

5 Understanding African LGBT Traveller Motivations: A Non-Westernised Perspective

Christiaan Hattingh

Although the Western world (e.g. Northern America and Western Europe) is witnessing several social, cultural and political developments resulting in homosexuality being increasingly visible, tolerated and constitutionally protected, a large majority of countries in the non-Western world, most often those with high levels of religious conviction (Hattingh, 2017), do not outlaw anti-gay discrimination or protect gay¹ rights (Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2016). The African continent, in particular, seems to be a competitive arena for violation of gay rights, where 38 of 54 countries strictly outlaw homosexuality (ILGA, 2016). For instance, in 2008 the Gambian President threatened to 'cut off the head' of any homosexual² the government 'catches' (Wockner, 2008). In 2014, a British tourist was arrested, tried and found guilty of 'homosexual acts' in Morocco, and sentenced to four months in jail (Strudwick, 2014). That same year, a Kenyan parliamentary committee insisted on applying anti-gay laws more rigorously and warned that homosexuality is 'as serious as terrorism' (Nelsson, 2014). In 2016, forced anal examinations, Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and Hepatitis B tests of men suspected of 'practising' homosexuality were ruled constitutional by a Kenyan Court. In addition, the test results could serve as 'evidence' in criminal prosecutions on homosexuality (HRW, 2016). Although this decision was overturned in 2018, it being argued that these tests 'are both medically worthless and a severe violation of medical ethics', several African countries including Egypt, Cameroon and Tunisia continue to conduct them (HRW, 2018). In 2017, two South African men were arrested in Tanzania for 'promoting homosexuality' (Mzantsi, 2017), while in 2018, 57 Nigerian men were arrested and charged with performing 'homosexual acts'. If convicted, these men could face up to 14 years in prison, considered to be

a 'light' sentence compared with the 12 northern Nigerian states with Sharia law, where gays are stoned to death (Jackman, 2018).

The presidents of Uganda and Namibia and the former president of Zimbabwe have been particularly vocal about their anti-homosexual views (Kennedy, 2006), stating that homosexuality is 'un-African' and a Western colonial import (Reddy, 2014). These leaders view homosexuality 'as foreign in all respects to indigenous African culture' (Croucher, 2002: 316) and believe that it threatens the cultural integrity of their countries (Gomes da Costa Santos, 2013). Consequently, with beliefs like these, the gay tourism³ phenomenon remains largely unexplored in non-Western countries (Hattingh, 2017).

South Africa, however, is the first country in the world to outlaw unfair discrimination against 'sexual orientation' (Gomes da Costa Santos, 2013), and one of the very few non-Western countries and the only country on the African continent that protects the right to 'sexual orientation' in its post-apartheid constitution of 1996 (Gomes da Costa Santos, 2013). But, as with most other non-Western countries (and even some Western countries), the everyday reality for many lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) South Africans remains grim due to ongoing 'sexual orientation-based' violence and harassment including the heinous practice of 'corrective rape', where the intent of the perpetrators is to enforce conformity and to 'cure' those who 'challenge the dominant heterosexual identity' (Kutsch, 2013). In 2016, a report entitled *Hate Crimes against LGBT People in South Africa* (Out LGBT Well-being, 2016) found that 44% of LGBT South Africans had experienced discrimination in their everyday lives due to their sexual orientation or gender identity (DeBartos, 2016). Therefore, it is crucial to note that the protection of gay rights in South Africa's post-apartheid Constitution is a result of a constitutional order by the progressive new government, the African National Congress, and a commitment to human rights (Jara, 1998), but certainly it is not due to the country's tolerance of homosexuality. The new government and constitution of South Africa are in contrast with the beliefs of many South Africans, who still overwhelmingly oppose gay rights (Ilyayambwa, 2012), often described as 'a deeply conservative, heteronormative country in spite of its progressive politics' (Thoreson, 2008: 682).

The development of a liberal and historic Constitution inevitably resulted in the development of uniquely gay spaces for the gay community (Visser, 2003), which brought about the emergence of a gay leisure market (Visser, 2002). Few South African destinations are, however, taking advantage of gay tourism, with Cape Town being the notable exception (Visser, 2003; Hattingh & Bruwer, 2020; Hattingh & Spencer, 2020). Cape Town—informally known as the 'gay capital of Africa'—is recognised by *The Guardian* as 'one of the 10 most popular gay travel destinations in the world' (UNWTO, 2012: 23). Consequently, it is entirely possible that some LGBT individuals residing in environments where discrimination and marginalisation are still strong

are attracted to Cape Town's gay village—the only gay village on the African continent—in search of a safe space in which they can be themselves, even if only temporarily while on holiday. Hattingh and Spencer (2017) found that gay travellers from other provinces in South Africa and non-Western countries who live in conservative environments felt an increasing need to escape from disapproving societies and argued that a safe space is more likely possible in Cape Town than in their heteronormative home environments. Cape Town and its gay village, therefore, seemingly offer a safe escape in a largely conservative country and continent.

To date, apart from a minor number of exceptions, most studies on gay tourism deal with Western gays, resulting in perceptions often being biased towards travellers and destinations within those regions. Indeed, as Vorobjovas-Pinta and Hardy (2016) argue, there remains a 'lack of insight into travel motivations and behaviour of gay travellers going to or, especially, coming from non-Western countries that are hostile towards homosexuals'. As the Western world is considered increasingly 'gay friendly' (Kauhanen, 2015), this could explain why most of the studies conducted to date are unavoidably biased towards the Western world. The hidden nature of the LGBT population makes it nearly impossible to locate informants as it is 'difficult to randomly confront people for an interview because homosexuality is a sensitive sexual identity, which is not visible unless people want to express it themselves' (Månsson & Østrup, 2007: 5). Additionally, the early literature has widely contributed to the belief that gay travel is a highly desirable market to target for tourism, owing to, among other factors, up-scale characteristics such as higher levels of education and incomes as gay couples choose not to have children (so-called DINKs, i.e. double income, no kids). This was believed to allow for flexibility to travel at any desired time, leading to less seasonal behaviour (Pritchard *et al.*, 1998), and led to the myth that gay travellers represent an affluent homogeneous market, resulting in a number of tourism destinations actively targeting these travellers (Hughes, 2005).

Despite individual researchers, some as far back as 20 years ago, arguing that gay travellers are not homogeneous (Blichfeldt *et al.*, 2011; Hattingh & Spencer, 2020; Hughes, 2006; Pritchard *et al.*, 1998), most destinations targeting these travellers continue to regard them as a homogeneous group, which may hinder effective marketing (Hattingh, 2017; Ro *et al.*, 2017) due to their distorted understanding of the needs and desires of gay travellers (Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2016). Consequently, Cohen *et al.* (2014), Herrera and Scott (2005), Hughes (2006) and Ro *et al.* (2017) called for further consumer research on the diversity among LGBT travellers' behaviour. The current study's aim was therefore twofold: (i) to investigate a sample of non-Western, i.e. African gay leisure travellers' holiday motivations; and (ii) to determine if there were significant differences among these travellers' motivations in order to challenge the myth regarding the homogeneity of this market.

