Hikers as cultural tourists: differences between hard and soft behaviours
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ABSTRACT
There is an urgent need to redirect tourist policies and products towards a more economically and environmentally sustainable model. The main objectives of this paper were to identify the profile of hiking cultural tourists; to segment the hiker profile using the intensity of the sports activity undertaken, and according to the pursuit of various cultural activities during their stay; and finally, to model the factors of being a cultural tourist. Based on a sample study composed of hikers, four groups were distinguished based on their physical capabilities and propensity towards risk, as soft and hard hikers and soft and hard cultural tourists. The analysis reveals different characteristics and patterns of associated behaviour, justifying the development of differentiated commercial strategies.

Introduction
Given the prominence active tourism is acquiring in tourism markets and destinations, an in-depth study of these tourists is vital. The present study has focused on the analysis of hiking and cultural tourists in the Balearic Islands. This type of tourism is of particular interest as a strategy to reduce seasonality in similar, mature destinations. Therefore, a review of the essential aspects associated with cultural tourism is provided below, including the sport of hiking within the scope of its concept, in the privileged setting of the Serra de Tramuntana mountain range.

The definition of cultural tourism has become more comprehensive over time. Richards (1996) defined cultural tourism as the movement of people towards cultural attractions outside of their place of residence, with the intention of obtaining new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs. Donlon, Donlon, and Agrusa (2010) consider that cultural tourism “takes place when visitors come into contact with historically unique groups and settings, which may be connected, to varying degrees, with the everyday life of a host community”.

Richards and Wilson (2006) have observed a change from high cultural consumption based on visits to museums, heritage sites, and so forth, towards a cultural tourism with more popular tastes for the tourism experience, based on the enjoyment of an intangible cultural or natural heritage and creative activities. In this respect, the European Commission and the European Council have acknowledged as priority the promotion of cultural tourism for the sustainability of the European Union, based on sustainable and quality tourism, and supported by the diversity of landscapes and extraordinary cultural wealth within the EU (Artal-Tur & Villena-Navarro, 2016).
According to Mateu (2014), UNESCO was the first organization to recognize the heritage value of cultural landscapes understood as cultural property representing the “combined works of nature and of man”. These illustrated the development of society and human settlements throughout the years, under the influence of the limitations and/or the advantages presented by the natural environment, and of successive social, cultural, and economic forces, both external and internal.

The integration of natural heritage with tourism is facilitating the development of new products, and new nature-related spaces for tourism, and thus promoting tourism which places emphasis on visiting these spaces, along with other cultural attractions, such as art galleries, museums, and historic sites, or attending cultural events or festivals (Kemmerling-Clack, 1999; Miller, 1997).

Other aspects of cultural tourism can be found in studies such as those of Richards (2001), focused on the perspective of demand, or Poria, Butler, and Airey (2006), examining the perceptions of cultural tourists. There are a number of studies which use segmentation as an essential tool for developing an understanding of the cultural tourist (Lee, Lee, & Wicks, 2004; Lee & Sparks, 2007; Pulido & Sánchez, 2010). Cultural tourism mitigates the negative effects of seasonality by promoting options for tourism outside of high season, and increasing levels of tourist satisfaction (García-Sánchez & Alburquerque-García, 2003), as well as generating differentiation in an overcrowded global marketplace. Other research, such as that undertaken by Artal-Tur and Villena-Navarro (2016), has used probability models to analyze the factors which increase the probability of being a cultural tourist in Spain.

As culture and tourism have a mutually beneficial relationship which can strengthen the attractiveness and competitiveness of destinations, regions, and countries (Debeș, 2011), the main objectives of this study are: (i) to identify the profile of tourists hiking in the Balearics, specifically in the Sierra de Tramuntana mountain range; (ii) to segment using as criteria the intensity of the sports activity engaged in by the hikers, and the pursuit of cultural activities during their stay in the destination; (iii) to model the factors that increase the probability of being a cultural tourist.

