Sea or Hill: Investigating the Contributing Aspects Behind Choosing the Destination

Asif Imtiaz[*]
G. M. Selim Ahmed[**]

Abstract: *The trend of choosing destination among the travelers in Bangladesh is changing. In Bangladesh, two types of destination are popular among the tourists. One is sea like Cox's Bazar, Kuakata (the most common destination for travelers who seeks better accommodation, leisure, easy accessibility, safety and security from the destination), the other is hill tracts like Bandarban, Rangamati, Khagrachari (preferred by adventure seekers, especially popular among young traveler). This paper is focused on determining whether the sea is chosen over hills and what is its extent. The research has been conducted among such a group of people who secure a big market share in Bangladeshi tourism industry – people with age between 17-34 years. Results reveal that as the age grows, travelers pick sea over hills in terms of rest and relaxation, escaping and attractive destination image. Females, than males, love more to visit sea than to visit hills.*

Keywords: *Tourism, Destination, Destination Image, Relax, Escaping, Gender*

Introduction

Bangladesh has been possessing immense position in Asian tourism industry since the pre-liberation period. Her beautiful sea beaches and adventurous hill tracts are highly attractive to the tourists from home and abroad in spite of a series of occasions, those brought political instabilities in regular succession. Travel and tourism consistently showed its resilience despite ever increasing and unpredictable shocks from the terrorist attack on Holey Artisan Bakery and political volatilities in recent times. This dynamic industry has become an efficient engine of economic development. Travel and tourism are contributing directly to the growth of GDP at the rate of 4.3% and expected to reach 7.2% by the end of the year. Moreover, it has created 6 million jobs in this sector. Tourism is pivotal as the way of exchanging culture, creating peace and developing mutual understanding. Tourist's decision-making process involves a consecutive number of stages with the help of the appraisal of a destination product or service. The solution

[*]Lecturer, Department of Management Information Systems, Faculty of Business Studies, University of Dhaka; Email: asifimtiaz.mis@du.ac.bd
[**]Lecturer, Department of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Sheikh Borhanuddin Post Graduate College; Email: selimahmed1993@gmail.com

emerged from three stages (Conative, affective and cognitive) which remain in essence of hierarchy of influence model (Karl, Reintinger and Schmude 2015; Decrop 2010; Lavidge & Steiner, 1961) and majority of the models explaining consumer behavior (e.g., Crompton and Ankomah 1993; Engel, Kollat & Blackwell, 1973; Howard & Sheth, 1969). Howard (1963) was the first person who suggested that substitutes are classified in an address set that helps consumer or guest to consider the brand and next purchase. Taking elaborately, estimation or selection set model emphasizes on a thought that consumer or tourist first considers different alternatives of services or brands and scrutinizes them with a view to reaching the final choice (Karl, Reintinger & Schmude 2015; Decrop 2010; Hauser and Wernerfelt, 1990; Howard and Sheth, 1969). Travel decision-making process is a complicated task. Tourists prefer to visit the destinations according to their choice and choice depends on several interrelated factors like age, lifestyle, season, relaxation types, accommodation facilities of the destination, transportation facilities, destination image, and family members and so on. In most of the cases, aged tourists prefer more comfortable and easy way to reach the destination like sea beach. But young tourists or backpackers prefer more adventurous destination like hill tracts because of the thrill of trekking and camping. Dellaert, Etterma, and Lindh (1998) as well as Karl et al., (2015); Hsu, Tsai, and Wu (2009); Sirakaya and Woodside (2005) comprehensively reviewed the visitor's judicial process. They squashed the major theoretical and experimental works, which had been published in tourism writing. Among those, the destination choice model carries immense importance. Consumer or tourist satisfaction depends on the input-output approaches of Destination Management Company (Wangari, 2017; Crompton and Ankomah 1993; Um and Crompton, 1990; Woodside and Lysonski, 1989; Crompton, 1977) or in the way of making aware of tourist (Decrop 2010; Mathieson and Wall, 1982; Moutinho, 1987; van Raaij and Francken, 1984). In comparison with others, the model developed by Um and Crompton for decision making for a destination (1990) is methodically and theoretically easy. The research assumes a visitor's decision-making process is a 3 – consecutive action. Which consists of a cognition set (which is popular), an evoked group (late consideration set), and final destination choice. According to this pattern, at every stage, the ultimate destination should be covered. Push factors pull factors and constraints can be affected by these features. One might take 2 or 3 factors to eliminate the substitutes from the awareness set to the evoked set; else, there might be too many factors to balance (Whang, Yong and Ko 2015; Hsu, Tsai and Wu 2009; Crompton and Ankomah 1993). Again, Lam and Hsu (2006) added that this critical process of taking the decision on choosing a destination had not been investigated adequately. The last exercise affiliated to spot selection mainly emphasized on defining pivotal attributes which are influencing to choose the destination. Occupational consideration and analysis of factors were the major processes (Whang, Yong and Ko 2015; Tan and Wu 2015; Hsu, Tsai and Wu, 2008; Goossens, 2000; Heung, Qu, and Chu, 2001; Kim and Prideaux, 2005; Kozak, 2002).

