

Preko, A., Doe, F., & Dadzie, S. A. (2019). The future of youth tourism in Ghana: motives, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. *Journal of Tourism Futures*, *5*(1), 5-21.

Randall, D. M., & Wolff, J. A. (1994). The time interval in the intention-behaviour relationship: Meta-analysis. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *33*(4), 405-418.

Rasouli, S., & Timmermans, H. (2017). Specification of regret-based models of choice behaviour: formal analyses and experimental design based evidence. *Transportation*, *44*(6), 1555-1576.

Richards, G. (2015). The new global nomads: Youth travel in a globalizing world. *Tourism Recreation Research,* 40(3), 340-352.

Richards, G., & Wilson, J. (2006). Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture? *Tourism Management, 27*(6), 1209-1223.

Riley, R. W. (1995). Prestige worthy tourist behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research, 22*(3), 630-49.

Rita, P., Brochado, A., & Dimova, L. (2019). Millennials' travel motivations and desired activities within destinations: A comparative study of the US and the UK. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *22*(16), 2034-2050.

Ryan, C. (1998). The travel career ladder: An appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research, 25*(4), 936–957.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68.

Șchiopu, A. F., Pădurean, A. M., Țală, M. L., & Nica, A. M. (2016). The influence of new technologies on tourism consumption behavior of the millennials. *Amfiteatru Economic Journal, 18*(10), 829-846.

Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention—behavior relations: a conceptual and empirical review. *European Review of Social Psychology, 12*(1), 1-36.

Shi, L., Cole, S., & Chancellor, H. C. (2012). Understanding leisure travel motivations of travelers with acquired mobility impairments. *Tourism Management, 33*(1), 228-231.

Smith, N. L., Cohen, A., & Pickett, A. C. (2014). Exploring the motivations and outcomes of long-term international sport-for-development volunteering for American Millennials. *Journal of Sport and Tourism, 19*(3-4), 299-316.

Smith, W. W., Clement, J. C., & Pitts, R. E. (2018). Oh the places they'll go. Examining the early career path of hospitality alumni. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism, 18*(2), 109-122.

Staffieri, S., Cavagnaro, E., & Rowson, B. (2017). Change as a travel benefit: Exploring the impact of travel experiences on Italian youth. *Research in Hospitality Management, 7*(2), 81-89.

SHT (n.d.). What is Cohen's Kappa Statistic? *Statistics How To.* Available at: https://www.statisticshowto.com/cohens-kappa-statistic/.

Swarbrooke, J. (1996). Towards the development of sustainable tourism in Eastern Europe. In Richards, G. (ed.) *Tourism in Central and Eastern Europe: Educating for Quality*. ATLAS Tilburg University Press (Netherlands).

Tanwar, K., & Prasad, A. (2017). Employer brand scale development and validation: a second-order factor approach. *Personnel Review, 46*(2), 389-409.

Todorović, N., & Jovičić, D. (2016). Motivational factors of youth tourists visiting Belgrade. *Journal of the Geographical Institute, 66*(2), 273-289.

Todorović, N., Apelić, J., & Romić, G. (2015). Characteristics of foreign youth tourism in Belgrade. *Bulletin of the Serbian Geographical Society, 95*(3), 1-16.

Tsai, T. H., & Chen, C. M. (2019). Mixed logit analysis of trade-off effects between international airline fares and fences: a revenue management perspective. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *22*(3), 265-275.

UNWTO (2018). *UNWTO Tourism Highlights*. Available at: https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284419876

UNWTO (2016). *Travel and Tourism: Economic Impact 2016 World*. Available at: https://www.wttc.org/media/files/reports/economic%20impact%20research/regions%202016/world2016.pdf

UNWTO (2020). *UNWTO World Tourism Barometer*. Available at: https://www.e-unwto.org/loi/wtobarometereng.

Veiga, C., Santos, M. C., Águas, P., & Santos, J. A. C. (2017). Are millennials transforming global tourism? Challenges for destinations and companies. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, *9*(6), 603-616.

Virgilio, F.D., Camillo, A. A., & Camillo, I. C. (2018). The impact of social network on Italian users' behavioural intention for the choice of a medical tourist destination. In *Medical Tourism: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 232-247). IGI Global (the USA).

Wiele, C.V.D., & Tong, S. T. (2014, September). Breaking boundaries: The uses & gratifications of Grindr. In *Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive And Ubiquitous Computing* (pp. 619-630).

WTTC (2019). *Travel and Tourism: Economic Impact*. Available at: https://wttc.org/Research/Economic-Impact.

Yoon, Y., & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, *26*(1), 45-56.

Yousaf, A., Amin, I., & C Santos, J. A. (2018). Tourist's motivations to travel: A theoretical perspective on the existing literature. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, *24*(1), 197-211.

