

Dragan Đuranović

Faculty of Economics Subotica,
University of Novi Sad,
Serbia

✉ djuranovic@ef.uns.ac.rs

Ksenija Leković

Faculty of Economics Subotica,
University of Novi Sad,
Serbia

✉ ksenija.lekovic@ef.uns.ac.rs

Slavica Tomić

Faculty of Economics Subotica,
University of Novi Sad,
Serbia

✉ tomics@ef.uns.ac.rs

Dražen Marić

Faculty of Economics Subotica,
University of Novi Sad,
Serbia

✉ drazen.maric@ef.uns.ac.rs

SLOW TOURISM IN VOJVODINA – MOTIVES AND GOALS OF CONSUMERS

СПОРИ ТУРИЗАМ У ВОЈВОДИНИ – МОТИВИ И ЦИЉЕВИ ТУРИСТА

Summary: *Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors in the world characterized by numerous new forms aimed at satisfying the sophisticated needs of the modern consumer. In such circumstances, the concept of slow tourism is gaining in importance with emphasized need for slowing down the pace of life. Slow tourism offers a solution to this need. In developing countries, this concept frequently tied with sustainable tourism, is linked to social movements such as: “slow food” (authentic, local food), “slow cities” (environmentally responsible and peaceful environment) and “slow transportation” (local buses and trains). The aim of the paper is the explanation of this phenomenon from the perspective of consumers. The authors conduct research based on a model consisting of: six general slow tourism motivations (relaxation, self-reflection, escape, novelty-seeking, engagement and discovery), two universal goals of slow tourism (revitalization and self-enrichment) and travel outcomes (satisfaction, future return intention and recommendations). The sample included 320 respondents from the territory of the Republic of Serbia who have visited some of the destinations in Vojvodina labeled as “slow place” in the past two years.*

Key words: *sustainable development, quality of life, eco-gastronomy, Vojvodina, slow trip*

JEL classification: *Z39, L83*

Резиме: *Туризам је један од најбрже растућих сектора на свијету и карактеришу га бројни нови облици који имају за циљ задовољавање софистицираних потреба савремених туриста. У таквим околностима, концепт спорог туризма добија на значају уз наглашену потребу за успоравањем ритма живота. Спори туризам нуди рјешење за такве потребе. У земљама у развоју овај концепт који спада у одрживи туризам повезан је са друштвеним покретима као што су: „спора храна“ (аутентична, локална храна), „спори градови“ (еколошки одговорно и мирно окружење) и „спори саобраћај“ (локални аутобуси и возови). Циљ рада је да се објасни овај феномен из угла потрошача, односно туриста. Аутори су спровели истраживање засновано на моделу који се састоји од: шест опитних мотивација за спори туризам (опуштање, саморефлексија, бјекство, тражење новитета, ангажовање и откривање), два универзална циља спорог туризма (ревитализација и само-обогаћивање) и исхода путовања (задовољство, намјере за будући повратак и препоруке). Узорак је обухватио 320 испитаника са територије Републике Србије који су посјетили неке од војвођанских дестинација које су у посљедње двије године означене као „споро мјесто“.*

Кључне ријечи: *одрживи развој, квалитет живота, еко-гастрономија, Војводина, споро путовање*
ЈЕЛ класификација: *Z39, L83*

Paper presented at the 8th Scientific Conference with International Participation “Jahorina Business Forum 2018: Sustainable Tourism and Institutional Environment” Jahorina, 22-24th March 2018

This paper is part of the results of the research conducted for the project Development potential of slow tourism from the aspect of consumers in the function of sustainable development of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina financed by the Provincial Secretariat for Higher Education and Scientific Research

1. INTRODUCTION

As a region, Vojvodina has a Central European and Danubian position. The word that perhaps best describes Vojvodina is diversity. The diversity in demographic and sociocultural terms describes it as a multinational, multicultural and multiconfessional environment. Geographical diversity of Vojvodina consists of plain areas, dunes, low mountains and water currents (rivers and lakes). These characteristics are the basis for economic and social development along with the development of tourism.

During its development, tourism has gone through different stages and today we are witnessing the diversion of tourist trends from mass to selective or specific forms of tourism. Some new, specific forms of tourism have appeared due to the large number of different motives which are the driving forces of tourism trends. Thereby, the sustainability of the environment and the well-being of an individual/society are two fundamental driving forces of these forms of tourism (Moore 2012).

The motives and satisfaction of tourists are the basis for understanding the behavior of consumers – tourists (Xu and Chan 2016). Although motivation is just one of many variables shaping the behavior of tourists, it is a critical variable for marketing and destination managers, because it represents the driving force of every behavior (Jensen 2015). Authors Robbins and Cho (2012) point out that a modern and busy way of life results in an increase in the stress of individuals, which leads to a desire to "slow down" and flee from everyday life. Under such conditions, slow tourism, as one of the modern trends, offers a solution to this need (Georgica 2014).

