Journal of Vacation Marketing

Benefit segmentation of potential wellbeing tourists

Juho Pesonen, Tommi Laukkanen and Raija Komppula

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

SAGE

http://www.sagepublications.com

Additional services and information for *Journal of Vacation Marketing* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jvm.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jvm.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jvm.sagepub.com/content/17/4/303.refs.html

>> Version of Record - Oct 14, 2011

What is This?

Benefit segmentation of potential wellbeing tourists

Juho Pesonen, Tommi Laukkanen and Raija Komppula
University of Eastern Finland, Finland

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to segment tourists according to the benefits they seek from a tourism destination. These segments are examined in order to find attractive segments for local wellbeing products. Segmentation in the context of wellbeing and wellness provides companies information on what kind of tourists are most interested in buying wellbeing products and contributes to the existing segmentation theory by using data driven segmentation in a situation where traditionally commonsense segmentation is used. The literature surrounding benefit segmentation in tourism is reviewed in order to find the benefits tourists might think of as important. The results of K-means cluster analysis show that tourists in the Savonlinna region, Finland, can be divided into four segments. The segments differ from each other in the benefits they seek and in interest in wellbeing holidays, but are quite similar regarding to their socio-demographic factors. This study shows that data-driven segmentation can be used to find markets for a certain product instead of *a priori* segmentation. The results also show that benefits sought have a strong influence on customer behavior but little in common with socio-economic factors, which proves the usefulness of benefit segmentation in tourism. Based on the results, tourism companies can find the most suitable segments for their offerings.

Keywords
benefit segmentation, cluster analysis, wellbeing, wellness, tourism

Introduction

According to Buhalis (2000) each destination can only match certain types of demand. Hence, destinations should be aware of the needs and wants of potential tourists in order to manage the destination resources and attract the right customer groups. Segmentation is generally used to gain a better position compared to competitors, because it provides valuable information on customers and makes it possible for a destination to adjust its offering to better match customers' needs (Matzler et al., 2004). In this study the aim is to determine how benefit segmentation, a method for grouping consumers based on their needs and wants, can be used to find target markets for a certain product at a specific tourism destination. Segmentation in the context of wellbeing and wellness provides companies with information on what kind of tourists are most interested in buying wellbeing products and contributes to the existing segmentation theory by using data driven segmentation in a situation where traditionally commonsense segmentation is used.

Market segmentation is a much used marketing tool among both practitioners and academics. There are two different approaches or criteria to market segmentation: *a priori* and *a posteriori*, which are also known as commonsense and data-driven segmentation (Dolnicar and Grün,

Corresponding author:
Juho Pesonen, University of Eastern Finland, Centre for Tourism Studies, Kuninkaankartanonkatu 7, P.O. Box 86, 57101 Savonlinna, Finland
Email: juho.pesonen@uef.fi

2008). According to Dolnicar and Grün (2008), in the case of commonsense segmentation the crucial decision is the selection of the segmentation criterion or criteria, whereas in *a posteriori* segmentation this burden of responsibility rests with the research approach of the data-driven segmentation study undertaken. In tourism especially, segments have often been identified according to prior knowledge (Dolnicar, 2004b). These *a priori* factors may be age, income, or country of origin (Hoek et al., 1996). The choice of approach has to be justified as it is one of the most important decisions to be taken when conducting segmentation research (Dibb, 1998).

Both of the aforementioned approaches have been used in several market segmentation studies in tourism. The *a priori* approach has been used, for example, in segmenting travelers according to their geographic location and stage in the family life cycle (Bojanic and Warnick, 1995), expenditure (Craggs and Schofield, 2009; Díaz-Pérez et al., 2005; Mok and Iverson, 2000), their interest in ecotourism (Dolnicar, 2004a), nationality (Juaneda and Sastre, 1999), or visitors' participation in certain activities (Ignatov and Smith, 2006).

Many academics have chosen the data-driven approach for their studies. Blamey and Braithwaite (1997) segmented potential ecotourists in Australia on the basis of social values. Galloway (2002) used psychographic segmentation in park visitor markets. Laesser et al. (2006) used two-step cluster analysis for international visitors to Australia in order to segment travelers by travel reasons. González and Bello (2002) used lifestyle in their segmentation study to examine the behavior of tourist consumers.

Benefit segmentation has been claimed to be one of the best ways to segment markets *a posteriori* (Wu, 2001). Benefit segmentation has been used, for example, to study eco-tourists, rural tourists, pleasure travelers and snowmobilers. However, one specific market segment that has received only very little attention in earlier studies is wellbeing tourists. According to Korthals (2004), more and more people are travelling to improve their wellness and health. Korthals (2004) also states that the health and wellness tourism segment has a considerable future growth potential. However, not much is known about the profile of wellbeing tourists and how they differ from other tourists. This information is crucial for companies planning to develop their wellbeing services and products.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. First, a literature review on earlier benefit segmentation studies in tourism is presented followed by the research goals. Based on this literature review, 20 benefit statements were constructed according to the characteristics of the Savonlinna region in Finland. Second, the methods for collecting and analyzing empirical data using a survey are explained. Finally, the results of this study are presented and managerial implications and directions for further research are discussed.