**Literature review**

The study of hikers has generated wide interest among researchers, allowing for further examination of a diversity of aspects such as the typology of the hiker tourist experience (Li, 2000); the underlying motivations for doing this sport in the heart of nature (Goldenberg, Hill, & Freidt, 2008; Hill, Goldenberg, & Freidt, 2009); the pull and push factors which may influence the decisions of tourists and hikers (Jang & Wu, 2006; Kim, Lee, & Klenosky, 2003; Lee, O’Leary, Lee, & Morrison, 2002) and aspects associated with hiker behaviour and their relationship with the environment, as well as their levels of satisfaction (DeLucio & Múgica, 1994; Hull & Stewart, 1995; Ryan & Glendon, 1998; Tribe & Snaith, 1998; Vitterso, Vorkinn, Vistad, & Vaagland, 2000).

**The Sierra de Tramuntana as a cultural destination**

The Balearic Islands enjoy a mild, typically Mediterranean climate throughout the year, with average annual temperatures of between 16 and 18º C, and an annual rainfall of between 450 and 650 mm. The Islands possess a privileged natural environment, and a strategic geolocation, only two hours away from many major European cities. The Islands are one of the main destinations for international tourism, with more than 11 million tourist arrivals per year. Over 1% of world tourism converges within a limited territory of 5014 km², renowned internationally for its hegemony of the sun and beach segment. However, new tourist demands and intense competition are forcing the destination to diversify the products on offer, to propose new experiences for visitors, and to counteract the seasonality of the destination.

Many of the new experiences proposed are oriented towards active tourism, as increasingly more tourists show interest in engaging in sport or cultural activities, or both, during their stay at their holiday destination. The most typical activities of this tourist model are: golf (6.8%), hiking (3.5%), and adventure sports (1.1%) (IET, 2014). The 150 km long-distance trail (GR-221) running through the
Sierra de Tramuntana, is becoming one of the main hiking destinations of European source markets, and the recent inclusion of the Sierra de Tramuntana on UNESCO’s World Heritage list has provided a suitable context for exploration of the potential of this natural cultural landscape as a tourism resource for hikers.

Methodology

In order to carry out the present study, a questionnaire was designed by a panel of experts and approved by the Balearic Federation of Mountaineering and Climbing. The questionnaire contained three sections: the first to collect general and socio-demographic information, as well as information about sports activity. The second section explored the organization of motivations behind and sources of information about the trip. The third section focused on the characteristics of the trip and the tourism destination. Most of the variables and elements used were Likert-type scales, used previously by researchers in the fields of consumer behaviour in tourism, tourism sustainability, and environmental psychology (Hill, Gómez, Goldenberg, & Fellows, 2014; Jeong, 2014; Légaré & Haider, 2008).

The interviews were conducted mid-season – April, May, and June 2015, while the hikers were walking in the Sierra de Tramuntana. Data were gathered from both Spanish and foreign hikers, but residents of Mallorca were excluded from the sample. The method used was non-probabilistic quota sampling, reaching a sample size of 238 individuals with a level of confidence of 95% and sampling error of 6.3%.

Results

The average age of the sample was 46.64 and consisted of: 5% between the ages of 15 and 25; 25.9% between 26 and 40; 43% between 41 and 59; and 24.7% of 60 or above. Regarding educational background, 38% stated they had a university education (diploma or degree) while 48% had completed secondary education, and 7.1% had completed primary education. Regarding nationality, the majority of the sample were Spanish (40.2%), followed by Germans (30.1%), English (8.4%), Dutch (5%), Swiss (5%), and Welsh (3.4%), among others. According to the sample, sun and beach activities were the most popular (27.3%) with tourists visiting the Balearic Islands. In relation to cultural activities, the most popular were: enjoying the local gastronomy (15.9%), visiting monuments and museums (12.3%), going on excursions (11.9%), and visiting natural parks and reserves (2.3%). These figures are similar to those obtained by other studies on cultural tourism on a national scale (Artal-Tur & Villena-Navarro, 2016).