Nicolau and Ma´s (2006) observed an experimental evidence of choosing the destination with disclosed and explained partial assumption stepwise. However several studies were conducted to identify the motivations of contentment; nevertheless, pragmatic selection of literature has attached slight sight to the effect of visitor's motivations to choose the travel spot (Hsu, Tsai and Wu 2008; Nicolau and Ma's, 2006). Visitor's character is an accumulated emission, which involves pre-travel determination making on spot percéption, perception appraisal and after-visit motive and posture (Tan and Wu 2015; Chen and Tsai 2007; Williams & Buswell, 2003; Ryan, 2002). Majority of the papers investigated the structure of the guest satisfaction as a 2 stage selection model where initially the guest decides which destination to consider and then he evaluates the alternative brands when a purchase situation arises (Decrop, 2010; Laroche, Kim and Matsui, 2003). An effective number of explorative evidences assist the essence of tourist satisfaction to lie in psychology and economics though these are not immediately investigable (Decrop 2010; Hauser and Wernerfelt, 1990; Shocker, Ben-Akiva, Boccara, Nedungadi, 1991). Some researchers view consumer, guest or tourist satisfaction as opportunity cost between the destination usefulness and price (Hauser and Wernerfelt, 1990; Roberts and Lattin, 1991). Guest satisfaction model is benefitted from the considerable attention it drew in the marketing writings (Crompton and Ankomah 1993; Howard, 1977; Howard and Sheth, 1969; Narayana and Markin, 1975; Nedungadi, 1990; Turley and LeBlanc, 1995). Bronner and de Hoog (1985) support Woodside and Sherrell's (1977) proposal that tourists practice the exertion to appraise only a few substitutes among several sets of available choices. Karl, Reintinger and Schmude (2015), Decrop (2006) as well as Smallman and Moore (2010) criticize that researches on destination choice involve theoretical procedure in a too high extent and often lack empirical verification. Offering a multifarious set of products and services is the prerequisite of presenting a destination as attractive and memorable (Reitsamer, Brunner-Sperdin and Stokburger-Sauer, 2016; Cracolici and Nijkamp, 2008; Pine and Gilmore, 1998). Partial or impartial appraisal of destination experience expresses through the outlook of the tourist to the destination (Zhang, Fu, Cai and Lu 2013; Lee, 2009). Several studies have analyzed the appearance or in an appearance of inequality in understanding and the characters of former visitors (who already arrived a specific place) and non-visitors (who have not arrived the place) to the tourist spot. These disparities differences involve how they understand the scenery of the tourist visiting area (Tan and Wu 2015; Baloglu, Henthorne, and Sahin, 2014; Hughes and Allen, 2008; Phillips and Jang, 2010) over and above their individual perception and moving norms (Choi, Tkachenko, & Sil, 2011; Phillips and Jang, 2010; Riscinto-Kozub and Childs, 2012). Destination marketing organizations are devoted to persuading the pleasure seeker to visit and former visitors to re-visit the particular destination. The market segmentation, which ensures cost-effectiveness, is repeated visitation. This segment provides lucrative profit and minimizes charge of market exchange (Tan and Wu 2015 Kastenholz, Eusebio, and Carneiro, 2013;

Lau and McKercher, 2004; Zhang, Fu, Cai, and Lu, 2014). Tourism spot popularity helps us to perceive how individual feature the scenery of a travel area (Tan and Wu 2015; Chen and Lin, 2012). Again, destination popularity affects particulars choice of the tourist spot, satisfaction and positive word of mouth behavior (Tan and Wu 2015; Chen and Lin, 2012; Ozdemir et al., 2012). Over popularity can also reduce a visit less enjoying and less concerning (Tan and Wu 2016; Kastenholz, 2010). Alba and Hutchinson (1987) connected popularity with the knowledge and identified several products and service related knowledge, which has been integrated by tourist (Jacobsen and Munar 2012; Alba and Hutchinson, 1987, p. 411). Consequently, popularity has often been used and perceived among the tourists as a single parameter of former visitation (Beerli and Martin 2004; Milman and Pizam, 1995) or an amount of former visits (Tan and Wu 2015; Sun, Chi, and Xu, 2013; Tasci, Gartner, and Cavusgil, 2007), or it has been done in comparison with newcomers and repeat visitors (Tan and Wu 2015; Prentice, 2006). To be an attractive travel destination it requires infrastructure, superstructure, transportation facilities, amenities, and scenery and host people. In short, the physical structure of a tourist spot builds the utmost basic components of pressing tourist to the destination (Kim, Ritchie, and McCormick, 2012). Benur and Bramwell (2015) emphasized that tourist destination depends on their primary tourism product as mechanisms to pull and encourage tourist to visit the destination. Some researcher emphasized on attractions from their functional point of view, while others have focused on good management and geographical locations (Ngwira and Kankhuni 2018; Leask, 2016; Leask, 2010; Hu and Wall, 2005; Pearce, 1998). Furthermore, it has been an unwritten belief by almost all destinations that if attractions have been built, visitors, people or tourists will come (Ngwira and Kankhuni 2018; McKercher, 2016a; McKercher, 2016b).