Examining benefit segmentation in tourism

Benefit segmentation was developed by Russell Haley in 1968 to provide better information on customers' buying behavior than other segmentation methods. In benefit segmentation, it is important to know what kind of relative value people attach to different benefits (Haley, 1968). Some benefits will be important for several segments, or all segments may seek multiple benefits, but the relative importance and the combination of different benefits separates a segment from other segments (Haley, 1968; Hanlan et al., 2006). According to Frochot and Morrison (2000), benefit segmentation can be classified as an *a posteriori* technique, as the composition of segments cannot be known in advance. This means that a researcher first collects data and then analyzes it to identify homogeneous segments.

In benefit segmentation (e.g. Frochot, 2005; Kemperman and Timmermans, 2006; Sarigöllü and Huang, 2005), tourists are distinguished according to the benefits they seek rather than traditional factors such as demographic, socioeconomic or geographic characteristics (Frochot and Morrison, 2000). This method has yielded valid results in many studies (e.g. Frochot, 2005; Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999), in which benefits refer to travelers' push motivations (e.g. Beh and Bruyere, 2007; Boksberger and Laesser, 2009; Koh et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2004; Park and Yoon, 2009) or pull attributes of a destination (Kastenholz et al., 1999; Sarigöllü and Huang, 2005; Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999), or a combination of these (Bieger and Laesser, 2002; Jang et al., 2002; May et al., 2001) .

Nature-based tourism, eco-tourism and rural tourism have been contexts for several benefit segmentation studies (Frochot, 2005; Jang et al., 2002; May et al., 2001; Palacio and McCool, 1997; Sarigöllü and Huang, 2005; Weaver and Lawton, 2002; Yannopoulos and

Rotenberg, 1999). These studies are closely related to the topic at hand as nature-based tourism and rural tourism are important and very prominent parts of destination marketing in the Savonlinna region (see www.savonlinna.travel/en/home).

According to Palacio and McCool (1997), knowledge of the benefits sought by tourists helps to provide facilities which are attractive to them and to understand the preferences of different market segments as well as to design effective promotion. Understanding of preferences is particularly important when the aim is to identify markets for a certain tourism product. Frochot and Morrison (2000) called for further application of benefit segmentation in specific market segments. This study is an attempt to respond to this challenge.

In this study, the focus is on benefits based on the characteristics of the destination (pull factors) that may attract a person to visit the area. Frochot and Morrison (2000) state that one of the issues in benefit segmentation studies is that benefits are not precisely defined. In this study benefits are defined as destination attributes that attract travelers to the region. Kemperman and Timmermans (2006) as well as Snepenger et al. (2006) advise against including both destination attributes and motivations in one factor analysis. According to Leiper (1990), it is easier for a destination to change its attributes than tourists' motivations, hence they are more useful than push-factors when used in a benefit segmentation study. Nevertheless, it can be difficult to separate push and pull-factors from each other, because benefits can be a means to reach a desired end state, although they can also be the end state the customer seeks (Kemperman and Timmermans, 2006).

Wellbeing tourism

Savonlinna is a region in the Finnish Lakeland area, where the lakes, tranquil natural environment, rural scenery and atmosphere, as well as nature-based activities are the main attractions. A few cultural events (e.g. the Savonlinna Opera Festival) and facilities also offer opportunities for visitors seeking cultural experiences. The tourism industry is based on micro family businesses that are supported and encouraged by local authorities to produce development efforts in order to improve the competitiveness of the region. Developing wellbeing tourism services has been suggested as a means to attract

more tourists to the area. This challenge was the motivation for choosing wellbeing tourism in Savonlinna region as a case study in this research project.

Wellbeing tourism may be regarded as a form of wellness tourism (Sheldon and Bushell, 2009). According to Erfurt-Cooper and Cooper (2009) the wellness concept was originally based on the use of natural hot and mineral springs. There is no consensus about the definition of the wellness tourism concept, but according to Erfurt-Cooper and Cooper (2009) the concept has its origins in a natural and holistic approach to health, including the use of water and the minerals it contains. In several publications and typologies of wellness tourism, spas play an essential role (Smith and Kelly, 2006; Smith and Puczkó, 2009)

Nevertheless, wellness tourism as a phenomenon is by no means confined to spas. According to Smith and Kelly (2006) various wellness tourism motivations refer to different kinds of wellness tourism locations and activities. They state that the destination in wellness tourism is often an alternative space in which one can engage in self analysis without the stresses and distractions of home. For example, tourists motivated by escapism and relaxation may prefer beach, spa and mountains, and those with existential and psychological motivations may be interested in holistic centers focused on self-development and philosophical contemplation. According to Smith and Puczkó (2009) the concept of wellness includes elements of lifestyle, physical, mental, and spiritual wellbeing, and one's relationship to oneself, others, and the environment.