Hiker sub-sample

With the aim of categorizing the intensity of sports activity, the following factors were taken into consideration: the level of activity, the propensity for risk-taking in sport, and the level of expertise of the hikers. This is in line with the classification proposed by many researchers who have divided the activities into gentle/moderate or hard/intense, and have categorized hiking as a low risk, gentle tourist activity, which does not demand a high level of physical fitness (Hill, 1995; Kastenholz & Rodrigues, 2007; Latiesa & Paniza, 2006; Loverseed, 1997; Pomfret, 2006). The preceding segmentation allowed for differences to be established between two groups of hikers, soft and hard in terms of intensity of sports activity.

Authors such as Kastenholz and Rodrigues (2007) have suggested dividing active tourists into those who do sport as a recreational activity and those who do sport more intensively, that is, those who spend more time in preparation for and on doing the activity, use a greater level of physical exertion, and have greater involvement in the activity. In line with this division, respondents were asked about the frequency of their sports activity on a scale of 4 positions: 1 = never; 2 = occasionally; 3 = often; 4 = regularly. Thus, the total sample was divided into two heterogeneous groups formed of those...
individuals who stated they did the following sports at least often or regularly: climbing, canyoning, psicobloc, or potholing. These sports were considered to be highly demanding physically, and of high risk by hiking experts.

In making this distinction, the sample consisted of sub-group one \((n_{\text{hard hiker}} = 130; 54.62\%)\), referred to as hard hikers, composed of individuals with a higher propensity for activities requiring demanding physical ability, and a higher propensity for risk. The other sub-sample \((n_{\text{soft hiker}} = 108; 45.37\%)\) referred to as soft hikers, was formed of those individuals stating they participated in less physically demanding activities, and showed less interest in high-risk sports activities, having had limited experience of them (see Figure 1).

**Cultural sub-sample**

The second phase of the segmentation, based on cultural activities, revealed the existence of two groups of hikers: those who engaged more with cultural activities, referred to as hard cultural hikers, and those who paid less attention to culture, and more to the sport, referred to as soft cultural hikers. This proposed classification is in line with the segmentation in the study by Artal-Tur and Villena-Navarro (2016) who distinguish between cultural tourist and general tourist, based on the declared activities of the respondents. In particular, those individuals who stated they visited monuments and museums, natural parks and reserves, went on excursions, attended events, and enjoyed the local gastronomy, were considered hard cultural hikers. On the basis of this distinction, a sub-sample was obtained formed of 38.7% \((n_{\text{cultural}} = 92)\) of tourists with cultural motives, whereas the remaining respondents declared they mainly engaged in other, non-cultural activities \((61.3\%; n_{\text{non-cultural}} = 146)\) (see Figure 2).

When the two sub-samples were compared, no differences were found regarding gender or educational level of the general tourist. With regard to age, the cultural tourist was mainly in the youngest group; for the other age groups, no significant differences were detected. The nationalities of the cultural tourist were mainly German (43.5%), Spanish (32.6%), and Austrians (8.7%). The most common type of accommodation used was hotels or hostels, followed by apartments; the general tourist made greater use of the home of family or friends. The majority of cultural tourists were accompanied by family (62%) and friends (25%) and were the largest group of lone travellers (12%). It was precisely the cultural tourists who spent more in the €301 to €1,500 bracket, as opposed to the general tourist who mostly spent less than €300. A greater number of soft hikers (65.2%) were cultural tourists as opposed to a greater number of hard hikers (67.1%) categorized as general tourists (see Table 1).

The two segmentations generated (intensity vs activity) are synthesized in Figure 1, showing that the group defined as soft hikers, with less intensive sports activity, were mainly hard cultural hikers (55.6%)

![Figure 1. Sub-sample by intensity and activities. Source: Own elaboration.](image-url)
with greater pursuit of cultural activities. Obviously, within the group classified as hard hikers with more intensive sports activity, 75.4% were soft cultural hikers, with a lower pursuit of cultural activities.

