

---

# Pull and Push Factors in Adventure Tourism

Mukhamad Arfian Setyonugroho<sup>1</sup>, Ade Irma Anggraeni<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

---

## Abstract

Indonesia is a country that has many volcanoes that are well-known among local and foreign tourists. This causes the mountain climbing Basecamp to pay more attention to their preparations in meeting the needs of tourists who come. Basecamp parties need to consider factors that can add value to the effectiveness and efficiency of mountain climbers who will carry out adventure activities on the mountain. Motivation, preparation, knowledge, and experience are the pull factors needed to influence the participation of mountain climbers to decide to climb the hill. In addition to considering the pull factors, the involvement of mountain climbers is also influenced by standard operational procedures, quality, security and cooperation with mountaineering basecamps with the other party is the driving factor.

At the same time, the driving factor is self-motivation to carry out adventure tourism activities. Lifestyle, character, hobbies, or experience become a motivation to carry out this adventure tourism activity. For both beginner and experienced mountaineers, knowledge of mountaineering is essential to minimize risk and strengthen the determination to climb. Meanwhile, until now, research on push factors and pull factors is still very minimal. The research that will be carried out includes climbing Mount Slamet via Bambangan, which is the highest mountain in Central Java.

---

## Keywords

Motivation, Motives, Natural Environment, Mountaineering Oportunities, Push-Pull Factor, Tourism

---

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism is an activity carried out by most people to spend free time or for vacation. Cultural Ruins, Historical Museums, and Natural Conditions Indonesia is a beautiful tourism destination. Indonesia's natural conditions are one of the most attractive tourism destinations for both local and foreign tourists. Indonesia has stunning natural beauty such as mountains, beaches, lakes, islands, caves, and cliffs. This attracts tourists who want to go on an adventure by visiting these places.

Adventure tourism results from tourists who want to do tourism activities that are more challenging both physically and mentally. Adventure tourism is characterized by tourist characteristics that provide high sensory stimulation for tourists, and it is usually characterized by a physically and mentally challenging experience component (Muller & Cleaver, 2000). Of the many Adventure Tourism activities available in Indonesia, Mountaineering is one of the favourites for tourists. Even now, mountain climbing in Indonesia seems to be a new trend, so many tourists want to experience this. Mountain

climbing activities are prevalent because the natural beauty can make us relax.

On the other hand, mountain climbing is a very crucial thing. Mountain climbing is one of the risky adventure tourism activities. Hillson (2005) claims that the word risk comes from Italian, which means to be brave. When discussing contexts where risk is significant, people may mention situations that pose a physical hazard, such as mountain climbing or skydiving. Others may say gambling, online poker, or the stock market as high-risk activities ( Lipscombe, 2007). Climbing a mountain is a safe activity if mountain climbers pay attention and follow the mountain manager's rules. In addition, mountain climbers must also pay attention to the standard of equipment needed to climb the mountain.

Therefore, prospective climbers who will climb can experience or at least know about risks and ways to overcome threats. The central premise about risk is how they have sufficient knowledge. When a tourist buys a flight ticket or books accommodation, it poses a threat. They buy intangible services and tourist experiences obtained after making

payment (Boksberger and Craig-Smith 2006). Tourism also carries different risks due to its intangible nature and experience (Sirakaya and Woodside 2005). Cohen (2009), writing about deaths on holiday, argues that death during holidays becomes a challenge for those closest to him because it occurs in a foreign physical, cultural, and social environment. In other words, in a place where they lack the knowledge they have. This is because a combination of expertise and risk produces information about the locations they will visit (Cohen 1972). Even though it is full of dangers and challenges, few are still curious to keep climbing the mountain. Therefore, the basecamp must consider risk management to prevent and overcome the risks that mountain climbers face. Risk management in mountaineering adventure tourism service providers focuses on effectiveness and efficiency, especially if it is seen from the characteristics of the business processes that are carried out and the limitations they have.

According to Dann (1997), tourists have many factors that motivate them to go to the places they want to visit; these factors can be separated as a push or pull motivation. In this case, push factors and pull factors are meant. (Dann, 1977), Push factors are socio-psychological characteristics of tourists. Personality characteristics, lifestyle elements, and personal perception of adventure are categorized as push factors. While pull factors are elements that represent satisfaction in the destination they are going to. Internally generated motives such as escapism, social recognition, socialization, self-esteem and novelty. Which of these are the needs needed in the destination is a category of push factors.