The wellness tourism offering is often taken to include luxury (Konu et al., 2010) and expensive services (e.g. Smith and Puczkó, 2009). Typical wellness visitors are high income visitors, older people, motivated by a desire for rest, relaxation, health, rejuvenation or escapism (Smith and Puczkó, 2009). In some countries wellness has become a label that allows the customer to expect added value (Erfurt-Cooper and Cooper, 2009) and the hotels may perceive wellness activity as offering high added value for purposes of positioning and branding their image as luxurious (Gelbman, 2009).

The concept of wellbeing tourism, by contrast, refers to emotional motivations, such as connection with community or nature, inner and outer beauty therapy, relaxation and energy balancing (Sheldon and Bushell, 2009) instead of emphasising the luxury of the facilities. So, for example small scale recreational spas for skiers,

hikers and even families with children (Smith and Puczkó, 2009) in Alpine regions could be considered wellbeing locations.

Wellbeing tourism products and services in Finland are based mainly on nature, including lakes (Kangas and Tuohino, 2008) and may include pampering, activities and experiences of luxury, but may more often refer to culture, nature, peace and quiet in the countryside (Konu et al., 2010). Water is a key element of a wellbeing tourism facility and service (Erfurt-Cooper and Cooper, 2009), but not necessarily in the form of pools and fountains, but as part of the wider landscape and a space for water activities in lakes and rivers.

Konu and Laukkanen (2010) studied predictors of tourists' wellbeing holiday intentions in Finland. They used logistic regression analysis to determine which factors increase the likelihood of tourists being interested in taking wellbeing holidays. Konu and Laukkanen (2010) found that the number of annual trips, the importance of waterparks and/or spas, the importance of natural sights and of ease of access to the destination as well as the importance of motivations such as recreation, experiencing fashionable/trendy places and aesthetic experiences increase the interest of tourists in taking a wellbeing holiday.

Pesonen and Komppula (2010) examined motivation based segmentation of rural tourists. They identified four rural tourism segments in Finland, among which one is motivated mainly by the same motivations as wellbeing tourists. In their study they called this segment the Wellbeing segment, as the members of that segment were motivated by hassle-free vacation, escape from a hectic life, recreation, physical rest and relaxation. When compared to other segments this wellbeing segment valued benefits such as privacy, tranquil atmosphere and spending time outside in natural surroundings. They did not, however, examine the actual interest of that segment in wellbeing products and services.

A little is known about what kind of destination attributes appeal to wellbeing tourists. This means that benefit segmentation is a logical choice for identifying customer segments that are interested in wellbeing holidays and services. The purpose of this study is to determine how benefit segmentation can be used to find markets for a certain product in a specific destination. The goals of this study are:

1. to segment tourists according to the benefits they seek from a destination;

2. to find out how interested given segments are in a certain product, in this case a wellbeing holiday; and

3. to examine how segments interested in taking a wellbeing holiday differ from other segments as regards socio-demographic profile and interest in different wellbeing holiday attributes.

Methodology

Data collection

Data were collected from tourists visiting Savonlinna region in Finland during a three month-period between June and August 2007. Summertime accounts for 60% of approximately 300,000 annual overnight stays in the region. As many tourists as possible were asked to complete the questionnaire in the five most popular attractions in the town of Savonlinna. Respondents were asked to complete an electronic questionnaire using the computers the interviewers provided. The questionnaire was offered both in Finnish and in English. Tourists interested in answering the questionnaire but too busy to do so were given notes with a link to the Internet questionnaire. A total of 230 usable responses to the questionnaire were obtained, of which 35 had to be excluded from further analysis due to missing values, resulting in total of 195 usable responses.

The respondents were asked to rate the importance of 18 benefit statements that are essential to the Savonlinna region. A Likert-type scale (from 1: completely insignificant to 5: very important) was provided to rate the importance of each statement. Twelve (12) statements were based on a review of the benefit segmentation literature (Table 1). Because in tourism benefits are often attached to a specific destination, vacation or activity, and cannot be generalized (Frochot and Morrison, 2000), six of the statements in the questionnaire were specific for the Savonlinna region. The statements used in this study are listed in Table 1.