This paper offers a thorough study of a somewhat unexplored area of research where it has tried to find out answers to these following research questions in Bangladesh aspect:

• Do the travelers prefer the sea to the hill or vice versa?

• What are the reasons behind the selection of their traveling destination preference?

Methods

Sampling:

The object population for this study was people with experience of visiting both sea and hills. Our aim was to collect a diverse range of response relevant to our research interest for this particular study so that a Maximum Variation Purposive Sample was chosen as the survey instrument. Since we adopted Purposive Sampling Method, 170 persons who paid their visit to both sea and hills in Bangladesh were purposively chosen from the database of Intelligent Tourist Aid (ITA), an emerging tourist agency located in Dhaka.

The respondents were interviewed via online and over the telephone. 7 responses were omitted due to at least one missing value. Total 163 responses were selected for analysis. The sample covers respondents, who differ in income brackets, age, gender and marital status. This had been done intentionally to offer a robust insight into the issue from travelers' perspective.

Instrumentation:

A questionnaire that contains both closed-ended and open-ended questions was distributed as the survey instrument. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first section contains demographic variables and the second section contains modified questionnaire items generated from previous studies. For the closed-ended part of the questionnaire, a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagrees to strongly agree, which is a very popular form of ordinal polytomous scale, was used. The open-ended part of the questionnaire was used to collect data on demographic variables.

Measures:

The respondents were asked to rate the statement "I prefer Sea to Hills" at a five-point Likert scale which served as the dependent variable in our analysis. The higher the value of the dependent variable, the more the sea is preferred to the hills. Similarly, the lower the value of the dependent variable, the more the hills are preferred to the sea. The items for independent variables which were germane to the motive of the study and consistent with the reality of Bangladesh were elected from the study of Hsu, Tsai, and Wu (2009). The preference of sea over hills in terms of rest and relaxation, escaping, adventure seeking, nightlife, cultural exploration and historical resource, environmental safety and security, novelty seeking, luxurious accommodation, attractive destination image, better transportation, personal safety and self-actualization were served as independent variables along with demographic variables like age, gender, income and marital status. Age and income were stated by the respondent's Gender were coded as a factor variable with male=1 and female=0. Similarly, marital status coded as married=1 and single=0. Travel budget was measured in Taka for a single round trip. The details of the measurement items are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Independent variable and definition

Items	Definition
Sea to hills	I prefer sea to hill for rest and relaxation
Escaping	I prefer sea to hill for escaping
Adventure seeking	I prefer sea to hill for adventure seeking
Night life	I prefer sea to hill for enjoying night life
Health treatment	I prefer sea to hill for health treatment
Culture and historical resources	I prefer sea area to hilly area for culture exploration and historical resources
Environmental safety and security	I prefer sea to hill for environmental safety and security
Novelty seeking	I prefer sea to hill for novelty seeking
Luxurious accommodation	I prefer sea to hill for luxurious accommodation
Attractive destination image	I prefer sea to hill for attractive destination image
Transportation facilities	I prefer sea to hill for better transportation facilities
Safety	I prefer sea to hill for my personal safety
Self-actualization	I prefer sea to hill for self-actualization
Gender	1 if a participant is male, 0 otherwise
Marital status	1 if a participant is married, 0 otherwise
Age	Actual age of the participant
Income	Monthly income of the participant
Travel budget	Budget for a single trip

Procedure:

An ordered logistic regression model was used in this study seeing as the analysis involves the ordinal scale variable as the regressand. In the ordered logistic regression model, the log-odds and in effect the odds ratios are assumed to be equal in ordered categories of the outcome and differ by the level of the explanatory variable (Agga & Scott, 2015). This is worth mentioning that though the slope coefficients of the regressors are constant in each category, the cutoffs (intercepts) will vary across the categories. Thus we will have parallel lines anchored on different cutoffs. The odds ratio indicates the cumulative probability that the outcome is less than or equal to any ordered category

by which dependent variable was categorized (Gujarati, 2011). In the beginning, a model was estimated where all the independent variables those were assumed to have the relationship with the dependent variable were entered. Then we estimated models with only the regressors whose coefficients were found statistically significant from zero at the 5% level of significance in the first estimated model. Akaike Information Criterion was exercised to find the appropriate model for the study. Brant Test and 'omodel' command in STATA were performed for checking whether the assumption of parallel regression lines in violated or not.

