

# TRAVEL MOTIVATIONS TO VISIT CBT COMMUNITIES ADJACENT TO NATIONAL PARKS IN THE SOUTHERN REGION OF THAILAND

Jakkrit Charoensit<sup>\*</sup>, Dachanee Emphandhu and Noppawan Tanakanjana Phongkhieo

Faculty of Forestry, Kasetsart University, Thailand

## ABSTRACT

**\*Corresponding author:**  
Jakkrit Charoensit  
[jakkrit.cha@ku.th](mailto:jakkrit.cha@ku.th)

**Received:** 12 August 2020  
**Revised:** 19 October 2020  
**Accepted:** 29 October 2020  
**Published:** 28 January 2022

**Citation:**  
Charoensit, J., Emphandhu, D.  
and Phongkhieo, N. T. (2022).  
Travel motivations to visit CBT  
communities adjacent to  
national parks in the southern  
region of Thailand. *Humanities,  
Arts and Social Sciences  
Studies* 22(1): 50-61.

According to the analysis of the community based tourism (CBT) situation in Thailand, one of the weak points that was identified was the lack of tourist behavior understanding, including travel motivations. This led to development of research questions that seek to know what factors motivate the tourists' decision making on their visits to CBT communities and also whether there are differences in tourists' motivations among these study areas. Seven study sites were selected from a synthesis of CBT researches showing the knowledge gaps in communities that operate tourism in the areas adjacent to the national parks. The purposes of this study were: 1) to explore the components of travel motivations among tourists visiting CBT communities adjacent to national parks in the southern region of Thailand, and 2) to compare the travel motivations among the study areas. A four-level rating scale questionnaire was considered as a research instrument for collecting data from a sample size of 980 Thai and foreign tourists. The findings revealed that 1) eight distinct factors explaining 59.97% of the variance emerged from the factor analysis of the 37 motivational items extracted by principal component analysis and rotated by the varimax method. These factors were labeled: (1) physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement, (2) nature exploration, (3) rest and tranquility, (4) security and comfort, (5) introspection and independence, (6) escape role overloads and crowds, (7) cultural learning and activity variousness, and (8) family togetherness and similar values sharing. 2) Travel motivations among the study areas were significantly different at the level of .05 in five components.

**Keywords:** Travel motivation; community based tourist; national parks; Thailand

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Community based tourism (CBT) is an emerging form of sustainable tourism that stresses the importance of natural and cultural resources conservation. Thus, the CBT concept is brought to serve as a growth tool for local communities, especially those surrounding protected areas (Suansri and Yeejaw-haw, 2013; Suansri, 2017). A community development process which integrates the CBT concept enables locals and visitors to realize and be aware of sustainable conservation. Besides, CBT can be utilized as an intermediary and a plausible way to establish good cooperation and collaboration between protected areas and local communities (Emphandhu and Songpornwanich, 2013).

In Thailand, CBT is widely mentioned and has been applied in community development for a while. According to the survey conducted as part of this study, currently, a total of 405 CBT communities all over Thailand were enumerated and increasingly settled. Nevertheless, with respect to the analysis of Suansri (2017) on the CBT situation in Thailand since the beginning to the current time, one of the weak points was identified as being the lack of tourist behavior understanding, including travel motivations. Communities were still short of knowledge and comprehension for suitable tourism program design destined to different groups of tourists. This issue, referred to as a knowledge gap, relates to the findings of Charoensit and Emphandhu (2018) which revealed a lack of CBT researches regarding marketing and tourist behavior, leading to a shortage of databases about customers' demand. Moreover, it reported that most of researches emphasized the study on communities mainly doted in terms of culture, while the knowledge from the area-based investigation of those employing the nature-based recreation resources for tourism was still lacking.

Having an understanding of tourist behavior is indispensable given that tourists are the ones who fix the demand. The key factor of tourists' behavior study is travel motivation (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981), or the so-called desired experience (Tanakanjana et al., 2006; Sukur et al., 2018). As the matter of fact, motivation refers to the reasons underlying behavior (Guay et al., 2010). In other words, travel motivation is the reason why tourists travel (Cohen, 2003; Rewtrakunphaiboon, 2009). A new development of CBT marketing should adapt to the model of "Market Pull" which actually knows what tourists want before conceiving a tourism product (tourism program) to respond to the demands and motivations of tourists. This type of marketing plan differs from "Market Push" used in the past whereby a community offers only its own good products without knowing who the target tourists are (Suansri, 2017). Thus, finding a balance between tourists' and communities' needs is a good way to position an effective marketing strategy (Rewtrakunphaiboon, 2009; Manowaluilou et al., 2015). In conclusion, previously, CBT product design was conducted based on theories and community's needs, but tourist databases were not yet taken into account.

In this regard, the issue as indicated above became the main point of the research question. In other words, this investigation attempted to explore what factors motivate the tourists' decision making a visit to CBT communities and also whether there are differences in tourists' motivations among the study areas. Hence, the study objectives were conceived through the following points: 1) exploring the components of travel motivations among tourists visiting CBT communities adjacent to national parks in the southern region of Thailand, and 2) comparing the travel motivations among the study areas. Remarkably, the selected communities for this study use mainly tourism resources in nature-based recreational areas. According to a synthesis of CBT researches (Charoensit and Emphandhu, 2018), it revealed that there were knowledge gaps in communities that operate tourism in the areas adjacent to the national parks. The results of this study will provide a better understanding of CBT in Thailand and can be used in the effective suggestions for development of a CBT management system and appropriate product design conforming to the tourists' needs and motivations. It can be generalized for other communities and national parks in the southern part of Thailand and also be applied specifically for the study sites. This would bring about an uplifting of tourists' satisfaction and quality experience levels.