Indonesia is a country that has its natural tourism attraction. This is because of the unique nature of Indonesia, which is still beautiful and honest, and the lack of accommodation and facilities is a challenging attraction for tourists. The tourism sector also plays a significant role in increasing the country's foreign exchange. It is proven from year to year, income from the tourism sector continues to grow. Berdasarkan data from the Ministry of Tourism, foreign exchange earnings increased from 2009 to 2019. The foreign exchange income in 2015 alone reached the figure of US \$ 12.2 billion. This number continues to increase along with the increasing quality and access to tourist destinations and the increase in the information provided. Due to natural conditions, nature tourism in Indonesia is quite

challenging for tourists who want to test their adrenaline and also add to the experience of an adventurous impression. Therefore, the tourism manager needs to pay attention to the aspects required by tourists. Improving the quality of infrastructure and increasing tourist information is very important to be carried out by the manager. With the quality of infrastructure and good news, it will undoubtedly add to the tourist attraction. This will significantly help tourists and is also needed by tourists who want to visit these tourist destinations. In addition, the safety aspect of tourists must be improved to minimize risks.

Mountaineering is one type of adventure tourism that is quite popular among local and foreign tourists. Tropical rain forests are a distinctive feature of the mountains in Indonesia. The lush forest becomes an attraction for challenging adventures. The uniqueness and beauty of the mountains in Indonesia is a pull factor for mountaineers. Pull factors are factors that make mountaineers interested in doing adventure tourism activities. The management of mountaineering basecamps has a significant influence on the pull factor. Access to climbing basecamps, information on trails, and safety factors are the pull factors for adventure tourism activities. In addition to most mountaineers, beginners would prefer to climb that has an easy track but still does not eliminate the mountain's natural shades and natural beauty, such as Gunung Prau and Bukit Sikunir, the area of Wonosobo, Central Java, Indonesia. Gunung Prau and Bukit Sikunir have a unique attraction for mountaineers beginners. The track is relatively easy to estimate the time that does not require a long time but still has the feel and beautiful natural scenery. Meanwhile, we know that Indonesia is one of the destinations for adventure tourism in great demand by local and foreign tourists.

The management of mountaineering in Indonesia is undoubtedly still lagging when compared to Japan or Nepal. The management of mountain climbing in Indonesia is managed mainly by Perum Perhutani and the Regency Governments. In other words, the direction of mountain climbing in Indonesia is still controlled by the government. On the island of Java, climbing posts or mountaineering basecamps on average have more than one hiking trail. Before climbing, mountaineers will be briefed in advance to provide information about the

hiking trail. Among them are providing information about the rules, tracks, and conditions that mountaineers must obey to climb. Basecamp management is essential to support the pull factors and push factors for mountaineers. As for the knowledge that must be known and understood by mountaineers. Starting from the equipment that must be brought, the equipment needed, and mastery of knowledge about the area. Therefore, mountaineering managers should improve their information so that the required preparation by mountaineers has been carefully prepared. One good example is the manager of TNBTS (Bromo Tengger Semeru National Park) about climbing Mount Semeru. They provide complete information on their website pages with details. In addition, they also provide briefings to all mountaineer members so that information is more evenly distributed to all mountaineer members who will visit Mount Semeru.

The research that will be carried out includes climbing Mount Slamet via Bambang, which is the highest mountain in Central Java. The highest peak is Central Java, which should be a tourist destination favoured by tourists. The research will be taken from the mountaineering community in Central Java.

### **Push Factor**

According to which, bai, hu & wu (2009) push factor is the need for sociological passage and the psychology of the individual who makes somebody travelled. Same as with Kozak (2002), which describes a push factor as encouraging internally an individual to travel. So also with Yoon & Uysal (2005) also explain that the push factor is the aspect of internal or emotional a person doing the tour. In terms of this, the push factor can be described as encouraging the self individual to travel to the destination specified.

While mountaineering tourism push factor is an impulse or desire of individuals correlated with the motivation of individuals mentioned in the follow mountaineering (Elmes & Barry, 1999; Ewert, 1985; Loewenstein, 1999; Walter, 1984). Thus, mountaineering tourism push factors are internal factors that make an individual's reason to participate in mountaineering activities.

The dimensions of mountaineering tourism push factors, according to Ewert (1985) and Loewenstein (1999), are divided into two, including:

### **Motivational Dimension**

The motivation dimension is a process that initiates someone to do something; in this case, motivation explains why an individual participates in mountaineering, according to Weiner (1992), which demonstrates that motivation is a collection of internal and external factors that evoke the behaviour of an individual. In terms of this, a group of factors that make a person participate in mountaineering activities. Meanwhile, according to Driver, Tinsley & Manfredo (1991) in Ewert (1993), motivation is the possibility of a series of states of a person when individuals realize this, which explains that motivation is also a result of needs. Research has shown many motivations for a person to participate in mountaineering activities (Elmes & Barry, 1999; Ewert, 1985; Loewenstein, 1999; Walter, 1984).