Results

Demographic Information:

The demographic attributes of the respondents are shown in Table 2 and Table 3. Table 2 shows the number of male respondents (66.25%) is considerably higher than female respondents (33.75%). The surveyed sample is dominated by unmarried respondents (88.95%) rather than by married respondents (11.05%). Almost half of the respondents (54.6%) are of age between 17 and 23 years. Rests (45.6) are of age between 24 and 34 years.

Table 2: Demographics of the participants

Description			Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	1	108	66.25%
	Female	0	55	33.75%
Marital Status	Married	1	18	11.05%
	Unmarried	0	145	88.95%
Age	17-23		89	54.6%
	24-34		74	45.6%
Income	0-10000		127	77.9%
	More than 10000		36	22.1%

Table 3: Summary statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Standard deviation
Age <=23	89	21.38202	1.47329
>= 24	74	25.01351	1.548249
I prefer sea to hill	163	3.8159	1.182377
Income	163	9093.26	16284.21
Travel Budget	163	5783.13	7119.026

The income group with the range from 0 to 10000 Taka includes the lion's share of the respondents (77.9%) and 22.1% of the respondents fall in the category where income is greater than 10000. The mean age of the sample is 23.03 years with a standard deviation of 2.36. The sample represented an average income of 9093.26 Taka monthly with traveling budget 5783.13 Taka for a single trip. One intuition behind choosing a comparatively large number of young, unmarried groups with relatively lower income is they are the representative of students of today who is involved in traveling fulfilling the demand of their youth. We also assumed that they are the potential future travelers of tomorrow since most of them were university students and inferred to enjoy a higher income in future with the higher marginal propensity to travel. Their present mindset is important to forecast their future destination and make policy accordingly. The average score in support of the statement 'I prefer seas to hills' is 3.81 which is above the median value and indicates that seas, not hills, are relatively more alluring to the travelers.

Proportional Ordered Logistic Regression:

Model 1:

Results of the first model from ordered logistic regression have been shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Result of ordered logistic regression analysis for model 1

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs = 163
	LR chi2(18) = 135.54
	Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log likelihood = -160.53794	Pseudo R2 = 0.2968

Sea To Hills	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	Z	P>|Z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Age	1.242429	.1070125	2.52	0.012	1.049436	1.470913
Income	.9999991	.0000119	-0.07	0.942	.9999757	1.000023
1.Gender	.5006828	.1825353	-1.90	0.058	.2450405	1.023028
1.Maritalstatus	9885479	.6171531	-0.02	0.985	.2907973	3.36051
Travel Budget	.9999854	.000029	-0.50	0.615	.9999285	1.000042
Rest and Relax	2.462212	.4549077	4.88	0.000	1.714199	3.536631
Escaping	1.80194	.3038788	3.49	0.000	1.294774	2.507765
Adventure Seeking	1.282656	.2141852	1.49	0.136	.9246376	1.779298
Nightlife	1.080945	.1782371	0.47	0.637	.7824365	1.493339
Health Treatment	.8992245	.1473254	-0.65	0.517	.6522448	1.239726

Culture and History	1.32004	.2318117	1.58	0.114	.9356377	1.862371
Envsafetyandsec	.795987	.1393192	-1.30	0.192	.5648365	1.121732
Novelty Seeking	1.342411	.2629544	1.50	0.133	.9144298	1.970701
Lux Accom	.8271152	.1257473	-1.25	0.212	.6139837	1.114231
Attractive	1.506989	.2688446	2.30	0.022	1.062324	2.137781
Destimg Better Trans	.8864351	.1622511	-0.66	0.510	.6192199	1.268963
Personal Safety	1.332115	.2723542	1.40	0.161	.8923012	1.988713
Self-Actualization	1.051087	.1893442	0.28	0.782	.7384176	1.49615

Note: Envsafetyandsec = Environmental Safety and Security; Lux Accom = Luxurious Accomodation; Attractive Destimg = Attractive Destination Image; Better Trans = Better Transportation

The chi-square value is around 136 with the p-value is equal to zero. It means together all regressors have the sturdy influence on the choice probability. Age, Rest and Relaxation, Escaping and Attractive Destination Image are significantly associated (p<0.05) with the dependent variable. Gender (p=0.058) is significant at the 7% level. Other independent variables have no significant relationship (p>0.05) with the dependent variable. As age increases by one year, the sea becomes more preferred to the hills than before (OR 1.24, [95% CI 1.05-1.47]). Choosing the sea over the hills in terms of rest and relax, escaping are associated with an increased likelihood of overall preference for the sea over the hills (OR 2.46, [95% CI 1.71-3.54]; OR 1.80, [95% CI 1.29-2.50]). People having perception as the sea has more attractive destination image than the hills are more likely to prefer the sea to the hills (OR 1.50, [95% CI 1.06-2.14]). The interpretation of odds in terms of gender is somewhat interesting. Since male is coded as 0 and female as 1, females are less likely to prefer the sea to the hills (OR 0.50, [95% CI 0.24-1.02].