## 2. RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.1 Travel motivation

Travel motivation is an important basic concept and a starting point for tourist behavior study, because it is commonly seen as an impelling and compelling force behind all tourist behavior (Pearce and Lee, 2005; Rewtrakunphaiboon, 2009). Many scholars have developed lots of interesting definitions. Dann (1981) offered a working definition of tourism motivation as a meaningful state of mind, which adequately disposes an actor or a group of actors to travel. Meanwhile, Pearce and Lee (2005) defined the motivations as underlying reasons for travel which reflect an individual's needs and wants. On the other hand, Park and Yoon (2009) explained that the motivation to travel referred to a set of needs that causes a person to participate in a tourism based activity. Furthermore, some of the scholars profiled the motivations of tourists by measuring the recreation desired experience which is equivalent to the cause of decision making to visit nature-based recreation areas for recreational activities (Stein et al., 2003; Phumalee, 2005; Tanakanjana et al., 2006; Kaewuthai, 2012). In conclusion, travel motivation is the main reason or factor that makes a person decide to explore different kinds of tourist destinations or recreational activities.

Theoretically, travel motivation has been studied and explained as a tourism concept that links consumer behavior for over five decades. Gray (1970) stated two main motives for travel. One is the desire to go from a known place to an unknown place, called as "wanderlust". The other motive is "sunlust" which describes a trip to a place which can provide the traveler with specific facilities that do not exist in his or her own place of residence. In addition, there is Plog's (1974) model of allocentricity and psychocentricity, as well

as the optimal arousal theory of Iso-Ahola (1982) and the leisure motivation approach of Beard and Ragheb (1983), both of which have been widely cited in the tourism literature.

However, the travel career ladder (TCL) approach seems to be a key theory of travel motivation which was developed by Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) and Pearce (1988). The TCL model is based upon the well-known Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs theory, an essential paradigm among psychologists and sociologists that can be applied to explain human behavior, attitude, as well as motivation in tourism. Like Maslow, Pearce's TCL model specifies five different motivational levels affecting tourist behavior: 1) relaxation needs, 2) safety/security needs, 3) relationship needs, 4) self-esteem and development needs, and 5) self-actualization/fulfillment needs. The TCL can be used as a blueprint to design motivational studies for special markets, such as for ecotourists and for theme park patrons. According to this theory, travel motivation or need is not always necessary to debut from the relaxation needs following Maslow. Motivation can be changed according to the life span of tourists and/or accumulated travel experiences. In addition, tourists can have more than one level of motivation. Once tourists become more experienced, the ladder of their motivation will be accordingly higher (Pearce and Lee, 2005; Bejrananda, 2016).

Interestingly, travel motivation has been extensively investigated in the literature. However, in Thailand, few researches have specifically considered the motivation of CBT tourists in nature-based recreation settings. Phumalee (2005) studied recreational motivations in nature-based areas and identified six motivational factors: 1) personal and spiritual development, 2) nature experiencing and learning, 3) physical development, 4) social bonding, 5) escaping from routine, and 6) safety and comfort. Tanakanjana et al. (2006) reported the three highest motivations or desired recreation experiences, which were: 1) being close to nature, 2) getting away from the clatter and racket, and 3) exploring the beauty of nature, whereas the less significant experience for tourists was adventure or risk taking. From this study, five components among the motivations to visit nature recreation sites were: 1) development of physical skills and self-reliance, 2) resting and solitude, 3) comfort and social interaction, 4) discovering the beauty of nature and learning, and 5) escaping from the everyday responsibilities and learning about a community's way of life. Meanwhile, Kaewuthai (2012) conducted a study of the desired recreation experiences in community based ecotourism sites. The results revealed that the most rated item by visitors was experiencing fresh air, while the least rated item was using energy and exerting physically. Six components of motivations were categorized from the factor analysis: 1) freedom and mental health development, 2) self-development and social interaction, 3) intimacy to nature and stress relief, 4) amusement and a new experience, 5) adventure, challenges and physical reinforcement, and 6) comfort and security.

Through the literature review, it was found that the study of CBT tourists' motivations has not yet been conducted directly and especially among the researches conducted in Thailand. Thus, the motivation items used in this study were derived from grounded theories regarding tourists' behaviors which were referred in most of the quoted researches, as well as in the few of them relating to the study of travel motivations on nature-based recreational activities in national parks. These databases could be useful for the present study which emphasizes CBT communities that manage tourism in the areas adjacent to national parks.

## 2.2 Community based tourism (CBT)

Community based tourism (CBT) is a recognizable sustainable development concept on both the national and international stage. There have been a wide variety of studies conducted on this topic. Hence, many groups of scholars and official institutes have given numerous definitions of CBT. In conclusion, CBT is a form of tourism managed by a community which gains its benefits. It articulates the sustainability of the environment, society, culture and quality of local people's life. The cultural exchange between locals and tourists is also regarded within this concept (National Policy Committee for Tourism, 2016; The ASEAN Secretariat, 2016; Suansri, 2017). Likewise, according to the National Policy Committee for Tourism (2016), CBT's principles are presented as follows: 1) the concept is owned by the community, 2) villagers participate in setting directions and deciding on various issues, 3) promoting pride in themselves, 4) uplifting their quality of life, 5) environmental sustainability, 6) maintaining identity and local culture, 7) creating learning among people of different cultures, 8) respect of different cultures and human dignity, 9) generating equitable benefits for the local people, and 10) distributing income to the public good of the community.

In terms of the link between protected areas and CBT, the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) (2005) raised several reasons to explain why CBT should be encouraged in national parks, which were: 1) Economic benefits to local communities. Currently, protected areas in Thailand are still facing threats from local communities which surround them, such as land encroachment, illegal hunting, cutting of trees, as well as household uses or illegal selling/commercial purposes. Local people are generally poor and therefore they depend on natural resources for their living. Tourism can bring supplementary income to these local communities and reduce the illegal use of natural resources. 2) Major incentives to local people in supporting protected area conservation. Given that tourism in national parks can deliver direct and indirect benefits, local

people become more willing to help protect and preserve resources and the ecosystem in protected areas. 3) Environmental awareness. The relevant income from tourism in protected areas helps raise awareness among local people in preserving the environment. The more understanding of the importance of ecosystem protection, the more appreciation and conservation-orientation can be gained. 4) Popularity of tourism in parks. Each year, nature-based tourism in national parks lures a great number of tourists and has become one of main sources of income for the country. It is thus possible to channel income from park visitors to local communities and to have viable local tourism businesses. 5) Social movement and changes in civil rights. CBT enhances the power of the people in local communities and enables them to participate in state decision-making. Therefore, there is a tendency to seek more involvement from local communities in resource and protected area management regarding tourism.