Yousefi, M., & Marzuki, A. (2012). Travel motivations and the influential factors: The case of Penang, Malaysia. *Anatolia*, *23*(2), 169-176.

Yu, C. E., Wen, J., Goh, E., & Aston, J. (2019). "Please help me die": Applying self-determination theory to understand suicide travel. *Anatolia, 30*(3), 450-453.

Zhang, Y., Cole, S., Hirt, E., & Bilgihan, A. (2017). Self-determined travel facilitation with mental construal priming. *Tourism Management*, *61*, 472-483.

Zhang, J., Ye, H., Bhatt, S., Jeong, H., Deutsch, J., Ayaz, H., & Suri, R. (2020). Addressing food waste: How to position upcycled foods to different generations. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour, 1-9.*

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Mapping items to literature

Dimensions (Literature support)	**Sample Consumer voices**	**Generated items**	**Item mapping** **P:** Preko, Doe, and Dadzie (2019); **N:** Nikjoo and Ketebi (2015) **B**: Bizirgianni and Dionysopoulou (2013)
	"*Travelling help to enhance my knowledge*" ***(RP3)***	I travel to expand my *knowledge horizons* (KNL1)	"Developing Mentally and Intellectually" **(N)**
	"*I travel to enhance my knowledge about various cultures" (**RP12)***	I travel to learn about other cultures. (KNL2)	"I experienced new cultures." **(P)**
(Intrinsic regulation: Knowledge Seeking)	*"Love to learn about new lifestyles around the world" **(RP2)***	I travel to learn about other lifestyles (KNL3)	"Experiencing new cultures and lifestyles" **(N)**
	*"I travel for grooming my personal development" **(R15)***	I travel for my overall intellectual development (KNL4)	Developing mentally and intellectually" **(N)**
	*"Having knowledge about other places is important" (**RP7)***	I travel to increase knowledge about other locations. (KNL5).	"Promoting knowledge about a foreign destination offers" **(N)**
	*I want to have a break from daily usual life…want to live freely" **(RP8)***	I travel to escape from life's monotonies (ESC1)	"I want to de-stress myself." **(P)**
	"**I travel purposively for relaxation**" (RP1)	I travel to achieve relaxation. (ESC2)	"I wanted to just relax." **(P)**
(Integrated regulation: Escape)	*"Travel is the only option to find a release from work pressure" **(RP17)***	I travel to seek release from work pressure (ESC3)	"Being released from work pressure." **(N)**
	"*With all mounting pressures around me, travel provides a temporary break*" ***(RP9)***	I travel to get away from everyday routine. (ESC4)	"Escaping from daily routine life and its demands." **(N)**
	*"In a way travel defines me as I escape from the routine world" **(RP14)***	I travel for fun and entertainment. (ESC5)	"I want to travel for fun." **(P)**

(Identified regulation: Sense of Accomplishment)	*"Travelling makes me popular"* ***(RP21)***	I travel to places that impress others (SOA1)	"Visiting a destination, I can talk about." **(N)**
	"I travel so that I can recall the stories and brag about it" ***(RP6)***	Travel is a story of achievements to be shared with others (SOA2)	"Telling the account of the journey to others." **(N)**
	"I like to travel to places to visit where most people generally have not gone". ***(RP9)***	I travel to a destination that has been hardly visited. (SOA3)	"Going to places my friends have not visited before." **(P)**
	"I prefer to make trips to a destination that is very famous". ***(RP10)***	I travel to places that are very appreciated (SOA4)	"Going on a trip that people appreciate". **(N)**
(Introjected Regulation: Experience Stimulation)	*"I love to visit places with beautiful sites offering new experiences*". ***(RP6)***	I travel to experience sites of natural beauty. (EXP1)	"I was motivated by the beauty of the site". **(P)**
	"Travel makes me enjoy the different climates and weathers" ***(RP25)***	I travel to experience climate in other countries. (EXP2)	"I was motivated by the site environment". **(P)**
	"It is travel that enables me to visit places of historical importance" ***(RP8)***	I travel to visit famous heritage sites of the destination. (EXP3)	"It helped me experience and see new historical sites. **(P)**
(Introjected Regulation: Social Relationships)	*"Travelling makes me experience new things with my family and friends"* ***(RP2)***	I travel with my family/friends to share experiences with them. (SCR1)	"Going to new places with my family and friends". **(P)**
	"Travel enables me to spend more time with family/ friends" ***(RP24)***	I travel to spend time with family/friends. (SCR2)	"Spending time with my relatives/ friends." **(N)**
	"I travel to get along with my family and friends" ***(RP22)***	I travel to mix with my family/ friends. (SCR3)	"Facilitating friend / relative ties." **(P)**
(External regulation: Destination Rewards)	*"I prefer to travel to places that are light on my wallet"* ***(RP11)***	I travel to destinations that are affordable. (DSR1)	**"**Suitable price and quality of goods". (**N)**
	*"I travel to destinations where I can undertake various tourism activities**" (RP13)***	I travel to destinations that provide good sources of entertainment. (DSR2)	"I wanted to have some entertainment." **(P)**
	"I go to places with shopping opportunities" ***(RP18)***	I travel to destinations that provide me with shopping options. (DSR3)	"Shopping centres" **(P)**
	*"I travel to destinations that have best hotels and good cuisines**" (RP14)***	I travel to destinations that provide me with the best hospitality services (DSR4)	"Convenient accommodation and food". **(N)**