Understanding Tourist Behaviour Through Travel Motivations

Motivation is classically defined as 'a state of tension within the individual which arouses, directs and maintains behaviour toward a goal' (Mullen & Johnson, 1990: 91) or incentive (Luthans *et al.*, 1988) and drives an individual to act in order to reach personal fulfilment (Beerli & Martín, 2004). Goossens (2000) is of the opinion that in order to reach personal fulfilment, an individual must be aware of a service or product, and to perceive that the purchase of that service or product will assist in attaining personal fulfilment and satisfying a need. Tourism services and products can be developed and promoted as a solution to an individual's needs (Fodness, 1994). Therefore, needs are seen as the 'forces which arouse motivated behaviour' (Boekstein, 2012: 85). As Jago (1997) contends, in order to fully comprehend consumer motivation, it is crucial to have in-depth knowledge of the needs that consumers strive to fulfil, and how these needs can be fulfilled.

There is an increasingly important body of research regarding the study of motivation in the travel and tourism industry specifically (Bansal & Eiselt, 2004), with numerous motivation theories having developed over time to help explain the complexity of tourists' behaviour (Isaac, 2008). Undoubtedly, one of the most important contributions to the development of tourism motivational theories is the one proposed by Dann (1977), which suggests that motivations fall into two categories, namely push factors and pull factors. Push factors refer to the 'specific forces that influence a person's decision to take a vacation' and have been theorised as 'motivational factors or needs that arise due to a disequilibrium or tension in the motivational system' (Kim *et al.*, 2003: 170). Push factors include, for example, rest and relaxation, self-actualisation, adventure/nature, status/prestige, novelty, escape, social interaction, nostalgia or romance/sex (Hartingh, 2017). Pull factors can be viewed as relating to the supply dimension and are characterised by the attributes, features or attractions that pull travellers towards a specific destination and include, for example, festivals or special events, recreational activities, cultural resources (Kim & Lee, 2002), sunshine, beaches, sports facilities, inexpensive airfares (Klenosky, 2002), friendliness of local people, population density, urban layout, currency exchange, pricing structures (Prayag, 2003) or any potential activity offered to the traveller (Kasseean & Gassita, 2013).

Table 5.1 identifies some of the most common destination attributes (pull factors) and motivational (push) factors from a selection of mainstream tourist motivation studies which all vary in their focus, research design and target groups. Although these studies confirm the preceding common push and pull factors, it has been argued that 'motivations behind travel are constructed out of the social realities of the lives of those who participate in tourism-related activity' (Kimaird & Hall, 1994: 212), suggesting that the gay traveller may have different travel motivations

Table 5.1 A selection of previous mainstream tourism motivation studies

Researcher(s)	Research approach used	Push factors identified	Pull factors identified
Yuan and McDonald (1990)	Factor analysis of 29 motivational/push items and 53 destination/pull items	Enhancement of kinship relationships, novelty, escape, prestige, hobbies/relaxation	History and culture, budget, wilderness, cosmopolitan environment, hunting, ease of travel, facilities
Uysal and Jurovski (1994)	Factor analysis of 26 motivational/push items and 29 destination/pull items	Escape, sports, cultural experience, re-experiencing family togetherness	Culture/heritage, entertainment, outdoors/nature, rural/inexpensive, resort
Turnbull and Uysal (1995)	Factor analysis of 30 motivational/push items and 53 destination/pull items	Prestige, escape, re-experiencing family, cultural experiences, sports	Comfort/relaxation, city enclave, culture/heritage, outdoor resources, rural/inexpensive, beach resort
Oh <i>et al.</i> (1995)	Canonical correlation analysis of 30 motivational/push items and 52 destination/pull items	Novelty, prestige/entertainment, adventure, knowledge/intellectual, sports, kinship/social interaction, rest/escape	Outdoor/nature, upscale/safety, historical/cultural, budget/inexpensive, sports/activity
Klenosky (2002)	Means-end theory, ladder interviews	New/novel experience, relax/rest, enjoy nature, outdoor recreation, get sun/tan, escape, look good/socialise/meet people, get refreshed/renewed, healthy, know more, date more, fun and enjoyment, be more productive, self-esteem, accomplishment, excitement, learn more, challenge/thrill	Warm climate, beaches, new/unique location, party atmosphere, scenic/natural resources, cultural/historical attractions, skiing
Kim <i>et al.</i> (2003)	Factor analysis of 12 motivation/push items and 12 destination/pull items	Family togetherness and study, appreciating health routine, adventure and building friendship	Accessibility and transportation, information and convenience of facilities, key tourist resources
Kasseean and Gassita (2013)	Factor analysis of 74 motivation/push items and destination/pull items	Social interaction, prestige/recognition, rest and relaxation, self-actualisation, novelty, escape, nostalgia	Unique flora and fauna, authentic Mauritian culture, exotic expanse and atmosphere, special climate and weather, exorbitant landscape and scenery, exotic beaches, Mauritian hospitality
Khunong and Ha (2014)	Factor analysis of 17 motivation/push items and destination/pull items	To fulfil my dream of visiting a foreign land/country, with local community and meet new people, to socialise, learn something new and interesting, to socialise a place that I have not visited before, to escape from daily routine	Warm and sunny weather, good physical amenities (recreational facilities, transportation, accommodation), cultural, historical, religious and art attractions, special events/festivals and activities, variety of food, safe and easy access destination, beautiful landscape and natural scenery (forests, mountains, beaches)

Source: Researcher construct from secondary data.

from those of the mainstream traveller and even among gay travellers themselves, as there is 'no more reason to believe that gay women's holiday profiles are the same as those of gay men's than there is to believe males and females generally have the same motivations and behaviours' (Hughes, 2006: 58).

Gay travellers' holiday motivations

Clift and Forrest (1999) conducted one of the first empirical investigations into the holiday motivations of gay men and proposed three dimensions of gay travel: 'gay social life and sex', 'culture and sights' and 'comfort and relaxation' (Clift & Forrest, 1999). The authors tentatively conclude that the most important travel motivations for gay travellers are largely similar to those of mainstream travellers, i.e. good food, relaxation and comfort, and sunshine (Clift & Forrest, 1999). Although Pritchard *et al.* (2000) confirmed this notion, they found the need to escape from heterosexism and to interact with like-minded people in an exclusively gay-safe environment were key factors influencing gay travellers' destination choice, particularly for those who hid their sexuality at home.

Hughes (2002: 304) too argued that 'the "types" of holidays that gay men go on are identical to those of the rest of society'. They are attracted (pulled) by destinations that offer scenery, heritage, sea and sun, sport and entertainment, and culture. Push factors such as social interaction, regeneration, evaluation of self, ego-enhancement, escape, freedom and self-realisation apply equally to gay men (Hughes, 2002). Hughes (2002) proposed a typology of gay men's holidays: 'gay-centric', 'gay-related' and 'non-gay'. A 'non-gay' holiday is no different from that taken by mainstream tourists (Hughes, 2006). A 'gay-related' holiday fulfils the desire for a safe and comfortable destination (where gay space or gay friendliness and tolerance are somewhat important but do not outweigh other requirements) (Hughes, 2002). Gay space and experience, on the other hand, are the key attributes looked for in a 'gay-centric' holiday (Hughes, 2006), implying usually, although not always, sun-and-sea holidays in which gay bars, gay clubs, gay saunas, gay beaches, casual sex contact and socialising with other gay men feature predominantly in the tourists' holiday activities (Hughes & Deutsch, 2010).