**Factors affecting the probability of being a hard or soft hiker, and the probability of being a hard or soft cultural tourist**

With the intention of analysing the factors which increase the probability of being a hard or soft hiker, and hard or soft cultural tourist, a Logit binomial model was applied. In the first case, the probability of being a hard hiker active tourist was expressed as: Hard = 1, Soft = 0; in the second case, a hard-cultural tourist was expressed as: Hard = 1, Soft = 0. In both cases the model was defined as:

\[
\pi_i \Pr \left( Y_i = 1 \mid X_i = x_i \right) = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_i)}
\]

where \( \exp \) denotes the exponential function, \( \beta \) are the parameters of the model, and \( \Pr \left( Y_i = 1 \mid X_i = x_i \right) \) the probability that an active tourist be classified as a hard hiker conditioning the existence of a set of explanatory variables \( (x_i) \) which the tourist profile includes, such as: the characteristics of the trip, activities undertaken during the trip, and the general level of satisfaction. Specifically, the following were defined as explanatory variables of the model:

**Table 1. Profile of tourist with cultural motivations (hard cultural) and with general motivations (soft cultural).**

| Variables        | Soft cultural | Hard cultural |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|
|                  | General tourist (%) | Cultural tourist (%) |
| **Gender**       |               |               |
| Male             | 50.7          | 52.2          |
| Female           | 49.3          | 47.8          |
| **Age**          |               |               |
| 15–25            | 7.5           | 1.1           |
| 26–40            | 26            | 26.4          |
| 41–59            | 40.4          | 49.5          |
| +60              | 26            | 23.1          |
| **Education**    |               |               |
| University       | 44.4          | 36            |
| Secondary        | 48.9          | 55.1          |
| Primary          | 6.7           | 9             |
| **Country**      |               |               |
| Spain            | 45.2          | 32.6          |
| Germany          | 21.9          | 43.5          |
| Holland          | 4.1           | 6.5           |
| Argentina        | 0             | 4.3           |
| Austria          | 0             | 8.7           |
| United Kingdom   | 11            | 4.3           |
| Switzerland      | 8.2           | 0             |
| Rest of the world| 2.7           | 0             |
| **Accommodation**|               |               |
| Apartment        | 13.0          | 9.8           |
| Hotel/hostel     | 33.6          | 73.9          |
| Mountain hut     | 5.5           | 5.4           |
| Friends/family   | 8.9           | 4.3           |
| Own home         | 1.4           | 1.1           |
| **Travelling with** |           |               |
| Family           | 34.9          | 62.0          |
| Friends          | 17.8          | 25.0          |
| Partners         | 2.7           | 0             |
| Alone            | 6.8           | 12.0          |
| Other            | 37.7          | 1.1           |
| **Expenditure**  |               |               |
| €0–€300          | 48.6          | 8.7           |
| €301–€600        | 20.5          | 34.8          |
| €601–€1,000      | 18.5          | 25.0          |
| €1,001–€1,500    | 6.8           | 27.2          |
| +€1,500          | 5.5           | 4.3           |
| **Hiker Type**   |               |               |
| Soft             | 32.9          | 65.2          |
| Hard             | 67.1          | 34.8          |

Source: Own elaboration.
• **Tourist profile:** country of residence (nationality); level of education; (primary, secondary, higher); age (15–30; 31–50; over 50); gender (male or female).

• **Characteristics of the trip:** length of stay (6–8 days, more than 9 days); type of accommodation used (apartment, hotel or hostel, mountain hut, home of family or friends, own house); type of transport used (plane, boat); number of days doing sport (less than 2 days, 3–5 days, more than 6 days); travel expenditure (€0–€300, €301–€600; €601–€1,000; €1,001–€1,500; + €1,500).

Activities engaged in during the trip which are usually complementary to cultural activities, such as: sun and beach, nautical sports, shopping, nightlife, and gastronomy.

• **General level of satisfaction declared by the tourist during their stay:** Level of satisfaction: low (<1), medium (1–2), high (≥3), very high (4).