In times when "new consumers" are looking for a calmer rhythm, authentic experiences, cultural and natural resources in destinations they visit, Vojvodina as a tourist destination is suitable for the development of slow tourism. The main goal of this paper is to determine whether there are any differences in motives that drive consumers to travel, depending on their demographic characteristics.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Slow tourism – a special form of tourism

Slow tourism is a holistic approach in which traveling, destination and return make a unique experience of the consumers – tourists. Thus the authors Lumsdon and McGarth (2011) equate the concept of slow travel as a journey and slow tourism as a way of enjoying a destination. According to Dickinson and Lumsdon (2010), a slow trip is characterized by travel by bus, by train, by bike or by foot, which allows tourists to experience local cuisine, customs, habits and culture of the locals. In this way, the experience of tourists on the one hand and the benefits that this kind of tourism brings to the local community and stakeholders on the other hand are connected (Caffyn 2012).

Although the term 'slow' is related to time, when it comes to slow tourism, the term derives from the use of the word 'slow' in slow food movement, Cittaslow (slow cities) and slow consumption (Fullagar et al. 2012; Hall 2012). Namely, slow travel and slow tourism are developed from the slow food movement (Kummer 2002) which is dedicated to foods based on the principles of high quality and taste (Yurtseven and Kaya 2011). The movement originated in Italy in 1986 as an opposition to the fast food cult in order to promote the quality of food and local food products (Robbins and Cho 2012). Over time, the movement expanded to cities (slow city movement, CittaSlow) with the basic idea of improving living conditions in both urban and rural areas. Authors Robbins and Cho (2012) point out that the basic ideas of these movements are food quality, quality of life, promotion of sustainable development and local production.

The author Caffyn (2012) summarizes the basic elements of slow tourism: minimization of the traveling distance (destination distance); maximizing the length of stay in the destination; psycho-physical relaxation; researching local culture and customs through contact with the locals; visits to local restaurants and shops; achieving personal development through learning new skills; minimizing the use of technology; minimizing commercialization while emphasizing the local products; maximizing the experience of authenticity; as well as the emphasis on environmental sustainability with the reduction of carbon dioxide. The above mentioned elements vary from destination to destination, but the higher the number of listed elements in the destination the 'slower' it is. In the same paper, the author Caffyn lists the key dimensions of slow tourism: 1) place (local, specialty, landscape, heritage, environment); 2) people (community, culture, local businesses, local cuisine, hospitality, authenticity); 3) time (tempo, relaxation, calmness); 4) travel (distance, speed, reduction of carbon dioxide emissions) and 5) dimension related to personality of a consumer - tourist (welfare, satisfaction, recreation, fellowship, learning, enjoyment, understanding). According to Yurtseven and Kaya (2011) slow tourism is based on two basic principles: dedicating time to a specific destination and linking to a destination - a place.

The author Caffyn (2007) defines slow tourism as tourism that involves building relationships to the people, places, culture, food, heritage and environment. According to Conway and Timms (2012) slow tourism means deciding to 'slow down' and enjoy the journey itself. Similarly, authors Guiver and McGrath (2016) see slow tourism as a conscious decision-making. Word slow is an acronym too - S – sustainability; L – locally; O – organic and W – whole. Taking the above mentioned facts into account it is possible to conclude that slow tourism has a potential to offer 'win-win-win' in the sense that it represents a special form of sustainable tourism which contributes to the welfare of the local community while offering satisfaction and new experience to the consumers – tourists.

2.2. Motives of the slow tourism consumers

The author Oh and associates (2016) view slow tourism as a series of goal-driven activities. Thus, in order to develop the conceptual slow tourism model, the theory of goal-driven consumer behavior is applied, according to which most consumer behavior is targeted. The author Bagozzi and Dholakia (1999) constructed a model of a targeted process of consumer behavior that includes three elements: 1) setting goals; 2) planning the action and 3) achieving / not achieving the goal. In the context of slow tourism, 'merging' with the natural environment while revitalizing the body and spirit could be the main goals of making a decision on travel (Oh et al. 2016).