The influential research of Clift and Forrest (1999), Hughes (2002) and Pritchard *et al.* (2000) led to an important body of research regarding the study of gay travellers' motivations as discussed throughout this chapter. However, as a result of increasing societal tolerance and legislation, the motivations of a modern gay traveller may have substantially changed, especially considering that 'much of the early demographic and motivational research was conducted prior to social and institutional reform in relation to this sector' (Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2016: 412). An extensive literature review of this body of research revealed that although some

studies suggest gay and mainstream travellers travel for similar reasons to those discussed above, some studies provide evidence suggesting otherwise (Hughes, 2006).

The specific push motivations that distinguish some gay travellers from other groups appear to include (Hattingh & Spencer, 2017):

- (i) Escaping heteronormativity as a result of the need to escape the tension and burdens brought about by the oppressive heteronormative home environment.
- (ii) Pursuing sex/romance, especially important to those living in small cities or heteronormative communities that strictly prohibit same-sex sexual activity.
- (iii) Constructing and validating gay identity, especially relevant to those more prone to social censure, who could have a need to travel to 'gay-friendly' environments in which they can express their 'true' identities.

The specific pull motivations appear to include (Hattingh & Spencer, 2017):

- (i) Gay friendliness, as their safety and approval and acceptance of their sexuality is more likely in a 'gay-friendly' destination.
- (ii) Gay marriage or civil partnerships, which might be illegal in the home environment, which could result in travelling for the purpose of getting married.
- (iii) Gay events/festivals, due to the opportunity of being part of a majority gay population, which might not be the case in their home environments.
- (iv) Gay space/infrastructure, also referred to as gay-related infrastructure, services and facilities, or the gay scene in which homosexuality is the majority and the norm with no risk of rejection and homophobia.

For a full discussion of these push and pull motivations, see Hattingh and Spencer (2017).

Methodology

This study applied a quantitative research method by means of a self-administered web-based electronic survey to avoid surveying *only* openly LGBT individuals who patronise gay bars/venues at the destination. Respondents could opt to remain anonymous on the web if they wished, which was important considering the heteronormative home environments that some in the study sample have become accustomed to. A judgment sample of eight gay travel agencies and tour operators across South Africa were asked to distribute the survey hyperlink via email to African gay travellers on their databases who had previously travelled to Cape Town.

A list of 13 push factors and 24 pull factors was adapted from a variety of studies including Kasean and Gassita (2013), Kim and Lee (2002) and Zhou (2005). Some specific push and pull motivations for travel among LGBT individuals as found in the literature were also added to the survey. Participants rated the importance level of the push and pull factors on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important, 2 = unimportant, 3 = neither important nor unimportant (neutrally important), 4 = important, 5 = very important). The survey was available online for eight months (May 2016–January 2017), and was completed by a sample of 250 LGBT travellers from African countries including Botswana, Kenya, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Results

African LGBT traveller profile

Most LGBT travellers were married or partnered (61%), and aged between 31 and 40 years (36%). More males (89%) participated in the study than females (11%). Most respondents identified as gay (84%), while lesbians (8%), bisexuals (5%) and transgendered individuals (<1%) made up the balance of the sample. These LGBT travellers were mostly open about their sexuality in their home environments (85%), while 15% were only partially open or concealed their sexuality. Almost two-thirds of respondents (63%) classified their home environments as liberal, while more than a third (37%) originated from conservative environments.

LGBT travel motivations: Push factors

The most important push factors for African LGBT travellers were ‘opportunities for rest and relaxation’ (4.15), followed by ‘escaping from everyday life and daily routine’ (4.05) (Table 5.2). These push factors were all relatively close to 4, the value of the ‘important’ level. Opportunities for rest and relaxation and to escape appeared to be important push factors for mainstream travellers (Kasean & Gassita, 2013) as well as LGBT travellers (Ballegaard & Chor, 2009; Hughes & Deutsch, 2010). These findings tentatively suggest that, despite the deeply conservative and heteronormative attitudes across most South African provinces as well as the unfair discrimination against ‘sexual orientation’ elsewhere on the African continent, the most important factors that push African LGBT individuals to travel are in line with those of mainstream travellers.

LGBT travel motivations: Pull factors

The most important pull factors attracting LGBT travellers to Cape Town were the ‘dramatic/beautiful landscape and scenery’ (4.35),

Table 5.2 Push factors’ mean scores (n = 250)

Rank	Push factor	Mean score	SD
1	Opportunities for rest and relaxation	4.15	1.022
2	Escape from everyday life/daily routine	4.05	1.057
3	Enhancement of kinship relationships (family/friends)	3.72	1.290
4	Novelty (discovering/exploring a new or exciting place)	3.68	1.224
5	Enriching myself intellectually (learn something new)	3.42	1.243
6	Exploration and evaluation of self (gain insight about self)	3.17	1.338
7	Social interaction with other gay people	3.12	1.417
8	Opportunity to develop close friendships/romance	2.97	1.397
9	Nostalgia	2.89	1.334
10	Escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity	2.61	1.504
11	Opportunity to have a sexual adventure	2.54	1.508
12	Social recognition/ego enhancement	2.52	1.392
13	To get married/go on honeymoon	1.70	1.201

followed by the destination’s ‘relaxing atmosphere’ (4.31) (Table 5.3). The importance attached to these attributes is no surprise – Cape Town is set in some of the most dramatic scenery to be seen anywhere in the world and offers the tourist a world of relaxation (Fisher, 2012). The ‘local food and wine’ (4.06) was also among the most important attributes that attracted African LGBT travellers, possibly due to Cape Town being named the best food city in the world by the *Condé Nast Traveller World’s Best Food Cities Readers’ Choice Awards* in 2016 (Voelker, 2016). This accolade, therefore, appears to draw African LGBT travellers. The above findings are supported by Clift and Forrest (1999) and Ersoy *et al.* (2012), who found that comfort/relaxation and good food are strong pull factors for LGBT leisure travel.

The next most important pull factors were the destination’s ‘safety and security’ (3.96) related to LGBT travellers’ personal safety, and the ‘gay-friendly environment and friendliness of locals towards gays’ (3.94). Although the need for safety appears to be a powerful motivational force behind human behaviour and an important consideration in destination selection (Hu & Ritchie, 1993), LGBT travellers do face physical or verbal abuse, discrimination and harassment and even criminalisation initiated by countries that enforce sexuality-based discrimination (Hughes, 2005). Furthermore, some evidence exists that gay friendliness was not an important consideration for LGBT travellers (Blichfeldt *et al.*, 2011; Retnam, 2012). In contrast, most African LGBT travellers regarded the ‘gay-friendly’ environment and tolerance of the locals in Cape Town to be important, possibly due to its ‘gay-friendly’ reputation and gay-tolerant society (Hattingh & Spencer, 2017).