Model 2:

Omitting all the independent variables those do not possess any substantial relationship with the dependent variable, we estimate the second model.

Table 5: Result of ordered logistic regression analysis for model 2

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs = 163
	LR chi2(18) = 113.94
	Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log likelihood = -171.33842	Pseudo R2 = 0.2495

Sea to hills	Odds ratio	std. Err.	Z	p>|z|	[95% conf.	Interval]
Age	1.217224	.0880923	2.72	0.007	1.056253	1.402728
Gender	.5525096	.1835516	-1.79	0.074	.2881102	1.059549
Rest And Relax	2.545758	.4203279	5.66	0.000	1.841942	3.518506
Escaping	1.797245	.265418	3.97	0.000	1.345555	2.400563
Attractive Destimg	1.796084	.2721261	3.87	0.000	1.334629	2.41709

Table 5 shows the results for the estimated model. Intuitively results are pretty much the same for the variables. One interesting observation is the standard error associated with age gets lower in the second model compared with that in the first model. Gender is now significant at the 8% level.

Model 3:

We excluded 'Gender' from the second model and estimated the third model. Table 6 gives the result.

Table 6: Result of ordered logistic regression analysis for model 3

Ordered logistic regression	Number of obs = 163
	LR chi2(18) = 110.71
	Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
Log likelihood = -172.95671	Pseudo R2 = 0.2424

Sea to hills	Odds ratio	std. Err.	Z	p>|z|	[95% conf.	Interval]
Age	1.212553	.0886111	2.64	0.008	1.050743	1.399281
Rest and relax	2.564385	.4224703	5.72	0.000	1.856743	3.541724
Escaping	1.787419	.2634926	3.94	0.000	1.338894	2.386197
Attractive destimg	1.819385	.2749765	3.96	0.000	1.352934	2.446655

Once again, odds ratios for all the variables included gave the prediction in the same way as found in model 1 and 2. Standard errors are consistent with standard errors found in model 2 leaving us ambiguous about selecting the proper model.

Akaike Information Criterion:

To spot the variables those were more predictive of the preference of the sea to the hills, we availed the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as our apparatus for appropriate model selection. The usual practice is the model with minimum AIC should be selected (Hu, 2007). Table 7 shows the results for AIC among three estimated models. Model 2 has the lowest AIC value (AIC=360.68). Model 3 (AIC=361.91) has slightly higher AIC value than model 2. Model 1 (AIC=365.08) has the highest AIC value and therefore has been ruled out of consideration. Finally, as per the AIC value, Model 2 has been selected as the appropriate model for predicting the preference for the sea over the hills.

Brant Test and model:

The proportionality assumption of the ordered logistic regression tells us that the odds ratios of the regressors are constant across the ordered categories. The proportionality assumption was examined by Brant Test for the parallel regression assumption. A significant test statistic offers the evidence that the parallel regression assumption has been violated (Long & Freese, 2005). Table 8 shows the results of the Brant test for Model 2. The test statistic, in this case, is chi-square which is equal to 13.24 with the p-value greater than 0.05 (p=0.584) for the overall model. Thus the insignificant test statistic proves there is no breach of the parallel regression assumption. For each independent variable, the respective chi-square values (p>0.05) show that they are individually abiding by the proportionality assumption.

Similar results have been produced by running logit (Table 9). A chi-square value equals 15.72 with p=0.4 implies the non-violation of proportionality assumption.

Table 7: Akaike's information criterion

Model	AIC
Model 1	365.0759
Model 2	360.6768
Model 3	361.9134

Table 8: Brant Test of Parallel Regression Assumption

Variable	X2	P>x2	Df
All	13.24	0.584	15
Age	4.00	0.262	3
Gender	0.56	0.905	3
Rest & relaxation	3.33	0.344	3
Escaping	2.74	0.433	3
Attractive destination Image	4.12	0.249	3

Table 9: Likelihood-ratio test of proportionality of odds across response categories