### **Motives**

Motive is a driving force that facilitates action or a reason why individuals do something; in this case, motive explains a person's reasons for participating in mountaineering activities. Loewenstein (1999) states that if an individual has a strong motive, then the people can just let themselves through the dangerous things.

Jang and Cai (2002) stated that the motive could be manifold following the chosen destinations by individuals who participated. There are two types of reasons, general motives and motives that are not too important such as status. When someone is getting increased experience of travelling, the motive usually has turned into a necessity (Pearce, 2005).

### **Pull Factor**

Pull factor is defined as features, attractions, or the attributes of a destination (Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2002). Like Lee, O'Leary, Lee, & Morrison (2002), Pull factors are elements that exist in destinations that promise satisfaction to their visitors. As that is said by Dann (1977), that pull factor influencing the decision someone in choosing destinations. In case this pull factor can be interpreted as a feature of a destination that can attract visitors to visit destinations such.

Tourism Mountaineering pulls factor element pullers that attract people to the destinations specified that has a source of power that is appropriate (Pomfret, 2006), the destination specified that mentioned a place mountaineering are there. As are described by

Ewert (1985) that the nature of the mountains is one of the features that motivate a person to engage in the activities of mountaineering. The dimensions of mountaineering tourism pull factors, according to Ewert (1985) and also Pomfret (2006), including :

### **Natural Environment**

Lauesen (2013) explains that the natural means is something that happens in the world outside of the behaviour of human beings, which contains a variety of species of life such as animals and plants, as well as geophysical that exist at their location such as water, landscape, and air. At the same time, the environment means that it is seen from an angle of view. So, the natural environment is everything that is created in nature that surrounds humans.

In terms of this, the natural mountain environment is all that there is in the mountains surrounding mountaineers, such as plants, landscapes and skies of the mountains. Such as that expressed by Ewert (1985) that the environment of nature is one of the pull factors of the mountains that attract travellers. Similarly, explained by Clarke & Stankey ( 1979). The natural environment is a combination of physical, biological, social, and managerial conditions for the destinations mentioned.

### **Mountaineering Opportunities**

Pomfret (2006) explains that their chances in following mountaineering activities for the rating would potentially attract travellers to participate. The opportunity to participate in mountaineering has two dimensions, namely :

#### **'Hard' and 'soft' activities**

Pomfret (2006) describes the dimensions is as follows activities of soft that requires not much experience, skills are limited, and the risks are minimal. Or you can participate in activities classified as challenging activities, such as opening mountain trails that have never been done before.

#### **Commercially organized activities**

The commercial organization provides their activities also can add to urge someone to follow the actions of mountaineers.

### **Mountain Participation**

According to lane (1995), participation is a comprehensive concept, which means that participation has a meaning different from others (Kelly, 200). However, Ndekha,

Hansen et al. ( 2003) called it a social process in which groups specific to the needs of the same are actively pursuing the needs are the same, take decisions, and establish mechanisms to meet those needs.

### **The effect of motivation towards mountaineering participation**

According to Weiner (1992), motivation is a collection of internal and external factors that evoke an individual's behaviour. The behaviour here mentioned as behaviour that makes someone participate in mountaineering activities were, (1993). So from that, research from Ewert (1985) shows that the dimensions of motivation positively influence mountain participation.

**H1: The motivation dimension has a positive influence on mountain participation**

### **The effect of motives towards mountaineering participation**

Loewenstein ( 1999 ) motif significantly affects individuals' participation, wherein if the motive was too strong, then the individual will to quickly put himself in a dangerous situation. In this case, Loewenstein (1999) research shows that the motive dimension has a positive influence on mountain participation.

**H2: The motive dimension has a positive influence on mountain participation**

### **The effect of natural environment towards mountaineering participation**

The natural environment is one of the pull factors of the mountains that attract tourists ( Ewert, 1985). Pomfret (2006) states that mountains must be set to attract tourists and give satisfaction to those who participate. In this regard, research from Ewert (1985) shows that the natural environment has a positive influence on mountain participation.

**H3: the natural environment has a positive influence on mountain participation**

### **The effect of mountaineering opportunity towards mountaineering participation**

Participation in the following sport at risk, such as mountaineering, will provide an opportunity for travellers to develop the identity of the new (Pomfret, 2006), due to the construction of the identity of the motif is essential for engagement constantly kept in the sport at risk ( Celsi et al., 1993) such as mountaineering. In this case, Pomfret (2006) research shows that mountaineering opportunity has a positive influence on mountain participation.