	"I visit destinations that are environmentally healthy." ***(RP16)***	I travel to destinations that offer a clean environment. (DSR5)	"The environment was clean". **(P)**
	*"I like to visit destinations that are generally clean**" (RP20)***	I travel to destinations that are clean and hygienic. (DSR6)	"I am interested in hygienic facilities at tour site". **(P)**
	*"Social media posts of my friends help me to plan my trip**" (RP21)***	Social media plays a big role in planning my trip. (SMC1)	"Sources of information used for planning the trip via social media (e.g. TripAdvisor, Expedia, Virtual Tourist etc." **(B)**
(External regulation: Social Media Compulsion)	*"I see my friends posting their travel pics on Instagram and Facebook and that motivates me"* ***(RP9)***	I travel after seeing pictures of my friends on social media (SMC2)	"I travel when I see audiovisual Material (Pictures, Videos, Recommendations) which have been posted by my friends." **(B)**
	"I love to post pictures and videos of my travel on social media" ***(RP7)***	I travel to put my travel pictures on social media (SMC3)	"I make posts of travel material (Photo's, videos, experiences etc.) on my profile in social media when the travel has been concluded." **(B)**
	"I am motivated to travel when I see others travelling, posting it on social media" ***(RP13)***	I compare my travel social media life with my friends' who also like to travel (SMC4)	"I got curious about what other people post when they are travelling, and it motivates me to plan my trip" **(B)**
RP: Respondent			

Table 2: EFA results

Factor (Eigen Value)	% of Variance Explained	Items	Factors 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			Factor Loadings						
Escape (5.47/5.66[d]/5.18[i])	11.79/11.94[d]/11.26[i]	ESC1	.80/.87[d]/.78[i]						
		ESC2	.79/.77[d]/.84[i]						
		ESC3	.74/.81[d]/.71[i]						
		ESC4	.73/.74[d]/.71[i]						
		ESC5	.66/.61[d]/.78[i]						
Social Media Compulsion (3.01/3.11[d]/2.97[i])	8.77/8.92[d]/8.67[i]	SMC1		.82/.85[d]/.79[i]					
		SMC2		.81/.89[d]/.77[i]					
		SMC3		.78/.71[d]/.83[i]					
		SMC4		.78/.77[d]/.76[i]					
Knowledge Seeking (2.22/2.19[d]/2.31[i])	10.06/9.97[d]/10.14[i]	KNL1			.78/.81[d]/.76[i]				
		KNL2			.77/.87[d]/.71[i]				
		KNL3			.75/.77[d]/.72[i]				
		KNL4			.71/.73[d]/.71[i]				
Sense of Accomplishment (1.75/1.74[d]/1.71[i])	9.43/9.55[d]/9.16[i]	SOA1				.78/.86[d]/.71[i]			
		SOA2				.72/.78[d]/.69[i]			
		SOA3				.71/.66[d]/.73[i]			
		SOA4				.65/.74[d]/.65[i]			
Destination Rewards (1.65/1.59[d]/1.66[i])	7.87/7.91[d]/7.64[i]	DSR2					.74/.79[d]/.72[i]		
		DSR3					.71/.71[d]/.72[i]		
		DSR4					.66/.69[d]/.65[i]		
		DSR6					.65/.68[d]/.64[i]		
Experience Stimulation (1.61/1.71[d]/1.59[i])	7.71/7.68[d]/7.82[i]	EXP1						.79/.84[d]/.77[i]	
		EXP2						.78/.79[d]/.71[i]	
		EXP3						.78/.82[d]/.74[i]	
Social Relationships (1.29/1.31[d]/1.27[i])	7.41/7.52[d]/7.08[i]	SCR1							.84/.89[d]/.79[i]
		SCR2							.76/.77[d]/.75[i]
		SCR3							.75/.76[d]/.78[i]

Factors arranged in decreasing order of eigenvalue; [d]Domestic travel; [i]International travel

