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Abstract: This field study explored motivation and satisfaction dimensions of sightseeing tourists. For this purpose, 225 were tested for their motives before the day's tour and for their satisfactions after it. The data were collected on 10 different tour buses. The results indicated a considerable similarity between motivation and satisfaction dimensions, with knowledge seeking, social interaction, and escape emerging as important motive and satisfaction factors. This similarity led to a very high overall satisfaction with the tour. A group of tourists who came together by chance scored significantly higher on the knowledge-seeking motive and on five satisfaction dimensions than did the regular tour group and the convention group. Keywords: motivation, satisfaction, sightseeing, social interaction, information seeking, escape.

Résumé: Les visites guidées et la motivation et satisfaction des touristes. Cette enquête sur le terrain a étudié les éléments de motivation et satisfaction chez les touristes en visite guidée. Dans ce but, on a fait un sondage auprès de 225 touristes pour déterminer leur motivation avant la visite et leur satisfaction après. On a recueilli des informations dans dix cars touristiques. Les résultats ont indiqué qu'il y a un rapport considérable entre les éléments de motivation et satisfaction; la poursuite des connaissances culturelles, l'interaction sociale et l'évasion ont émergé comme des facteurs importants de motivation et de satisfaction. Cette ressemblance a mené à un haut niveau de satisfaction générale avec la visite. Un groupe de touristes qui s'est réuni par hasard accordait beaucoup plus d'importance à la recherche des connaissances culturelles et à cinq éléments de satisfaction que le groupe déjà constitué et le groupe du congrès. Mots-clés: motivation, satisfaction, visite guidée, interaction sociale, poursuite des connaissances culturelles, évasion.

INTRODUCTION

It is becoming increasingly clear that tourism is primarily a social psychological experience (Iso-Ahola 1983; Mannel and Iso-Ahola 1987; Pierce 1982; Rubenstein 1980; Stringer and Pierce 1984; Van Raaij and Francken 1984). Although such sociological factors as in-
come and socioeconomic status affect tourism behavior, they are not significant determinants of the quality of the experiences. What matters is the individual's cognitions and feelings about the experience being undertaken. Bultena and Field (1978), two sociologists, admitted this by suggesting that perceptions of social and personal benefits to be derived from national park travel and the experiential interests of travelers mediate the influence of socioeconomic status on park visits. Thus, motivation and satisfaction are central concepts in attempts to understand tourism behavior.

Although knowledge in this area is respectable, much research remains to be done before one can fully understand the psychological nature of tourist experiences. Mannell and Iso-Ahola (1987) have recently identified a set of unanswered empirical questions, one of which deals with the nature of tourist motives and satisfaction. A related question has to do with the type of tourist experiences that may promote the similarity and difference between motivations and satisfactions. While it was not possible systematically vary the type of tourist experience in the present study, the researchers were able to empirically examine tourism motives and satisfactions in one type of tourist experience: a sightseeing tour.

In cognitive social psychology (Atkinson 1964; Heider 1958; Lewin 1951; Tolman 1959; Vroom 1964), motives are inextricably linked to expected outcomes of behavior. Accordingly, the initiation of behavior is largely a function of expectations about future consequences of behavior. Often, although not always, behavior is expected to produce personal satisfaction. This general information processing approach to motivation has in recent years been championed and expanded by Deci (1975) and Deci and Ryan (1985, 1987). Deci (1975:99) states that a motive is an internal factor that can be likened to "an awareness of potential satisfaction" in a future situation, meaning that motives are cognitive representations of future states. Such motivation refers to "autonomous initiation" or "self-determination" of behavior (Deci and Ryan 1987) and is expected to lead to personally satisfying experiences. In this theorizing, then, motivation and satisfaction are positively related to one another. But the two cannot be equated, because motives, by their definition, occur before an experience and satisfaction after it. It has been empirically demonstrated that if leisure motives are measured before a given leisure experience, they are very different from the same measurements taken after the leisure experience, especially when the leisure experience has clearly been positive or negative (Iso-Ahola and Allen 1982).