Table 5.3 Pull factors' mean scores ($n = 250$)

Rank	Pull factor (destination attribute)	Mean score	SD
1	Dramatic/beautiful landscape and scenery	4.35	0.924
2	Relaxing atmosphere	4.31	0.909
3	Local food and wine	4.06	1.087
4	Safe and secure destination related to LGBT personal safety	3.96	1.190
5	Gay-friendly environment/friendliness of locals towards gays	3.94	1.224
6	Beaches	3.87	1.248
7	General tourist attractions/well known tourist sites	3.82	1.166
8	Ease of access into destination	3.67	1.208
9	Diversity and cosmopolitan reputation	3.66	1.304
10	Climate/weather	3.64	1.209
11	Local gay culture/gay venues (gay village)	3.58	1.313
12	Culture and history (monument, heritage, arts, local customs)	3.38	1.287
13	Nightlife (bars, clubs and other entertainment)	3.34	1.363
14	Shopping facilities	3.26	1.317
15	Cost/value for money	3.25	1.278
16	Unique 'African' city	3.21	1.554
17	Nature, adventure offering (hiking, shark-cage diving, abseiling)	3.17	1.439
18	Same-sex marriage laws	2.99	1.619
19	Unique accommodation	2.93	1.356
20	Gay event	2.74	1.535
21	Gay/nude beach	2.67	1.554
22	Mainstream event	2.66	1.326
23	Wildlife, special animals	2.57	1.322
24	Sport/exercise & wellness facilities	2.48	1.375

The findings in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 have to be carefully considered. Vorobjovas-Pinta and Hardy (2016) are of the opinion that an overemphasis of descriptive data has resulted in the perception of a homogeneous LGBT travel market. In tourism research, sociodemographics such as gender, age, education, relationship status, occupation and income have been widely used for profiling travellers and examining differences among them (e.g. Beerli & Martin, 2004). However, very few empirical studies have examined the sociodemographic differences among LGBT travellers (Ro *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, further statistical analyses were required to test whether there are significant differences in LGBT travellers' motivations. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyse the variance within and between means for groups (categories) of data and is represented by the *F*-ratio or *F*-statistic (Saunders *et al.*, 2009). A large *F*-statistic with a probability of

less than 0.05 indicates that the variance is statistically significant (Saunders *et al.*, 2009). As the ANOVA only indicates whether there are significant differences between groups (categories), it was supplemented by the post hoc Bonferroni test to determine where the differences lie.

Comparisons of push and pull factors for different age groups

ANOVAs revealed statistically significant differences among the different age groups ($p < 0.05$) (Table 5.4) for some of the push and pull factors. An inspection of the mean scores across age groups indicated that to 'escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity' (2.81^a; 2.54^a), 'social recognition/ego enhancement' (2.84^a; 2.39^a) and 'exploration and evaluation of self' (3.60^a) were more important push factors among younger travellers (between the ages of 18 and 40), while an 'opportunity to have a sexual adventure' (1.59^b), was less important to senior travellers (61 years and older). Furthermore, the pull factor 'culture and history' (3.37^b) was less important to 31–40 year olds, while 'nature and adventure offering' (2.70^b) was less important to senior travellers (61 years and older). The travel behaviours of LGBT travellers of different age groups therefore appear to be varied.

Table 5.4 ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by age group ($n = 250$)

Push factor	18–30	31–40	41–50	51–60	61 and older	F-ratio	Sig. level
Escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity	2.81 ^a	2.54 ^a	2.29 ^b	2.10 ^b	1.85 ^b	4.545	0.001*
Social recognition/ego enhancement	2.84 ^a	2.39 ^a	2.33 ^b	2.51 ^b	1.81 ^b	4.199	0.002*
Exploration and evaluation of self	3.60 ^a	3.20 ^{b,c}	2.72 ^b	2.95 ^b	2.67 ^b	9.658	0.000*
Opportunity to have a sexual adventure	2.78 ^a	2.63 ^a	2.46 ^a	2.58 ^a	1.59 ^b	3.860	0.004*
Pull factor							
Culture and history	3.71 ^a	3.37 ^b	3.53 ^a	3.49 ^a	3.85 ^a	2.651	0.033*
Nature, adventure offering (hiking, shark-cage diving, abseiling, etc.)	3.67 ^a	3.38 ^a	3.22 ^a	3.17 ^a	2.70 ^b	3.442	0.009*

Notes: *Significance at the 5% level.

^{a,b,c}Means with different superscripts indicate significant differences. For example, age groups 18–30 and 31–40 (mean values with superscript *a*) differed significantly from age groups 41–50, 51–60 and 61 and older (mean values with superscript *b*) in the push factors 'to escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity' and 'social recognition and ego enhancement'. Age groups 41–50, 51–60 and 61 and older did not significantly differ from each other in terms of these push factors.

Table 5.5 ANOVA for comparison of pull factors by sexual identities (n = 250)

Pull factor	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual	F-ratio	Sig. level
Gay/nude beach	2.75 ^a	1.34 ^b	2.57 ^a	12.241	0.000*
Nightlife	3.28 ^a	2.52 ^b	3.03 ^{a,b}	5.029	0.007*
Shopping facilities	3.18 ^a	2.55 ^b	3.24 ^{a,b}	3.430	0.033*
Gay-friendly environment/friendliness of locals towards gays	3.89 ^a	4.14 ^a	3.41 ^b	3.632	0.027*
Local gay culture/gay venues (gay village)	3.49 ^a	2.86 ^b	3.16 ^{a,b}	3.880	0.021*
Culture and history (monument, heritage, arts, local customs)	3.63 ^a	3.03 ^b	3.05 ^b	6.922	0.001*

*Significance at the 5% level.

^{a,b}Means with different superscripts indicate significant differences. For example, lesbians (mean value with superscript b) differed significantly from gay and bisexual travellers (mean values with superscript a) in the pull factor 'gay/nude beach'. Gay and bisexual travellers did not significantly differ from each other in terms of this pull factor.

Comparisons of pull factors for different sexual identities

The travel motivations of gay, lesbian and bisexual travellers appear to differ according to their sexual identity. ANOVAs revealed statistically significant differences for the three sexual identities ($p < 0.05$) (Table 5.5) for some of the pull factors only. Lesbians attached lower importance to the pull factor 'gay/nude beach' (1.34^b) when compared with gay and bisexual travellers. Further statistical differences emerged between gay and lesbian travellers in terms of 'nightlife' (3.28^a; 2.52^b), 'shopping facilities' (3.18^a; 2.55^b) and 'local gay culture/gay venues (gay village)' (3.49^a; 2.86^b) in that gay travellers regarded these factors to be more important than lesbians. The pull factor 'gay-friendly environment/friendliness of locals towards gays' (3.41^b), appears to be a less important motivation for bisexual travellers when compared with the other two sexual identities, while gay men attached a higher importance to the 'culture and history' of a destination (3.63^a) when compared with lesbians and bisexual men and women.

