Pull-Extrinsic and Push-Intrinsic Motivations Effect on Destination Image Formation: The Moderate Effect of Tourists’ Experiences
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Abstract: To date, very little attention has been paid to the antecedents of the image of the destination in a non-western context. This study employed the pull-extrinsic and push-intrinsic motivations theory to examine tourists' experiences as a potential moderating factor in the indirect relationship between extrinsic motives associated with the destination on one hand and tourists' intrinsic motives and the destination image on the other. Using Smart PLS and PROCESS macro, the analysis of data obtained from 613 tourists of different nationalities revealed that second-order extrinsic motives associated with the destination directly impact tourists' intrinsic motivations and the destination image. The findings also show that tourists' experiences decrease the direct link between extrinsic motives and the destination image for first-time visitors compared to repeat visitors. In contrast, it increases the direct link between tourists' intrinsic motives and the destination image for repeated visitors compared to first-time visitors. The study's results have important implications for destination marketing managers from a practical standpoint.
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1.Introduction

Image is a significant concept in consumer behaviour and broader buyer behaviour research. Therefore, destination image (DI) is considered a critical factor in tourism research [1]. A good destination image has always been a critical component in effective destination marketing techniques. By sending out good marketing messages and getting good word of mouth [2], marketers can build a positive destination image. Thus, in the tourism literature, modeling DI antecedents such as destination attractions [3], tourist-generated content (TGC) [4], and tourists' intrinsic motives [5], remain popular recently. Although, little work has been done on the main factors influencing the DI in the emerging markets [3,4].
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Likewise, some prior studies have used motivation theory to explain how a DI is formed [6,7]. Furthermore, Madden [7] suggested a conceptual framework for DI formation that relied on a literature review to develop a motivation theory. And they proposed that this theory must incorporate the effects of social media and perceived security and safety (PSAS) in the construction of DI. Recently, social media has become the tourism industry's most popular communication medium, significantly impacting people's lives [8]; tourist-generated content based on social media has also been crucial to tourism [9]. Travelers can post photos, videos, and interactive trip content on social media [10]. Indeed, tourist-generated content is more pleasant, reliable, and trustworthy than marketers' opinions [11]. Moreover, tourist safety is more important than ever because unsafe conditions can damage a destination's image; Thus, safety and security determine a destination's appeal [12]. So, our research fills this gap.

Tourists' intrinsic motives (TIM) analysis improves DI and tourist selection [13]. Thus, in an increasingly competitive industry, marketing destination success should be driven by a thorough understanding of TIM and its link with destination perceptions, tourist happiness, and loyalty [6]. TIM is critical in DI models [14]; but, TIM's effect on DI is inconsistent. For example, Kartini [15] found that TIM does not improve DI, while Su [16] found that it does. Our study addresses this gap.

In brief, the current research on DI antecedents can be divided into four sections. The initial authors [17] theorize destination attractions as DI predictors, but their structure excludes TIM, TGC, and PSAS. The second group [18] theorizes the causal link between TIM and DI; while ignoring destination attractions, TGC, and PSAS in their structure. The third group [8] theorizes the link among TGC and DI. However, their framework disregards TIM, destination attractions, and PSAS. The fourth group [3] theorizes the link of destination attractions, political stability, and DI. However, their structure disregards TIM, and TGC.

Tourists' experiences can be behavioural, perceptual, cognitive, emotional, expressed, or implied [19]. The DI changes as tourists interact with destination offers [20]. A bad trip can ruin DI, or a visit can improve a destination's negative or neutral image [2]. Thus, assessing the DI requires distinguishing between first-time and repeat visitors. Frequent visitors may feel closer to a place and may be impressed and return [21]. Thus, prior studies found a gap in current DI formation research by ignoring visitors' experiences as moderators in the link between extrinsic motives (EM), TIM, and DI [22]. Egyptian context is the center of our research because it has the most diverse economy and the largest tourism industry in Africa [23]. Egypt is great for adventure, sailing, health, and heritage because of its rich history and unique geography [24]. Tourism contributed USD 13 billion in direct income, 20% of GDP, 10.9% of total employment, and 2% of global tourism to Egypt [24]. Egypt has a composite image; thus, tourists love Egypt's cheap attractions. Transportation, and recreation [23].

Overall, our research investigates the DI's antecedents and constructs a framework that includes second-order extrinsic motives (EM) includes five factors (cultural and natural attractions (CANA); local attractions (LA); value for money (VFM); PSAS; and TGC); TIM; and DI, when tourists' experiences as moderators in one integrated model.
2. Literature review and developing hypotheses

This study uses the push and pull theory and extrinsic and intrinsic theories to form destination images. According to researchers in various fields, extrinsic and intrinsic factors determine DI formation [25,26]. Push factors are intrinsic motives (mainly socio-psychological motives) that drive visitors' desires and needs, such as escape, leisure, status, stress relief, trying new things, social contact, adventure, and knowledge. These reasons can help destination managers attract more tourists [27]. Pull-extrinsic motives include climate, natural, historical, and cultural attractions; lodging; entertainment; political conditions; and costs [25]; these can boost TIM [27]. In contrast, [28] claimed that the destination environment and attractions influence the DI's creation and evolution. DI is also affected by amenities, infrastructure, ease of access, services, and safety [17]. DI also comes from visitors' assessments of the destination's appeal and political stability [3]. Digital technology is critical in tourism. Thus, social media must constantly promote the destination [9]. Tourists can post their travel experiences on social media, creating DI via TGC [10]. Thus, we will study second-order EM, including CANA and LA, VFM, PSAS, and TGC. Based on previous research, we propose this hypothesis:

H1. EM associated with the destination positively impact on the DI.