X2 (15)	= 15.72
Prob > X2	= 0.4006

Discussion

Factors those motivate a traveler to visit a destination cannot be discussed solely. In every trip, everyone needs satisfaction that is why the attractions which could make them contented in the destination have a great role in attracting tourists (Ngwira and Kankhuni, 2018; Benur and Bramwell, 2015; Leiper, 1990; Ritchie and Crouch, 2003). There is no such evidence that single attraction draws the tourist to visit a destination (Ngwira and Kankhuni, 2018; McKercher, 2016a). The findings of this study expose that age, rest and relaxation, escaping and attractive destination image have a significant association with the view that sea is better than hills as a tourist destination. Other independent variables have no significant relationship with the independent variable. Sea puts a more attractive image in the minds of the tourists than hills. The serenity and the massiveness of the sea soothe the tourists. Again, the visitors who seek safety and security prefer the sea to hills to avoid any kinds of risk. On the other hand, the visitors who want to travel in hills, seek adventurous experience and usually do not care much about the choice of preferences of friends and relatives, have little concern on their safety and security, have fewer family responsibilities are willing to visit regardless of the climatic conditions, are aware of travel product and destinations available in the hills, language is not an obstacle to them, and can use any available accommodation in hills during travel. From the study, we have found that the young people prefer hills to sea because of gathering adventurous experience from hills. On the other hand, female and aged people always try to ensure safety and security and emphasize the common or popular destination where they can afford the cost also. The latter part of the visitors also takes into consideration the destination image also. The study reveals that the male respondents are higher than female which indicates that the tendency of traveling among female in our country is lower than male because of the family restriction, safety, and security, personal willingness to travel etc. Travelers with a view to escaping from the chaotic city life and hectic daily schedules need a place like sea where they can sit with a mug of coffee in the hand and enjoy the beauty of nature. In this case, the sea is a better option than hills because hills are needed to be explored whereas sitting in front of the sea is like a watching a movie in a theatre. Therefore, we can conclude that relatively aged people, especially females, prefer sea over hills in terms of relaxing, escaping and better destination image.

Conclusion

Bangladesh is blessed with the pride of having both sea and hills in its land and maritime boundary. The sample respondents showed their affinity more towards sea than hills which is evident from the analysis. Among demographic factors, age and sex were important predictors for explaining the kinship for visiting sea more than hills. Better destination image, comparatively larger scope of rest and relaxation were also significant in predicting the tendency of preferring sea to hills. The serenity associated with an enormous sea-sight provides a better place for escaping from the stressful daily schedule. These aspects work behind the cognitive process of planning for a tour and selecting the tourist destination. Steps of making an attractive destination image for hills and offering better places for rest and relaxation can enable the hills to cover up the gaps of tourist intentions to pay a visit to the hills. In recent times, Grand Sultan Tea Resort and Gold, Moulvi Bazar and The Palace Luxury Resort, Habiganj offer enjoyable stay for the visitors in the hilly areas of Northeastern part of Bangladesh. If such kind of investment is made for improving accommodation and safety in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, the plot will be twisted and tourists would be able to rate hills as their preferred tourist destination at a higher scale than before. It is the need of the time for destination management organizations to reconsider and to find out whether the tourists they record in the country come for a particular tourist attraction or for multifaceted attractions to satisfy their different generic needs. DMO's should follow Leask's (2010) resolution that visitor attraction research should develop mechanisms for assessing the contribution of visitor's attractions within a destination area. The study has focused the most important segment of the current tourism market - the young generation. Therefore, the destination management organizations should underscore the need for deliberate and strategic interventions by Bangladesh Tourism industry to deliver offers that appeal to and meet the expectation of the current travel market. The DMO's should ponder the ways of making tourist destinations in Bangladesh more accessible, exciting and affordable. In the future, it will enable the adventurous, risk-averse and resilient youth travel market to explore new tourist destination within the country thus playing a significant role in creating a boost for the less visited tourist destinations.

References

Agga, G. E. and Scott, H. M. (2015). Use of generalized ordered logistic regression for the analysis of multidrug resistance data. *Preventive veterinary medicine*, *121*(3-4), 374-379.

Alba, J. W. and Hutchinson, J. W. (1987). Dimensions of consumer expertise. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13, 411–454.

Ankomah, P. K., Crompton, J. L. and Baker, D. (1996). Influence of cognitive distance in vacation choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(1), 138–150.

Baloglu, S., Henthorne, T. L. and Sahin, S. (2014). Destination image and brand personality of Jamaica: A model of tourist behavior. *Journal of Travel Tourism Marketing*, 31(8), 1057–1070

Beerli, A. and Martin, J. D. (2004). Factors influencing destination image. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3), 657-681.

Benur, A. M. and Bramwell, B. (2015). Tourism product development and product diversification in destinations. *Tourism Management*, 50, 213-224.

Bronner, F. and de Hoog, R. (1985). A recipe for mixing decision ingredients. *European Research*, *13*(1), 109-115.

Chen, C. F. and Phou, S. (2013). A closer look at destination: Image, personality, relationship, and loyalty. *Tourism Management*, 36, 269-278.