Comparisons of push and pull factors for different relationship status

The travel motivations of LGBT travellers appear to differ according to their relationship status (Table 5.6) for some of the push and pull factors. An inspection of the mean scores indicated that the push factors 'social interaction with other gay people' (3.38^a), 'exploration and evaluation of self' (3.39^a), and the 'opportunity to have a sexual adventure' (2.88^a) were more important to single travellers, when compared with those who are married/in a civil union or in a relationship. Statistical differences in terms of the push factor 'opportunity to develop close friendships/romance' and the pull factor 'nightlife' emerged between single travellers (3.26^a; 3.47^b) and those who were married/in a civil union (2.79^b; 2.90^b) in that single travel-

Table 5.6 ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by relationship status (n = 250)

Push factor	Single	In a relationship	Married/civil union	F-ratio	Sig. level
Social interaction with other gay people	3.38 ^a	3.02 ^b	2.93 ^b	5.201	0.006*
Exploration and evaluation of self (gain insight about self)	3.39 ^a	3.01 ^b	2.83 ^b	7.234	0.001*
Opportunity to have a sexual adventure	2.88 ^a	2.45 ^b	2.24 ^b	8.008	0.000*
Opportunity to develop close friendships/romance	3.26 ^a	2.99 ^{a,b}	2.79 ^b	4.468	0.012*
Pull factor					
Nightlife	3.47 ^a	3.18 ^{a,b}	2.90 ^b	7.296	0.001*

*Significance at the 5% level.

^{a,b}Means with different superscripts indicate significant differences. For example, single LGBT travellers (mean value with superscript a) differed significantly from those who are married/in a civil union or relationship (mean values with superscript b) in the push factor 'social interaction with other gay people'. LGBT travellers who are married/in a civil union or relationship did not significantly differ from each other in terms of this push factor.

Comparisons of push and pull factors for different classifications of home environments

ANOVAs revealed a statistically significant difference among respondents travelling from a liberal environment and those travelling from a conservative environment ($p > 0.05$) (Table 5.7) for one push factor. To 'escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity' (2.28^a) was less important to those travelling from an open-minded city with a

Table 5.7 ANOVA for comparison of push factors by classification of home environment (n = 250)

Push factor	Open-minded city with a variety of gay life and venues	Closed-minded city with limited/no gay life and venues	Village/rural area with limited/no gay life and venues	F-ratio	Sig. level
Escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity	2.28 ^a	2.91 ^b	2.52 ^b	7.283	0.001*

*Significance at the 5% level.

^{a,b}Means with different superscripts indicate significant differences. For example, LGBT travellers travelling from open-minded cities (mean value with superscript a) differed significantly from those who travelled from closed-minded cities and village/rural areas (mean values with superscript b) in the push factor 'escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity'. LGBT travellers who travelled from closed-minded cities and village/rural areas did

Table 5.8 ANOVA for comparisons of push and pull factors by openness of sexuality ($n = 250$)

Push factor	Conceal sexuality	Open about sexuality	Somewhat (partially) open about sexuality	F-ratio	Sig. level
Escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity	3.24 ^a	2.37 ^b	2.53 ^b	3.718	0.025*
Opportunity to have a sexual adventure	3.33 ^a	2.50 ^b	2.72 ^b	3.607	0.028*
Pull factor					
Gay/nude beach	3.52 ^a	2.63 ^b	2.51 ^b	3.735	0.025*

*Significance at the 5% level.

^{a,b}Means with different superscripts indicate significant differences. For example, LGBT travellers who concealed their sexuality (mean value with superscript a) differed significantly from those who were open or somewhat open about their sexuality (mean values with superscript b) in the push factor 'escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity'. LGBT travellers who were open or somewhat open did not significantly differ from each other in terms of this push factor.

variety of gay life and venues compared with those who travelled from village/rural areas or closed-minded cities.

Comparisons of push and pull factors for openness of sexuality

ANOVAs revealed statistically significant differences among those who concealed and those who were open about their sexuality ($p < 0.05$) (Table 5.8) for some of the push and pull factors. Those who concealed their sexuality attached more importance to the push factors 'to escape from disapproving society to freely express gay identity' (3.24^a) and for 'opportunities to have a sexual adventure' (3.33^a) and the pull factor 'gay/nude beach' (3.52^a) when compared with those who were open or somewhat open about their sexuality.

Discussion, Implications and Conclusion

There appears to be a lack of insight into the travel motivations and behaviours of LGBT travellers going to or, especially, coming from non-Western countries. This study marks one of the first attempts to investigate a sample of non-Western LGBT leisure travellers' holiday motivations to Cape Town, an under-researched African destination in the academic literature (Prayag, 2010).

The findings suggest that African LGBT travellers' push motivations, i.e. 'opportunities for rest and relaxation' and 'escaping from everyday life and daily routine', appear not to be influenced by sexual identity and are

therefore not specific to these travellers, as the factors pushing LGBT individuals to travel are in line with those of mainstream travellers. The most important destination-specific pull attributes attracting LGBT travellers to Cape Town include the 'dramatic/beautiful landscape and scenery', the 'relaxing atmosphere' and the 'local food and wine'. The importance attached to the gay-related attributes, i.e. 'safety/security' and the 'gay-friendly' environment suggest that African LGBT travellers' sexual identity influences their pull motivations. However, some authors argue that as people are becoming more tolerant towards homosexuality, the need for 'gay-friendliness' appears to be diminishing (Blichfeldt *et al.*, 2011), which is not supported by the current findings and therefore does not seem to fully apply to African LGBT travellers. This could be due to Cape Town's unique 'gay-friendly' environment and tolerant society in comparison with destinations across South Africa and elsewhere on the African continent. These findings should, however, be carefully considered as they can easily create the perception that the LGBT travel market is homogeneous. For instance, would it be accurate to conclude that *most* LGBT travellers are not pushed to experience a sexual adventure, or that *most* are attracted to a gay-friendly environment? Further statistical analyses tested for significant differences in LGBT travellers' holiday motivations and found that there are several variables that suggest that LGBT travellers do not hold the same travel motivations or pursue the same holiday activities, and are therefore not homogeneous.

Firstly, younger LGBT travellers (between the ages of 18 and 40) place a higher importance on escaping from a hostile society. They seem to have a stronger need for ego-enhancement (status) and to discover themselves on holiday. Senior travellers (61 years and older) regard sexual opportunities as less important in comparison with younger travellers. It further appears as if 31–40 year old LGBT travellers are less interested in culture and history when compared with the other age groups, whereas senior travellers (61 years and older) appear to regard the adventure offering of the destination to be less important than the other age groups. These findings contradict Bansal and Eiselt's (2004) argument that it may be a cliché that older travellers are mostly interested in cultural and heritage sites, whereas younger travellers are more interested in the outdoors and adventure activities, as significant differences were found among younger and older age groups for these specific pull factors.