Theoretically, what are the motives for leisure behaviors? Consistent with Deci's theorizing, it has been suggested (Iso-Ahola 1982, 1984, 1990) that seeking and escaping are the basic motivational dimensions of leisure behavior. Accordingly, two motivational forces simultaneously influence the individual's leisure behavior. On the one hand, leisure activities are sought because they provide novelty or change to daily routine and stress. By escaping the everyday environment, a person can leave behind the personal and/or interpersonal world. The former refers to escape from personal problems, troubles, difficulties, and failures, or the daily interpersonal world (e.g., coworkers, friends, fam-
ily members). A person can also escape both worlds. The other motivational force is the individual tendency to seek psychological (intrinsic) rewards from participation in leisure activities. The intrinsic rewards that the individual may pursue through leisure can also be divided into personal and interpersonal. The personal rewards consist mainly of self-determination, sense of competence, challenge, learning, exploration, and relaxation. On the other hand, people often want to engage in leisure activities mainly for social contact. Translated into tourism, this theory means that the psychological benefits of recreational travel emanate from the interplay of two motivational forces: escaping of routine or stressful environments and seeking of opportunities for certain psychological rewards (Iso-Ahola 1983:55).

It is unclear, however, when and under what conditions one motivational dimension is more dominant than the other. Berlyne's (1960) theory of exploratory behavior would generally suggest that in case of understimulation, a seeking tendency is dominant, and in case of overstimulation, an escape tendency may be expected. Wahlers and Etzel (1985) reported data supporting this theorizing and showed that people use tourism experiences for stimulation seeking and reduction in efforts to achieve the individual optimal level of arousal. While one could theorize that the escape dimension may be prevalent in tourism in general because of its inherent escape nature, especially in light of the recent trend toward shorter getaway vacations (Wall Street Journal, 1986), all the tourism experiences are not alike. Clearly, sightseeing tours are different than traditional 2–3-week family "dinosaur," station wagon vacations. Even within sightseeing tours, there are differences not only because of the length of time involved, but also because of the place and target of the tours (city vs. nature tours). Of the short sightseeing vacations, this study focused on one type, namely, city tours that are becoming increasingly popular in such big cities as Washington DC, and yet little is known about psychological factors involved in these kinds of tourist experiences.

It was theorized that of the two motivational "forces," the seeking rather than escape component would be more important to the 1-day sightseeing tourists. If people wish just to relax and do nothing, or do their familiar leisure activities during vacations, they would not be interested in sightseeing tours. By their definition, these tours imply that participants are seeking information and knowledge about certain places. This is not to say that the escape dimension is not present as a motivator of sightseeing because the two are interwoven: People seek by escaping and escape by seeking (Iso-Ahola 1990). The seeking tendency, however, is more likely to be true of those tours that are geared toward giving new exposures and information, as opposed to other types of sightseeing tours (e.g., scenic) in which aesthetic experience is emphasized.

In short, the present study was planned to answer the following research questions: Which motive and satisfaction dimensions are important to sightseeing tourists? Are these tourists more seeking versus escape oriented in their motives and satisfactions? What group differences are there in the extracted motivation and satisfaction dimensions?
METHOD

Sample

Three different types of tourist groups visiting Washington DC were asked to complete a survey questionnaire before and after a day's tour. The tour group types consisted of preformed tour groups traveling together (called Tour Groups), individuals with no affiliation to one another (called Non-Affinity Groups), and convention delegates and spouses (called Convention Groups). The first group is a typical group of tourists traveling together in conjunction with a prepackaged consumer tour product or as a special interest group. The second one is a group of individual tourists who came together by chance for the sole purpose of participating in a particular sightseeing tour. The Convention Group is any group visiting the destination in conjunction with a convention or similar business meeting; sightseeing excursions were offered to delegates and spouses as an optional activity. The Convention Groups and Tour Groups had a step-on tour guide, whereas the driver of the bus served as a guide for the Non-Affinity Groups.