The number of sample observations was 238, after the removal of extreme values in order to avoid observations of atypical tourists. The period of analysis was mid-season: April, May, and June 2015. In relation to the analyses made for the case of the hard hiker, the model diagnostics were adequate (−2 Log Likelihood = 152.46; $\chi^2 = 171.77, p < .005$; Goodness of fit = 69.2%) (see Table 2). Thus, the null hypothesis that the coefficients of the independent variables equal zero was rejected and, therefore, the large significance level led to the conclusion that the model did not differ significantly from the perfect model. The classification table indicated that 89.8% of the predicted outcomes matched observed outcomes.

This compared favourably with the naive model or assigning the model to all cases. Some of the independent variables of the model were statistically significant at the .05 level including: gender (male), educational level (other studies), length of stay (<5 days), accommodation (apartment, hotel, friends’ house), means of transport (boat), preferred period of the year for hiking (April–June), other motives for the visit (sun and beach). Whereas travel with friends, length of stay (6–8 days), level of satisfaction (medium), and shopping were statistically significant at $p < .1$.

In relation to the analyses made to determine the hard cultural tourist, the model diagnostics were adequate (−2 Log Likelihood = 155.174; $\chi^2 = 161.424, p < .005$; Goodness of fit = 67%) (see Table 3). The classification table indicated that 86.5% of the predicted outcomes matched observed outcomes. This compared favourably with the naive model or assigning the model to all cases. Some of the independent variables of the model were statistically significant at the .05 level including: gender (male); country (Spain and Germany); educational level (all levels); travelling with friends or alone; age ranging between 15 and 30 years ($p = .1$); spending less than two days doing sport at the destination; choosing to visit between October and December; as well as spending less at the destination, were all variables which increased the probability of being a hard cultural tourist.

The results obtained revealed that the nationality variable adequately explained the cultural tourist, the Spanish and Germans being those who pursued more cultural activities at the destination. With regard to the age variable, being between the ages of 15 and 50 increased the probability of being a hard cultural tourist. Concerning length of stay, those tourists who were most likely to pursue cultural activities (hard cultural tourists) were those who spent less than two days at the destination. With regard to travelling companions, travelling with friends or alone and staying in hotels increased the probability of being a hard cultural tourist. Those who engaged in intensive sports activity (hard) and spent longer at the destination (5–8 days), staying in an apartment, hotel or a friend’s house, explained the hard hiker. In terms of spending, none of the categories explained significantly corresponding to any of the segments.

**Conclusion and implications**

The categorization of hard versus soft cultural tourists applied in this study, based on the pursuit of cultural activities, continues along the lines proposed by authors such as Artal & Villena (2016), who classified tourists into two groups: general or cultural tourists according to their cultural consumption.
Table 2. Logit regression – factors affecting the probability of being a hard hiker.