Secondly, the LGBT tourism studies that have included lesbians show that there are substantial differences in the travel motivations of lesbians and gay men (Ballegaard & Chor, 2009; Hughes, 2006; Pritchard *et al.*, 2000). This study therefore supports these previously conducted studies in that lesbians, when compared with gay and bisexual travellers, appear to attach less importance to the gay/nude beach, possibly due to sex and the body not playing a role in lesbians' identity to the same extent as they do in gay men's identity (Hughes, 2006). Gay travellers, when compared

with lesbian travellers in particular, attach a higher importance to nightlife, shopping facilities and the local gay culture/gay venues (gay village). Hughes and Deutsch (2010) found that the need for frequenting gay space rarely featured among older gay men, while Blichfeldt *et al.* (2013) claimed that the literature may over-emphasise the significance of gay space for gay holidays. It is, however, clear from the findings of this study that the local gay culture and gay venues of Cape Town were more important attributes sought by African gay men when compared with lesbian travellers in particular. African gay men also differ from other sexualities in terms of the higher importance attached to the culture/history of a destination. What is less well known is how bisexual travellers differ from gay and lesbian travellers in terms of holiday motivations. Results of Community Marketing & Insight's 10th Annual LGBT Community Survey (Community Marketing and Insights, 2016) showed no significant differences between gay versus bisexual men or lesbian versus bisexual women (UNWTO, 2017). The findings of this study therefore contradict Community Marketing & Insight's findings in that bisexual travellers indeed have different, although not entirely different, motivations to travel when compared with gay men and lesbians, i.e. a lower importance attached to a 'gay-friendly' environment.

Thirdly, single LGBT travellers place a higher importance on discovering themselves and social interaction with other gay people while holidaying and seem more inclined to travel for sexual adventures when compared with those who are married/in a civil union or in a relationship. Single travellers, when compared with those who are married/in a civil union in particular, also place a higher importance on the opportunity to develop close friendships/romance and the nightlife of Cape Town. According to Storr (2005: 21), the ability to be alone, i.e. single, is 'linked with self-discovery and self-realization; with becoming aware of one's deepest needs, feelings, and impulses' which, based on the current findings, appears to pull through to the holiday. A possible reason why single LGBT travellers, and other travellers, are motivated by a sexual adventure while on holiday, and develop a need to visit a nightclub to form close friendships/romance, might be due to their being 'unattached and because holidays might reduce inhibitions and thus increase the opportunity for sex' (Thomsen, 2008: 61) and/or romance.

Fourthly, those travelling from a liberal home environment attach less importance to escaping from a disapproving society, as this heteronormative environment does not seem to exist. This study therefore supports Clift and Forrest's (1999) and Herrera and Scott's (2005) findings, in that this need for escape applied to LGBT individuals who live in conservative environments that have a limited or no obvious gay community or gay space and who, therefore, have an increased need to escape the oppressive heteronormative home environments. Similarly, travellers who conceal their sexuality attach more importance to escaping from disapproving society, and for sexual adventures, supporting Ballegaard and Chor's

(2009) and Köllen and Lazar's (2012) findings that the need to escape heterosexism depends on whether the individual is open about his/her sexuality or not, as those who live an openly gay lifestyle may not feel a need to escape. Furthermore, the study supports Hughes and Deutsch's (2010) finding that those concealing their sexuality are more likely to travel in pursuit of a sexual adventure. This study also finds that the gay and nude beaches of Cape Town are more important to those who conceal their sexuality, possibly due to the lack of these destination attributes in the home environment, and their being unique to Cape Town when compared with other destinations on the African continent.

These findings provide an important marketing implication. In order to effectively attract LGBT travellers, different marketing strategies and promotional messages will be required for different LGBT travellers. Products and services designed for and promoted to LGBT travellers could be better tailored to their specific needs based on the variables that distinguish their travel motivations, i.e. age, sexual identity, relationship status, classification of home environment and openness of sexuality. Therefore, a single or broad-brush approach will be ineffective to successfully attract *all* LGBT travellers to a destination.

In conclusion, this research provides two significant contributions to the broader LGBT tourism literature: firstly, it contributes to the gap in the literature regarding the travel motivations of non-Western LGBT travellers; secondly, empirical evidence, albeit not universally representative of all African LGBT leisure travellers (given that only eight African nationalities participated in the study and all respondents were internet users), suggests that African LGBT travellers, at least those who visited Cape Town, are not homogeneous and that this market is more complex than previously understood.

The author acknowledges that sample sizes for some of the groups used as part of the ANOVAs are low. Forming statistical conclusions from small sample sizes could violate the normality of distribution required; however, this research should be considered exploratory and does not intend to provide conclusive evidence. The results are nevertheless considered important. Further limitations relating to this research include: (i) respondents self-selected to participate in this study, and findings may therefore be biased towards LGBT individuals that self-identify as such, resulting in those who conceal their sexuality being under-represented. However, respondents could opt to remain anonymous on the web, if they wished, which would not have been the case should personal interviews have been conducted; (ii) the researcher made a judgment about the characteristics (variables or data) to include in the survey. The push and pull factors were borrowed from secondary data sources and did not come from primary data, i.e. open-ended questions in the survey. Therefore, although tourism stakeholders were requested during pilot testing to add push and pull factors that were presumed to be of importance to LGBT

travellers but not included in the survey, it may be possible that the final list of motivations was not exhaustive. Future research could implement a qualitative research method such as focus groups to investigate the deeper reasons as to why certain destination attributes and sociopsychological motivations are more important in non-Western LGBT travellers' holiday decision-making processes and travel behaviours. However, the fact that much of the LGBT population in the non-Western world remains hidden will make it difficult to find and interview them, particularly those who conceal their sexualities.

Notes

- (1) 'Gay' is sometimes used to describe both male and female homosexuals, i.e. gay men and women, as a 'shorthand' term (Hughes, 2006: 2). In order to keep the writing style fluid, the term 'gay' is used throughout this chapter to cover both male and female homosexuals. To denote a specific gender (where required), gay men, gay women or lesbians are used.
- (2) An individual having sexual desire for, or sexual activity with, persons of the same biological sex. In this chapter, the term 'gay' is used interchangeably depending on the context.
- (3) A term used to describe the tourism activity of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender travellers. Also referred to as LGBT tourism.

References

- Ballegaard, N. and Chor, J. (2009) Gay and lesbian tourism: Travel motivations, destination choices and holiday experiences of gays and lesbians. Unpublished Master's thesis, Copenhagen Business School.
- Bansal, H. and Eiselt, H.A. (2004) Exploratory research of tourist motivations and planning. *Tourism Management* 25 (3), 387–396.
- Beerli, A. and Martin, J.D. (2004) Tourists' characteristics and the perceived image of tourist destinations: A quantitative analysis – a case study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Tourism Management* 25 (5), 623–636.
- Blichfeldt, B.S., Chor, J. and Ballegaard-Milan, N. (2011) It really depends on whether you are in a relationship: A study of 'gay destinations' from a tourist perspective. *Tourism Today* 11, 7–26.
- Blichfeldt, B.S., Chor, J. and Ballegaard-Milan, N. (2013) Zoos, sanctuaries and turfs: Enactments and uses of gay spaces during the holidays. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 15 (5), 473–483.
- Boekstein, M.S. (2012) Revitalising the healing tradition – health tourism potential of thermal springs in the Western Cape. Unpublished Doctor of Technology in Tourism and Hospitality Management thesis, Cape Peninsula University of Technology.
- Clift, S. and Forrest, S. (1999) Gay men and tourism: Destinations and holiday motivations. *Tourism Management* 20 (5), 615–625. doi:10.1016/S0261-5177 (99)00032-1
- Cohen, S.A., Prayag, G. and Moital, M. (2014) Consumer behavior in tourism: Concepts, influences and opportunities. *Current Issues in Tourism* 17 (10), 872–909.
- Community Marketing and Insights (2016) *10th Annual LGBT Community Survey*. San Francisco: Community Marketing Inc. See https://www.communitymarketing.com/documents/CM1-10th_LGBT_Community_Survey_US_Profile.pdf (accessed 9 February 2021).