The total number of subjects was 255 and came from the three groups as follows: the Convention Groups (n = 69), the Tour Groups (n = 137), and the Non-Affinity Groups (n = 49). Subjects were selected according to the terms specified by the companies agreeing to participate in the study. Each of the three sample groups was served by two companies that agreed to have their guides administer the questionnaire to their tourists. The passengers on these buses who volunteered to participate became the sample. Thus, the subjects do not represent a probability sample; rather, they were selected to participate in the study simply because they were riding the buses on which the questionnaire was distributed upon the company's permission. Almost all the tourists on the buses agreed to participate in the study.

A descriptive analysis of the sample indicated the following: Most of the subjects (92%) lived in the United States and were from the northeast region of the country (66%); 68% of them were females, and 78% were 35 years or older; 51% of subjects had had at least some college education, and 65% had an annual income of $25,000 or more; 51% of subjects were visiting Washington for the first time, and 75% of them had not taken a tour of the city before; most of the subjects (80%) were staying for 3 nights or less.

Data Collection

The data were collected on 10 different tour buses. A two-page questionnaire, designed mainly to gather information on subjects' motives for taking the tour, was distributed to tourists at the beginning of the tour and collected at the first stop. If the passengers had not completed these two pages before the bus departed (most of them had), they had to fill out the questionnaire while the bus was moving. A different questionnaire designed mainly to tap subjects' satisfaction with different aspects of the tour was distributed as the passengers reboarded at the last stop and were filled out en route to the hotel or other drop-off
points. If they had not completed the questionnaire before the destination place, they took a few moments to complete it at the conclusion of the tour.

The questionnaires were administered by different tour guides of the five companies participating in the study. Those guides who volunteered to collect the data were informed about the general purpose of the study and given detailed instructions for administering the questionnaires, including an introductory statement explaining the study and the data collection procedures. This was done to ensure that the tour guides had the same knowledge and attitude toward the study and that they actually collected the data in an identical manner.

Each subject had a unique symbol on his or her questionnaire so that the two separate instruments could be matched later for data analysis. As expected, there were a few passengers on nearly every bus who did not follow the directions, making it impossible to match some of the questionnaires. As a result, the response rate was not perfect: 91% for the Non-Affinity Groups, 91% for the Tour Groups, and 66% for the Convention Groups.

In general, the itineraries of the three groups were similar, consisting of general sites, monuments, and memorials. The main difference was that the Convention Group's and Tour Group's time of touring was 4 hours, whereas the Non-Affinity Group's trip was a full-day tour. The latter group's tour had additional stops at the Smithsonian, Washington National Cemetery, and Mount Vernon.

Instruments

In the beginning of the tour, subjects were asked to indicate their agreement on a 1-5 scale (from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree") to 20 motivational items. Each statement began with the words, "I am taking this tour. . . ," for example, "to learn about the Federal Government" or "because sightseeing is more fun with a group of people." These items were adapted from earlier leisure motivation studies (Crandall 1980; Iso-Ahola and Allen 1982; Tinsley and Kass 1978) and designed to cover both seeking and escaping dimensions of leisure motivation. Table 1 presents Cronbach's alphas for each factor and shows that they vary from a high of .78 (first factor) to a low of .64 (second factor), thereby indicating satisfactory reliability for the motivation instrument.

At the conclusion of the trip, subjects indicated their satisfaction with various aspects of the tour, which corresponded to the motivational items presented before the tour. They did this by indicating their agreements to each of the 30 items on a 1-5 scale (from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"): for example, "I learned about the Federal Government" and "I had more fun with the tour group than I would have on my own." As mentioned, there were 20 motivational items and 30 satisfaction items, so that 10 items not covered by the motivation instrument were added to the posttour satisfaction measure. Along with the specific satisfaction items, subjects also indicated their "overall satisfaction with today's tour" and responded to the standard questions about their demographic characteristics. Table 2 presents Cronbach's
Table 1. Motivation Dimensions of a Sightseeing Tour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To see the famous sites</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To gain general knowledge</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To visit the places I especially want to see</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Tour enables me to see as much as possible in a short amount of time</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To learn about the history of the nation's capital</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* See more on a tour than on my own</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Washington said to be a beautiful city</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sightseeing is more fun with a group of people</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To be with others</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Feel more secure with a group than on my own</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Enjoy Sightseeing</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Escape</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To forget about work and other responsibilities</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To forget about personal worries and troubles</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Impulsive Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Result of an impulsive decision</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To have my picture taken in front of famous places</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Paid for it in advance</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To learn about the history of the nation's capital</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specific Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To learn about the Federal Government</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To learn about the history of the nation's capital</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shopping for Souvenirs</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To shop for souvenirs</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* To kill time</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only factor loadings of .40 and above reported.