Motivation in tourism can be seen in the context of push and pull factors. This is a two-phase process in which consumers make decisions about traveling based on internal – push factors and then select a destination based on external destination attributes – pull factors (Wong et al. 2017). Thus, push factors make consumers want go on the journey while pull factors make the choice of destination easier (Xu and Chan 2016). The authors Kim et al. (2007) include psychological motives such as escape, relaxation, social interaction, health and prestige in the group of the push motives while the authors Pesonen and associates (2011) include cultural motives such as new knowledge and education as well as attributes of the destinations themselves, such as natural attractiveness, food, local population and accommodation capacities in the group of pull motives. The author Heitmann describes the push factors as specificities of individuals - consumers while the pull factors are described as specificities of destinations (2011).

Based on the motives that drive them, the authors Yurtseven and Kaya (2011) separate consumers who visit CittaSlow into three groups: 1) dedicated; 2) interested and 3) accidental slow tourists. Those 'dedicated' slow tourists are also called 'hard slow' while the others are considered to be 'soft slow' (Guiver and McGrath 2016). 'Dedicated' slow tourists are interested in getting to know new cultures; they are educated; they are independent as

travelers with high expectations in relation to areas they explore and visit; they enjoy eco-gastronomy (Yurtseven and Kaya 2011).

3. METHODOLOGY

Some empirical evidence that would closely explain dimension and the process of slow tourism are not present within existing research on this specific form of tourism. Therefore, the authors of this paper tried to determine the differences in the motives of tourists - consumers of slow tourism, depending on their demographic characteristics (gender, age, education, monthly income).

In order to collect data, a field research was conducted using questionnaires and on-line questionnaires in the period from October to December 2017. The sample was quota, and approximately the same number of respondents were taken from the territory of each of the five cities covered by the survey (Subotica n=68; Novi Sad n=76; Belgrade n=58; Kragujevac n=54; Niš n=64). The respondents who visited one of the destinations in Vojvodina marked as 'slow place' (Palic, farm in Vojvodina, Fruska Gora) in the past two years could take part in the survey. The sample consisted of 198 women and 122 men. The largest number of respondents was aged between 26 and 35 and 36 to 45, 69.3% are college educated with monthly income up to 600 euros.

The applied questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part covered issues related to the general socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. The second part included questions about traveling and visiting the destination, while the third part of the questionnaire covered questions related to motives, goals and outcomes of the trip. The questions of the third part of the questionnaire were formulated in the form of attitudes to which the respondents answered using the five-step Likert scale (motives and goals: 1 - I completely disagree, 5 - completely agree, outcomes: 1 - very dissatisfied, 5 - very satisfied, 1 - very desperate, 5 - very enthusiastic, 1 - completely impossible, 5 - very possible). The questionnaire was adapted to the scale applied by the author Oh and associates (2016) (Cronbach Alpha coefficient for motives > 0.944; Cronbach Alpha coefficient for goals > 0.968; coefficient Cronbach Alpha for outcomes > 0.832).

In their research, the authors Oh and associates (2016) identified six motives of slow tourism: 1) Relaxation – release from pressure, stress, tension that results in a sense of relief and comfort; 2) self-reflection – the innate need of an individual to connect and identify with himself; 3) escape – the desire of an individual to (physically and mentally) distance himself from everyday duties and routines; 4) novelty seeking – through new places, new people who offer new experiences; 5) engaging – merging with local culture and environment; 6) discovery - a desire to learn and understand something new. The above mentioned authors also state the goals of visiting a slow destination: 1) revitalization – both physical and mental refreshment, and 2) self-enrichment – the extension of one's own views. Finally, the authors identify three outcomes of using slow tourism: 1) satisfaction – fulfillment of a desire and achievement of a goal; 2) future return intention – return to the destination under similar circumstances; 3) recommendation intention – spreading a positive word-of-mouth about a visited destination.

In this paper, the authors present a part of the results of the conducted research related to the motives of slow tourism consumers (relaxation, self-reflection, escape, discovery, engagement and learning). Based on the review of the leading opinions from the literature and the results of the previous research, the following hypotheses have been posed:

H₁: There is a statistically significant difference in the motives of slow tourism between the respondents of different sexes.

H₂: There is a statistically significant difference in the motives of slow tourism between the respondents of different ages.

H₃: There is a statistically significant difference in the motives of slow tourism between the respondents with different monthly income.

H₄: There is a statistically significant difference in the motives of slow tourism between the respondents of different educational structures.

