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Abstract

The current study investigates psychosocial development and basic need satisfaction of travellers and non-travellers. One hundred and sixty-seven participants were recruited through the University of Regina Psychology Department Participation Pool and through online snowball sampling. Participants completed questionnaires measuring travel preference, identity and intimacy development, and basic need satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Different types of travellers (and non-travellers) were predicted to vary in identity and intimacy development as well as basic need satisfaction. Additionally, the Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM) was developed and administered to explore topophilic and tropophilic traits of travellers associated with travel preferences. A cluster analysis of ITR scores grouped all participants \( n = 167 \) into four distinct travel types. Differences between clusters were found on intimacy, autonomy, and relatedness, although no differences were found on identity and competence. There are psychosocial development and psychological need differences between certain tourist roles as anticipated. Implications of psychological needs as motivators for travel preferences are discussed.
Psychosocial Development and Basic Need Satisfaction of Travellers and Non- Travellers

You have an average of 27,375 days of experience, over 510 million km² of room to roam, and over one billion travellers with whom to share a love of travel. The number of travellers has increased substantially since the 19th century (E. Cohen, 1972). This increase is likely due to historical shifts in the acceptance of and purposes for travel, increased affluence, and more efficient means of travel. Consequently, a modern cultural phenomenon of travel and lifestyle travelling has emerged, particularly in the form of gap year participation. Current research on tourism and travelling explores the defining characteristics of travellers, and the relationship between travel and identity development. However, little empirical research quantitatively explores psychosocial development and psychological needs of travellers compared to their more home-bodied colleagues.

History of Travel

**Working-Mans’ Grand Tour.** Historically, travel was based on survival needs and economic expansion. With little knowledge of foreign societies, cultures, and geographical conditions outside of their homelands, traveling was rightly viewed as threatening and fearful (E. Cohen, 1972). Travel shifted in the 17th and 18th centuries with European exploration and the *Grand Tour* (Adler, 1985; O’Reilly, 2005; White & White, 2004) wherein aristocratic elites sought the rehabilitative travel experiences of “sight-seeing, adventure, and education” (Alder, 1985, as cited in White & White, 2004, p. 200). The so-called *Working Man’s Grand Tour* offered working-class young men an economic advantage in the workforce and the opportunity for skill development with the inevitable elements of tourism.

**Tramping.** The act of these young men to travel was known then as *tramping* and was the forerunner to what we today call *backpacking*. Later characterizations of these young men as
unskilled and disorganized migrant workers led to a functional decline in the number of trampers in the early 20th century. The meaning of travel and *tramping* changed as there was another conceptual shift in the views of travel from work-oriented travel to a “romanticized recreational vision of modern tourism” (White & White, 2004, p. 201). As it is now referred today, backpacking is the most popular way in which independent travelling, drifting, exploring, and lifestyle travelling takes its form (S.A. Cohen, 2010).

Traditional relationships between people and place has been redefined as a result of the evolving aspects of travel, from a “force of extreme circumstances” (E. Cohen, 1972, p. 165), to an instrumental means of work (Adler, 2004), to a position of willful and sought-after travel “associated with ideals of youthful freedom, personal development, and fulfillment” (O’ Reilly, 2005, p. 150). The relationship between person and place has undergone significant transformation and reexamination due to the effects that mobility has on the traveler’s identity (Anderson & Erskine, 2004).

**Interaction between Person and Place.** Anderson and Erskine (2014) coined the term *tropophilia* as a counter-point to the traditional relationship between person and place termed *topophilia*. *Topophilia*, the love of place, is the affective bond between person and place; a static and stable sense of belonging, typical of homebodies, developed through a consistent and familiar culture. *Tropophilia*, love of change, on the other hand, is a “love of mobility, change and transformation in the person-place relation” (Anderson & Erskine, 2014, p. 130). Tropophilia is an intrinsic need to be stimulated by environmental change through experiencing foreign cultures and is strongest among high novelty seeking travellers.
International Tourism

Past studies have explored leisure travel styles by the length of time spent travelling and the number of returns (S.A. Cohen, 2011), the use or disuse of commercialized travel commodities (e.g., travel agencies; E. Cohen, 1972), flexibility of itineraries (Hyde & Lawson, 2003), and geographical destination (Godfrey, 2010; O'Reilly, 2005). E. Cohen (1972) proposed a widely cited theory of international tourism based on familiarity-novelty behavioural characteristics that provided a typology of four kinds of travellers: the organized mass tourist, the individual mass tourist, the explorer, and the drifter.

The organized mass tourist is characterized by purchasing a fixed itinerary and accommodation packages. The individual mass tourist has greater leniency in the trip itinerary, but the itinerary is still booked through commercial providers. By contrast, the explorer plans her trip without the assistance of the tourist industry. Her focus is on non-tourist locations and unarranged activities with the exception of “comfortable accommodations and reliable means of transportation” (E. Cohen, 1972, p. 168). E. Cohen (1972) characterized the drifter, which S. A. Cohen (2011) later titled the lifestyle traveller, as furthest from having any contact with commercial tourism, with full submersion into the host culture typically in the form of backpacking.