According to previous studies on CBT in Thailand, Charoensit and Emphandhu (2018) stated that more than 70% of the researches accentuated significantly the concept of tourism management and communities' participation, whereas 17% focused on tourism resources with respect to both nature and culture. Only 9% and 4% had taken in account the issues of marketing/visitor and services/facilities, respectively. Apart from that, the research gaps in current knowledge were identified as follows: 1) CBT marketing and visitors, 2) CBT hospitality and services, 3) CBT knowledge sharing, 4) CBT knowledge transfer, 5) CBT monitoring and assessment, 6) CBT management by lessons learned, 7) CBT in protected areas, 8) CBT initiatives throughout ASEAN countries, and 9) Creative community based tourism.

As determined by the secondary data surveys of CBT communities throughout Thailand, there were in total 405 communities. In the South there were a total of 137, followed by 111 in the North, 67 in the Central area, 58 in the Northeast, and finally 32 in the East. Furthermore, after categorizing these CBT communities by tourism resources use basis, 259 communities were identified as being communities that use both natural and cultural tourism resources, whereas 127 communities were identified as those that use merely cultural resources, and only 18 communities were identified as those that use simply natural resources (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Number of CBT Communities in Thailand Sorted by Region and Tourism Resource Category

Regions	Tourism resources (Number of communities)			
	Culture	Nature	Culture and nature	Total (%)
South	13	9	115	137(33.83%)
Central	48	5	14	67 (16.54%)
East	9	2	21	32 (7.90%)
Northeast	33	2	23	58 (14.32%)
North	24	0	87	111 (27.41%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>405 (100.00%)</b>

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Hypothesis

This study specifically hypothesized that there were the differences in travel motivation factors among communities.

#### 3.2 Study sites selection

According to Table 1, after categorizing CBT communities by how they used tourism resources, there were 18 communities where the resources in nature-based recreation areas are mainly used to manage tourism. Among these, there were seven communities which are located in areas adjacent to national parks. Thus, these seven communities were chosen to be the focused study sites. Communities using cultural resources were omitted from this study. This criterion for the selection related to the research rational concept that attributes the knowledge gaps which is the study on the CBT communities relying on natural resources in national parks for tourism management.

In this respect, CBT is rather conceived as a result of the management dimension. In other words, the community, as a cultural source, is not portrayed in the form of a tourist attraction or learning site by its own. But it plays the role of an operator and owner of tourism businesses that employs tourism resources in national parks. The community area can be used for accommodation or homestay for tourists.

Among these seven communities, three are sorted within terrestrial national parks (1-3), while four are in marine national parks (4-7), as follows: 1) Ban Pitam community (BPT), Nakhon Si Thammarat Province, Khao Luang National Park, 2) Ban Khao Theppitak Community (BKT), Surat Thani Province, Khao Sok National Park, 3) Ban Ruam Thai community (BRT), Prachuap Khiri Khan Province, Kui Buri National Park, 4) Ban Tung Yee Peng Community (BTY), Krabi Province, Mu Ko Lanta National Park, 5) Ban Nateen Community (BNT),

Krabi Province, Hat Noppharat Thara - Mu Ko Phi Phi National Park, 6) Ban Thongtomyai Community (BTT), Chumphon province, Mu Ko Chumphon National Park, and 7) CBT networks of Satun (SAT), Satun Province, Satun Geopark, Mu Ko Phetra National Park and Tarutao National Park. Furthermore, they are good representatives of the recreation diversity in nature-based recreation areas.

### 3.3 Population and sample

The population in this research included both Thai and foreign tourists who came to visit the study sites. The unit of analysis was the individual. For the sample, the researchers employed the concept of Comrey and Lee (1992) and determined the sample size to be 1,000 Thai and foreign tourists to acquire data with the excellent level for factor analysis. After that, stratified random sampling with the proportional allocation method was conducted. In other words, the sample size of each community is proportionate to the population size of the community. Finally, a total of 980 usable questionnaires were obtained from CBT tourists (98% response rate).

### 3.4 Research instrument

The research instrument was a four-level rating scale questionnaire. Its questions were formulated based on a comprehensive review of nature-based travel motivation literatures (Manfredo et al., 1996; Phumalee, 2005; Tanakanjana et al., 2006; Jantowat et al., 2011; Kaewuthai, 2012; Bejrananda, 2016; Kasikam and Phongkhieo, 2016; Xu and Chan, 2016; Whiting et al., 2017) and characterized by both closed and open-ended-questions. Examination of the quality of research instrument consisted of content validity and reliability. To find the content validity, the indexes of item-objective congruence (IOC) was used to evaluate the items of the questionnaire based on a score range from -1 to +1. In this process, the questionnaire was assessed by five experts. The questions that had scores equal to or above 0.50 were chosen. After that, the questionnaire was tested with 30 tourists that were not in the sample group. The reliability value was calculated by using Cronbach's Alpha to ensure there was internal consistency within the items. Its result was 0.941 for the 37 motivation items, so the questionnaire was highly reliable. In the questionnaire, the subjects were specifically asked to rate the importance of the 37 general travel motivational statements (from 1: very slightly to 4: very strongly).

### 3.5 Data collection

All data were collected from target samples within the study sites during both weekdays and weekends over a period of three months, between December 2019 and February 2020, in order to receive the most representative samples of tourists. The researchers and team distributed the questionnaires directly to the replying tourists after their tourism activities. They were thoroughly informed about how to complete the questionnaire.