Most organizational behavior research has focused on the interrelationship among EM and TIM [29]. Social and environmental influences can either positively or negatively affect TIM when forced to reveal feelings [30]. Furthermore, [29] indicated that EM develops TIM. Moreover, EM may not necessarily weaken TIM [31]. Undoubtedly, [32] discovered no substantial negative link among EM and TIM. Based on studies, we hypothesize:

H2. EM associated with the destination has a positive impact on TIM.

Tourists' intrinsic motives in tourism is critical and must be considered while marketing a destination [16]. Likewise, Beerli [33] demonstrated that TIM positively influences DI. Earlier studies [34] corroborated that the value of the image people associate with destinations is based on TIM. In contrast, Prameswari [8] showed that TIM directly impacts the cognitive image. Beerli [5] showed that escape and intellectual motives positively affects the DI. Based on studies, we hypothesize:

H3. TIM has a positive impact on DI.

H4. TIM significantly mediates the impact of EM on the DI.

Tourists' experiences influence future decision-making and is a factor driving image alteration [35]; for instance, researchers indicated that the images held by repeat and first-time travelers were considerably different. Moreover, Someone who has been to a place before doesn't need as much secondary information because the basic information is more reliable [33]. Thus, prior knowledge is a crucial source of data when choosing a destination [19]. Furthermore, [7] and [19] recommended examining the moderation influence of tourists' experiences on the link of both EM, TIM, and DI. Based on studies, we hypothesize:

H5a. Tourists' experiences significantly moderate the impact of EM on the DI.

H5b. Tourists' experiences significantly moderate the impact of TIM on the DI.

3. Methodology

The study population includes tourists above the age of 18. Surveys were sent to foreign visitors in different areas of Egypt from Sept. to Dec 2021; a self-administered survey
and convenience sample approach was used. A total of 665 respondents were contacted in various Egyptian tourist places, including Cairo, Giza, and Alexandria, with 52 surveys considered unsuitable. Thus, 613 replies were judged eligible for further analysis. The study sample size was adequate for structural equation modelling. The survey had four parts: gender, nationality, duration of stay, and tourists' experiences. These were examined in the first part. The second segment examined second-order EM, using five scale-tested components; CANA measured by seven items developed from [3,23]. PSAS was measured by adapting nine items from [36]. LA was measured by five items from [3] and four items adapted from [23] to measure VFM. Moreover, TGC was assessed by nine items from [37]. The third section measured TIM by adapting seven items from [38]. The fourth section measured DI by eight items [3], and using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

4. The study's findings

In this work, Harman's single factor examined (CMB). 37.07% of the variation came from the greater factor. No general component explains over 50% of the variation. The inquiry found that CMB was unimportant. We used disjointed two-stage reflective-formative higher-order EM according to [39]'s recommendation. First, using Smart PLS’s data imputation function, the first-order structures' scores (CANA, LA, PSAS, TGC, and VFM) were estimated to analyze the link among EM and DI via TIM. In the second step, we used these scores as signs of second-order EM in our structural framework.

As shown in Table 1, the study's components were psychometrically tested using alpha and items-to-total correlation [40]. This technique eliminates one PSAS scale item, which affects internal reliability; all measurement items have appropriate reliability and composite reliability (CR), indicating high internal consistency [40].

Moreover, Hair [40] says that the measuring framework's internal consistency must be sufficient for evaluation. All measurement items had construct loads of over 0.70 and significantly affected the variables they were supposed to affect (p 0.001). And each element's AVE exceeded 0.50, indicating convergent validity. As shown in Table 2, the measurement model did not suffer from multiple collinearity issues because the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each indicator element was less than 5. The Fornell-Larker criterion revealed no correlation with any other concept greater than its AVE value, indicating discriminatory validity. The outer weights, loadings, and VIF; indicate the HOC (EM) was valid because all conditions were met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items no</th>
<th>alpha</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Fornell and Larcker Criteria and Validating Second Order EM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>CANA</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>LA</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>PSAS</th>
<th>TGC</th>
<th>VFM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CANA</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAS</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGC</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFM</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Weights</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Statistics</td>
<td>7.504</td>
<td>5.604</td>
<td>8.567</td>
<td>5.800</td>
<td>6.958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Loadings</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>1.648</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The diagonals show AVE, and the bottom cells reflect the squared correlations among the variables.