International Tourism Role

E. Cohen’s (1972) typologies were critiqued by Mo, Howards, and Havitz (1993), who found the original four proposed traveller types overlapped and “were too simplistic because they were based on a one-dimensional concept of novelty” (Mo, Havitz, & Howard, 1994, p. 24). Mo et al. (1993) explored E. Cohen’s typologies, and produced the International Tourist (ITR) scale, later revised and validated by Jiang, Havitz, and O’Brian (2000). The twenty-item scale
focuses on three travel dimensions: The *Destination-Oriented Dimension* (DOD), the *Travel Services Dimension* (TSD), and the *Social Contact Dimension* (SCD).

Through cluster analysis Mo et al. (1994) derived a four-cluster solution, with each cluster differing on high and low values of the three dimensions based on travel preference. The newly proposed traveller typologies evaluate each of the three dimensions of DOD, TSD, and SCD on a novelty-familiarity continuum. *High Novelty Seekers* (HNS) are high in novelty (and low in familiarity) on all three dimensions. *High Familiarity Seekers* (HFS) are high in familiarity (and low in novelty) on all three dimensions. *Destination Novelty Seekers* (DNS) are high in familiarity (and low in novelty) on the TSD and the SCD, but low in familiarity (and high in novelty) on the DOD. Finally, the *Social Contact Seekers* (SCS) are high in familiarity (and low in novelty) on the DOD, but low in familiarity (and high in novelty) on the TSD and SCD.

Additionally, Mo et al. (1994) argue the ITR is inclusive of all travellers, including non-travellers, because it measures travel preference over behavioural characteristics. However, this categorization may not capture the experiential preferences of travellers because it fails to account for those who do not travel and their lack of experience with travelling. Thus, I propose two additional typologies of non-travellers: the *topophilic non-traveller* (TONT) and the *tropophilic non-traveller* (TRNT). The TONT has little to no independent travel experience and does not have a longing for travel. The TONT prefers to spend breaks and vacations at home.

**Psychosocial Development**

The motivations of travellers have been linked to concerns with identity and intimacy. Travelling for the purpose of self-discovery and development, commonly known as *finding oneself*, is addressed in a number of travel publications (Anderson & Erskine, 2014; S.A. Cohen, 2010, S.A. Cohen, 2011; Godfrey, 2011; Hirschorn & Heffron, 2013; O’Reilly, 2005; Riley,
1988; White & White, 2004). Although the purpose of leisure travel may not be self-discovery and relationship development, there are unavoidable components of travel that contribute to personality development in the face of new challenges, new environments, and new social interactions. Erikson’s (1994) psychosocial stage theory proposes eight intertwined stages of personality crises. Integration of each stage allows for individuals to move to the next stage, and “these crises can be resolved in ways that either promote or hinder optimal development” (Faye & Sharpe, 2008, p. 190). For the purpose of this study, we focus primarily on the psychosocial stage most associated with the beginning of independent leisure travel pursuits, that stage between adolescence and young adulthood, emerging adulthood.

According to Erikson (1994), the developmental stage associated with adolescence is ego identity versus role confusion. Montgomery (2005) described Erikson’s conceptualization of successful identity integration “as a self-constructed dynamic organization of drives, abilities, beliefs, and personal history into a coherent and autonomous self that guides the unfolding of one's adult life course” (p. 347). A developed sense of identity or knowing oneself, identity achievement, is attributed to greater well-being.

Alternative forms of identity resolution can occur that may hinder identity development. Identity development at a young age may lead to quick and temporary over-identification with idealized roles in order for adolescents to keep themselves together (Erikson, 1968) or identity foreclosure (see Marcia, 1966). Alternatively, adolescents may experience identity diffusion when the individual has little interest in pursuing identity achievement. Others may take advantage of adolescent freedom by choosing a time out from pursuing identity resolution, also known as an identity moratorium. The failure to resolve this stage, the failure to answer the questions of who am I? and who do I want to be?, may lead to a state of role confusion.
Intimacy may be a medium to integrate and organize a sense of self. The stage following the identity crisis, the *intimacy crisis*, falls during young adulthood; pursuing and developing close and supportive relationships with caregivers, friends, and eventually long-term partners would provide successful resolution to this crisis. Failing to resolve this crisis through intimacy avoidance or environmental obstacles may result in the negative outcomes of isolation, loneliness, and fear of commitment.

Arnett (2000) argued for an extension of the transition from adolescence to young adulthood, *emerging adulthood*, characterized by “greater exploration of possible life directions” (p. 469). Those individuals in emerging adulthood are no longer considered adolescents by society but do not yet self-identify as adults. Arnett suggests emerging adulthood is a function of socioeconomic and demographic changes in Western society that permit an extended adolescence into the mid- to late-twenties.

The extension and time of emerging adulthood coincides with increased extended travel pursuits, both being the products of shifting globalization. As a result, gap year participation for the purpose of a break, and postponing career and education paths, is on the rise through structured (e.g., *voluntourism*) or unstructured activities (e.g., leisure travel). Gap year participation allows for skill and motivation development, leading to more positive outcomes in post-secondary success in terms of academic motivation and performance (Martin, 2010).

That being said, travel may provide different or unique developmental tools for identity and intimacy. Subject to travellers’ preferences, travellers are inevitably exposed to a number of new social interactions, independent decision making in the face of travel challenges, and contact with new cultural environments. As a result of the novel factors of environmental change, it is
important to examine the development of travellers’ basic psychological needs that are either supported or thwarted by their changing environment.