alphas for each satisfaction factor and shows that they varied from a high of .84 (first factor) to a low of .45 (fourth factor). The relatively low alphas for the fourth and fifth factor are more of a reflection of a small number of items loading highly on these factors than of unsatisfactory reliability. The remaining four factors had relatively high coefficients of internal consistency.

RESULTS

Motivation Dimensions

Table 1 presents results relevant to the questions of which motive dimensions are most important to the tourists. Similarly, Table 2 shows the data pertinent to the question of which satisfaction dimensions are most important to the tourists. Both tables summarize the findings produced by principal component factor analysis and subsequent varimax rotations. Principle component factors with an eigenvalue of one or greater were then rotated by the varimax analysis. Both tables present factor loadings of .40 or higher for the variables on each factor.

As can be seen, the six extracted motivation factors explained 63% of the total variance, of which the first factor, termed "General Knowledge," explained 20%. Clearly, the variables that loaded highly on this factor reflect tourists' tendency to seek general knowledge (.64), because they sought to learn about the history of the nation's capital (.54), see famous sites (.67), and visit the places they especially wanted to see (.63). They were also motivated by the tour because it "enables them to see as
much as possible in a short amount of time" (.61). The second factor, "Social Interaction," also explained a relatively large portion (19%) of the total variance and reflected tourists' tendency to seek social contacts and company through the tour. The highest factor loadings occurred on the variables "sightseeing is more fun with a group of people" (.72), "to be with others" (.61), and "because I feel more secure with a group than on my own" (.47).

The remaining four factors' ability to explain variance declined noticeably. The third factor, "Escape," explained only about one-third (7.1%) of what the previous two factors did but was still of some importance to subjects and showed these tourists also wanted to escape their "work and other responsibilities" (.96) and "personal worries and troubles" (.58). The fourth factor, "Impulsive Decision," explained 6.4% of the variance and indicated that tourists' motives are in part based upon (or lead to) temporary and "impulsive decisions" (.69). This was reinforced by the desire to "have their pictures taken in front of famous places" (.50) and not "to learn about the history of the nation's capital" (-.45). The fifth factor, "Specific Knowledge," explained 5.7% of the variance and was indicated by the motive "to learn about the Federal Government" (.68) and "to learn about the history of the nation's capital" (.51). Finally, the sixth factor, "Shopping for Souvenirs," explained
5.3% of the variance and was loaded mainly on the variables “to shop for souvenirs” (.61) and “to kill a little time” (.45).

To compare the three groups on the extracted factors, items that had a rotated factor loading of at least +.30 were used to compute a factor score for each subject on each of the extracted factors. The formula used for these computations was: Factor Score = Rotated Factor Coefficient + (Item Mean)/Standard Deviation. Analysis of variance indicated that the three groups differed significantly from one another on two factors only: General Knowledge \(F(2,252) = 7.27, p < .0008\) and Specific Knowledge \(F(2,252) = 6.63, p < .001\). The first finding revealed that General Knowledge as a motivator was more important for the Non-Affinity Group \(M = -.16\) than for either the Convention Group \(M = -.44\) or the Tour Group \(M = -.94\). The Scheffe post-hoc test showed the significance to lie between the Non-Affinity and the Tour Group. The second finding indicated that the Specific Knowledge as a motivator was more important for the Non-Affinity Group \(M = -.03\) than the Convention Group \(M = -.26\) or Tour Group \(M = -.70\). Again, the Scheffe test showed the significance to lie between the Non-Affinity and Tour Groups.