- Croucher, S. (2002) South Africa's democratisation and the politics of gay liberation. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28 (2), 315–330.
- Dann, G.M.S. (1977) Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 4 (4), 184–194.
- DeBarros, L. (2016) Shocking scale of LGBT discrimination in South Africa revealed. *Mamba Online*, 29 November. See <http://www.mambaonline.com/2016/11/29/shocking-scale-lgbt-discrimination-south-africa-revealed/> (accessed 12 September 2018).
- Eisoy, G.K., Ozer, S.U. and Tuzunkan, D. (2012) Gay men and tourism: Gay men's tourism perspectives and expectations. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 41, 394–401.
- Fisher, S. (2012) Table Mountain one of New7 Wonders of nature. *Eyewitness News*, 03 May. See <https://ewn.co.za/2012/05/03/Table-Mountain-one-of-New7Wonders-of-Nature> (accessed 11 February 2021).
- Fodness, D. (1994) Measuring tourist motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 21 (3), 555–581.
- Gomes da Costa Santos, G. (2013) Decriminalising homosexuality in Africa: Lessons from the South African experience. In C. Lennox and M. Waite (eds) *Human Rights, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in the Commonwealth: Struggles for Decriminalisation and Change* (pp. 313–337). London: Human Rights Consortium.
- Goossens, C. (2000) Tourism information and pleasure motivation. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27 (2), 301–321.
- Hattingh, C. (2017) A typology of gay leisure travellers: An African perspective. Unpublished Doctor of Technology in Tourism and Hospitality Management thesis, Cape Peninsula University of Technology.
- Hattingh, C. and Bruwer, J. (2020) Cape Town's gay village: from "gaytrified" tourism mecca to "heterosexualised" urban space. *International Journal of Tourism Cities* 6 (4), 907–928.
- Hattingh, C. and Spencer, J.P. (2017) Salient factors influencing gay travellers' holiday motivations: A push-pull approach. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 6 (4), 1–26.
- Hattingh, C. and Spencer, J.P. (2020) Homosexual not homogeneous – a motivation-based typology of gay leisure travellers holidaying in Cape Town, South Africa. *Journal of Homosexuality* 67 (6), 768–792.
- Herrera, S.L. and Scott, D. (2005) 'We gotta get out of this place!': Leisure travel among gay men living in a small city. *Tourism Review International* 8 (3), 249–262.
- HRW (2016) Kenya: Court upholds forced anal exams. *Human Rights Watch*, 16 June. See <https://www.hrw.org/news/2016/06/16/kenya-court-upholds-forced-anal-exams> (accessed 12 September 2018).
- HRW (2018) Kenya: Court finds forced anal exams unconstitutional. *Human Rights Watch*, 22 March. See <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/03/22/kenya-court-finds-forced-anal-exams-unconstitutional> (accessed 12 September 2018).
- Hu, Y. and Ritchie, J.R.B. (1993) Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual approach. *Journal of Travel Research* 32 (2), 25–34.
- Hughes, H.L. (2002) Gay men's holiday destination choice: A case of risk and avoidance. *International Journal of Travel Research* 4 (4), 299–312.
- Hughes, H.L. (2005) The paradox of gay men as tourists: Privileged or penalized? *Tourism, Culture & Communication* 6 (1), 51–62.
- Hughes, H.L. (2006) *Pink Tourism: Holidays of Gay Men and Lesbians*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Hughes, H.L. and Deutsch, R. (2010) Holidays of older gay men: Age or sexual orientation as decisive factors? *Tourism Management* 31 (4), 454–463.
- ILGA (2016) *State-Sponsored Homophobia. A World Survey of Sexual Orientation Laws: Criminalisation, Protection and Recognition*. Geneva: International Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex Association. See <http://ilga.org/>