| Dependent: Hard Hiker | Coefficient estimate (B) | Standard error | Wald | Sig. | Odds ratio exp (B) | Hard (%) | Soft (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------|------|-------------------|----------|----------|
| Intercept             | −3.778                   | 2.658          | 2.021| .155 | .023              |          |          |
| Gender                | Male                     | 1.117          | .540 | .039 | 3.057**           | 68       | 54       |
| Country               | Spain                    | −1.494         | .921 | .105 | .224              | 68       | 28       |
|                      | Germany                  | −1.077         | 1.269| .152 | 6.155             | 54       | 38       |
|                      | University               | 1.817          | 2.052| .341 | .310              | 30       | 42       |
| Educa-                | Secondary                | .721           | 1.146| .529 | 2.057             | 60       | 55       |
|    tional Level       | Primary                  | .723           | 1.459| .620 | 2.061             | 6        | 11       |
|                      | Other                    | −4.589         | 1.936| .018 | .010**            | 40       | 68       |
| Companion             | Friends                  | −3.023         | 1.775| .058 | .810              | 15       | 6        |
| Length of stay        | ≤5 days                  | 5.840          | 1.283| .000 | 343.651***        | 76       | 10       |
|                      | 6–8 days                 | 1.543          | .808 | .056 | 4.678*            | 43       | 58       |
| Age                   | 15–30                    | −.899          | 1.157| .437 | .407              | 22       | 68       |
|                      | 31–50                    | −.977          | .600 | .376 | .513              | 59       | 51       |
| Accommodation         | Apartment                | 3.937          | 1.335| .003 | 51.255***         | 16       | 12       |
|                      | Hotel                    | 3.085          | 1.363| .024 | 21.876*           | 49       | 68       |
|                      | Mountain hut             | −.893          | 1.516| .556 | .410              | 6        | 2        |
|                      | Friends' House           | 6.566          | 1.547| .000 | 710.506***        | 12       | 6        |
|                      | Own House                | 2.465          | 23.179| .111 | .915              | 1       | 1        |
|                      | Boat                     | 3.581          | 1.243| .004 | 35.901***         | 51       | 4        |
| Mean of transport     | January–March            | .010           | .985 | .992 | 1.010             | 21       | 30       |
|                      | April–June               | 1.359          | .678 | .045 | 3.891**           | 45       | 53       |
|                      | June–September           | .236           | .786 | .764 | 1.266             | 18       | 23       |
|                      | October–December         | −.332          | .762 | .663 | .718              | 25       | 37       |
| Year period           | €0–€300                  | −.596          | 2.482| .810 | .551              | 4        | 6        |
|                      | €301–€600                | 2.124          | .785 | 7.316| .007              | 8.367*** | 61       |
|                      | €601–€1,000              | −1.273         | .762 | 2.793| .095              | .280*    | 20       |
|                      | 1001–1,500 €             | −.377          | 1.722| .048 | .827              | .686     | 2        |
|                      | Natural parks and nature | .588           | .653 | .812 | .368              | 1.801    | 25       |
|                      | N                        |               |      |      |                   |          | 4        |
|                      | Sports                   | .178           | 1.119| .025 | .873              | 1.195    | 12       |
|                      | Nautical Sports          | .795           | 1.555| .261 | .609              | .451     | 64       |
|                      | Sun and Beach Sports    | .844           | 1.354| .388 | .533              | .430     | 25       |
|                      | Shopping                 | −.151          | 1.386| .012 | .913              | .860     | 27       |
|                      | Sports Events            | .075           | 1.366| .003 | .956              | 1.078    | 12       |
|                      | Of shore excursions      | .238           |      |      |                   |          | 4        |

(Continued)
during their stay, and the classification between the intentional or accidental cultural tourist (Marrero-Rodríguez & Abdul-Jalbar, 2012).

Based on the results obtained in this study, it cannot be concluded that tourists interested in heritage and/or culture present the common feature of a mid- to high-level of education, as stated by (Correia, Kozak, & Ferradeira, 2011; Herbert, 2001; Kim, Cheng, & O’Leary, 2007; Lynch, Duinker, Sheehan, & Chute, 2011; Richards, 1996, 2002), as the average age of the sample analysed is significantly higher than the average age of the holidaymaker tourist in the Balearics. Thus, the resulting figure for higher education is lower. In terms of spending, it should be noted that those tourists who spend less are, for the most part, soft cultural tourists, whereas hard cultural tourists spend greater amounts, in line with the findings of other studies (Artal-Tur & Villena-Navarro, 2016; Pulido-Fernández & Sánchez-Rivero, 2010).

The power of cultural tourism to counteract seasonality was brought to light by García-Sánchez and Alburquerque-García (2003), who stated that sun and beach tourism and cultural tourism offer complementary potential, especially in coastal areas and at times of the year when it is not possible for tourists to enjoy sun and beach. The present study finds evidence of a clear preference for the active tourist to enjoy their holidays during the low- and mid-season, thereby contributing towards the mitigation of the high seasonality of the Balearics. This interpretation is shared by authors such as Artal-Tur and Villena-Navarro (2016).

A new binomial has appeared with this study, one which is not yet contemplated in the current portfolio of tourism products on offer in a mature destination such as the Balearic Islands. The binomial culture and sports would seem to be a response to the emerging demands of the contemporary people. From this research into hiking in the Balearics, it is fairly clear that there are four main groups of hikers segmented by the declared level of intensity of engagement in sports activities and the degree of inclination towards high-risk sports (hard vs. soft hikers), and a second, large group segmented by the intensity of their pursuit of cultural activities at the destination (hard vs. soft cultural tourists).