**Satisfaction Dimensions**

As can be seen from Table 2, the extracted factors explained 56% of the total variance, of which the first factor, called “Knowledge,” explained more than one-half (30%). This factor reflected the tourists’ satisfaction with having “learned about the history of the nation’s capital” (.81), “learned about the Federal Government” (.81), and “learned as much as they thought they would” (.55).

The second factor, “Escape” (6% of the variance), reflected subjects’ satisfaction with having been “able to forget about their troubles and worries” (.63) and “feeling that they had received a good value” (.53). The fact that subjects had received a psychological value by being able to escape was reinforced by the high negative loading of such a practice-related item as “microphone and speakers were in good working order” (−.62), meaning that these things were unimportant to subjects. The third factor, “Tour Pace” (5.5%), reflected subjects’ satisfaction with sufficiency of “time to use comfort facilities” (.63), “time to take pictures” (.53), and “time to buy souvenirs” (.36). The fourth factor, “Social Interaction” (5.1%), showed subjects’ satisfaction with “company of others” (.60). The fifth factor, “Social Security” (4.7%), reflected subjects’ satisfaction with having “felt more secure in the tour group” (.86) and having “had more fun with the tour group than they would have had on their own” (.60). Finally, the sixth factor, “Practical Aspects” (4.4%), was somewhat ambiguous because it showed subjects’ satisfaction with the fact that the “bus was clean” (.57) and “the tour was an important part of their visit to Washington” (.49) on the one hand, and their satisfaction with having been able “to forget their work and other responsibilities” (.43) on the other.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) disclosed statistically significant differences between the three groups on five of the six extracted factors. First, the Non-Affinity Group \(M = -.04\) was more satisfied
[\(F(2,252) = 5.30, p < .005\)] on the "Knowledge" factor than either the Convention Group (\(M = -.90\)) or the Tour Group (\(M = -1.27\)), with the first and the last group differing significantly (\(p < .05\) by Scheffe). Second, the Non-Affinity Group (\(M = -.08\)) was significantly [\(F(2,252 = 6.07, p < .003\)] more satisfied on the "Escape" factor than the Tour Group (\(M = -1.32\)). Similarly, the Non-Affinity Group (\(M = -.07\)) was significantly [\(F(2,252) = 5.61, p < .004\)] more satisfied on the "Tour Pace" factor than either the Convention Group (\(M = -.94\)) or the Tour Group (\(M = -.97\)). On the "Social Interaction" factor, the Non-Affinity Group (\(M = -.05\)) again was more satisfied [\(F(2,252) = 5.55, p < .004\)] than the Tour Group (\(M = -.70\)). Finally, the Non-Affinity Group (\(M = .01\)) was also significantly [\(F(2,252) = 7.47, p < .0007\)] more satisfied on the "Practical Aspects" factor than both the Tour Group (\(M = -1.30\)) and the Convention Group (\(M = -1.05\)).

While 92.4% of all the subjects were either "moderately" or "very satisfied" with "today's tour," there were differences between the three groups. The least satisfied group was the Convention Group (\(M = 4.28\)), with 83.5% of them being moderately or very satisfied with the tour. The Tour Group (\(M = 4.63\)) was more satisfied, as 94.3% of them indicated being moderately or very satisfied. The Non-Affinity Group (\(M = 4.87\)) was the most satisfied of the three groups, as 100% of them were moderately or very satisfied with the tour. The first and the last groups were statistically significantly different from one another (\(p < .05\) by Scheffe).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Results supported the conjecture that the "seeking dimension" is an important motivational force for these sightseeing tourists. Subjects were primarily motivated by knowledge seeking and social interaction, with the former being a little more important because two knowledge factors (general and specific) emerged in the factor analysis. While the seeking tendency was dominant, the escape dimension was also present. The fifth factor, "Escape," indicated that the tourists not only wanted to seek, but also to escape their troubles, work, and other responsibilities through the tour. It should be noted, however, that the "Escape" factor explained only 7.1% of the total variance. At any rate, these results support the theory that both motivational forces are present in such leisure behaviors as tourism experiences and suggest that the seeking dimension (both personal and interpersonal rewards) is of greater importance to sightseeing tourists (Iso-Ahola 1982, 1990). Results are also consistent with other studies that have reported intellectual curiosity and enrichment to be important motivators to recreators in general (Beard and Ragheb 1983) and vacationers in particular (Crompton 1979; Rubensteiın 1980).