#### **H4: mountaineering opportunity has a positive influence on mountain participation**

#### **METHODS**

The type of research used is a research survey with approach quantitative Based on the explanation on the above, the study uses survey and through the approach quantitative.

Objects were addressed in the research of this is the participation of mountaineers influenced by motivational dimension, motives, natural environment, and mountaineering opportunity.

Research is conducted at Basecamp ascent of Mount Slamet via Bambang, in the District Purbalingga, Jawa Tengah. The location selection is due to the phenomenon that indicates that management at Basecamp Climbing Mount Slamet via Bambang rated have less reasonable control.

The population in the study of this is the community of lovers of nature. Both are located in the campus and community of lovers of nature every day in Banyumas, province of Jawa Tengah. Perpetrators with mountaineer criteria who have climbed Mount Slamet via the Mount Slamet Climbing Basecamp route via Bambang.

Primary data on research is the data main obtained from respondents mountaineers who are in the community of lovers of nature presented in the questionnaire, which contains about motivational dimension, motives, natural environment, and mountaineering opportunity.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The sample of research from the population was determined using recommendations from (Cohen 1992) of 90 respondents. Sampling techniques using purposive sampling with students or people with criteria in Banyumas regency who had climbed Slamet mountain through Bambang route.

#### ***Respondent Overview***

Respondents in this study were students and people who had climbed Slamet mountain through the bambangan route. This research was conducted with a quantitative approach using a questionnaire.

The distribution of questionnaires is using online questionnaires through a google form. In this case, the researchers distributed questionnaires to one of the mountaineering

community members on each campus, school, the general community and asked to spread them on social media groups to other community members. In google form, researchers also screen respondents with the required criteria so that respondents who do not fit the criteria can not fill out the questionnaire that has been distributed. The questionnaire rate obtained in this study reached 100%.

The results obtained from the dissemination of the questionnaire had information about the identity of the respondents covering gender, age, and occupation.

The gender of most research respondents was male, with 62 respondents, while women numbered 28 respondents. Then in the age classification of most research respondents, namely aged 21-30 years with the number of 60 respondents, the age of 15-20 amounted to 26 respondents, and 31-45 amounted to 4 respondents. Furthermore, the classification of the occupation of college student research respondents amounted to 40 respondents, then workers with the number of 40 respondents, and students with the number of 10 respondents.

#### ***Pilot Test***

Pilot tests are used to test the validity and reliability of the question indicators on the questionnaire. This research was conducted using the help of computer software in the form of SPSS Statistics. Researchers took the data by distributing questionnaires to students that participating in mountaineering activities. The amount of data collected for the pilot test was 43 respondents. The following are the test results using pilot tests.

#### ***Validity Test***

Validity testing is used to determine the validity of the indicators in the questionnaire question. The validity of each indicator can be measured using an R-counted value. Valid test results are R-calculated values more than R-table values. The R-table value in this study used a probability level of 5% and degree of freedom n-2 and obtained a result of .308. Here are the validity test results using SPSS: The results showed that each variable's indicators have passed the validity test and can be said to be valid because it has an R-count value more than R-table.

### **Reliability Test**

Reliability testing aims to measure the consistency of respondents' answers to questions in research questionnaires. Reliability in this study used SPSS Statistics and measured through the Cronbach alpha technique. Question indicators can be declared to have reliability if the Cronbach alpha value is more significant than .60. Based on the reliability test results, the five variables in this study had a Cronbach alpha coefficient value more significant than the minimum limit of more than .60. This indicates that all the indicators in the questionnaire have passed the reliability test and can be said to be reliable.

### **Descriptive Statistical Analysis**

Analysis of descriptive statistics is an overview of respondents' answers to the variables used in the study. This study examined the overview of push factors and pull factors that affect mountaineer participation. Independent variables in this study are Motive, motivational dimension, mountaineering opportunity, and ecoserv. For dependent variable is mountaineering participation.

Descriptive statistical analysis can provide an overview of the distribution of data about respondents' answers to the questions contained in the questionnaire. The answer is measured using a five-point Likert scale that applies to each variable with a classification (1) strongly disagrees, (2) disagrees, (3) is neutral, (4) agrees and (5) strongly agrees.

The average number of each indicator of mountaineer participation variables has an average of more than 4.00, and the average of all indicators obtained results is 4,285. The number of answers based on the table shows that the scales of 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree) amount to 304 (4) and 384 (5) out of a total of 810. This shows that most mountaineers in Banyumas Regency agree that mountaineer participation has an essential role in this research.