**Basic Need Satisfaction**

Self-Determinism Theory (SDT) is a widely used theoretical approach to the study of human motivation and well-being on a social-contextual plane via basic need satisfaction. Motivation is the drive behind self-regulation and is a fundamental function of social and cognitive development and, in turn, psychological well-being. Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET), Ryan and Deci’s (2000) sub-theory within SDT, focused on the development of basic needs through supportive or non-supportive environmental factors. The basic needs in CET are autonomy, competency, and relatedness.

*Autonomy* refers to an individual’s need to feel that they have a personal choice in their actions, decisions, and experiences. In other words, autonomy is an internal sense of control. *Competence* refers to an individual’s capacity and their need to be optimally challenged as it “fuels persistence, sustained effort and attention, and the determination to improve” (Legault, 2017, p. 1), promoting self-efficacy and effectiveness. *Relatedness* refers to the need for healthy, secure, deep, and connected relationships with others.

Independent leisure travellers, especially those high in tropophilia, may have greater satisfaction of their basic needs through travel. Autonomy satisfaction could be greater met by the frequent independent decision making of destination, accommodation, transportation, and activity planning. Competence satisfaction could be greater met by the frequent adaptations to cultural differences and travel difficulties that optimally challenge the traveller. Relatedness satisfaction could be greater met through the social interactions and forming of relationships with
locals, as well as through the forms of transportation and accommodation that present greater chances for social interaction (e.g., hostels, airports).

Faye and Sharpe (2008) comparatively examined Erickson's psychosocial stage theory to Ryan and Deci's (2000) SDT in a university student population; Faye and Sharpe (2008) found that identity predicted autonomy and competence satisfaction, and that intimacy predicted relatedness satisfaction. Identity and intimacy development are associated with basic need satisfaction and, as travel is commonly linked to identity and intimacy exploration and development, exploring the basic need satisfaction of travellers may provide insight into the identity and intimacy development of travellers as a product of varying travel styles.

**Present Study**

The present study seeks to examine the relationship between categories of travellers (High Familiarity Seekers or HFS, Destination Novelty Seekers or DNS, Social Contact Seekers or SCS, and High Novelty Seekers or HNS) and non-travellers (topophilic non-traveller or TONT and tropophilic non-traveller or TRNT) in identity and intimacy achievement, and basic need satisfaction (autonomy, competence, and relatedness).

**Hypotheses.** Firstly, it was hypothesized that the categories of travellers would differ in identity and intimacy development. Specifically, those higher in travel novelty preference (HNS) or tropophilia and those who are higher in travel familiarity preference (HFS) or topophilia would present more advanced identity and intimacy development because of their certainty in their environmental preferences and satisfaction. Secondly, it was hypothesized that categories of travellers would vary in satisfaction of basic needs. Specifically, those higher in novelty seeking (HNS) and those higher in familiarity seeking (HFS) in their travel preferences would be more advanced in their psychosocial development and satisfaction of their basic needs.
Methods

Participants

After obtaining ethics approval, approximately 167 participants were recruited from the Department of Psychology Participant Pool at the University of Regina as well as through online snowball sampling (e.g., Facebook); the majority of participants were recruited through snowball sampling. Adults 18 years and older with no upper age limit were recruited irrespective of demographics. A power analysis revealed 164 participants were required in order to have 80% power to detect a medium sized effect with alpha set at the traditional 0.05.

Materials

*International Tourist Role (ITR)*. The International Tourist Role (ITR; Appendix A) was developed by Mo et al. (1993) and was used to assess traveller typologies on a familiarity-novelty continuum. The ITR consists of 20 items responded to on a seven-point Likert scale from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. The ITR assesses three travel dimensions. The *Destination-Orientation Dimension* (DOD) consists of nine items that measure familiarity-novelty preference in the destination, with a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$). The *Travel Service Dimension* (TSD) consists of five items that measure familiarity-novelty in the use-extent of tourist service providers, with an acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .79$). The *Social Contact Dimension* (SCD) consists of six items that measure familiarity-novelty preference for social engagement, with an acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .75$). Example items include “I put high priority on familiarity when thinking of destinations” for the DOD, “I prefer not to stay in international hotel chains when travelling in a foreign country” for the TSD, and “I prefer to make friends with the local people when travelling in a foreign country” for the SCD.
Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM). The Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM; Appendix B) was developed for the present study to examine topophilic non-travellers (TONT), with an acceptable internal consistency (α = .79) and tropophilic non-travellers (TRNT), with an acceptable internal consistency (α = .76). A total of nine items from two subscales are responded to in a 7-point Likert Scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The topophilic non-traveller subscale consists of 4 items and the tropophilic non-traveller subscale consists of 5 items. Sample items include “I prefer to stay at home on holidays and vacations” for TONT, and “I feel a strong sense of longing for travel and change” for TRNT.

Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory (EPSI). The Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory (EPSI; Appendix C) was developed by Rosenthal, Gurney, and Moore (1981), to examine six of Erikson’s psychosocial stages. Items from two of the six subscales are responded to on a 5-point Likert scale from “hardly ever true” to “almost always true”. The identity and intimacy subscales consist of 12 items; half represent healthy resolution. Sample items include “I know what kind of person I am” for identity, and “I care deeply for others” for intimacy. Identity had a high internal consistency (α = .84), and intimacy had an acceptable internal consistency (α = .75).

Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction (BPNS). The revised Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction Scale (Gagné, 2003; Ryan & Deci, 2000; Appendix D) was used to assess basic need satisfaction. The scale consists of 21 items responded to on a seven-point Likert scale from not at all true to very true. The three subscales consist of seven items to measure autonomy (e.g., “I feel like I am free to decide for myself how to live my life”) which had acceptable internal consistency.
A few items were missing from ITR, EPSI, and BNS and not administered during data collection (see Appendix E).

**Demographics Questionnaire.** Participants were asked about their age, gender, time spent travelling, current job (e.g., student, self-employed, employed for wages, military, unable to work, retired), marital status, personal annual income, level of education, as well as a descriptive self-selected travel role identification, for which participants chose what type of traveller role identify they identified most strongly.

**Procedure**

Upon expressing interest in the present study, participants were redirected to a Qualtrics survey web page. Participants were guided through the purpose of the study, the time requirement, Research Ethics approval (see Appendix F), any concerns related to the study, as well as the incentive to participate --- either the opportunity to be entered to win $75 or to receive a one-percent credit toward a first or second level psychology class through the University of Regina’s participant pool. Participants were informed that by participating, consent was implied. Participants were informed they were free to drop out of the study at any time without penalty. The participants were then asked to complete the demographics measure, the ITR (see Appendix A), the NTTM (see Appendix B), the EPSI (see Appendix C), and the BNS (see Appendix D). Upon completion of the study, each participant was thanked for their time and participation, and were directed to a debriefing form (see Appendix G).

**Analyses**

All analyses were conducted using SPSS. Prior to analysis, respondents’ data were examined for missing values, normality, and outliers. Only those respondents who completed 85% or more of items were included; missing data were substituted for by mean scores.
Demographic values were tabulated. Bivariate correlations were calculated to identify relationships between measures. In order to generate psychosocial development and basic need satisfaction profiles of traveller categories, a principle factor analysis (PFA) was conducted on the 20 item ITR scale because factors are more easily interpreted than a large number of variables (Mo et al., 1994).

A hierarchical cluster analysis was then conducted on the resulting factors using a furthest neighbour cluster method based on squared Euclidean distance intervals. Four clusters emerged. Although the clusters could be identified based on high or low combinations of the averages, an additional discriminant function analysis (DFA) was performed that breaks each cluster down into more details of the determining functions or predictive dimensions of the clusters. The four clusters (High Familiarity Seekers, Destination Novelty Seekers, Social Contact Seekers, and High Novelty Seekers) were examined via univariate ANOVAs to determine if the clusters differed in responses to the EPSI (identity and intimacy), the BNS (autonomy, competence and relatedness), and demographics. Statistical significance was set at alpha = 0.05.

**Demographics**

The largest age group of participants fell between 22-25 years of age (27.5%). Over half of the participants fell into the age range associated with the psychosocial stage of emerging adulthood 18 to 29 years of age (55.1%). Of those older than emerging adulthood, 18.6% fell into early adulthood, 10.2% fell into middle adulthood, and 16.2% fell into late adulthood. There were twice as many females (67%) as there were males (33%). Most participants were Caucasian (84.4%). Over one-third of the participants were single (33.5%), nearly one-third were married (29.3%), and 25.1% reported being in a non-marital relationship.
Annual income was highly variable; one-third reported an annual income of less than $20,000 (27.5%), and another third reported an annual income between $50,000 and $79,000 (29.9%). Almost half of participants reported being employed for wages (49.7%), with a little over a quarter of the participants reporting being students (25.1%). Most participants had an undergraduate degree or college diploma (59.9%). The average number of months reported travelling within the past 24 months was 3.7 months ($SD = 4.66$), where 12% of participants experienced no independent travel experience, 50.9% experienced one to three months of travel experience, 29.1% experienced four to ten months of travel, and 5.5% experienced eleven to twenty-four months of travel. Lastly, over one-third of participants self-identified as a social contact seeker (32.3%), 21.6% self-identified as a high novelty seeker, and 21.6% self-identified as a tropophilic non-traveller.

**Correlations Between Measures**

Correlations between measures are reported in Table 1. Higher scores on the Travel Service Dimension indicate preference against the use of commercial travel services. The travel service dimension of the ITR was associated negatively with the social contact dimension of the ITR, $r (165) = -.381, p < .01$, tropophilic non-traveller subscale of the NTTM, $r (165) = -.188, p < .001$, identity subscale of the ESPI, $r (165) = -.205, p < .01$, intimacy subscale of the ESPI, $r (165) = -.192, p < .01$, and BNS subscales of autonomy, $r (165) = -.236, p < .002$, competence, $r (165) = -.243, p < .002$, and relatedness, $r (165) = -.209, p < .007$. Together these correlations
Table 1

Correlations between measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>TSD</th>
<th>DOD</th>
<th>SCD</th>
<th>TONT</th>
<th>TRNT</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>AUTO</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>RELA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>-.381**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONT</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.487**</td>
<td>-.353**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRNT</td>
<td>-.188*</td>
<td>-.324**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td>-.522**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>-.205**</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.158*</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>-.192*</td>
<td>-.260**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO</td>
<td>-.236**</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.584**</td>
<td>.424**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>-.243**</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>-.206**</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.621**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.643**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELA</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.247**</td>
<td>.351**</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TSD = Travel Service Dimension, DOD = Destination Orientation Dimension, SCD = Social Contact Dimension, TONT = Topophilic Non- Traveller, TRNT = Tropophilic Non- Traveller, ID = Identity, INT = Intimacy, AUTO = Autonomy, COMP = Competence, RELA = Relatedness.