As expected, there was considerable similarity between motivation and satisfaction dimensions. "Knowledge" emerged as a significant satisfaction factor and suggested that the knowledge-seeking motivation was successfully met through the tour. Social interaction was an important motive before the tour and also surfaced as one of the six satisfac-
tion factors along with "social security." Similarly, escape emerged as a satisfaction factor. Given these similarities between motivation and satisfaction dimensions of the sightseeing, it was expected and observed that subjects' overall satisfaction with the tour was high. Over 90% of the participants were either moderately or very satisfied with the tour. Apparently, then, the tourists came to seek personal and interpersonal rewards and to escape the everyday world and were able to meet these motivations through the tour; consequently, they were quite satisfied with it.

It was also evident that sightseeing tourists' satisfaction is influenced by factors unrelated to long-term or planned motivational considerations. Such practical aspects as the pace of the tour, opportunities to use comfort facilities, and cleanliness of the bus figured noticeably among the satisfaction dimensions. This may suggest that knowledge seeking and escape are more easily achieved if such practical aspects are taken into account and catered for in sightseeing tours. Results similar to the practical aspects of satisfaction found in the present study have been reported elsewhere. For example, Lounsbury and Hoopes (1985) observed "food and lodging" to be the fifth most important satisfaction dimension among vacationers. Although this factor explained only 6% of the total variance, nevertheless, it emerged as one of the factors and suggests, along with the present findings, that practical aspects contribute measurably to tourist satisfaction. In a similar vein, Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman's (1959) research on work motivation suggests that hygiene factors (e.g., cleanliness of the bus) cannot be compensated if not fulfilled, leading to dissatisfaction. The practical implication of all this is that tour operators should always try to satisfy hygiene factors, and then, if possible, motivational factors.

As for the group differences, the Non-Affinity Group was more motivated by knowledge-seeking than the other groups. Similarly, the Non-Affinity Group was more satisfied on five satisfaction dimensions than the other groups. It was not surprising, then, that the Non-Affinity Group's overall satisfaction was higher than that of the other groups. They came to get knowledge and apparently succeeded in it and, therefore, were very satisfied with the tour and its various aspects. This raises an interesting possibility that when the primary motivation is relatively high and is successfully met through tourist experiences, the resultant satisfaction spills over to various aspects of the experience. Since the Non-Affinity Group was higher on the knowledge-seeking motive, it is logical that they would also be higher on the knowledge-related satisfaction afterwards. But, because they were not higher on other motivation dimensions and yet were higher on four other aspects of satisfaction, it is possible that satisfaction with being able to meet the primary motivation (knowledge seeking) radiated positive effects on other satisfaction dimensions like "escape," "tour pace," "social interaction," and "practical aspects."

If this conjecture is correct, a practical implication would be to help sightseeing tourists focus and channel their motivation into a few primary motives and then direct tours for meeting these few motives. Such a suggestion seems also relevant in the light of the general finding of the study that there was a considerable similarity between motivation and
satisfaction dimensions and that the resultant overall satisfaction was high. If companies are interested in people's satisfaction with their tours, and perhaps increasing it, they would do well to find out the motives in the first place and then attempt to meet them through tours. While knowledge seeking may be a primary motive for most sightseeing tourists in Washington DC, it may not be so at all for other sightseeing tours and groups. Social interaction, for example, was an important motive in the present study and suggests that tour companies have to try to facilitate social interaction and contacts through their services. It is not enough to show and give information about famous places. Alternatively, as mentioned earlier, they may manipulate tourists' motives by emphasizing those that they can more readily handle and by deemphasizing those that are more difficult for them to deal with. The extent to which such manipulations can be successful, however, is largely unknown.
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