The average number of each indicator of benefit perception variables has an average of more than 4.00, and the average of all indicators obtained results is 4.016. The number of answers based on the table shows that the scales of 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree) amount to 168 (4) and 167 (5), while for answers on a scale of 1, 2 and 3 amount to 12 (1), 21(2), and 82 (3) out of a total of 450

The average number of each indicator of benefit perception variables has an average of

more than 3.00, and the average of all indicators obtained results is 3.850. The number of answers based on the table shows that the scales of 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree) amount to 108 (4) and 125 (5), while for kawaban on a scale of 1, 2 and 3 amounts to 61 (1), 72 (2), and 144 (3) out of a total of 360.

The average number of each indicator of the benefit perception variable has an average of more than 4.00, and the average of all indicators obtained results is 4.259. The number of answers based on the table shows that the scales of 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree) amount to 378 (4) and 387 (5) out of a total of 900. This shows that most mountaineers in Banyumas Regency agree that ecoserv has an essential role in this research.

### **Measurement Model Analysis (Outer Model) PLS**

The measurement model or outer model defines how each indicator block relates to its latent variables. Outer models with reflexive indicators are evaluated with convergent and discriminant validity indicators and composite reliability for block indicators. This section will be discussed about the test results of the validity of the instrument used. Validity testing is carried out to determine the extent of the ability of research instruments to measure things to be measured. A validity test is done by analyzing the validity of a sub variable used as a measurement, and then from a valid sub variable is done grain analysis. Item validity testing is performed using PLS analysis tools. The results of this item analysis test will be discussed in this section. Although this instrument has been tested for validity in previous studies, a validity test is still necessary because the research is done under different conditions. Different conditions in terms of respondents, such as the characteristics of respondents, are different, but differences also lie in the respondents who are intended.

### **Convergent Validity**

Convergent validity refers to the presence of correlations between different instruments that measure the same construct. Convergent validity is assessed based on the correlation between the item score or indicator (component score) and the construct score calculated by PLS. Convergent validity is used to determine the validity of each relationship between the indicator and its latent construct (variable). Individual reflexive measures are

high if they correlate more than 0.7 with the constructs to be measured. Nevertheless, for early-stage research of the development of measurement scale loading value of 0.50 is considered sufficient (Hair et al., 1998). Based on this criterion, the indicator whose loading value is less than 0.50 is dropped from the analysis and reestimated.

The result of data processing using PLS produces outer loading for each indicator (variable manifest) of latent Mountaineer Participation (MP), Motive (MTV), Motivation Dimension (MD), Mountaineering Opportunity (MO), and Ecoserv (EC). From outer loading appears the value of 40 indicators. After the process of exiting (drop) the invalid indicator, then all indicators have a loading value above .50

### **Discriminant Validity**

Discriminant validity is used to show that latent constructs predict the size of their blocks better than the size of other blocks. Discriminant validity can be seen from the cross-loading value; the value of the indicator's correlation to the construct must be greater than the correlation value between the indicator and other constructs. All loading correlations between each variable are more significant than loading correlations with other variables. This indicates that latent constructs are able to predict the size of the blocks themselves more than the size of other blocks, meaning that the variables Mountaineer Participation (MP), Motive (MTV), Motivation Dimension (MD), Mountaineering Opportunity (MO), and Ecoserv (EC) have good discriminant validity. Another way to measure discriminant validity is to compare the AVE root of each latent variable construct with the correlation between other constructs. If the value of the AVE root is greater than the correlation between a construct and other constructs, each construct has a good discriminant validity value (Fornell dan Lackner Dalam Ghozali, 2006).

The AVE root value in EC constructs is .654 (.428) higher than the correlation between EC and MD (.361), MTV (.354), MO (.312), and MP (.579). Similarly, the AVE root value of the MD construct of .660 (.436) is greater than the correlation between MD and EC (.361), MTV (.627), MO (.629), and MP (.535). Then the AVE root value of the MTV construct was .709 (.503) greater than the correlation between MTV and EC (.354), MD (.627), MO (.475), and MP (.403). Then the AVE root value of the MO construct is .780

(.608) greater than the correlation between MO and EC (.312), MD (.629), MTV (.475), and MP (.410). Then the AVE root value of the MP construct is .628 (.394) greater than the correlation between MP and EC (.579), MD (.535), MTV (.403), and MO (.410). based on these results, it can be said that all latent constructs have good discriminant validity.

### **Composite Reliability**

Reliability assessment of indicator block is done using composite reliability. Compared to Cronbach alpha, composite reliability assumes that all indicators are weighted equally. So composite reliability is a closer approximation assuming parameter estimation is accurate while Cronbach alpha tends to lower bound estimate reliability. According to Dahlan et al. (2014) Cronbach alpha scale is divided into 5 criteria namely, 0 - .20 is very un-reliable, .21 - .41 is not reliable, .42 - .60 quite reliable, .61 - .80 reliable, and .81 - 1 very reliable. It appears that all latent variables are acceptable. The composite reliability measurement of all variables is above .61. Thus the construct that is built points to the accuracy and accuracy of the gauge or the reliability.