### 4.1 Structural Model

The second step was to test the structural model and its five hypotheses. Our framework assigns 54.1% to TIM and 64.4% to DI, indicating a stronger predictive capacity. GOF = .630 > 0.36, APC = (.530, p.001), AVIF = 2.311, AR^2 = (.592, p.001) and AR^2 adjusted = (.591, p.001), show that the global fit of our model was good.

#### Table 3. Standardized coefficient and Direct, Indirect, and Total Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Variable</th>
<th>Predictor variables</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>Adj R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.57****</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.28****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.74****</td>
<td>0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship directions:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIM</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P < .01**

The results of our four model hypothesize testing are shown in Fig.1. And Table 3 shows the coefficients of the estimated path for each factor and the link among EM → TIM (β = .74, T = 26.13, P = 0.00) and EM → DI (β = .57, T = 13.11, P = 0.00) and TIM → DI (β = .28, T = 5.91, P = 0.00). Therefore, H1, H2, and H3 were supported and significant. EM’s causal effects on DI could have been indirect or direct (i.e., mediating by the influence of TIM (β = .21, T = 5.53, P = 0.00). H4 is thus accepted. The authors used Model.15 and Hayes’ PROCESS MACRO to test the fifth hypothesis (H5a and H5b) (5000 Bootstrapping). The findings show that tourists’ experiences moderate the link between EM and DI (β = -0.08, T = -2.69, 95%CI LL = -1.14; UL = -0.02). Furthermore, moderate the link between TIM and DI (β = .25, T = 2.64, 95%CI LL = 0.06; UL = .44). As a result, H5a and H5b are supported. (See Table 4 for details).
Table 4. Moderated-mediation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>LL</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EM*Experience)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TIM*Experience)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect conditional impact of EM on DI through TIM

Tourist Experience (−1 SD) 0.06 0.01 0.04 0.09
Tourist Experience (+1 SD) 0.12 0.02 0.08 0.16
Moderated Mediation Index 0.06 0.03 0.01 0.10

5. Discussion and Conclusions

This study examines the relationships between a second-order EM and both TIM and DI in an emerging destination like Egypt to help tourist companies and governments improve their DI and tourism success. It also seeks to understand how tourist experiences moderate the effects of EM and TIM on DI. According to the results, our integrated model predicts DI (n = 613) well. In the current study, second-order EM formed from five dimensions based on their relative importance: PSAS (36.7%), CANA (29.2%), VFM (26.9%), TGC (21.6%), and LA (21.2%). The study’s results show EM improved DI. These findings supported motivation theory [7,25,26], which states that destination-related EM directly affects DI. EM also positively affects TIM. The findings supported the literature [29,41]. This result is logical because exciting and attractive external factors will affect TIM when choosing a vacation destination, especially if the EM is consistent with TIM when visiting a destination. TIM directly and significantly affected DI. These results matched [16,18]; but differed from [15], who found no effect of TIM on DI. Because Egypt is known for culture, history, and recreation, most tourists come for entertainment, knowledge, and adventure. Thus, Egypt is preferred by tourists. Finally, tourists’ experiences as moderators reduce EM’s effect on DI for first-time compared to repeat visitors. First-time visitors know less about the destination, which affects their DI perception. Repeat visitors’ moderator experiences boost TIM’s effect on DI. Compared to first-time visitors, repeat tourists’ DI will be affected because they will be more aware of the destination’s qualities and how well they match their intrinsic motives for visiting. Researchers [16,19] suggested studying tourists’ experiences as moderators between EM, TIM, and DI. These findings support that.

Our research advances the theoretical understanding of EM, TIM, and DI. Thus, our research's main theoretical contribution is to understand better the mechanisms of the influence of a second-order EM and TIM on DI considering tourists' experiences as a moderator variable in one integrated framework in an emerging market. This study is the first to examine the link between EM and TIM in tourism research. Thus, this study expands the current literature [29,31]. Finally, our third contribution is to analyze visitors' experiences as moderators on the link among EM, TIM, and DI. Practically, EM affected DI; thus, the Egyptian Ministry of Tourism and tourism agencies can promote their DI by emphasizing its strengths, such as low service prices and unique cultural and...
natural attractions, and improving its weaknesses, such as security and safety, by deploying police in tourist areas. Second, encouraging visitors to post positive reviews about the destination on social media attracts new visitors. And advertising Egypt is a good-value tourist destination (e.g., housing prices, food, and tourist sites). Third, the study found that TIM directly affects DI, and most foreign tourists visit Egypt for recreation, knowledge, and adventure. Thus, Egyptian tourism marketers must categorize tourists by purpose and design programs accordingly. Tourism marketers must focus on TIM and DI-related destination characteristics. Finally, destination marketers may use different strategies for first-time and repeat visitors because new visitor marketing may not affect returning visitors. Destination managers can promote EM and TIM benefits in repeat visitor programs. This article expands knowledge, but its limitations suggest further research. First, this study examined tourist experiences so future studies can use emotional solidarity with locals as moderators in our model; it's rare to analyze DI without residents. Tourists choose a destination based on their ability to interact with locals and learn about their customs, and culture. Second, our research examines the DI's antecedents, so future studies can examine its effects, such as tourist citizenship.
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