The statistical software in which data is processed and in which hypotheses were tested is IBM SPSS version 20.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To test H₁ hypothesis, a t-test of independent samples was applied to show if there is a statistically significant deviation between the motives of slow tourism (motive 1 - relaxation, motive 2 – self-reflection, motive 3 - escape, motive 4 - discovery, motive 5 - engagement, motive 6 - learning) and the gender of the respondents (i.e. if there is a significant difference between female and male gender according to the motives of slow tourism). The results are shown in the Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 Statistics of the group

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Motive 1	Female	198	4,07	1,263	,089
	Male	122	3,79	1,364	,123
Motive 2	Female	198	3,64	1,118	,079
	Male	122	3,26	1,207	,109
Motive 3	Female	198	3,82	1,317	,093
	Male	122	3,59	1,320	,119
Motive 4	Female	198	3,33	1,151	,081
	Male	122	3,24	1,182	,107
Motive 5	Female	198	3,36	1,123	,079
	Male	122	3,15	1,103	,099
Motive 6	Female	198	3,96	1,113	,079
	Male	122	3,62	1,192	,107

Source: *The authors' calculation*

Table 2 Test of independent samples

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Motive 1	4,121	,043	1,765	241,335	,079	,269	,152	-,031	,570
Motive 2	1,626	,203	2,851	318	,005	,378	,132	,117	,639
Motive 3	,455	,500	1,546	318	,123	,234	,151	-,063	,533
Motive 4	,180	,671	,714	318	,475	,095	,133	-,167	,358
Motive 5	,161	,688	1,624	318	,105	,208	,128	-,044	,461
Motive 6	2,465	,117	2,556	318	,011	,336	,131	,077	,595

Source: *The authors' calculation*

For motive 1, there was no significant difference between the results in women ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.263$) and men ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.364$); $t(320) = 1.765$, $p = 0.079$. The difference between the mean values of the marks by groups (average difference = 0.27, 95% CI: -0.03 to 0.57) was small (eta squared = 0.01). For motive 2, a significant difference was observed between results in women ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 1.118$) and men ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 1.207$); $t(320) = 2.851$, $p = 0.005$, suggesting that the need to identify and interact with oneself is more likely

to trigger women than men. The difference between the mean values of the marks by groups (average difference = 0.38, 95% CI: 0.12 to 0.64) was small (eta squared = 0.02). For motive 3, there was no significant difference between the results in women ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.317$) and men ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.320$); $t(320) = 1.546$, $p = 0.123$. The difference between the mean values of the marks by groups (average difference = 0.23, 95% CI: -0.06 to 0.53) was small (eta squared = 0.01). There was no significant difference between the results in women ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 1.151$) and men ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.182$) in motive 4; $t(320) = 0.714$, $p = 0.105$. The difference between the mean values of the marks by groups (average difference = 0.10, 95% CI: -0.17 to 0.36) was small (eta squared = 0.01). For motive 5, there was no significant difference between the results in women ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.123$) and men ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.103$); $t(320) = 1.624$, $p = 0.123$. The difference between the mean values of the marks by groups (average difference = 0.21, 95% CI: -0.04 to 0.46) was small (eta squared = 0.01). For motive 6 a significant difference was observed between the results in women ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.113$) and men ($M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.192$); $t(320) = 2.556$, $p = 0.011$, leading us to conclude that the desire to learn and understand something new moves women more than men. The difference between the mean values of the groups by group (average difference = 0.34, 95% CI: 0.08 to 0.60) was small (eta squared = 0.02).

The significance of the variables motive 1, motive 3, motive 4 and motive 5 is above the required limit value of 0,05, and it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in these motives according to the gender of the respondents. When it comes to motive 2 and motive 6, the significance is equal to and less than 0,05, and it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in these motives when it comes to the gender of the respondents. Bearing in mind that there is no statistically significant difference in relation to sexes with a large number of motives, it can be concluded that the H_1 hypothesis is discarded, i.e. that there is no statistically significant difference between the subjects of the different sexes in the motives of slow tourism.

To test the H_2 hypothesis the one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was used to test if there was a statistically significant difference between the motives of slow tourism and the age of the respondents (i.e. if the groups of the respondents of different age significantly differ according to the motives of slow tourism). In order to test the hypothesis, respondents are separated into six different groups according to their age (group 1: up to 25 years, group 2: 26 to 35 years, group 3: 36 to 45 years, group 4: 46 to 55 years, group 5: 56 to 65 years, group 6: 66 years and older). The results are shown in the Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Motive 1	Up to 25	57	3,57	1,502	,198	3,17	3,97	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,99	1,286	,119	3,75	4,23	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,93	1,343	,140	3,65	4,21	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	4,27	1,003	,172	3,92	4,62	1,33	5,00
	56-65	16	4,43	,916	,229	3,94	4,92	1,67	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,55	,720	,293	3,79	5,31	3,33	5,00
	Total	320	3,96	1,307	,073	3,82	4,10	1,00	5,00
Motive 2	Do 25	57	3,30	1,248	,165	2,97	3,64	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,54	1,191	,110	3,32	3,76	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,31	1,160	,121	3,07	3,55	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	3,90	,989	,169	3,55	4,24	1,00	5,00
	56-65	16	3,66	,926	,231	3,17	4,16	2,00	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,16	,781	,319	3,34	4,98	3,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,49	1,166	,065	3,36	3,62	1,00	5,00