In summary, the present study demonstrates the significance of the degree of complementarity detected between engagement in sports activities and consumption of cultural activities. The main conclusion is that active tourists who spend less time on sports activities spend more time on cultural activities. This binomial should be taken into consideration by public and private tourism management bodies, which currently suggest that sports and cultural tourism products are substitutes for each other, when, in fact, they are complementary.

The findings reveal the important potential of active tourism to counteract seasonality in mature tourism destinations, as the periods preferred by the study sample coincide with the low- and mid-season of the destination under analysis. The results obtained and the criteria of segmentation used have clear practical implications, among which are: firstly, the possibility to improve the design

### Table 2. (Continued)

| Coefficient estimate (B) | Standard error | Wald | Sig. | Odds ratio exp (B) | Hard (%) | Soft (%) |
|--------------------------|----------------|------|------|-------------------|----------|----------|
| −2 Log likelihood        | 152.462        |      |      |                   |          |          |
| χ² Goodness of fit       | 171.779; df = 40; p < .005 | .692 |      |                   |          |          |

Notes: Hard Hiker = dummy variable coded 1 for respondent’s hard hikers and 0 for those are soft hikers.
*Significance at .10 level; **Significance at .05 level; ***Significance at .005 level.
of the hiking and cultural product or experience, with the incorporation of the environmental, economic and social sustainability of natural areas; secondly, the importance of using criteria of segmentation based on the intensity of sports activity and the pursuit of cultural activities, as these allow for the determination of clear differences between groups of soft and hard hikers, and soft and hard cultural tourists.

One of the main limitations of the study is that the sample analysed was comprised only of tourists hiking in the Tramuntana mountain range in the Balearic Islands. This implies that the findings, in

Table 3. Logit regression – factors affecting the probability of being a hard cultural tourist.