The respondents were also asked about their interest in wellbeing holidays in Finland in general, and if they would be interested in buying any wellbeing services. A wellbeing holiday was defined in the questionnaire as a holiday in which the main goal is improvement of health or prevention of sickness. Wellbeing services were defined as services aiming to improve or maintain holistic wellbeing. Respondents were provided with a list of 15 statements regarding

Table 1. Benefit statements in earlier studies

Variable	Benefit statement	Previous studies with similar benefit statements
1.	Natural landscape	Manfredo et al., 1996; Palacio and McCool, 1997; Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Frochot and Morrison, 2000; May et al., 2001; Jang et al., 2002; Frochot, 2005; Sarigöllü and Huang, 2005
2.	Peace and solitude	Palacio and McCool, 1997; Frochot and Morrison, 2000; Weaver and Lawton, 2002
3.	Attractions	Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Kastenholz et al., 1999; Jang et al., 2002; Molera and Albaladejo, 2007
4.	Culture (e.g. exhibitions, events)	Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Jang et al., 2002
5.	Different activities	Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Jang et al., 2002
6.	History of the region	Kastenholz et al., 1999; Frochot and Morrison, 2000
7.	Safety of the region	Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Jang et al., 2002
8.	Clean environment	Kastenholz et al., 1999; Jang et al., 2002; Molera and Albaladejo, 2007
9.	Area is suitable for children	Ryan and Glendon, 1998; Kastenholz et al., 1999
10.	Reachability (easiness to travel to the region)	Yannopoulos and Rotenberg, 1999; Kastenholz et al., 1999
11.	Atmosphere and lifestyle of the area	Kastenholz et al., 1999,
12.	Getting to know the region	Manfredo et al., 1996; Jang et al., 2002
13.	Lakes	Designed by the authors
14.	Versatile well-being services	Designed by the authors
15.	Accessibility (easiness to travel inside the region)	Designed by the authors
16.	Pets are considered	Designed by the authors
17.	Cottages	Designed by the authors
18.	Walking and hiking trails	Designed by the authors

different aspects of a potential wellbeing holiday and were asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale ranging from completely insignificant to very important.

Analysis

The data were analyzed in four stages. First, a descriptive analysis of the sample profile was conducted. To segment the tourists the approach of Boksberger and Laesser (2009) was used in the second phase. To overcome response style effects, the different cultural backgrounds of respondents and unwanted homogeneity within a case a magnitude were calculated to indicate the individual relative magnitude per item in relation to the overall mean of all items of benefit statements per case. Third, hierarchical and K-means clustering were used in order to group the individual respondents into clusters representing homogenous visitors in terms of the new relative importance benefit statements scores. Thereafter, ANOVA was used to identify statistical differences between the clusters in terms of the benefit statements. F-statistics were moreover used to provide information on which of the statements were the most influential

differentiators between the segments identified. Tamhane's T2 post-hoc tests were used to ascertain how each segment differed from each of the others. Finally, the variability in terms of demographic factors and traveling behavior between the visitor segments was analyzed using cross-tabulations and chi-square tests.

Results

Sample profile

A descriptive analysis of the socio-demographics of the sample was concluded including all the socio-economic factors. There are slightly more female respondents (56.3%) in the sample than male respondents. All age groups are well represented. The largest age group is those under 35 years of age (41.8%). Over half (53.1%) of the respondents have a university degree. While 24.9% of the respondents live alone, 20.2% live with a partner. The largest group is families with children (27.5%), but there are also many couples whose children have left home (17.6%). The most common occupation among the respondents is clerical worker (30.7%). There are also many respondents working at an executive/

managerial level (25.9%). All income groups are well represented. Brochures, the Internet and family and relatives are the three most important information sources.

Of all the respondents, 115 (59.0%) are Finnish and 80 (41.0%) foreigners. Of all foreign respondents, 25.5% are from Germany, 15.3% from Spain, and 11.2% from Italy. Almost 90% of foreign respondents are from Europe.

Including both Finnish and foreign respondents in the same analysis may cause some problems such as possible cross-cultural differences in response styles. These problems should be discussed in interpreting the results (Dolnicar, 2006). However, this can also be considered an advantage in this study, because it provides interesting information on how Finns and foreigners are distributed over different segments. Frochot and Morrison (2000) point out in their review of benefit segmentation studies in travel and tourism that specific nationalities would be an area of interest for tourism benefit research.

Only 13.8% of the respondents are going to stay in the region for less than a day, while most (54.9%) prefer to stay for one to three days. Almost half (42.5%) of the respondents had never been to the Savonlinna region before. Approximately half of the people interviewed are interested in wellbeing holidays or services, and 63.6% in hypothetical wellbeing products and services in the Savonlinna region.