Motive 3	Up to 25	57	3,42	1,496	,198	3,02	3,81	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,74	1,374	,127	3,49	3,99	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,74	1,245	,130	3,48	4,00	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	4,11	1,022	,175	3,76	4,47	1,00	5,00
	56-65	16	3,65	1,300	,325	2,96	4,34	1,00	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,16	,752	,307	3,37	4,95	3,50	5,00
	Total	320	3,73	1,321	,073	3,58	3,87	1,00	5,00
Motive 4	Up to 25	57	3,22	1,323	,175	2,87	3,57	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,33	1,202	,111	3,11	3,55	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,21	1,110	,116	2,98	3,44	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	3,38	,985	,168	3,03	3,72	1,00	5,00
	56-65	16	3,28	1,048	,262	2,72	3,83	1,00	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,00	,707	,288	3,25	4,74	3,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,29	1,162	,064	3,16	3,42	1,00	5,00
Motive 5	Up to 25	57	3,17	1,200	,159	2,85	3,49	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,28	1,117	,103	3,07	3,49	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,19	1,074	,112	2,97	3,42	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	3,45	1,068	,183	3,08	3,82	1,00	5,00
	56-65	16	3,21	1,196	,299	2,58	3,85	1,00	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,41	,584	,238	3,80	5,03	3,50	5,00
	Total	320	3,27	1,118	,062	3,15	3,39	1,00	5,00
Motive 6	Up to 25	57	3,56	1,323	,175	3,21	3,91	1,00	5,00
	26-35	116	3,86	1,098	,101	3,66	4,06	1,00	5,00
	36-45	91	3,68	1,216	,127	3,42	3,93	1,00	5,00
	46-55	34	4,25	,837	,143	3,95	4,54	1,00	5,00
	56-65	16	4,21	,912	,228	3,73	4,70	1,50	5,00
	66 and older	6	4,58	,491	,200	4,06	5,09	4,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,83	1,154	,064	3,70	3,95	1,00	5,00

Source: The authors' calculation

In Table 4, the significance value is greater than 0.05, thus it is concluded that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean value of motive 1, motive 2, motive 3, motive 4 and motive 5 in 6 groups of respondents. Since the result is not statistically significant, subsequent tests for determining differences between groups are not carried out. For motive 6, a statistically significant difference was found at $p < 0.05$, but the groups do not differ significantly from each other.

Table 4 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motive 1	Between Groups	17,862	5	3,572	2,127	,062
	Within Groups	527,514	314	1,680		
	Total	545,376	319			
Motive 2	Between Groups	14,010	5	2,802	2,095	,066
	Within Groups	419,977	314	1,338		
	Total	433,988	319			
Motive 3	Between Groups	11,836	5	2,367	1,364	,238
	Within Groups	545,052	314	1,736		
	Total	556,887	319			
Motive 4	Between Groups	4,289	5	,858	,631	,676
	Within Groups	426,508	314	1,358		
	Total	430,797	319			
Motive 5	Between Groups	10,100	5	2,020	1,630	,152
	Within Groups	389,174	314	1,239		
	Total	399,274	319			
Motive 6	Between Groups	18,098	5	3,620	2,794	,017
	Within Groups	406,790	314	1,296		
	Total	424,888	319			

Source: The authors' calculation

Considering that in most of the observed motives (except motive 6) there was no statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$, it can be concluded that respondents (all 6 age groups) are equally motivated for slow tourism. Hence, the set hypothesis H2 is rejected, i.e. there is no statistically significant difference between the subjects of different ages in the slow tourism motives.