*p < 0.05, **p < .01
suggest that as the preference for the use of travel services increases, preference for social engagement with locals of the host culture decreases, tropophilic traits decrease, identity and intimacy development increase; and basic need satisfaction increase. Furthermore, the travel service dimension of the ITR is positive associated with the Destination Orientation Dimension of the ITR, $r (165) = .508, p < .01$, and the Topophilic Non-Traveler of the NTNM, $r (165) = .395, p < .05$. These associations suggest that travelers who prefer to rely on commercial travel services seek destinations similar to their own and possess a strong sense of place at home.

Higher scores on the Destination Orientation Dimension indicate a preference against destinations that are similar to the travelers’ home. This dimension is negatively associated with the Social Contact Dimension of the ITR, $r (165) = -.525, p < .01$, the Tropophilic Non-Traveler subscale of the NTNM, $r (165) = -.324, p < .01$, and the intimacy of the EPSI, $r (165) = -.26, p < .001$, and the Basic Need subscales of autonomy, $r (165) = -.223, p < .004$, and relatedness, $r (165) = -.237, p < .001$. These associations suggest that as preference for destinations that are similar to their own country increases, participants’ preferences for social engagement with the local decreases, tropophilic traits decrease, identity and intimacy development increase, autonomy increase, and relatedness increase. Furthermore, the Destination Orientation Dimension was positively correlated with Topophilic Non-Traveler subscale of the NTNM, $r (165) = .487, p < .05$, indicating that as preference for novel destinations increases, topophilic traits also increase.

Higher scores on the Social Contact Dimension indicate a preference for social engagement with the locals of the host culture. This dimension is positively associated with the Topophilic Non-Traveler subscale of the NTNM, $r (165) = .356, p < .05$, the identity subscale of the EPSI, $r (165) = .158, p < .05$, the intimacy subscale of the EPSI, $r (165) = .385, p < .05$, and
the BNS subscales of autonomy, \( r (165) = .219, p < .05 \), competence, \( r (165) = .171, p < .05 \), and relatedness, \( r (165) = .351, p < .05 \). These associations suggest that as a preference for social engagement increases, tropophilic traits increase, identity and intimacy development decrease, and basic need satisfaction decrease. Furthermore, the Social Contact Dimension of the ITR was negatively correlated with Topophilic Non-Traveler subscale of the NTM, \( r (165) = -.353, p < .05 \), implying that as preference for social contact increases, tropophilic traits decrease.

As expected, there was a relationship found between identity and intimacy scores, indicating that as intimacy increased, identity also increased, \( r (165) = .534, p < .005 \). Consistent with Faye and Sharpe’s (2008) findings, identity was positively correlated with autonomy, competence, and relatedness, \( r (165) = .584, r (165) = .621, r (165) = .485 \), all \( p < .001 \), respectively. These correlations lead one to conclude that as identity increases, autonomy, competence, and relatedness also increase. Intimacy also positively correlated with autonomy, competence, and relatedness, \( r (165) = .424, r (165) = .454, r (165) = .720 \), all \( p < .001 \), respectively, meaning that as intimacy scores increase, autonomy, competence, and relatedness also increase.

Consistent with Ryan and Deci’s (2000) findings, autonomy was positively correlated with competence and relatedness \( r (165) = .643, r (165) = .433 \), all \( p < .001 \), respectively, and competence and relatedness were also positively correlated, \( r (165) = .518, p < .001 \).

**Cluster Analysis**

A complete linkage, furthest neighbour hierarchical cluster analysis based on Squared Euclidean distances on the factor analyzed ITR scores produced four traveller clusters (see Table 2). The final cluster solution placed the 167 participants into four distinct clusters, with 73
participants (43.7%) in the first cluster, 24 participants (14.4%) in the second cluster, 22 participants (13.2%) in the third cluster, and 47 participants (28.1%) in the fourth cluster.

Cluster analysis was followed by discriminant function analysis (DFA) that revealed three discriminant functions. The first function explained 75.1% of the variance, $\Lambda = .29$, $X^2(9) = 200.97$, $p < .001$, whereas the second function explained 20.8% of the variance, $\Lambda = .68$, $X^2(4) = 62.93$, $p < .001$, and the third function explained only 4.2% of the variance, $\Lambda = .93$, $X^2(1) = 11.63$, $p < .001$. The first function was associated with high scores on Destination Orientation Dimension ($r = .71$) and low scores on Social Contact Dimension ($r = -.51$) --- that first function was associated positively with Destination Novelty Seeker and negatively with Social Contact Seeker. The second function was associated with high scores on the Social Contact Dimension ($r = .93$) --- that second function was associated positively with High Novelty Seekers and negatively with High Familiarity Seekers. The third function was associated with high scores on the Travel Service Dimension ($r = .99$) --- that third function was associated positively with High Familiarity Seekers.

**Between-Cluster Differences**

ANOVA were used to explore between-cluster differences on responses to the ESPI and BNS measures. These results are also presented in Table 2. Differences were found between social contact seekers and destination novelty seekers wherein social contact seekers were higher in intimacy, autonomy, and relatedness than destination novelty seekers.