Segmentation

To segment the respondents according to the benefits they seek from Savonlinna region as a tourism destination, a cluster analysis was conducted. Since the number of segments was not known beforehand, a hierarchical cluster analysis was used to determine the most suitable number of segments. Hierarchical clustering procedure with squared Euclidean distance as a similarity measure between cases was used. The Ward method was used to maximize within-cluster homogeneity because it is a frequently used algorithm known to produce stable and interpretable results (Hair et al., 2010; Saunders, 1994). The results of the hierarchical cluster analysis suggested a five-cluster solution. K-means cluster analysis was used to test three, four, five and six cluster solutions. A solution with four clusters was found to provide the best segments, because the results were easily interpreted and the segments were clearly distinguishable. It also provided the best results regarding the goal of this study, finding the wellbeing segment. Segmentation results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Cluster analysis results

Benefit statement	Overall mean	Cluster				F-value
		A (N = 51)	B (N = 18)	C (N = 46)	D (N = 80)	
Natural landscape	4.54	**4.75**[D]	**5.00**[A,C,D]	4.52	4.33	5.660*
Lakes	4.59	**4.82**[D]	**4.89**[C,D]	4.57	4.40	5.182*
Walking and hiking trails	3.71	**4.04**	3.50	3.63	3.60	1.912
Peace and solitude	3.91	3.86	**4.67**[A,C,D]	3.76	3.85	3.296*
Attractions	3.83	3.08	3.22	**4.52**[A,B,D]	**4.05**[A]	21.449**
Culture (e.g. exhibitions, events)	3.66	2.39	**3.94**[A]	**3.98**[A]	**4.23**[A]	42.054**
Different activities	3.09	2.98[B]	1.89	**3.30**[B]	**3.30**[B]	10.953**
Atmosphere and lifestyle of the area	4.04	4.00	4.39	4.17	3.91	1.654
Getting to know the region	3.77	**4.08**[D]	3.39	**4.02**[D]	3.53	5.227*
History of the region	3.57	3.10	2.89	**4.35**[A,B,D]	3.59	14.143**
Safety of the region	3.76	3.61	3.44	**4.02**	3.79	1.520
Clean environment	4.34	**4.41**	**4.50**	4.35	4.26	0.545
Area is suitable for children	2.87	2.18	**3.17**	2.39	**3.51**[A,C]	13.408**
Pets are considered	2.31	2.02[C]	1.67	1.41	**3.15**[A,B,C]	31.845**
Accessibility (easiness to travel inside the region)	3.04	**3.31**[B,C]	2.11	2.07	**3.64**[B,C]	25.138**
Reachability (easiness to travel to the region)	3.53	**3.76**[B]	2.22	3.13	**3.90**[B,C]	15.532**
Versatile well-being services	3.08	**3.10**[B]	1.44	2.83[B]	**3.58**[B,C]	20.367**
Cottages	3.21	3.00	**3.78**	2.67	**3.51**[C]	5.597*

Superscript in the mean value of a cluster denotes those clusters that have significantly lower mean score; bolded are higher segment means than overall mean; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.001.

Table 3. Interest in wellbeing holidays and services

Question	Outdoor types	Nature enthusiast	Sightseers	Culturals	χ^2	Sig.
Are you interested in extended weekend trips in Finnish wellbeing tourism resorts/ destinations?					9.7*	p = 0.021
Yes	21 (42.0%)	8 (44.4%)	33 (71.7%)	46 (58.2%)		
No	29 (58.0%)	10 (55.6%)	13 (28.3%)	33 (41.8%)		
Are you interested in purchasing wellbeing services during your holiday?					7.9*	p = 0.047
Yes	19 (37.3%)	7 (38.9%)	29 (63.0%)	43 (54.4%)		
No	32 (62.7%)	11 (61.1%)	17 (37.0%)	36 (45.6%)		
If wellbeing services are started to develop to Savonlinna region would you be interested in using them?					5.8*	p = 0.120
Yes	30 (62.5%)	6 (35.3%)	28 (63.6%)	46 (66.7%)		
No	18 (37.5%)	11 (64.7%)	16 (36.4%)	23 (33.3%)		

* The percent of the cell having expected count less than five is less than 20.0%.

Segments

All the clusters are named as segments according to the benefits the respondents seek. The clusters' mean scores are also compared against the overall mean score of the sample, because, according to Raaij and Verhallen (1994), a segment can be typified by selecting only those variables for which the segment mean scores differ significantly from the overall mean scores for all segments together. One feature common to all segments is that the respondents think the natural beauty of the area and lakes are the greatest benefit the region of Savonlinna provides.

The first segment, named 'Outdoor types' ($N = 51$, 26.2% of all respondents), value the clean, unspoiled environment, getting to know the region and walking and hiking trails most after natural landscape and lakes. The suitability of the area for children and pets and culture are not very important for 'Outdoor types'. The second cluster was named 'Nature enthusiasts' ($N = 18$, 9.2% of all respondents). They value natural landscape and lakes the most, as well as peace and solitude. Clean environment is also very important for them whereas a wide range of wellbeing services do not matter. 'Sightseers' ($N = 46$, 23.6% of all respondents) are very interested in the attractions and history of the region but do not value pet friendliness of the area. The last segment was labeled 'Culturals' ($N = 80$, 41.0% of all respondents) as they value culture and attractions as well as suitability of the area for pets and children more than other segments.