To test the H3 hypothesis, the one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) of different groups was also applied to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the slow tourism motives and respondents with different monthly income. In order to test the hypothesis, respondents were divided into five groups according to monthly income (group 1: up to 300 euros, group 2: 301 to 600 euros, group 3: 601 to 900 euros, group 4: 901 to 1200 euros, group 5: over 1200 euros). The results are shown in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5 Descriptive statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Motive 1	Up to 300 euros	51	3,47	1,593	,223	3,02	3,91	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,89	1,377	,139	3,62	4,17	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	4,17	1,115	,134	3,90	4,44	1,00	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	4,00	1,216	,155	3,69	4,31	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	4,32	,995	,155	4,01	4,63	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,96	1,307	,073	3,82	4,10	1,00	5,00
Motive 2	Up to 300 euros	51	3,32	1,269	,177	2,96	3,68	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,55	1,280	,129	3,29	3,80	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	3,64	1,069	,128	3,39	3,90	1,00	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	3,49	1,023	,131	3,23	3,75	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	3,30	1,105	,172	2,95	3,64	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,49	1,166	,065	3,36	3,62	1,00	5,00
Motive 3	Up to 300 euros	51	3,37	1,486	,208	2,95	3,79	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,64	1,434	,144	3,36	3,93	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	3,86	1,137	,136	3,58	4,13	1,00	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	3,82	1,175	,150	3,52	4,12	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	4,01	1,262	,197	3,61	4,41	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,73	1,321	,073	3,58	3,87	1,00	5,00
Motive 4	Up to 300 euros	51	3,13	1,284	,179	2,77	3,49	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,34	1,275	,128	3,09	3,60	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	3,34	1,041	,125	3,09	3,59	1,00	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	3,33	1,031	,132	3,07	3,60	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	3,24	1,129	,176	2,88	3,60	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,29	1,162	,064	3,16	3,42	1,00	5,00
Motive 5	Up to 300 euros	51	2,97	1,159	,162	2,64	3,29	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,40	1,266	,127	3,15	3,66	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	3,38	,993	,119	3,14	3,62	1,00	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	3,303	,962	,123	3,05	3,54	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	3,12	1,065	,166	2,78	3,45	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,27	1,118	,062	3,15	3,39	1,00	5,00
Motive 6	Up to 300 euros	51	3,32	1,445	,202	2,91	3,73	1,00	5,00
	301 to 600 euros	98	3,84	1,252	,126	3,59	4,09	1,00	5,00
	601 to 900 euros	69	4,06	,882	,106	3,85	4,27	1,50	5,00
	901 to 1200 euros	61	3,86	,987	,126	3,60	4,11	1,00	5,00
	over 1200 euros	41	3,98	,984	,153	3,67	4,29	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,83	1,154	,064	3,7043	3,95	1,00	5,00

Source: The author's calculation

Table 6 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motive 1	Between Groups	21,338	4	5,334	3,207	,013
	Within Groups	524,038	315	1,664		
	Total	545,376	319			
Motive 2	Between Groups	4,898	4	1,224	,899	,465
	Within Groups	429,090	315	1,362		
	Total	433,987	319			
Motive 3	Between Groups	12,233	4	3,058	1,769	,135
	Within Groups	544,655	315	1,729		
	Total	556,888	319			
Motive 4	Between Groups	1,886	4	,471	,346	,847
	Within Groups	428,911	315	1,362		
	Total	430,797	319			
Motive 5	Between Groups	8,293	4	2,073	1,670	,157
	Within Groups	390,981	315	1,241		
	Total	399,274	319			
Motive 6	Between Groups	18,006	4	4,501	3,485	,008
	Within Groups	406,882	315	1,292		
	Total	424,888	319			

Source: The author's calculation

A statistically significant difference at the level of $p < 0.05$ in the results of five groups was determined at motive 1: $F(4, 315) = 3.207$, $p = 0.013$. The actual difference between the mean values of the groups is small. The size of that difference, expressed by the eta squared, is 0.04. Subsequent comparison using the Tukey HSD test value indicates that the median value of group 1 ($M = 3.47$; $SD = 1.593$) differs significantly from the mean of group 3 ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.115$) and group 5 ($M = 4, 32$; $SD = 0.995$). Group 2 ($M = 3.89$; $SD = 1.377$) and group 4 ($M = 4.00$; $SD = 1.216$) do not significantly differ from group 1, 3, and 5. In motive 6, a statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ in the results of five groups is noticed: $F(4, 315) = 3.485$, $p = 0.008$. The actual difference between the mean values of the groups is small. The size of that difference, expressed by the eta squared, is 0.04. Subsequent comparison using the Tukey HSD test value indicates that the mean value of group 1 ($M = 3.32$; $SD = 1.445$) is significantly different from the mean value of group 3 ($M = 4.06$; $SD = 0.882$) and group 5 ($M = 3, 98$; $SD = 0.984$). Group 2 ($M = 3.84$; $SD = 1.252$) and group 4 ($M = 3.86$; $SD = 0.987$) do not differ significantly from group 1, 3 and 5. Considering that for the remaining motives (motives 2, 3, 4 and 5), a statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ level was not found, it can be concluded that respondents with different monthly incomes are equally motivated for slow tourism. The H_3 hypothesis is thus discarded, i.e. there is no statistically significant difference in the motives of slow tourism between respondents with different monthly incomes.