**Discussion**

**International Tourist Role**

The present study sought to examine differences between traveller categories on psychosocial development and basic psychological need satisfaction. It was first hypothesized
Table 2

*ANOVAs of Factor Scores by Cluster*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>1 (SCS)</th>
<th>2 (HFS)</th>
<th>3 (HNS)</th>
<th>4 (DNS)</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOD</td>
<td>24.52(^a)</td>
<td>26.83(^a)</td>
<td>33.77(^b)</td>
<td>37.04(^b)</td>
<td>59.45</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSD</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>20.63(^a)</td>
<td>23.86(^a)</td>
<td>22.23(^a)</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>29.12(^a)</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>21.73(^a)</td>
<td>26.37</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>38.59</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>47.29(^a)</td>
<td>45.00(^{ab})</td>
<td>45.52(^{ab})</td>
<td>42.83(^b)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO</td>
<td>18.78(^a)</td>
<td>17.38(^{ab})</td>
<td>16.68(^{ab})</td>
<td>16.79(^b)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELA</td>
<td>33.43(^a)</td>
<td>32.92(^{ab})</td>
<td>32.05(^{ab})</td>
<td>30.6(^b)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. TSD = Travel Service Dimension, DOD = Destination Orientation Dimension, SCD = Social Contact Dimension, TONT = Topophilic Non-Traveler, TRNT = Tropophilic Non-Traveler, ID = Identity, INT = Intimacy, AUTO = Autonomy, COMP = Competence, RELA = Relatedness. Means with the same superscript are not statistically significant (Tukey HSD post-hoc test).
that different traveller categories of high familiarity seekers, social contact seekers, destination novelty seekers, and high novelty seekers would differ on the psychosocial development of identity and intimacy, as well as the basic psychological need satisfaction of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Traveller categories differentiate by travel preferences for familiarity or novelty in the destination, the social engagement, and the use of travel services compared to the home country of these travellers. A cluster analysis produced the four traveller categories based on the Destination Orientation Dimension, the Social Contact Dimension, and the Travel Service Dimension of the International Tourist Role, consistent with Mo et al. (1994). This outcome provided support for categorizing individuals into E. Cohen’s (1972) novelty-seeking continuum of tourist roles. The clusters of travellers provided the basis for psychographic exploration, and ANOVAs revealed differences between the clusters on psychosocial development and basic psychological need satisfaction.

**Need Satisfaction and Psychosocial Development**

ANOVA revealed relationships between novelty seeking preferences and basic psychological need satisfaction, and psychosocial development, confirming the first hypothesis. However, only two of the three basic needs differed between select traveller categories. Our second hypothesis was twofold: firstly, we anticipated that travellers higher in novelty seeking behaviours and those higher in familiarity seeking behaviours would present more advanced satisfaction of basic needs. This hypothesis was drawn on the idea that those who fall on the extremes of the familiarity-novelty preferences continuum may be more advanced in their satisfaction of their basic needs because they possess a strong sense of home, whether it be grounded at a geographic location (topophilia) or whether it be a lifestyle of changing environments (tropophilia), therefore facilitating psychosocial stage development.
Secondly, we anticipated that these travellers would therefore present more advanced psychosocial development because of Faye and Sharpe’s (2008) examination of the relationship between basic need satisfaction and psychosocial stage development, wherein they suggest that autonomy and competence facilitate identity development, and relatedness facilitates intimacy development. Thus, with this in mind, autonomy and competence can be discussed in terms of identity development, and relatedness can be discussed in terms of intimacy development.

The results presented the opposite, suggesting basic psychological need satisfaction actually differ between the traveller categories that fall more central on the familiarity-novelty continuum: the social contact seekers and the destination novelty seekers. Social contact seekers presented higher in the basic needs of autonomy and relatedness, but not competence, and higher in intimacy, but not identity, than destination novelty seekers. These results lead us to ask the questions what are the travel preferences that differentiate the social contact seekers from destination novelty seekers, and how may these differences relate to the differences in basic psychological need satisfaction and psychosocial development of these travellers?

Social contact seekers prefer socially engaged travel without the use of commercial travel services to destinations that are similar to their own country. On the other hand, destination novelty seekers are opposite to social contact seekers, in that they prefer socially reserved travel with the use of commercial travel services to destinations that are novel compared to their own countries.

Social contact seekers presented higher in the need satisfaction of relatedness and the psychosocial development of intimacy than destination novelty seekers. One explanation is that because social contact seekers may be higher in relatedness and intimacy prior to travel experience, they may be more inclined to pursue social engagement in travel as opposed to
destination novelty seekers who may be lower in relatedness and intimacy prior to travel and are therefore less inclined to pursue social engagement. A second explanation is that relatedness and intimacy may be lower in social contact seekers prior to travel, and social engagement seeking behaviours through travel may be a vehicle by which they are developed.

Social contact seekers were also higher in autonomy than destination novelty seekers, but not in competence or identity development. Firstly, it makes sense that social contact seekers presented higher in autonomy than destination novelty seekers, because social contact seekers exercise more autonomous decision making with respect to the use of travel services compared to destination novelty seekers, who prefer preplanned and familiar means of transportation and accommodation. Again, autonomy may have been higher in social contact seekers prior to travel, and lower in destination novelty seekers prior to travel, indicating that basic need satisfaction at home may be a determinant of travel preferences.