The respondents in the various segments are very different in their attitude towards wellbeing holidays in Finland (Table 3) and there are statistical differences ($p < 0.05$) in every wellbeing-related question in this survey except for interest in using new wellbeing services in Savonlinna region. 'Culturals' and 'Sightseers' are more interested in wellbeing holidays and services than the other segments. The 'Actives' are the least interested in wellbeing services.

Respondents were also asked to rate the importance of 15 wellbeing holiday attributes and services. The results from comparing segments are presented in Table 4. As can be seen from Table 4, there are not many statistical differences between the four segments. For all segments the most important thing is the high standard of hygiene in the services provided. 'Culturals' and 'Sightseers' generally value different attributes and services more than 'Outdoor types' and 'Nature enthusiasts'.

The segments differ from each other statistically significantly ($p < 0.05$) only in nationality regarding socio-demographic profile. These differences are described in Table 5. There are also differences between segments in the number of times the respondents have previously been in the Savonlinna region. More than half of the 'Culturals' and the 'Sightseers' had already visited the region, but only a small percentage of the 'Outdoor types' had done so. Most of the 'Nature enthusiasts' had been to the Savonlinna region more than four times in the past.

Discussion

This study pursued a more profound insight into the various benefits tourists seek from a tourism

Table 4. Importance of wellbeing holiday attributes and services

		Cluster				
Wellbeing statement	Overall mean	Outdoor types	Nature enthusiast	Sightseers	Culturals	*F*-value
Wellbeing holiday should automatically include additional services	3.49	3.38	3.06	**3.65**	**3.59**	1.489
The possibility to take part in fitness and wellbeing seminars	2.92	2.73	2.47	2.91	**3.18**	2.366
The possibility to get physical examination / test	3.04	2.78	2.82	**3.14**	**3.23**	1.770
The possibility to refresh physically and spiritually (e.g. fasting)	3.47	**3.49**	3.24	3.40	**3.55**	.384
The possibility to go to sauna and have sauna treatments	4.10	4.04	3.76	**4.19**	**4.18**	.798
The possibility to practice healthy lifestyle or special diets	3.32	2.84	3.18	3.30	**3.69**[A]	5.070*
The possibility to enjoy health spas	3.52	**3.59**	3.00	3.44	**3.63**	1.569
The possibility to enjoy recreational spas	3.30	**3.42**	2.71	**3.35**	**3.33**	1.609
The possibility to get light and healthy food from the restaurant/restaurants	3.94	3.53	3.94	**4.12**[A]	**4.13**[A]	4.085*
High hygiene level of the provided services	4.51	4.31	4.41	**4.70**	**4.56**	1.951
The need for luxury on my well-being holiday	2.92	2.49	2.53	2.91	**3.34**[A]	6.077*
The possibility to take part in active well-being services (e.g. sport, fitness)	3.74	3.47	3.12	**3.84**	**4.01**[A]	5.302*
The possibility to get treatments that promote health (e.g. acupuncture)	3.02	2.64	2.41	**3.14**	**3.35**[A,B]	5.465*
The possibility to get pampering treatments (e.g. honey treatments)	2.98	2.54	2.65	**3.09**	**3.29**[A]	4.156*
The possibility to get local food made from ingredients that are organic or are produced locally	3.68	**4.00**	**3.82**	3.56	3.49	2.529

Superscript in the mean value of a cluster denotes those clusters that have significantly lower mean score; bolded are higher segment means than overall mean; *p* < 0.05.

destination. Information was obtained on what benefits different segments consider important and on the characteristics of different segments. It was found that benefit segmentation can be used to find markets for wellbeing products.

Altogether four different segments were found. These segments seek different benefits from their visit to the Savonlinna region. The results are especially interesting because of minimal differences between segments in socio-economic backgrounds. This means that the benefits sought override who they are. This study proves that it is pointless to segment customers into socio-demographic segments, such as 25-year-old single males, as the benefits they seek from their trip may well be the same as the benefits sought by middle-aged females with a family. The results of the study by Konu and Laukkanen (2010) also support this in the

wellbeing context, as the results of their study show that socio-demographic factors did not have statistically significant role in predicting the tourists' interest in wellbeing holidays.