Chen, C. F., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral intentions?. *Tourism Management*, 28(4), 1115-1122.

Chen, C. and Lin, Y. H. (2012). Segmenting mainland Chinese tourists to Taiwan by destination familiarity: A factor-cluster approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(4), 339–352.

Choi, J. G., Tkachenko, T. and Sil, S. (2011). On the destination image of Korea by Russian tourists. *Tourism Management*, *32*(1), 193-194.

Cracolici, M. F. and Nijkamp, P. (2008). The attractiveness and competitiveness of tourist destinations: A study of southern Italian regions. *Tourism Management*, 30, 336–344.

Crompton, J. L. and Ankomah, P. K. (1993). Choice set propositions in destination decisions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(3), 461–476.

Decrop, A. (2006). Vacation decision making. Wallingford: CABI Pub.

Decrop, A. (2010). Destination choice sets An inductive longitudinal approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(1), 93–115.

Dellaert, B., Ettema, D. and Lindh, C. (1998). Multi-Faceted tourist travel decisions: A constraint-based conceptual framework to describe tourists' sequential choices of travel components. *Tourism Management*, 19, 313–320.

Engel, J. F., Kollat, D. T. and Blackwell, R. D. (1973). Consumer behavior. New York: holt, rinehart and winston. *Inc. Engel2Consumer Behavior1973*.

Eusebio, C. and Vieira, A. L. (2013). Destination attributes' evaluation, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions: a structural modeling approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 66–80.

Goossens, C. (2000). Tourism information and pleasure motivation. Annals of Tourism Research, 27, 301–321

Gujarati, D. N. (2011). *Econometrics by example*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hauser, J. and Wernerfelt, B. (1990). An evaluation cost model of consideration sets. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, 393–408.

Heung, V. C., Qu, H. and Chu, R. (2001). The relationship between vacation factors and socio-demographic and travelling characteristics: The case of Japanese leisure travellers. *Tourism Management*, *22*(3), 259-269.

Howard, J. A. and Sheth, J. N. (1969). The theory of buyer behavior. New York: Wiley.

Hsu, T. K., Tsai, Y. F. and Wu, H. H. (2009). The preference analysis for tourist choice of destination: A case study of Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 30(2), 288-297.

Hu, S. (2007). Akaike information criterion. *Center for Research in Scientific Computation*, *93*.

Hu, W. and Wall, G. (2005). Environmental management, environmental image, and the competitive tourist attraction. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13(6), 617-635.

Karl, M., Reintinger, C. and Schmude, J. (2015). Reject or select: Mapping the destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 54, 48-64.

Kastenholz, E. (2010). 'Cultural proximity' as a determinant of the destination image. Journal of Vacation Marketing, 16, 313–322.

Kastenholz, E., Eusebio, C. and Carneiro, M. J. (2013). Studying factors influencing repeats visitation of cultural tourists. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 19(4), 343–358

Kim, S. S. and Prideaux, B. (2005). Marketing implications arising from a comparative study of international pleasure tourist motivations and other travel-related characteristics of visitors to Korea. *Tourism Management*, *26*(3), 347-357.

Kozak, M. (2002). Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations. *Tourism Management*, 23, 221–232

Lam, T. and Hsu, C. H. (2006). Predicting behavioral intention of choosing a travel destination. *Tourism management*, *27*(4), 589-599.

Laroche, M., Kim, C. and Matsui, T. (2003). Which decision heuristics are used in consideration set formation?. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 20(3), 192–209.

Lau, A. and McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus acquisition: A comparison of first-time and repeat visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 279–285.

Lavidge, R. J., and Steiner, G. A. (1961). A model for predictive measurements of advertising effectiveness. *The Journal of Marketing*, 59-62.

Leask, A. (2008). The nature and role of visitor attractions. Managing visitor attractions, new directions, 2, 3-15.

Leask, A. (2016). Visitor attraction management: A critical review of research 2009–2014. *Tourism Management*, 57, 334-361. doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2016.06.015

Leask, A. (2010). Progress in visitor attraction research: Towards more effective management. *Tourism Management*, 31(2), 155-166.doi:10.1016/j.tourman.2009.09.004

Lee, T. H. (2009). A structural model to examine how destination image, attitude, and motivation affect the future behavior of tourists. *Leisure Sciences*, 31, 215–236.

Long, J. S., and Freese, J. (2005). Regression models for categorical outcomes using Stata.

Mathieson, A., and Wall, G. (1982). Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts. Harlow: Longman Scientific & Technical.

McKercher, B. (2016b). Do Attractions Attract Tourists? A Framework to Assess the Importance of Attractions in Driving Demand. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 120-125. doi:10.1002/jtr.2091

Milman, A. and Pizam, A. (1995).The role of awareness and familiarity with a destination: The central Florida case. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33, 21–27.