| Dependent: Hard cultural | Coefficient estimate (B) | Standard error | Wald | Sig. | Odds ratio – exp (B) | Hard (%) | Soft (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------|------|----------------------|----------|----------|
| Intercept                | -14.450                  | 3.71           | 15.118 | .000 | .00***               | -        | -        |
| Gender                   |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| Male                     | .501                     | .48            | 1.056 | .304 | 1.65                 | 48 (39,3) | 74 (60,7) |
| Country                  |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| Spain                    | 4.362                    | .97            | 20.213 | .000 | 78.41***             | 30 (31,3) | 66 (68,8) |
| Germany                  | 3.561                    | .83            | 18.430 | .000 | 35.21***             | 40 (53,6) | 32 (44,4) |
| Educational Level        |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| University               | 4.620                    | 1.59           | 8.403 | .004 | 101.46***            | 32 (34,8) | 60 (65,2) |
| Secondary                | 4.033                    | 1.37           | 8.561 | .003 | 56.41***             | 49 (42,6) | 66 (57,4) |
| Primary                  | 7.118                    | 1.82           | 15.182 | .000 | 1234.14***           | 8 (47,1)  | 9 (52,9)  |
| Other studies            | 6.644                    | 2.14           | 9.572 | .002 | 767.86***            | 57 (52,8) | 51 (47,2) |
| Companion                |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| Friends                  | 6.159                    | 2.13           | 8.336 | .004 | 473.06***            | 23 (46,9) | 26 (53,1) |
| Lone traveler            | 8.201                    | 2.34           | 12.264 | .000 | 3644.22***           | 11 (52,4) | 10 (47,6) |
| Length of stay           |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| <5 days                  | -0.998                   | .95            | 1.096 | .304 | .36                  | 13 (15,1) | 73 (84,9) |
| 6–8 days                 | -0.869                   | .72            | 1.434 | .231 | .41                  | 49 (48,5) | 52 (51,5) |
| Age                      |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| 15–30                    | 3.362                    | 1.17           | 8.252 | .004 | 28.85***             | 8 (25,0)  | 24 (75,0) |
| 31–50                    | 1.132                    | .64            | 3.045 | .081 | 3.10***              | 45 (40,9) | 65 (59,1) |
| Days doing sport         |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| ≤2 days                  | 4.389                    | 1.12           | 15.224 | .000 | 80.57***             | 21 (36,2) | 37 (63,8) |
| Accommodation            |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| 3–5 days                 | -0.885                   | .78            | 1.288 | .256 | .41                  | 40 (51,3) | 38 (48,7) |
| Apartment                | .965                     | 1.07           | .810 | .368 | 2.62                 | 9 (32,1)  | 19 (67,9) |
| Hotel                    | 1.690                    | .82            | 4.169 | .041 | 4.12***              | 68 (58,1) | 49 (41,9) |
| Mountain hut             | 1.380                    | 3.12           | .196 | .658 | 3.97                 | 1 (12,5)  | 7 (87,5)  |
| Friend's House           | 1.485                    | 1.21           | 1.495 | .221 | 4.41                 | 4 (23,5)  | 13 (76,5) |
| Mean of transport        |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| Own House                | -2.263                   | 2.26           | .999 | .318 | .10                  | 1 (50)    | 1 (50)    |
| Boat                     | .918                     | 1.47           | .385 | .535 | 2.50                 | 4 (7,3)   | 51 (92,7) |
| Year period              |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| January–March            | -0.320                   | .82            | .150 | .699 | .72                  | 25 (49,0) | 26 (51,0) |
| April–June               | .715                     | .54            | 1.700 | .192 | 2.04                 | 52 (53,1) | 46 (46,9) |
| June–September           | -.990                    | .64            | 2.345 | .126 | .37                  | 17 (41,5) | 24 (58,5) |
| October–December         | 2.148                    | .67            | 10.055 | .002 | 8.56***              | 38 (61,3) | 24 (38,7) |
| Satisfaction level       |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| Low                      | 1.991                    | 1.83           | 1.183 | .277 | 7.32                 | 4 (6,9)   | 54 (93,1) |
| Medium                   | .760                     | 1.68           | .202 | .653 | 2.13                 | 3 (37,5)  | 5 (62,5)  |
| High                     | 1.637                    | 1.23           | 1.755 | .185 | 5.14                 | 14 (46,7) | 16 (53,3) |
| Very High                | .179                     | .96            | .035 | .852 | 1.19                 | 60 (48,8) | 63 (51,2) |
| Travel expenditure       |                          |                |      |      |                      |          |          |
| €0–€300                  | -7.603                   | 2.38           | 10.176 | .001 | .00***               | 8 (10,1)  | 71 (89,9) |
| €301–€600                | -2.375                   | 1.64           | 2.089 | .148 | .09                  | 32 (51,6) | 30 (48,9) |
| €601–€1,000              | -2.011                   | 1.70           | 1.389 | .239 | .13                  | 23 (46)   | 27 (54)   |
| €1,001–€500              | -2.089                   | 1.69           | 1.515 | .218 | .12                  | 25 (71,4) | 10 (28,6) |

N = 238

Notes: Hard Hiker = dummy variable coded 1 for respondent’s hard hikers and 0 for those are soft hikers.
*Significance at .10 level; **Significance at .05 level; ***Significance at .005 level.

of the hiking and cultural product or experience, with the incorporation of the environmental, economic and social sustainability of natural areas; secondly, the importance of using criteria of segmentation based on the intensity of sports activity and the pursuit of cultural activities, as these allow for the determination of clear differences between groups of soft and hard hikers, and soft and hard cultural tourists.

One of the main limitations of the study is that the sample analysed was comprised only of tourists hiking in the Tramuntana mountain range in the Balearic Islands. This implies that the findings, in
terms of the characteristics and motivations of tourists when choosing a tourism destination, may be difficult to extrapolate. Furthermore, only motivations related to pull factors have been analysed. In future research, both pull and push factors should be included, and compared with other types of sports tourists.
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