Many earlier benefit segmentation studies in tourism have reported significant differences in socio-economic profiles of segments (e.g. Frochot, 2005; Molera and Albaladejo, 2007). Such is not the case in this study. Visitor segments in Savonlinna region differed from each other only in nationality, which is reflected in the number of previous visits to the region. However, there are significant differences between segments in their interest in wellbeing holidays. 'Outdoor types' were not interested in wellbeing holidays as such, but most of the 'Sightseers', for example were very interested in wellbeing holidays. The results indicate that wellbeing companies in the region should mainly target their

Table 5. Statistically significant socio-demographic and travel behavior differences between segments

Socio-demographics	Outdoor types	Nature enthusiast	Sightseers	Culturals	χ^2	Sig.
Nationality					29.8*	*p* < 0.001
Finn	14 (27.5%)	13 (72.2%)	29 (63.0%)	59 (73.8%)		
Foreign	37 (72.5%)	5 (27.8%)	17 (37.0%)	21 (26.3%)		
Have you been in the Savonlinna region before?					34.1*	*p* < 0.001
No, never	37 (72.5%)	4 (22.2%)	17 (37.8%)	24 (30.4%)		
Yes, 1–4 times	10 (19.6%)	3 (16.7%)	14 (31.1%)	27 (34.2%)		
Yes, more than 4 times	4 (7.8%)	11 (61.1%)	14 (31.1%)	28 (35.4%)		

* The percent of the cell having expected count less than five is less than 20.0%.

marketing at domestic visitors. When examining the segment with most foreign members, 'Outdoor types', it would seem best to emphasize sauna treatments, high standard of hygiene and local food (Table 4).

Comparing the results of this study to those of Pesonen and Komppula (2010), permits some very interesting conclusions. For example the Wellbeing segment in their study favored most spending time outside in natural surroundings as well as privacy. However, in this study the segment 'Nature enthusiasts' favoring natural landscape and peace and solitude the most are not very interested in purchasing wellbeing products and services whereas 'Sightseers' and 'Culturals' are.

Benefit statements used in previous studies differ from each other considerably. Some use push-factors (e.g. Frochot, 2005) and others use pull-factors (e.g. Kastenholz et al., 1999). In some studies, both are used (e.g. Beh and Buyere, 2007). If benefit segmentation studies are conducted in the future, special attention should be paid to the selection of segmentation variables. Kemperman and Timmermans (2006) advise against using both push- and pull factors. Using only pull-factors regarding a tourism destination can detect which attributes are the most important for tourists and companies can also position their offerings better. The results of benefit segmentation studies are difficult to generalize, because they are very often destination-related and different destinations attract different travelers (Frochot and Morrison, 2000).

Implications, limitations and further research

Benefits sought by wellbeing tourists is a virtually unexplored field of study, the research conducted by Koh et al. (2010) being the only

example using the benefit segmentation method in this context. Their study was based on push factors. According to their results the four major benefits sought by spa goers were socializing, relaxation, health and rejuvenation. In contrast to the study by Koh et al. (2010), the focus of this study was on benefits based on destination specific pull factors. The members of the segment most interested in wellbeing services, 'Sightseers', are also the most interested in history and attractions. 'Culturals' was the second potential segment, more interested in culture and suitability of the area for children and pets. Even though 'Culturals' may not be as interested as 'Sightseers' in wellbeing holidays and services, it should be noted that they are almost twice as large a segment as 'Sightseers' and clearly an attractive segment for companies offering, for example, treatments that promote health and healthy lifestyle (Table 4). Nevertheless, in order to determine actual wellbeing tourism segments, the push factors should also be examined. The segments identified in this study may be interested in wellbeing tourism services, but whether their main motivations refer to those allegedly typical for wellbeing tourists, remains unexplored.

This study suggests that benefit segmentation can be used to find segments for a certain product or service, in this case wellbeing services. According to Morrison (1996), the essence of good marketing is to pick out the segments that are the most interested in specific services and to aim marketing programs at them. Thus the findings have at least destination specific managerial implications. The most important pull factor for all the segments in the Savonlinna region is nature. It seems sound to develop wellbeing services based on nature and lakes, as those who are interested in wellbeing holidays seem to appreciate nature as the most important benefit.

However, the results of this study show that actually those most interested in buying wellbeing are those who value culture, history, different activities and attractions. It seems that the segment most interested in nature, the 'Nature enthusiasts', enjoy nature based passive wellbeing whereas other, more active segments, especially 'Sightseers' and 'Culturals', are actually more interested in buying wellbeing, such as treatments, light and healthy food and additional services. This is a very important managerial implication of this study.

There are some limitations in this study such as the relatively small sample size. Samples of similar size have, however, been used before, for example by Kastenholz et al. (1999) and Palacio and McCool (1997). There is no information on the representativeness of the sample and some groups, foreigners, for example, might be over-represented. Yuksel (2003) thinks that using statistical analysis alone to determine exclusive segments may be insufficient and that the segments should be examined by their profitability, accessibility, reachability and other requirements for successful segmentation. These requirements should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of this study.

Another limitation of this study is also a possibility for further research. This study focused on potential wellbeing tourists without actually interviewing those who buy wellbeing services. Segmenting the buyers of wellbeing services and comparing those segments to the segments presented in this study could provide some insight on wellbeing tourists' behavior. An international study segmenting wellbeing tourists in different wellbeing locations would allow the comparison of wellbeing destinations and the benefits different kinds of tourists seek.