### 3.6 Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to explore the basic data of the sample profile which was described by frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation (SD). Inferential statistics comprised the factor analysis and analysis of variance (F-test). In this study, the exploratory factor analysis by principal component analysis (PCA) with varimax rotation was employed for data reduction by grouping or including travel motivation variables that corresponded to the same groups or factors. This method conceived a clearer picture of big groups of variables.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Sample profile

The socio-demographic characteristics of community based tourists in the sample are presented in Table 2. Descriptive analysis of the sample showed that the gender percentages of the respondents were 63.7% being female, 34.7% male and 1.6% others. Their average age was 32.14 years. A total percentage of 88.3% of respondents were domestic tourists compared to the 11.7% for international tourists who came from various countries. In terms of education, slightly more than half (54.4%) were educated with a bachelor's degree. A total of 32.1% of the sample's occupation were students and, subsidiary, 25.0% were enterprise employees. With respect to income, nearly half (40.9%) of the foreign respondents earned more than US\$ 4,001 per month, while among Thai tourists, 38.7% earned THB 15,000 (equivalent to US\$ 500) or lower per month. When examining their travel experiences, there were 65.2% of the respondents who visited the site for the first time. Moreover, the length of stay indicated that 64.1% of respondents chose a one day trip, whereas 35.9% stayed overnight.

**Table 2:** Socio-Demographic and Trip-related Characteristics of the Respondents (n = 980)

Variables		Frequency (%)	
Gender			
	Male	340	(34.7%)
	Female	624	(63.7%)
	Others	16	(1.6%)
Nationality			
	Thai	865	(88.3%)
	Foreigner	115	(11.7%)
Age	( $\bar{x}$ ) = 32.14 (SD) = 12.55		
Education			
	Lower than bachelor's degree	202	(20.6%)
	Bachelor's degree	533	(54.4%)
	Higher than bachelor's degree	245	(25.0%)
Occupation			
	Civil servant	168	(17.1%)
	Enterprise employee	245	(25.0%)
	Merchant/Businessman	48	(4.9%)
	Private business/Self-employed	157	(16.0%)
	Student	315	(32.1%)
	Others	47	(4.8%)
Monthly income (Thai)			
	THB 15,000 or lower	335	(38.7%)
	THB 15,001 - 30,000	278	(32.1%)
	THB 30,001 or higher	252	(29.1%)
Monthly income (Foreigner)			
	US\$ 2,500 or lower	32	(27.8%)
	US\$ 2,501 - 4,000	36	(31.3%)
	US\$ 4,001 or higher	47	(40.9%)
Number of visits			
	First visit	639	(65.2%)
	Multiple visits	341	(34.8%)
Length of stay			
	Day trip	628	(64.1%)
	Overnight	352	(35.9%)

#### 4.2 Travel motivations and principal component analysis

This part of the study seeks to explore factors that motivate tourists' decision making to visit CBT communities. As reported by the assumption test, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure yielded 0.941 which was greater than the minimum value required of 0.5. This demonstrated that the distribution of values in the initial measure of motivation dimensions was adequate for conducting the factor analysis. The Bartlett's test was also found to be significant and, therefore, the reduction of data by principal component would be justifiable (Bartlett's test: Chi-Square = 15620.856, df = 666, p = .000).

Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on the importance ratings of the 37 motivational items identified in the instrument development process. By considering eigenvalues equal to or above 1.0 (Hair et al., 2014), the run with varimax rotation produced an eight-factor solution accounting for 59.97% of the total variance. The eigenvalues for these factors ranged from 1.02 to 11.68. Items with factor loadings greater than 0.4 were retained to explain the factor (Comrey and Lee, 1992). Following this, factor loadings of all relevant variables in the rotated factor matrix were clearly related to only one factor each. As seen from Table 3, each factor was named based on the common characteristics of the variables it included.

Factor 1 exhibited most of the variance (12.53%), with an eigenvalue of 11.68. This factor incorporated ten items of motivation which were: 1) test your own physical abilities, 2) develop personal skills and abilities in nature recreation, 3) adventure and take risks, 4) be a leader or teach your activity skills to others, 5) get exercise and enhance physical fitness, 6) have an opportunity to share and help others, 7) be self-reliant, 8) gain a sense of self pride, 9) maintain and rehabilitate one's health, and 10) meet and talk to new and varied people. This factor is best described as *physical skills development and self-esteem reinforcement*.

Factor 2 was labeled *nature exploration* and included six variables, such as 1) experiencing new and different things in nature, 2) enjoying the sounds of nature, 3) exploring or pioneering new destinations, 4) enjoying fresh air, 5) having the opportunity to visit the place of your dreams, and 6) learning more about nature, plants and wildlife. This factor accounted for approximately 8.83% of the variance in the data, with an eigenvalue of 2.55.

Factor 3 was aptly named *rest and tranquility* and included five variables, such as 1) rest physically from stress, 2) have more private time, 3) rest mentally from stress, 4) experience tranquility, solitude, peace and calm, and 5) have fun and enjoy yourself. With an eigenvalue of 2.02, this factor explained 7.95% of the total variance.

Factor 4 identified *security and comfort*, which focused on safety, facilities, accessibility, and cost. This factor accounted for approximately 7.25% of the variance in the data and had an eigenvalue of 1.47.

Factor 5 was *introspection and independence*, which included: 1) gaining a new perspective on life, 2) portraying personal tastes and/or reflecting on personal values, 3) spending time thinking and learning more about yourself, and 4) feeling independence and autonomy. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.23 with an explanation of 6.45% of the total variance.

Labeled *escape role overloads and crowds*, factor 6 included three variables: 1) getting away from the usual demands of life for a while, 2) avoiding everyday responsibilities for a while, and 3) getting away from crowded environments for a while. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.16 and could explain 6.24% of the total variance.

With an eigenvalue of 1.06 and explaining 5.65% of the total variance, factor 7 was labeled *cultural learning and activity variousness*. This factor included three items, such as 1) learning about history, lifestyle and local culture, 2) visiting national and/or world class destinations, and 3) doing various recreational activities.

Spending time doing recreational activities with your family or friends and being with others having the same likes and interests as you were plainly related to the final factor, *family togetherness and similar values sharing*. This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.02 and explained 5.06% of the total variance.