- downloads/02_ILGA_State_Sponsored_Homophobia_2016_ENG_WEB_150516.pdf (accessed 28 January 2017).
- Iiyayambwa, M. (2012) Homosexual rights and the law: A South African constitutional metamorphosis. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2 (4), 50–58.
- Isaac, R. (2008) Understanding the behaviour of cultural tourists: Towards a classification of Dutch cultural tourists. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences.
- Jackman, J. (2018) Police in Nigeria arrest 57 men for having gay sex. *Pink News*, 27 August. See https://www.pinknews.co.uk/2018/08/27/gay-sex-nigeria-police-arrest-57-men/?utm_source=Facebook&utm_medium=Buffer&utm_campaign=PN (accessed 17 August 2018).
- Jago, L.K. (1997) Special events and tourism behaviour: A conceptualisation and an empirical analysis from a values perspective. Unpublished DPhil thesis, Victoria University.
- Jara, M.K. (1998) Gay and lesbian rights: Forcing change in South Africa. *Southern African Report* 13 (3), 31.
- Kassan, H. and Gassita, R. (2013) Exploring tourists' 'push and pull' motivations to visit Mauritius as a tourist destination. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure* 2 (3), 1–13.
- Kauhanen, S. (2015) Think pink in tourism – a study of LGBT+ tourism. Unpublished Bachelor of Tourism thesis, Laurea University of Applied Sciences.
- Kennedy, B. (2006) Homosexuals in the periphery: Gay and lesbian rights in developing Africa. *Nebraska Anthropologist* 21, 59–68.
- Khuong, M.N. and Ha, H.T.T. (2014) The influences of push and pull factors on the international leisure tourists' return intention to Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam – a mediation analysis of destination satisfaction. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance* 5 (6), 490–496.
- Kim, S.S. and Lee, C. (2002) Push and pull relationships. *Annals of Tourism Research* 29 (1), 257–260.
- Kim, S.S., Lee, C. and Klenosky, D.B. (2003) The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management* 24 (2), 169–180.
- Kinnaird, V. and Hall, D. (1994) Conclusion: The way forward. In V. Kinnaird and D. Hall (eds) *Tourism: A Gender Analysis* (pp. 210–216). Chichester: Wiley.
- Klenosky, D.B. (2002) The 'pull' of tourism destinations: A means–end investigation. *Journal of Travel Research* 40 (4), 385–395.
- Köllen, T. and Lazar, S. (2012) Gay tourism in Budapest: An exploratory study on gay tourists' motivational patterns for travelling to Budapest. *American Journal of Tourism Management* 1 (3), 64–68.
- Kutsch, T. (2013) Homosexuality still a crime in 38 African countries. *Aljazeera America*, 14 November. See <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2013/11/14/senegal-s-criminalizationofhomosexualitypartofaregionaltrend.html> (accessed 25 May 2018).
- Luthans, F., Hodgetts, R.M. and Rosenkrantz, S.A. (1988) *Real Managers*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Månsson, M. and Østrup, J.H. (2007) Producing borders of sexuality – the complexity of gay destination marketing. Paper presented at the 16th Nordic Symposium in Tourism and Hospitality Research, Helsingborg, Sweden, 27–30 September.
- Mullen, B. and Johnson, C. (1990) *The Psychology of Consumer Behaviour*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mzantsi, S. (2017) South Africans detained in Tanzania for 'promoting homosexuality'. *Cape Times*, 23 October. See <https://www.iol.co.za/capetimes/news/south-africans-detained-in-tanzania-for-promoting-homosexuality-11663994> (accessed 17 August 2018).
- Nelson, K.G. (2014) Gay rights ruling in Kenya could reverberate through Africa. *The World*, 17 April. See <https://www.pri.org/stories/2018-04-17/gay-rights-ruling-kenya-could-reverberate-through-africa> (accessed 13 September 2018).
- Oh, H.C., Uysal, M. and Weaver, P.A. (1995) Product bundles and market segments based on travel motivations: A canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 14 (2), 123–137.
- Out LGBT Well-being (2016) *Hate Crimes against LGBT People in South Africa*. Pretoria: US Department of State. See <https://out.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Hate-Crimes-Against-LGBT-People-in-South-Africa-21-November-2016-Web.pdf> (accessed 9 February 2021).
- Prayag, G. (2003) An investigation into international tourists' perceptions of Cape Town as a holiday destination. Unpublished Master of Business Science thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Prayag, G. (2010) Images as pull factors of a tourist destination: A factor-cluster segmentation analysis. *Tourism Analysis* 15 (2), 1–14.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N.J., Sedgely, D. and Jenkins, A. (1998) Reaching out to the gay tourist: Opportunities and threats in an emerging market segment. *Tourism Management* 19 (3), 273–282.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N.J., Sedgely, D., Khan, E. and Jenkins, A. (2000) Sexuality and holiday choices: Conversations with gay and lesbian tourists. *Leisure Studies* 19 (4), 267–282.
- Reddy, V. (2014) Identity, law, justice: Thinking about sexual rights and citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa. In A.K. Nord and J. Luckscheiter (eds) *Perspectives: Political Analysis and Commentary from Africa: Struggle for Equality – Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity and Human Rights in Africa* (pp. 18–23). Cape Town: Heinrich Böll Foundation Southern Africa.
- Retnam, S. (2012) Travel behavior among Malaysian gays: A comparison between Malay, Indian and Chinese ethnicities. Unpublished Master of Business Administration dissertation, University of Malaya.
- Ro, H., Olson, E.D. and Choi, Y. (2017) An exploratory study of gay travelers: Sociodemographic analysis. *Tourism Review* 72 (1), 15–27.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009) *Research Methods for Business Students* (5th edn). Harlow: Pearson.
- Storr, A. (2005) *Solitude: A Return to the Self*. New York: Free Press.
- Strudwick, P. (2014) Morocco releases British tourist jailed for 'homosexual acts'. *The Guardian*, 7 October. See <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/07/morocco-releases-british-tourist-jailed-homosexual-acts-ray-cole> (accessed 10 September 2018).
- Thomsen, A. (2008) Danish homosexual men in a tourism context. Unpublished Master of Tourism dissertation, Aalborg University.
- Thoreson, R.R. (2008) Somewhere over the rainbow nation: Gay, lesbian and bisexual activism in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 34 (3), 679–697.
- Turnbull, D.R. and Uysal, M. (1995) An exploratory study of German visitors to the Caribbean: Push and pull motivations. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* 4 (2), 85–92.
- UNWTO (2012) *Global Report on LGBT Tourism*. Madrid: World Tourism Organization. See <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284414581> (accessed 11 February 2021).
- UNWTO (2017) *Second Global Report on LGBT Tourism*. Affiliate Members Global Reports Vol. 15. Madrid: World Tourism Organization. See <https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284418619>.
- Uysal, M. and Jurowski, C. (1994) Testing the push and pull factors. *Annals of Tourism Research* 21 (4), 844–846.
- Visser, G. (2002) Gay tourism in South Africa: Issues from the Cape Town experience. *Urban Forum* 13 (1), 85–94.
- Visser, G. (2003) Gay men, tourism and urban space: Reflections on Africa's 'gay capital'. *Tourism Geographies* 5 (2), 168–189.

- Voelker, J. (2016) The best food cities in the world right now. *CN Traveler*, 7 April. See <https://www.cntraveler.com/galleries/2015-04-07/worlds-best-food-cities-readers-choice-awards-2014> (accessed 11 August 2018).
- Vorobjovas-Pinta, O. and Hardy, A. (2016) The evolution of gay travel research. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 18 (4), 409–416.
- Wockner, R. (2008) Two Spanish men arrested for alleged gay crimes in Gambia. *PrideSource*, 12 June. See <https://pridesource.com/article/30767/> (accessed 31 August 2018).
- Yuan, S. and McDonald, C. (1990) Motivational determinates of international pleasure travel. *Journal of Tourism Research* 29 (1), 42–44.
- Zhou, L. (2005) Destination attributes that attract international tourists to Cape Town. Unpublished Master of Commerce research project, University of the Western Cape.

6 (Re)discovering Chinese Lesbian and Gay Travel

Xiongbin Gao

Introduction

Research into lesbian and gay travel in tourism scholarship has gained increasing interest over the past two decades (e.g. Clift & Forrest, 1999; Guaracino, 2007; Hughes, 2005; Melián-González *et al.*, 2011; Pritchard *et al.*, 1998). The inclusion of the lesbian and gay community in tourism research is crucial to affirming the increasing recognition of lesbian and gay consumers in the fast-growing tourism market. However, most studies of lesbian and gay travel have focused only on middle-class white gay men without children, hence homogenising the gay travel market (Vorobjovas-Pinta & Hardy, 2016). Lesbians and gay men from non-Western countries, therefore, have been significantly absent in the understanding of gay travel (Coon, 2012; Puar, 2002b). Moreover, some critics of the homogenisation of the gay travel market emphasise that lesbian and gay sexualities are seen as an emerging market segment in the supply-and-demand analysis in current research into lesbian and gay travel (Puar, 2002a; Waitt *et al.*, 2008). According to these scholars, reducing lesbian and gay subjects to (or at least overemphasising them as) a market profile sustains acceptable, non-threatening ideas of gayness, that is, homonormativity (Waitt *et al.*, 2008).

Unlike in Western countries where most of the research into lesbian and gay travel is conducted, the recognition of same-sex attraction in contemporary China remains ambiguous. While homosexuality has gained increased acceptance (especially in cyberspace) since the initiation of China's 'reform and opening' in late 1970s, any assumption that being lesbian and gay has ceased to be problematic in China would be inappropriate (Engelbreten & Schroeder, 2015; Jeffreys & Wang, 2018; Kong, 2011). Ho *et al.* (2018: 494) caution that what we have been witnessing in the past four decades is not a progressive "freeing" of sexuality from "repression" but a continuous reconstruction of new non-liberating forms of sexual subjectivity. For instance, recent empirical studies (Kam, 2013; Zheng, 2015) have revealed that homosexuality is continually discriminated against and marginalised in China, if not outright repressed. In this case, assuming that homosexuals' travel patterns and experience differ