Table 3: Measurement model

Construct	Code	Loadings	CR	AVE	MSV
Knowledge Seeking	KNL1	.73/.78[d]/.72[i]	.85/.87[d]/.83[i]	.59/.63[d]/.54[i]	.37/.44[d]/.38[i]
	KNL2	.78/.81[d]/.77[i]			
	KNL3	.72/.77[d]/.74[i]			
	KNL4	.77/.82[d]/.71[i]			
Escape	ESC1	.77/.76[d]/.79[i]	.88/.92[d]/.88[i]	.61/.64[d]/.59[i]	.29/.37[d]/.31[i]
	ESC2	.77/.84[d]/.79[i]			
	ESC3	.75/.77[d]/.72[i]			
	ESC4	.77/.76[d]/.79[i]			
	ESC5	.78/.86[d]/.76[i]			
Experience Stimulation	EXP1	.74/.79[d]/.74[i]	.75/.80[d]/.81[i]	.52/.57[d]/.59[i]	.26/.29[d]/.24[i]
	EXP2	.73/.76[d]/.81[i]			
	EXP3	.78/.72[d]/.75[i]			
Sense of Accomplishment	SOA1	.79/.83[d]/.76[i]	.84/.87[d]/.84[i]	.58/.63[d]/.57[i]	.29/.37[d]/.24[i]
	SOA2	.75/.79[d]/.73[i]			
	SOA3	.79/.82[d]/.81[i]			
	SOA4	.70/.72[d]/.71[i]			
Social Relationships	SCR1	.71/.76[d]/.72[i]	.83/.85[d]/.81[i]	.62/.66[d]/.59[i]	.24/.37[d]/.31[i]
	SCR2	.82/.88[d]/.83[i]			
	SCR3	.77/.79[d]/.74[i]			
Destination Rewards	DSR2	.74/.76[d]/.79[i]	.78/.87[d]/.86[i]	.57/.62[d]/60[i]	.32/.29[d]/.38[i]
	DSR3	.74/.71[d]/.72[i]			
	DSR4	.79/.83[d]/.77[i]			
	DSR6	.81/.84[d]/.81[i]			
Social Media Compulsion	SMC1	.77/.79[d]/.71[i]	.87/.85[d]/.83[i]	.63/.57[d]/.55[i]	.27/.29[d]/.33[i]
	SMC2	.71/.76[d]/.72[i]			
	SMC3	.77/.74[d]/.72[i]			
	SMC4	.76/.75[d]/.79[i]			

[d]Domestic travel; [i]International travel

Table 4: Second order loadings

Second-Order Construct	First Order Construct	Code	Second-Order Loading	First-Order Loadings
AUTONOMOUS MOTIVATIONS	Knowledge Seeking	KNL1	.78/.79[d]/.82[i]	.74/.76[d]/.72[i]
		KNL2		.80/.87[d]/.81[i]
		KNL3		.71/.74[d]/.70[i]
		KNL4		.76/.79[d]/.74[i]
	Escape	ESC1	.80/.83[d]/.74[i]	.77/.79[d]/.73[i]
		ESC2		.78/.79[d]/.81[i]
		ESC3		.76/.79[d]/.75[i]
		ESC4		.75/.77[d]/.81[i]
		ESC5		.79/.82[d]/.81[i]
	Sense of Accomplishment	SOA1	.82/.89[d]/.82[i]	.79/.75[d]/.77[i]
		SOA2		.75/.78[d]/.71[i]
		SOA3		.79/.83[d]/.87[i]
		SOA4		.71/.77[d]/.71[i]
CONTROLLED MOTIVATIONS	Social Relationships	SCR1	.78/.79[d]/.81[i]	.79/.78[d]/.76[i]
		SCR2		.84/.89[d]/.84[i]
		SCR3		.76/.79[d]/.78[i]
	Experience Stimulation	EXP1	.71/.70[d]/.76[i]	.72/.75[d]/.71[i]
		EXP2		.75/.74[d]/.72[i]
		EXP3		.78/.81[d]/.79[i]
	Destination Rewards	DSR2	.71/.70[d]/.74[i]	.73/.74[d]/.78[i]
		DSR3		.75/.72[d]/.82[i]
		DSR4		.77/.79[d]/.82[i]
		DSR6		.74/.71[d]/.72[i]
	Social Media Compulsion	SMC1	.79/.79[d]/.82[i]	.76/.76[d]/.74[i]
		SMC2		.72/.76[d]/.74[i]
		SMC3		.78/.73[d]/.88[i]
		SMC4		.76/.73[d]/.80[i]

[d]Domestic travel; [i]International travel

Table 5: Measurement Invariance

Constraint	χ^2	GFI	CFI	IFI	NFI	TLI	RMSEA
FIRST ORDER MODEL							
Unconstrained	514.86	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.05
Measurement weights	558.99	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.05
Structural Covariance	574.17	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.91	0.06
Measurement residuals	597.26	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.91	0.06
SECOND ORDER MODEL							
Unconstrained	612.18	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.06
Measurement weights	634.85	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.91	0.06
Structural Covariance	648.97	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.07
Measurement residuals	665.65	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.07

Figure 1: Structural model