To test the H_4 hypothesis, a one-way ANOVA variation analysis was applied to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the slow tourism motives and the educational structure of the respondents. In order to test the hypothesis, according to the educational structure, respondents were divided into three groups (group 1: secondary school, group 2: faculty graduates, group 3: doctorate). The results are shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Motive 1	Secondary school	66	3,67	1,495	,184	3,30	4,04	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	4,01	1,280	,085	3,84	4,18	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	4,19	,979	,173	3,84	4,55	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,96	1,307	,073	3,82	4,10	1,00	5,00
Motive 2	Secondary school	66	3,45	1,190	,146	3,16	3,75	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	3,47	1,187	,079	3,32	3,63	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	3,66	,972	,171	3,31	4,01	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,49	1,166	,065	3,36	3,62	1,00	5,00
Motive 3	Secondary school	66	3,53	1,352	,166	3,19	3,86	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	3,75	1,346	,090	3,57	3,93	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	3,98	1,019	,180	3,61	4,35	2,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,73	1,321	,073	3,58	3,87	1,00	5,00
Motive 4	Secondary school	66	3,16	1,151	,141	2,88	3,44	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	3,33	1,193	,080	3,17	3,49	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	3,29	,957	,169	2,95	3,64	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,29	1,162	,064	3,16	3,42	1,00	5,00
Motive 5	Secondary school	66	3,13	1,111	,136	2,86	3,40	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	3,29	1,135	,076	3,14	3,44	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	3,46	1,007	,178	3,10	3,83	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,27	1,118	,062	3,15	3,39	1,00	5,00
Motive 6	Secondary school	66	3,50	1,257	,154	3,19	3,81	1,00	5,00
	Faculty	222	3,89	1,145	,076	3,74	4,04	1,00	5,00
	Doctorate	32	4,07	,852	,150	3,77	4,38	1,00	5,00
	Total	320	3,83	1,154	,064	3,70	3,95	1,00	5,00

Source: The author's calculation

Table 8 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Motive 1	Between Groups	7,808	2	3,904	2,302	,102
	Within Groups	537,568	317	1,696		
	Total	545,376	319			
Motive 2	Between Groups	1,082	2	,541	,396	,673
	Within Groups	432,905	317	1,366		
	Total	433,987	319			
Motive 3	Between Groups	4,835	2	2,418	1,388	,251
	Within Groups	552,052	317	1,741		
	Total	556,888	319			
Motive 4	Between Groups	1,452	2	,726	,536	,586
	Within Groups	429,345	317	1,354		
	Total	430,797	319			
Motive 5	Between Groups	2,523	2	1,261	1,008	,366
	Within Groups	396,752	317	1,252		
	Total	399,274	319			
Motive 6	Between Groups	9,681	2	4,841	3,696	,026
	Within Groups	415,206	317	1,310		
	Total	424,888	319			

Source: The author's calculation

A statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ level was found at motive 6 in the results of three groups: $F(2, 317) = 3.696$, $p = 0.026$. The actual difference between the mean values of the groups is small. The size of this difference, expressed by the eta squared, is 0.02. Subsequent comparison using the Tukey HSD test value indicates that the mean value of group 1 ($M = 3.50$; $SD = 1.257$) differs significantly from the mean value of group 2 ($M =$

3.89, SD = 1.145). Group 3 (M = 4.07; SD = 0.852) does not differ significantly from group 1 or from group 2. Considering that there is no statistically significant difference at $p < 0.05$ level for the remaining motives (motives 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5), it can be concluded that respondents of different educational structures are equally motivated for slow tourism. The H_4 hypothesis is thus discarded, i.e. there is no statistically significant difference between the respondents of different educational structures in the motives of slow tourism.

Based on the obtained results it can be generally concluded that no significant differences between the motives of slow tourism were observed depending on the demographic characteristics of the respondents, which is confirmed by the hypothesis tested. Nevertheless, when observing the gender of the respondents, it was noticed that women are more likely motivated by the motives of self-reflection and learning. By exploring the relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents and the motives that make them want to go on a tourist trip, the author Jensen (2015) discerns significant differences between the respondents of different gender (women find escape and social interaction to be more important motives, while men find prestige to be the most important). Observing the age of the respondents, the motive for understanding and learning something new was emphasized only in the oldest group of respondents (66 and older). Depending on the monthly income, the biggest deviation is observed in the relaxation motive – the relaxation is most prominent among consumers with the highest amount of monthly income (over 1,200 euros), which coincides with the results of research carried out by the author Jensen (2015). Finally, respondents with the highest level of education highlighted the motive of learning and understanding something new as a motive that moves them to practice slow tourism.