Internal consistency between the items in the factors was measured using Cronbach's coefficient alpha which, with a value of at least .70, is usually considered reliable (DeVellis, 2017). Some scholars (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994; Griethuijsen et al., 2014; Taber, 2018) have argued that an alpha of .60 represented an acceptable value. Apart from the cultural learning and activity variousness factor (0.668) and the family togetherness and similar values sharing factor (0.637), all factors resulted in a Cronbach's coefficient alpha scored greater than 0.70, which indicated strong consistency among the items in each factor.

The corrected item-total correlation coefficients of the items ranged between 0.546 and 0.706 for factor 1; between 0.496 and 0.616 for factor 2; between 0.392 and 0.658 for factor 3; between 0.500 and 0.588 for factor 4; between 0.472 and 0.608 for factor 5; between 0.570 and 0.713 for factor 6; between 0.427 and 0.516 for factor 7; and 0.469 for factor 8. These scores are higher than 0.20. Accordingly, it can be said that the item can serve the aim of the relevant factor significantly (Pallant, 2016).

Considering from the mean values of each motivation component, tourists had the highest motivation on rest and tranquility ( $\bar{x} = 3.37$ ,  $SD = 0.53$ ) and subsidiary rated by escape role overloads and crowds ( $\bar{x} = 3.31$ ,  $SD = 0.67$ ), nature exploration ( $\bar{x} = 3.30$ ,  $SD = 0.50$ ), and family togetherness and similar values sharing ( $\bar{x} = 3.29$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ). Lower than average motivation was shown on physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement ( $\bar{x} = 2.90$ ,  $SD = 0.59$ ) and security and comfort ( $\bar{x} = 2.97$ ,  $SD = 0.60$ ).

Based upon the results, it can be implied that this group of CBT tourists gave their most interest on rest and tranquility without being concerned about role overloads and crowded situations. The rest must be surrounded by a serene atmosphere. And then they focused on nature exploration that permits time with family members and similar people to do activities and spend time together. On the other hand, they did not emphasize adventurous activities or those that require comfort and security, nor did they give any importance to the price or expense of activities.

**Table 3:** Factor Analysis of Travel Motivations of Community Based Tourists

Motivations	Factor loading	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\alpha$
<b>Factor 1 Physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement</b> (Eigenvalue 11.68)		<b>2.90</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.884</b>
1. To test your own physical abilities.	.745	2.87	0.84	
2. To develop personal skills and abilities in nature recreation.	.677	2.97	0.81	
3. To adventure and take risks.	.654	2.81	0.87	
4. To be a leader or teach your activity skills to others.	.631	2.55	0.94	
5. To get exercise and enhance physical fitness.	.524	2.85	0.86	
6. Have an opportunity to share and help others.	.511	2.85	0.84	

**Table 3:** Factor Analysis of Travel Motivations of Community Based Tourists (continued)

	Motivations	Factor loading	$\bar{x}$	SD	$\alpha$
7.	To be self-reliant.	.510	3.12	0.79	
8.	To gain a sense of self pride.	.509	3.06	0.81	
9.	To maintain and rehabilitate one's health.	.479	2.88	0.86	
10.	To meet and talk to new and varied people.	.451	3.04	0.84	
<b>Factor 2 Nature exploration</b>			<b>3.30</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.782</b>
(Eigenvalue 2.55)					
1.	To experience new and different things in nature.	.720	3.42	0.67	
2.	To enjoy the sounds of nature.	.642	3.38	0.68	
3.	To explore or pioneer new destinations.	.607	3.23	0.76	
4.	To enjoy fresh air.	.594	3.48	0.65	
5.	To have the opportunity to visit the place of your dreams.	.532	3.24	0.78	
6.	To learn more about nature, plants and wildlife.	.480	3.07	0.81	
<b>Factor 3 Rest and tranquility</b>			<b>3.37</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.790</b>
(Eigenvalue 2.02)					
1.	To rest physically from stress.	.653	3.39	0.73	
2.	To have more private time.	.647	3.30	0.74	
3.	To rest mentally from stress.	.644	3.42	0.71	
4.	To experience tranquility, solitude, peace and calm.	.617	3.29	0.75	
5.	To have fun and enjoy yourself.	.447	3.45	0.65	
<b>Factor 4 Security and comfort</b>			<b>2.97</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.754</b>
(Eigenvalue 1.47)					
1.	To feel secure.	.728	3.09	0.74	
2.	To gain comfort.	.704	3.00	0.76	
3.	To get easy access to the area.	.660	3.04	0.75	
4.	To buy low cost goods and services in tourism.	.608	2.74	0.88	
<b>Factor 5 Introspection and independence</b>			<b>3.13</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.756</b>
(Eigenvalue 1.23)					
1.	To gain a new perspective on life.	.756	3.30	0.72	
2.	To portray personal tastes and/or reflect on personal values.	.608	3.07	0.77	
3.	To spend time thinking and learning more about yourself.	.568	2.97	0.83	
4.	To feel independence and autonomy.	.402	3.20	0.76	
<b>Factor 6 Escape role overloads and crowds</b>			<b>3.31</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.792</b>
(Eigenvalue 1.16)					
1.	To get away from the usual demands of life for a while.	.806	3.35	0.77	
2.	To avoid everyday responsibilities for a while.	.767	3.25	0.83	
3.	To get away from crowded environments for a while.	.721	3.35	0.78	
<b>Factor 7 Cultural learning and activity variousness</b>			<b>3.07</b>	<b>0.61</b>	<b>0.668</b>
(Eigenvalue 1.06)					
1.	To learn about history, lifestyle and local culture.	.607	3.04	0.82	
2.	To visit national and/or world class destinations.	.578	3.14	0.76	
3.	To do various recreational activities.	.486	3.03	0.79	
<b>Factor 8 Family togetherness and similar values sharing</b>			<b>3.29</b>	<b>0.60</b>	<b>0.637</b>
(Eigenvalue 1.02)					
1.	To spend time doing recreation activities with your family or friends.	.783	3.38	0.68	
2.	To be with others having the same likes and interests as you.	.657	3.21	0.73	