Competence may not differ between clusters because irrespective of preferences, the simple act of travel requires a belief in one’s effectiveness and ability to travel, which was relatively stable across all four traveller categories. It may be that the Destination Orientation and Travel Service Dimensions have less to do with competence, and more to do with “security, safety, and convenience” (Jiang, 2014, p. 131). Furthermore, competence is a key component along with autonomy in identity development, which may be indicative as to why the clusters did not differ on identity development with the absence of a difference between the traveller categories on competence.

Travellers have a plethora of decisions to make when travelling, and these preferences fall on a familiarity and novelty continuum, which determines what type of traveller they are. Our results suggest that travel preferences may be a result of how one’s basic needs are being
met at home. Indeed, there may be a greater emphasis on the home of the traveller in predicting travel preferences and seeking behaviours.

**Non-Traveller Typology and the International Tourist Role**

This study introduced a new measure called the Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM) which examines the relationship between people and place. It explores topophilia, a sense of home tied to a particular geographic location, and tropophilia, a sense of home in movement, change, and travel in travellers and non-travellers. As anticipated, topophilia and tropophilia were negatively correlated, suggesting that if one is high in topophilia, he or she is likely to present low in tropophilia and vice versa. The title of the measure may present as misleading, because the trait of tropophilia is particular to travellers; renaming of the measure is necessary to better indicate what it is the measure examines. However, relationships were found between the Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM) and the International Tourist Role (ITR), wherein novelty seeking behaviours were associated with tropophilia and familiarity seeking behaviours were associated with topophilia. These associations suggest that how individuals perceive their sense of home may influence their travel seeking behaviours, although further investigation is recommended.

**Limitations**

As with any self-report study, there are disadvantages to this methodology and problems associated with it, however, "it can be argued that a simple, easily administered and short [questionnaire]... has its place as a research tool" (Rosenthal et al., 1981, p. 534). Even so, validity and reliability efforts on the ITR, ESPI, and the BNS present these instruments as promising, and the present study supports their internal consistencies. There are also limitations
to substituting missing data with mean scores because this approach to missing data decreases participant variability.

There is a further notable limitation to the present study regarding the administration of only two of the six subscales of the Erikson Psychosocial Inventory, because doing so fails to comprehensively examine Erikson’s theoretical formulation that “resolution of the core conflicts of earlier developmental stages can be influenced in part by crises characteristic of child development, adolescence, adulthood, and aging” (Rosenthal et al., 1981, p. 534). In other words, the identity and intimacy development scores may be influenced by failure to resolve earlier crises in stages prior to emerging adulthood.

Additionally, there may be limitations to the use of the ITR scale only in measure of traveller behaviours. Because the ITR is a preference scale, it is inclusive of all travellers (including non travellers). Preferences in the absence of experience may have influenced the results. The non-travellers of this study could have been comprised of younger and therefore less developed psychosocially in the absence of such a transformative experience such as travel. These non travellers could have fallen into the category of destination novelty seekers, therefore influencing the presentation of psychosocial development and basic need satisfaction.

Lastly, the present study is exploratory at its best, because the sample was drawn from a relatively homogeneous population, which is unlikely to be representative of all travellers. Although there was high variability in demographics, the data were collected on a convenience basis within Regina and surrounding areas and was not particular to a traveller group per se (e.g., tourists visiting Regina), which limits generalizability.
Future Research

We suggest future investigation involving both travel preference and behaviours in order to develop a more multidimensional and comprehensive examination of travellers. Additionally, we suggest exploring the relationships between personality characteristics and basic need satisfaction in travellers, as personality traits have shown to act as buffers in adaptations to new environments (Geeraert et al., 2019). In terms of research design, a longitudinal examination of travellers and non-travellers could offer a much greater understanding of traveller psychological development. This approach would assist in understanding the impact travel has on the psychosocial development and basic need satisfaction of travellers prior to and as a result of travel.
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Appendices

Appendix A: International Tourist Role Scale

Please read each of the following items carefully thinking about how each item relates to your travel life (or what you would like your travel life to be). Use the following scale to respond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I prefer to start a trip with no preplanned or definite routes when travelling to a foreign country.  

I prefer to travel to countries where the people are of different ethnic groups from mine.  

I prefer to travel to countries where they have the same tourism infrastructure (such as highways, water supply, sewers, electric power, and communications systems) as in my country.  

I prefer not to associate with the local people when travelling in a foreign country.  

I prefer to seek the excitement of complete novelty by engaging on direct contact with a variety of new and different people.  

I prefer to travel to countries where the culture is different from mine.  

I prefer to make no major arrangements through travel agencies when travelling in a foreign country.  

I prefer to travel to countries with well-developed tourism industries.  

I prefer to start a trip with no preplanned or definite routes when travelling in a foreign country.  

I prefer to travel to countries where there are restaurants familiar to me.  

I prefer to stay in international hotel chains when travelling in a foreign country.  

If I find a place that particularly pleases me, I may stop there long enough doe social involvement in the life of the place to occur.
I put high priority on familiarity when thinking of destinations.

I prefer to travel to countries where they have the same transportation system as in my country.

I prefer not to be on a guided tour when travelling in a foreign country.

I prefer to have little personal contact with the local people when travelling in a foreign country.

I prefer to live the way the people I visit live by sharing their shelter, food, and customs during my stay.

I prefer to have travel agencies take complete care of me, from beginning to end, when travelling in a foreign culture.

I prefer to travel to countries that are not popular destinations.