5. CONCLUSION

Slow tourism represents the tourism of the future (Conway and Timms 2010). A central place in it is taken by a consumer – a tourist whose needs must be recognized by the destination. As such, the 'slowdown' can be both the motive and goal of 'escaping' to traveling and visiting a slow destination (Oh et al. 2016). On the other hand, applying the principle of slow tourism destinations can reduce the outflow of funds to foreign suppliers and thus generate more income for the local population (Caffyn 2012).

Slow tourism offers a new vision and perspective for the development of tourism in Vojvodina. The results of this study show that the inhabitants of the five largest cities in Serbia are driven by different motives when selecting certain destinations marked as slow place in Vojvodina. Future research should contribute to a better understanding of the slow tourism phenomenon by involving foreign tourists and increasing the size of the sample in that way.

REFERENCES

- Bagozzi, Richard P., and Utpal Dholakia. 1999. "Goal Setting and Goal Striving in Consumer Behavior" *Journal of Marketing*, 63: 19-32
- Caffyn, Alison. 2007. "Slow Tourism". *Tourism Society Journal*, 133: 10-16
- Caffyn, Alison. 2012. "Advocating and Implementing Slow Tourism". *Tourism Recreation Research* 37(1):77-80
- Conway, Dennis, and Benjamin Timms. 2010. "Re-branding alternative tourism in the Caribbean: The case for 'slow tourism'". *Tourism and Hospitality Research* 10 (4): 329-344
- Conway, Dennis, and Benjamin Timms. 2012. "Are Slow Travel and Slow Tourism Misfits, Compadres or Different Genres?". *Tourism Recreation Research* 37 (1): 71-76
- Dickinson, Janet, and Les Lumsdon. 2010. *Slow Travel and Tourism*. UK: Earthscan.
- Fullagar, Simone, Kevin Markwell, and Erica Wilson. 2012. *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities*. UK: Channel View Publications.
- Georgica, Gheorghe. 2014. "The Tourist's Perception about Slow Travel – A Romanian Perspective". *Procedia Economics and Finance* 23: 1596-1601
- Guiver, Jo, and Peter McGrath. 2016. "Slow tourism: Exploring the discourses". *Dos Algarves: A Multidisciplinary e-Journal* 27: 11-34
- Hall, Michael C. 2012. The Contradictions and Paradoxes of Slow Food: Environmental Change, Sustainability and the Conservation of Taste. In *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities* edited by Fullagar, Simone, Kevin Markwell and Erica Wilson 53-68, UK: Channel View Publications
- Heitmann, Sine. 2011. Tourist Behaviour and Tourism Motivation. In *Research Themes for Tourism*, edited by Robinson, Peter, Sine Heitmann and Peter Dieke, 31-44. UK: CAB International
- Jensen, Jan M. 2015. "The Relationships between Socio-demographic Variables, Travel Motivations and Subsequent Choice of Vacation". *Advances in Economics and Business* 3 (8): 322-328
- Kim, Kaykom, Ick-Keum Oh and Giri Jogaratnam. 2007. "College student travel: A revised model of push motives". *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 13 (1): 73-85
- Kummer, Corby. 2002. *The Pleasures of Slow Food: Celebrating Authentic Traditions, Flavors, and Recipes*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books
- Lumsdon, Les and McGrath, Peter. 2011. "Developing a conceptual framework for slow travel: a grounded theory approach". *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 19 (3): 265-279
- Moore, Kevin. 2012. On the Periphery of Pleasure: Hedonics, Eudaimonics, and Slow Travel. In *Slow Tourism: Experiences and Mobilities* edited by Fullagar, Simone, Kevin Markwell and Erica Wilson, 25-35. UK: Channel View Publications
- Oh, Haemoon, George A. Assaf and Seyhmus Baloglu. 2016. "Motivations and Goals of Slow Tourism". *Journal of Travel Research* 55 (2): 205-219
- Pesonen, Juho, Raija Komppula, Christopher Kronenberg and Mike Peters. 2011. "Understanding the relationship between push and pull motivations in rural tourism". *Tourism Review* 66 (3): 32-49
- Robbins, Derek and Jaedong Cho. 2012. "Slow Travellers – Who Are They, and What Motivates Them?". *Conference Proceedings of BEST EN Think Tank XII: Mobilities and Sustainable Tourism* 144-160
- Wong, Brian Kee Mun, Ghazali Musa and Azni Zarina Taha. 2017. "Malaysia my second home: The influence of push and pull motivations on satisfaction". *Tourism Management* 61: 394-410
- Xu, Jing and Shukman Chan. 2016. "A new nature-based tourism motivation model: Testing the moderating effects of the push motivation". *Tourism Management Perspectives* 18: 107-110
- Yurtseven, Ridvan H. and Ozan Kaya. 2011. "Slow Tourists: A Comparative Research Based on Cittaslow" Principles. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 1 (2): 91-98