### **Structural Model (Inner Model) PLS**

Evaluation using R-Square aims to measure the degree of variation of independent variable changes to dependent variables where the greater the value of R-Square, the better the prediction model of the research model (Abdillah and Hartono, 2015:197).

Mountaineer Participation (MP) variable value has an R-Square value of .459 (45.9%). These results showed that the variable ability of Mountaineer Participation reached 45.9%, while other variables outside this study explained 54.1%.

Based on the calculation results from Q-Square, it can be concluded that the relevance of the research data that this research model can explain is 46%, while the remaining 54% is explained by other factors outside the model of this study.

### **Hypothesis Test**

The hypothetical test used to determine the relationship between variables in this research model. This test will also prove that the initial hypothesis compiled in this study resulted in acceptance or rejection. Hypothetical test in this study using bootstrapping in SmartPLS, bootstrapping results in the form of path

coefficients. The path coefficient value in P-Value is used to determine the influence of the hypothesis, while T-Statistic is used for significant levels.

The first hypothesis (H1) in this study is the motivational dimension affecting mountaineer participation. The table explains that the first hypothesis has a P-Value of .006 and is less than .05. The T-Statistic value in the first hypothesis reaches 2,723 and is more significant than 1.96. The results can be concluded that the motivational dimension has a significant influence on mountaineer participation. The results are also following the first hypothesis so that the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

The second Hypothesis (H2) in this study is the Motive affecting mountaineer participation. The table explains that the second hypothesis has a P-Value of .921 and more significant than .05. The T-Statistic value in the second hypothesis reaches .099 and is less than 1.96. The results can be concluded that the Motive has an insignificant influence on mountaineer participation. The results did not match the second hypothesis, so the second hypothesis (H2) was rejected.

The third Hypothesis (H3) in this study is Ecoserv influence on mountaineer participation. The table explains that the third hypothesis has a P-Value of .000 and is less than .05. The T-Statistic value in the first hypothesis reached 5,319 and was more significant than 1.96. The results can be concluded that ecoserv has a significant influence on mountaineer participation. The results are also following the third hypothesis so that the third hypothesis (H3) is accepted.

The fourth hypothesis (H4) in this study is that mountaineering opportunity affects mountaineer participation. The table explains that the fourth hypothesis has a P-Value of .498 and more significant than .05. The T-Statistic value in the second hypothesis reaches .677 and is less than 1.96. The results can be concluded that mountaineering opportunity has an insignificant influence on mountaineer participation. The results did not correspond to the fourth hypothesis, so the fourth hypothesis (H4) was rejected.

### **Discussion**

Motivational dimension affects mountaineer participation. The first hypothesis (H1) test results concluded that the motivational dimension significantly affects mountaineer participation by students or people involved in mountaineering activities in

Banyumas Regency. This makes the first hypothesis (H1) accepted. These results may indicate that the mountaineer has motivational dimensions in him to climb the mountain. As explained in chapter 2, the motivational dimension has a positive influence on mountaineer participation. This study has resulted in line with the research (Yilmaz Akgunduz, 2018), which is about motivations for tourist participation. (Thompson and Matheson, 2008) also has a conclusion in their research that emphasizes the importance of one's uniqueness in motivation dimensions to stimulate participation. Then, research (Ewert, 1985) showed that the motivation dimension positively influences mountaineer participation. The results of this study have the meaning that mountaineering basecamp managers need to improve their service quality that supports aspects of the motivational dimension.

Motive does not influence mountaineer participation. The second hypothesis (H2) test results in this study concluded that Motive has no significant effect on mountaineer participation by students or people involved in mountaineering activities in Banyumas Regency. This makes the second hypothesis (H2) rejected. This indicates that mountaineers have different views about a person's motives for climbing a mountain. In this case, a person's Motive is to climb the mountain back to himself and be different from the Motive found in others. This is shown from the random answer to the questionnaire. The second hypothesis (H2) test results are not in line with those described in chapter 2. In research conducted by (Ben-Shaul, 2017) the central estimate for participation is socio-psychological motives. Then (Loewenstein, 1999), the Motive greatly influenced individual participation. The study from (Loewenstein 1999) also said that motives positively influence participation. However, the study from (Recours 2004) mentioned that the motives related to age, gender, nationality, and support. In this case, the Motive in mountaineer participation can produce different answers due to factors related by Motive so that questionnaires produce varied data.