I prefer to make friends with the local people when travelling in a foreign country.
Appendix B: Non- Traveller Typology Measure

Please read each of the following items carefully thinking about how each item relates to your life. Use the following scale to respond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I prefer to stay home on holidays and vacations. ____

I feel a strong sense of longing for travel and change. ____

I have no interest in independent travel. ____

I feel a strong connection with my home where I get everything I need. ____

I am waiting for my opportunity to travel independently. ____

I admire international travellers and envision myself as one. ____

I understand why other people travel, but I just don’t feel the same need. ____

Breaks from career or school are best spent at home. ____

If I had the resources to travel, I would already be on my way. ____
Appendix C: The Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory

Please read each of the following items carefully thinking about how each item relates to your life, and then indicate how true it is for you. Use the following scale to respond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hardly ever true</th>
<th>Often not true</th>
<th>Neither true nor untrue</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Almost always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I get embarrassed when someone begins to tell me personal things. __________

I change my opinion about myself a lot. __________

I am ready to get involved with a special person. __________

I feel mixed up. __________

The important things in my life are clear to me. __________

I've got it together. __________

I know what kind of person I am. __________

I am warm and friendly. __________

I can't decide what I want to do with my life. __________

I've got a clear idea of what I want to be. __________

It's important to me to be completely open with my friends. __________

I keep what I really think and feel to myself. __________

I have a strong sense of what it means to be female/male/other. __________

I think it's crazy to get too involved with people. __________

I like myself and am proud of what I stand for. __________

I don't really know what I'm on about. __________

I care deeply for others. __________

I find I have to keep up a front when I am with people. __________
I don't really feel involved.

I am basically a loner.

I have a close physical and emotional relationship with another person.

I prefer not to show too much of myself to others.

Being alone with other people makes me uncomfortable.

I find it easy to make close friends.
Appendix D: Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction Scale

Please read each of the following items carefully thinking about how each item related to your life, and then indicate how true it is for you. Use the following scale to respond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever true</td>
<td>Often not true</td>
<td>Neither true nor untrue</td>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>Almost always true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel like I am free to decide for myself how to live my life. 

I really like the people I interact with.

Often, I do not feel very competent.

I feel pressure in my life.

People I know tell me that I am good at what I do.

I get along with people I come into contact with.

I pretty much keep to myself and don’t have a lot of social contacts.

I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions.

I consider the people I regularly interact with to be my friends.

I have been able to learn interesting new skills recently.

In my daily life, I frequently have to do what I am told.

People in my life care about me.

Most days I feel a sense of accomplishment from what I do.

People I interact with on a daily basis tend to take my feelings into consideration.

In my life I do not get much of a chance to show how capable I am.

There are not many people that I am close to.

I feel like I can pretty much be myself in my daily situations.

The people I interact with regularly do not seem to like me much.
I often do not feel very capable.

There is not much opportunity for me to decide how to do things in my daily life.

People are generally pretty friendly towards me.

I am basically a loner.

I have a close physical and emotional relationship with another person.

I prefer not to show too much of myself to others.

Being alone with other people makes me uncomfortable.

I find it easy to make close friends.
### Appendix E: Description of the Assessed Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th># items (# items administered)</th>
<th>Missing items</th>
<th>$a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination Orientation Dimension</strong></td>
<td>International Tourist Role (ITR)</td>
<td>9 (8)</td>
<td>6. I prefer to travel to countries where the culture is different from mine.</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Service Dimension</strong></td>
<td>International Tourist Role (ITR)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Contact Dimension</strong></td>
<td>International tourist Role (ITR)</td>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>16. I prefer to have littler personal contact with the local people when travelling in a foreign country.</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Erikson Psychosocial Inventory (EPSI)</td>
<td>12 (11)</td>
<td>10. I’ve got a clear idea of what I want to be.</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intimacy</strong></td>
<td>Erikson Psychosocial Inventory (EPSI)</td>
<td>12 (12)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td>Basic Need Satisfaction (BNS)</td>
<td>7 (5)</td>
<td>14. People I interact with on a daily basis tend to take my feelings into consideration. 17. I feel like I can pretty much be myself in my daily situations.</td>
<td>0.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td>Basic Need Satisfaction (BNS)</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatedness</strong></td>
<td>Basic Need Satisfaction (BNS)</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tropophilic Non-Traveller</strong></td>
<td>Non-Traveller Typology Measure</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topophilic Non-traveller</strong></td>
<td>Non-Traveller Typology Measure</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix G: Debriefing Form

Debriefing

The study is now over. Thank you very much for completing the study. The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between travel preferences and personal development. In order to investigate this relationship, you were asked to complete the International Tourist Role (ITR), the Non-Traveller Typology Measure (NTTM), the Erikson Psychosocial Inventory (EPSI) and the Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction Scale (BNS). There has been little research exploring travel preference in relation to personal development and we hope to learn more about how our decisions and preferences while traveling impact our personal development.

If you have any questions about the outcomes of this study or the research, please feel free to contact me (Inge-Lise Bierman) at biermani@uregina.ca or leave a message in the Psychology Department at the University of Regina for Inge-Lise Bierman or Dr. Donald Sharpe (306-585-4157 or 306-585-4221). The University of Regina offers free student counselling through the University of Regina Counselling Centre. The Counselling Centre can be reached by phone (306-585-4491).

Thank you again for participating in this study.