KMO .941; Cumulative percentage of variance 59.97%

These findings are remarkably consistent with the results of Kanjanasomranwong (2003), who collected data from nature-based tourists and found that the three most significant travel motivations were: 1) relaxing with friends and family, 2) the need to release stress from work, and 3) nature study. Furthermore, the result that identifies relaxation as the greatest factor motivating tourist to travel also corresponds to the study of Mayor (2012) and Bejrananda (2016). Nevertheless, there are some previous studies which indicated that the highest group of motivations of tourists was the intimation and being in the touch with nature (Chantayo, 2003; Tanakanjana et al., 2006; Jantowat et al., 2011; Kaewuthai, 2012). Comparing the previous studies with this research, the component on nature falls into the third highest travel motivation of tourists, but is still considered as having quite a high average and not too different from relaxation. With respect to the lowest factor among travel motivations, the study revealed that it was the component on physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement. This result is relevant to findings of the study by Kaewuthai (2012) that gathered data from the samples resembling those of this study which are the tourists visiting community based ecotourism sites.

Furthermore, when this part of study was brought to compare with the theory of travel career ladder (TCL), it identified that the rest and tranquility component as the highest motivation corresponded to relaxation needs or physiological needs which are the most fundamental motivation. On the other hand, the

less than average level of motivation was identified as being physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement. This is quite related to the fourth level of the ladder concerning self-esteem and development needs.

#### 4.3 Comparison of the mean differences of travel motivations among communities

This part of study aims to test the hypothesis as to whether there were differences in the travel motivation factors among communities. Using One-Way ANOVA as a statistical method, a comparison of the mean differences of travel motivations among seven CBT communities which were the study sites showed that five components of travel motivations were significantly different at the level of .05: physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement ( $F = 8.70$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ), rest and tranquility ( $F = 3.53$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ), security and comfort ( $F = 9.85$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ), introspection and independence ( $F = 3.58$ ;  $p = 0.002$ ) and escape role overloads and crowds ( $F = 6.61$ ;  $P\text{-value} = 0.000$ ) (see Table 4).

According to the analysis of the differences by pair comparison, the results showed that the tourists of the Ban Pitam community had the motivation on physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement, which was significantly different from those of the Ban Tung Yee Peng, Ban Nateen, Ban Khao Theppitak and Ban Ruam Thai communities ( $p = 0.010, 0.014, 0.017$  and  $0.000$ , respectively). In this case, the Ban Pitam Community had this motivation higher than the others. Apart from that, the tourists of CBT networks of Satun had this same motivation, which was significantly different and higher than the Ban Ruam Thai Community ( $p = 0.001$ ). However, the same group of tourists from CBT networks of Satun had a different motivation with respect to escape role overloads and crowds, which was statistically significant, from those of the Ban Nateen and Ban Khao Theppitak communities ( $p = 0.001$  and  $0.005$ , respectively). For this case, they had an inferior level of this motivation than the other cited communities.

The results are consistent with the characteristics of the Ban Pitam Community's tourism resources and programs. In other words, this community provides a variety of tourism activities which are quite adventurous and require lots of physical skills, such as rafting, trekking to a waterfall, a cave tour, and discovering the sea of mist and hot spring. Hence, the tourists visiting the Ban Pitam Community have obviously set their motivation on physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement. With regard to the CBT networks of Satun, most of the tourists choosing this CBT tour program, with the exception of the seminar groups, are half-day or one day tour tourists. This characteristic might be remarkably the reason for the lower rate of motivational component on escape role overloads and crowds than two other communities.

The rest of the pair comparison relates mainly to the Ban Ruam Thai Community. In other words, the tourists from this community had their motivation on rest and tranquility, which was significantly different and lower than the Ban Tung Yee Peng and Ban Khao Theppitak communities ( $p = 0.048$  and  $0.020$ , respectively). Furthermore, the motivation on security and comfort of the Ban Ruam Thai Community was also significantly different and lower than the Ban Nateen, CBT networks of Satun, Ban Pitam and Ban Thongtomyai communities ( $p = 0.000, 0.000, 0.000$  and  $0.003$ , respectively). With respect to the factor of introspection and independence, the tourists from this community had this motivational factor, which was significantly different and lower than the Ban Nateen and Ban Pitam communities ( $p = 0.032$  and  $0.026$ , respectively).

Considering the indicated details, it was found that the Ban Ruam Thai Community had less motivation on these three components than the other mentioned communities. Given this point, it can be explained that the Ban Ruam Thai Community has remarkably one specific objective and characteristic for tourism. It refers to wildlife observation that takes only about 3-4 hours a day. In consequence, rest and tranquility might not be the major motivation of this tourist group when compared with other communities. In addition, this result implies that the tourists partaking in wildlife observation do not accentuate on security and comfort and the tour activities' length of time might not particularly allot the tourists enough time in regard of introspection and independence.

**Table 4:** Comparison of the Mean Differences of Travel Motivations among Communities ( $n = 980$ )

Travel Motivations	CBT Communities*							F	p
	BTY <i>n</i> =63	BNT <i>n</i> =169	SAT <i>n</i> =342	BPT <i>n</i> =128	BKT <i>n</i> =102	BRT <i>n</i> =112	BTT <i>n</i> =64		
	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)		
Physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement	2.73 (0.68)	2.82 (0.57)	3.01 (0.53)	3.09 (0.53)	2.79 (0.72)	2.71 (0.59)	2.80 (0.52)	8.70	.000
Nature exploration	3.31 (0.49)	3.30 (0.51)	3.29 (0.50)	3.32 (0.53)	3.35 (0.47)	3.30 (0.56)	3.28 (0.43)	0.26	.955
Rest and tranquility	3.49 (0.55)	3.43 (0.51)	3.31 (0.51)	3.38 (0.51)	3.48 (0.55)	3.25 (0.59)	3.43 (0.46)	3.53	.002