Ecoserv affects mountaineer participation. The third hypothesis (H3) test results concluded that ecoserv has a significant effect on mountaineer participation by students or people involved in mountaineering activities in Banyumas Regency. This makes the third hypothesis



(H3) accepted. These results may indicate that the management of mountaineering basecamp is considered necessary in increasing mountaineer participation. Ecoserv is identical to the natural environment, as mentioned in chapter 2; the results of this third hypothesis test are following those in chapter 2. Research conducted by (Pomfret 2006) states that mountains should attract tourists and give satisfaction to those who participate. Then the research conducted by (Khan 2003) mentioned that businesses that want to attract ecotourism participation should pay attention to safe facilities for the environment. Furthermore, (Ewert 1985) shows that natural environment identical with ecoserv positively influences mountaineer participation. This hypothesis testing shows that mountaineering basecamp needs to improve service quality to facilities and services located at mountaineering basecamp to support the ecoserv factor.

Mountaineering opportunity does not influence mountaineer participation. The fourth hypothesis (H4) test results in this study concluded that mountaineering opportunity has no significant effect on mountaineer participation by students or people involved in mountaineering activities in Banyumas Regency. This makes the fourth hypothesis (H4) rejected. It shows that mountaineers have different views on the importance of this mountaineering opportunity. This is shown from the results of the questionnaire collected, some consider that mountaineering opportunity is essential for them to participate in mountaineering activities, but others consider it unnecessary. The fourth hypothesis (H4) results are not in line with those mentioned in chapter 2. Research from (Americus Reed II et al., 2012) identity is relevant to the concept of mountaineering opportunities that can encourage participation. Then another study from (Pomfret 2006) showed that mountaineering opportunity has a positive influence on mountaineer participation. However, research conducted by (Hill 2012) says that opportunity will affect participation after choosing and determining to engage in their chosen activities. In this case, mountaineering opportunities get different answers because everyone will be different in achieving their goals in climbing mountains

## **CONCLUSION**

The overall results of this study showed an overview of push factors and pull factors that affect mountaineer participation. This study

showed that the motivational dimension of the push factor and ecoserv, which is part of the pull factor, shows a positive influence on mountaineering participation. This research shows mountaineer needs and what mountaineer expects to be described so that mountain basecamp managers can understand and improve their service quality to support what is needed and expected by a mountaineer.

An overview of push factors and pull factors that affect mountaineer participation have described factors that are considered essential and not essential and factors that are accepted and not accepted in influencing mountaineer participation in Banyumas Regency. This research can be used to reference further research that discusses the factors that affect mountaineer participation. Mountaineering basecamp is expected to make this research a reference source to optimize service quality to support essential factors to increase mountaineer participation.

The local government is expected to make this research a reference source to develop the right strategy for local government in managing mountaineering objects. Academics are expected to make this research a reference source regarding push factors and pull factors in tourism and hospitality management.

The research process uses questionnaires that are not entirely accompanied directly, so there are various possibilities of filling out questionnaires that do not correspond to what is meant by the question. This research uses the method of spreading questionnaires online through google form in data collection. This has a positive impact on the spread of questionnaires faster to respondents. However, it also had a negative impact in a lack of direct interaction with respondents. Respondents from this study used the criteria of mountaineers in Banyumas Regency who had climbed Slamet mountain through the bambangan route to feel less representative of the mountaineer. Further research is better done using questionnaires directly so that interaction with respondents is maximal.