Moutinho, L. (1987). Consumer behavior in tourism. *European Journal of Marketing*, 21(10), 5–44.

Narayana, C. and Markin, R. (1975). Consumer behavior and product performance: An alternative conceptualization. *Journal of Marketing*, 39(1), 1–6.

Ngwira, C. and Kankhuni, Z. (2018). What attracts tourists to a destination? Is it attractions? *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure, 7*(1). Retrieved from ttps://www.ajhtl.com/uploads/7/1/6/3/7163688/article_14_vol_7__1__2018.pdf.

Nicolau, J. L., & Ma´ s, F. J. (2006). The influence of distance and prices on the choice of tourist destinations: the moderating role of motivations. *Tourism Management*, 27, 982–996.

Ozdemir, B., Aksu, A., Ehtiyar, R., Cizel, B., Cizel, R. B. and Icigen, E.T. (2012). Relationships among tourist profile, satisfaction and destination loyalty: Ex- a mining empirical evidence in Antalya a region in Turkey. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing Management*, 21(5), 506–540.

Pearce, P. L. (1999). Touring for Pleasure: Studies of the Senior Self-Drive Travel Market. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 24(1), 35-42. doi:10.1080/02508281.1999.11014855

Phillips, W. J., and Jang, S. (2010). Destination image differences between visitors and non visitors: a case of New York City. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *12*(5), 642-645.

Pine, B. J., and Gilmore, J. H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard business review*, *76*, 97-105.

Prentice, R. (2006). Evocation and experiential seduction: Updating choice-sets modeling. Tourism Management, 27, 1153–1170

Reitsamer, B. F., Brunner-Sperdin, A., and Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2016). Destination attractiveness and destination attachment: The mediating role of tourists' attitude. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 19, 93-101.

Riscinto-Kozub, K., and Childs, N. (2012). Conversion of local winery awareness: An exploratory study in visitor vs non-visitor attitude and perception. *International Journal of Wine Business Research*, *24*(4), 287-301.

Roberts, J. H. and Lattin, J. M. (1991). Development and testing of a model of consideration set composition. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 429-440.

Ryan, C. (2002). From motivation to assessment. *The tourist experience*, *2*, 58-77.

Sharifpour, M., Walters, G., Ritchie, B. W. and Winter, C. (2014). Investigating the role of prior knowledge in tourist decision making: A structural equation model of risk perceptions and information search. *Journal of Travel Research*, *53*(3), 307-322.

Shocker, A., Ben-Akiva, M., Boccara, B., and Nedungadi, P. (1991). Consideration set influences on consumer decision-making and choice: Issues, models, and suggestions. Marketing Letters, 2(3), 181–197.

Sirakaya, E., and Woodside, A. G. (2005). Building and testing theories of decision making by travelers. *Tourism Management*, 26(6), 815–832.

Smallman, C., and Moore, K. (2010). Process Studies of Tourists' Decision-Making. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *37*(2), 397-422.

Sun, X., Chi, C.G.Q., and Xu, H. (2013).Developing destination loyalty: The case of Hainan Island. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 43, 547–577.

Tan, W. K., and Wu, C. E. (2016). An investigation of the relationships among destination familiarity, destination image, and future visit intention. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 5(3), 214-226.

Tasci, A, Gartner, and Cavusgil, S. (2007). Conceptualization and operationalization of destination image. *Journal of Hospitality Tourism Research*, 31(2), 194–223.

Um, S., and Crompton, J. L. (1990). Attitude determinants in tourism destination choice. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 432–448.

Um, S., and Crompton, J. L. (1992). The roles of perceived inhibitors and facilitators in pleasure travel destination decisions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(3), 18–25.

Van Raaij, W. F., and Francken, D. A. (1984). Vacation decisions, activities, and satisfactions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *11*(1), 101-112.

Van Vuuren, C., and Slabbert, E. (2012). Travel motivations and behavior of tourists to a South African resort. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 295-304.

Wangari, C. (2017). Understanding the travel motivation among youth travelers in Kenya: the 'push' and 'pull' paradigm.

Whang, H., Yong, S., & Ko, E. (2016). Pop culture, destination images, and visit intentions: Theory and research on travel motivations of Chinese and Russian tourists. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), 631-641.

Williams, C., and Buswell, J. (2003). Service quality in leisure and tourism. UK: CABI Publishing.

Woodside, A. G., and Sherrell, D. (1977). Traveler evoked, inept, and inert sets of vacation destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, *16*(1), 14-18.

Woodside, A., and Lysonski, S. (1989). A general model of traveler destination choice. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(Spring), 8–14.

Zhang, H., Fu, X., Cai, L. A., and Lu, L. (2014). Destination image and tourist loyalty: A meta-analysis. *Tourism Management*, 40, 213-223.