**Table 4:** Comparison of the Mean Differences of Travel Motivations among Communities (n = 980) (continued)

Travel Motivations	CBT Communities*							F	p
	BTY n=63	BNT n=169	SAT n=342	BPT n=128	BKT n=102	BRT n=112	BTT n=64		
	$\bar{x}$ (SD)								
Security and comfort	2.92 (0.63)	2.97 (0.50)	3.05 (0.55)	3.10 (0.56)	2.87 (0.71)	2.62 (0.65)	3.02 (0.56)	9.85	.000
Introspection and independence	3.10 (0.65)	3.19 (0.59)	3.11 (0.52)	3.21 (0.55)	3.16 (0.69)	2.93 (0.67)	3.25 (0.54)	3.58	.002
Escape role overloads and crowds	3.45 (0.68)	3.46 (0.57)	3.17 (0.69)	3.31 (0.62)	3.49 (0.60)	3.22 (0.76)	3.45 (0.65)	6.61	.000
Cultural learning and activity variousness	2.98 (0.67)	3.01 (0.63)	3.13 (0.58)	3.07 (0.62)	3.06 (0.63)	3.09 (0.67)	3.01 (0.50)	1.16	.328
Family togetherness and similar values sharing	3.28 (0.65)	3.34 (0.58)	3.28 (0.56)	3.27 (0.65)	3.39 (0.66)	3.21 (0.67)	3.30 (0.53)	1.08	.375

\*BTY = Ban Tung Yee Peng Community; BNT = Ban Nateen Community; SAT = CBT networks of Satun; BPT = Ban Pitam Community; BKT = Ban Khao Theppitak Community; BRT = Ban Ruam Thai Community; BTT = Ban Thongtomyai Community

## 5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In conclusion, regarding the behaviors of tourists visiting CBT communities, more than 50% visited them for the first time and were on a one day trip. The motivation for the visit and nature-based recreation activities was comprised of eight components. The motivation on rest and tranquility had the highest mean value, while the motivation on physical skill development and self-esteem reinforcement had the lowest average rate. The analysis of the variances found that there were five different motivational components among the study communities. This point is essential in applying the results of the study.

For theoretical contribution, the findings of this study can provide a greater understanding of CBT tourists' behaviors which has not been explored before. This result is crucial because the numbers of CBT tourists have surged significantly. Understanding their needs or motivations could help facilitate visitor management strategies in protected areas to enhance their satisfaction.

In regard to the managerial implications, there are four guidelines, as follows:

1. Overall, new CBT or other CBT communities located in the south of Thailand and offering nature-based tourism activities can implement the results regarding travel motivations from this study. The latter on rest, tranquility, escapism, nature exploration, and friend and family togetherness is rather placed as the first priority. Moreover, a tourism program should be offered that has both one day and night stay. The following suggestions on the activities should be presented to tourists: 1) a boat trip to explore the beautiful scenery, 2) comfortable marine activities, 3) a short nature trail for the appreciation of the wild beauty and the enjoyment of fresh air, etc. The essence is that the activities should make tourists relaxed and not be exhausting. The communities could also provide homestays to lengthen tourists' stay. This will contribute to an increase of income for the communities.

2. Concerning seven studied communities, the results of the study can be applied in management and tourism program development. The motivations on nature exploration, cultural learning and activity variousness, and family togetherness and similar values sharing are considered as a common feature of every community. In terms of other motivation components, each community might have to revise that by prioritizing the occurring mean values. However, there are some main remarks for two communities, as obvious differences in some motivation factors were found. In the first place, the Ban Pitam community should give importance to the development of tourism activities for a variety of activities and a physical ability challenge to tourists. Also, the activities should provide them opportunities for interpersonal exchange and learning about nature at the same time.

Secondly, for the Ban Ruam Thai Community which organizes wildlife tourism activities and has many different motivational components from and inferior than the other communities, in regard to tourism program development, primarily it should emphasize three main components, which are common features. Especially, the motivation on nature exploration should be highlighted according to its highest mean value. On the other hand, there currently might not be an emphasis on comfort, private time and autonomy for tourists, as they are not the main travel motivation.

3. The national parks can cooperate with their adjacent local communities in order to develop nature sites into CBT programs by consulting the database on travel motivations for tourism program design. Such cooperation could be established with the communities usually operating tourism or with the ones initiating tourism. In addition, according to the principal tourism motivation database, national parks could employ it to identify a suitable tourism zone in order to offer appropriate recreational experiences corresponding to tourists needs. Following the theory of recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) (Emphandhu et al., 2004), for this CBT tourists' group, the national parks can use the equivalent zone to "semi-primitive motorized" to develop and plan the tourism management. Such an area would enable tourists to be in the touch with nature and have a tranquil atmosphere for rest, although less than a primitive or semi-primitive non-motorized zone. Tourists would have a chance to learn about the authentic culture of the communities, as well as to have social interaction with other groups of tourists, easy accessibility to the zone and activities that require equipment and motors.

4. The recommendations for tourists are provided on the concept of cooperation and the respect in adhering to all visitor regulations in the national parks. Such action-taking will turn tourists into being partners in natural resources conservation. Once the tourist sites possess a complete natural state, they will be the potential to respond to tourists' needs and motivations. Besides, this form of tourism relates to the local communities. Many of them have interesting local cultures. Tourists should be encouraged to give respect to cultural diversity while they could also learn and appreciate such cultural values.