## REFERENCES

- Abdillah, W. &. (2015). Partial Least Squarre (PLs) - Alternatif Structural Equation Modeling (Sem) Dalam Penelitian Busnis. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Americus Reed li, M. R. (2012). Identity-Based Consumer Behavior. *Research In Marketing*, 310–321.
- Ben-Shaul, M. &. (2017). Motives, Modes Of Participation, And Loyalty Intentions Of Facebook Tourism Brand Page Consumers. *Travel Research*, 1-19.
- Boksberger, P. E.-S. (2006). Customer Value Amongst Tourists: A Conceptual Framework And A Risk-Adjusted Model. *Tourism Review*.
- Celsi , R. L., Rose , R. L., & Leigh, T. W. (1993). An Exploration Of High-Risk Leisure Consumption Through Skydiving. *Journal Of Consumer Research* .
- Chen, S. C. (2017). Construction And Validation Of The Customer Participation Scale. *Journal Of Hospitality & Tourism Research*,, 41(2), 131-153.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Toward Sociology Of International Tourism. *Social Research*, 164-182.
- Cohen, E. (2005). Death In Paradise : Tourist Fatalities In The Tsunami Disaster In Thailand. *Current Issues In Tourism*, 12(2), 183-199.
- Dann, G. (1977). Anomie, Ego-Enhancement And Tourism. *Annals Of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.
- Ewert, A. (1985). Why People Climb: The Relationship Of Participant Motives And Experience Level To Mountaineering. *Journal Of Leisure Research*.
- Ewert, A. (1993). Differences In The Level Of Motive Importance Based On Trip Outcome, Experience Level And Group Type. *Journal Of Leisure Research*.
- Findley , M. J., & Cooper, M. H. (1983). Locus Of Control And Academic Achievement: A Literature Review. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*.
- Ghozali, H. I. (2014). Structural Equation Modeling Metode Alternatif Dengan Partial Least Square (PLs) Dilengkapi Software Smartpls 3.0. Xlstat 2014 Dan Warppls 4.0 (4th Ed). . Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponogoro.
- Hair, J. F. (1995). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (4th). Saddle River, Nj: Prentice Hall.
- Haskett, J. J. (2008). Putting The Service-Profit Chain To Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 86(7/8), 118-129.
- Heskett, J. S. (1997). *The Service Profit Chain*, New York. The Free Press.
- Hill, B. &. (2012). Repeat Participation As A Function Of Program Attractiveness, Socializing Opportunities, Loyalty And The Sportscape Across Three Sport Facility Contexts. *Sport Management Review*, 15(4), 485-499.
- Juran, J. (1974). *Quality Control Handbook*. New York: Mcgraw-Hill.
- Kementrian Kebudayaan Dan Pariwisata. (2018, 9 10). Berapa Pendapatan Devisa Dari Sektor Pariwisata Indonesia? Retrieved From Databoks.Katadata.Co.Id: <https://Databoks.Katadata.Co.Id/Datapublish/2018/09/10/Berapa-Pendapatan-Devisa-Dari-Sektor-Pariwisata-Indonesia>
- Khan, M. (2003). Ecoserv: Ecotourist' Quality Expectation. *Annals Of Tourism Research*, 30, 109-124.
- Khan, M. M. (2003). Service Quality Expectations Of Travelers Visiting Cheju Island In Korea. *Journal Of Ecotourism*, 2(2), 114-125.
- Lauesen, L. M. (2013). Natural Environment. *Encyclopedia Of Corporate Social Responsibility*.
- Lipscombe, N. (2007). The Risk Management Paradox For Urban Recreation And Park Managers: Providing High Risk Recreation Within A Risk Management Context. *Annals Of Leisure Research*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Loewenstein. (1999). Because It Is There: The Challenge Of Mountaineering.For Utility Theory. *Kyklos*.
- Luburić, R. (2012). Synergistic Effects Of Total Quality Management And Operational Risk. *International Journal For Quality Research*.
- Mclaughlin, S. (2010). *Service Operations And Management. Introduction To Service Engineering*, 295.
- Muller, T. &. (2000). Targeting The Canzus Baby Boomer Explorer And Adventurer Segments. *Journal Of Vacation Marketing*, 6(2), 154-169.
- Parasuraman, A. Z. (1985). A Conceptual Model Of Service Quality And Its Implications For

- Future Research. *Journal Of Marketing*, 49(4), 41-50.
- Peters, T. (1988). *Thriving On Chaos*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pomfret, G. (2006). Mountaineering Adventure Tourists: A Conceptual Framework For Research. *Tourism Management*, 113–123.
- Pomfret, G. (2016). *An Exploration Of Adventure Tourism Participation And Consumption*. (Doctoral Dissertation, Sheffield Hallam University).
- Raz, T. &. (2005). A Comparative Review Of Risk Management Standards. *Risk Management*, 7(4), 53-66.
- Recours, R. A. (2004). Expressed Motives For Informal And Club/Association-Based Sports Participation. *Journal Of Leisure Research*, 36(1), 1-22.
- Said, A. S. (2013). *An Evaluation Of Service Quality From Visitors'perspectives: The Case Of Niah National Park In Sarawak*. *International Journal Of Business & Society*, 14(1).
- Schreyer, R., Lime, D. W., & Willia, D. R. (1984). Characterizing The Influence Of Past Experience On Recreation Behavior. *Journal Of Leisure Research*.
- Sekaran, U. &. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Untuk Bisnis* (6th Ed). Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Sirakaya, E. &. (2005). Building And Testing Theories Of Decision Making By Travellers. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 815-832.
- Timmer, C. F. (1983). *Food Policy Analysis*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tuncer, B. (2009). *Exploring Entrepreneurial Intention In The Context Of Theory Of Planned*. Muğla : Muğla Sitki Kocman University .
- Yilmaz Akgunduz, A. Y. (2018). Motivations Of Event Tourism Participants And Behavioural Intentions. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 341-357.