## REFERENCES

- Beard, J. G. and Ragheb, M. G. (1983). Measuring leisure motivation. *Journal of Leisure Research* 15(3): 219-228.
- Bejrananda, T. (2016). Travel motivations for visiting ecotourism destinations in border areas of Chiang Rai. *Suthiparithat Journal* 30(94): 42-59. [in Thai]
- Chantayo, R. (2003). *A Comparative Study of Motivation and Satisfaction of Visitors to Nature Based and Historical Recreation Areas: A Case Study of Mae Wong National Park and Kamphaeng Phet Historical Park*. Master's Thesis. Kasetsart University, Thailand. [in Thai]
- Charoensit, J. and Emphandhu, D. (2018). Analyzing the research gap on community based tourism in Thailand. *Damrong Journal of The Faculty of Archaeology Silpakorn University* 17(1): 175-203.
- Cohen, E. (2003). Backpacking: diversity and change. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change* 1(2): 95-110.
- Comrey, A. L. and Lee, H. B. (1992). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New Jersey: Hillsdale.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivation for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 6(4): 408-424.
- Dann, G. (1981). Tourist motivation: an appraisal. *Annals of Tourism Research* 8(2): 187-219.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Emphandhu, D. and Songpornwanich, S. (2013). Community based tourism and protected areas: overview of its challenging issues. In *Proceeding of Seminar on Natural Resources Adaptation to the Global Climate Change: Extended Abstracts*, pp. 96-100. Bangkok: Faculty of Forestry, Kasetsart University. July 16.
- Emphandhu, D., Wannalert, S. and Rachano, R. (2004). *Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS)*. Bangkok: Tourism Authority of Thailand. [in Thai]
- Gray, H. P. (1970). *International Travel-International Trade*. Lexington: Heath Lexington.
- Griethuijsen, R. A. L. F., van Eijck, M. W., Haste, H., den Brok, P. J., Skinner, N. C., Mansour, N., Gencer, A. S. and Boujaoude, S. (2014). Global patterns in students' views of science and interest in science. *Research in Science Education* 45(4): 581-603.
- Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S. and Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 80(4): 711-735.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. and Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Pearson.
- Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES). (2005). *Asia-Pacific Environmental Innovation Strategy Project (APEIS), Research on Innovative and Strategic Policy Options (RISPO), Final Report*. Hayama: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Towards a social psychology theory of tourism motivation: a rejoinder. *Annals of Tourism Research* 9(2): 256-262.
- Jantowat, H., Phongkhieo, N. T. and Kaitpraneet, S. (2011). Responses toward regulations and recreational user management measures of visitors to Doi Suthep-Pui National Park, Chiang Mai Province. *Thai Journal of Forestry* 30(2): 39-47. [in Thai]
- Kaewuthai, K. (2012). *Experience-based Management of Community Based Ecotourism Sites*. Master's Thesis. Kasetsart University, Thailand. [in Thai]

- Kanjanasomranwong, F. (2003). *Analysis of Tourists' Motivation in Choosing Site and Tour Season in Nature-Based Recreation Areas: Case Studies of Doi Inthanon and Khao Yai National Parks*. Master's Thesis. Kasetsart University, Thailand. [in Thai]
- Kasikam, K. and Phongkhieo, N. T. (2016). Recreation motivation and factors affecting the decision of tourists in revisiting Huai Mae Khamin waterfall, Khuean Srinagarindra National Park. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University (Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts)* 9(2): 424-437. [in Thai]
- Manfredo, M. J., Driver, B. L. and Tarrant, M. A. (1996). Measuring leisure motivation: a meta-analysis of the recreation experience preference scales. *Journal of Leisure Research* 28(3): 188-213.
- Manowalulou, N., Lertpongjukorn, N., Vitheepradit, A. and Lertsiri, S. (2015). *Behavior and Demands of Tourists for Creative Tourism of Trat Province*. Bangkok: National Research Council of Thailand. [in Thai]
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mayor, V. (2012). *A Study of Motivations and Satisfactions of Tourists Visiting Raksawarin and Pornrang Hot Springs in Ranong province*. Master's Thesis. Dhurakij Pundit University, Thailand.
- National Policy Committee for Tourism (NPT). (2016). *Thailand Community Based Tourism Development Criteria*. Bangkok: National Policy Committee for Tourism. [in Thai]
- Nunnally, J. C. and Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pallant, J. (2016). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using IBM SPSS*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Park, D. B. and Yoon, Y. S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: a Korean case study. *Tourism Management* 30: 99-108.
- Pearce, P. L. (1988). *The Ulysses Factor: Evaluating Visitors in Tourist Settings*. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Pearce, P. L. and Caltabiano, M. L. (1983). Inferring travel motivation from travelers' experiences. *Journal of Travel Research* 22(2): 16-20.
- Pearce, P. L. and Lee, U. I. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research* 43(3): 226-237.
- Phumalee, U. (2005). *Analysis of Recreation Diversity in Nature-based Recreation Areas*. Master's Thesis. Kasetsart University, Thailand. [in Thai]
- Plog, S. C. (1974). Why destination areas rise and fall in popularity. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly* 14(4): 55-58.
- Rewtrakunphaiboon, W. (2009). Tourism motivation research: problems and suggestions. In *Annual of International Thai Tourism Journal 2008*, edited by T. Choibamroong, pp. 361-368. Bangkok: Thailand Tourism Development Research Institute.
- Stein, T. V., Denny, C. B. and Pennisi, L. A. (2003). Using visitors' motivations to provide learning opportunities at water-based recreation areas. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 11(5): 404-425.
- Suansri, P. (2017). Community based tourism. *Tourism Economic Review* 7: 54-67.
- Suansri, P. and Yeejaw-haw, S. (2013). *Community Based Tourism (CBT) Standard Handbook*, translated by P. Richards. Bangkok: Wanida Karnpim Limited Partnership.
- Sukur, N., Johari, M. H. Y., Nazari, Z. A., Wasilan, N. H. M. and Fazil, F. (2018). Desired Recreation Experience of Visitors in Forest Setting. In *Proceeding of International Conference on Entrepreneurship, Business and Tourism (ICEBT, 2018)*, pp. 72-85. Putrajaya: Malaysia. April 28-19.
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education* 48: 1273-1296.
- Tanakanjana, N., Arunpraparut, W., Pongpattananurak, N., Nuampukdee, R. and Chumsangsri, T. (2006). *Decision Support System for Sustainable Management Planning of Nature-based Recreation Areas in Thailand Phase I*. Bangkok: Kasetsart University. [in Thai]
- The ASEAN Secretariat. (2016). *ASEAN Community Based Tourism Standard*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- Whiting, J. W., Larson, L. R., Green, G. T. and Kralowec, C. (2017). Outdoor recreation motivation and site preferences across diverse racial/ethnic groups: a case study of Georgia state parks. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 18: 10-21.
- Xu, J. B. and Chan, S. (2016). A new nature-based tourism motivation model: Testing the moderating effects of the push motivation. *Tourism Management Perspectives* 18: 107-110.