References

Beh A and Bruyere B (2007) Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves. *Tourism Management* 28(6): 1464–1471.

Bieger T and Laesser C (2002) Market segmentation by motivation: the case of Switzerland. *Journal of Travel Research* 41(1): 68–76.

Blamey R and Braithwaite V (1997) A social values segmentation of the potential ecotourism market. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 5(1): 29–45.

Bojanic D and Warnick R (1995) Segmenting the market for winter vacations. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 4(4): 85–95.

Boksberger P and Laesser C (2009) Segmentation of the senior travel market by the means of travel motivations. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 15(4): 311–322.

Buhalis D (2000) Marketing the competitive destination of the future. *Tourism Management* 21(1): 97–116.

Craggs R and Schofield P (2009) Expenditure-based segmentation and visitor profiling at The Quays in Salford, *UK. Tourism Economics* 15(1): 243–260.

Díaz-Pérez F, Bethencourt-Cejas M and Álvarez-González J (2005) The segmentation of Canary Island tourism markets by expenditure: implications for tourism policy. *Tourism Management* 26(6): 961–964.

Dibb S (1998) Market segmentation: strategies for success. *Marketing Intelligence and Planning* 16(7): 394–406.

Dolnicar S (2004a) Insights into sustainable tourists in Austria: a data-based a priori segmentation approach. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 12(3): 209–218.

Dolnicar S (2004b) Beyond 'commonsense segmentation': a systematics of segmentation approaches in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research* 42(3): 244–250.

Dolnicar S (2006) Are we drawing the right conclusions? *The dangers of answer format effects in empirical tourism research. Tourism Analysis* 11(3): 199–209.

Dolnicar S and Grün B (2008) Challenging 'factor cluster segmentation'. *Journal of Travel Research* 47(1): 63–71.

Erfurt-Cooper P and Cooper M (2009) *Health and Wellness Tourism. Spas and Hot Springs.* Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Frochot I (2005) A benefit segmentation of tourists in rural areas: a Scottish perspective. *Tourism Management* 26(3): 335–346.

Frochot I and Morrison A (2000) Benefit segmentation: a review of its applications to travel and tourism research. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 9(4): 21–45.

Galloway G (2002) Psychographic segmentation of park visitor markets: evidence for the utility of sensation seeking. *Tourism Management* 23(6): 581–596.

Gelbman A (2009) Using wellness elements for branding an exclusive image of tourism sites in the North of Israel. In: Smith M and Puczkó L (eds) *Health and Wellness Tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 335–340.

González A and Bello L (2002) The construct 'lifestyle' in market segmentation. *The behavior of tourist consumers. European Journal of Marketing* 36(1): 51–85.

Hair J, Black W, Babin B and Anderson R (2010) *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Haley R (1968) Benefit segmentation: a decision-orientated research tool. *Journal of Marketing* 32(3): 30–35.

Hanlan J, Fuller D and Wilde S (2006) *Segmenting tourism markets: a critical review.* Proceedings of the Council for *Australian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) Conference.* Melbourne, Australia: 220–232.

Hoek J, Gendall P and Esslemont D (1996) Market segmentation. *A search for the holy grail? Journal of Marketing Practice* 2(1): 25–34.

Ignatov E and Smith S (2006) Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists. *Current Issues in Tourism* 9(3): 235–255.

Jang S, Morrison A and O'Leary J (2002) Benefit segmentation of Japanese pleasure travelers to the USA and Canada: selecting target markets based on the profitability and risk of individual market segments. *Tourism Management* 23(4): 368–378.

Juaneda C and Sastre F (1999) Balearic Islands tourism: a case study in demographic segmentation. *Tourism Management* 20(4): 549–552.

Kangas H and Tuohino A (2008) Lake Wellness. *Uusi itäsuomalainen innovaatio? Matkailututkimus* 4(1): 23–41.

Kastenholz E, Davis D and Paul G (1999) Segmenting tourism in rural areas: the case of North and Central Portugal. *Journal of Travel Research* 37(4): 353–363.

Kemperman A and Timmermans H (2006) Preferences, benefits, and park visits: a latent class segmentation analysis. *Tourism analysis* 11(4): 221–230.

Koh S, Yoo JJ-E and Boeger CA (2010) Importance-performance analysis with benefit segmentation of spa goers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 22(5): 1–20.

Konu H and Laukkanen T (2010) Predictors of tourists' wellbeing holiday intentions in Finland. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 17(1): 144–149.

Konu H, Tuohino A and Komppula R (2010) Lake-Wellness – a practical example of a New Service Development (NSV) concept in tourism industry. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 16(2): 125–139.

Korthals M (2004) *Before Dinner. Philosophy and Ethics of Food.* Berlin: Springer.

Laesser C, Crouch G and Beritelli P (2006) Market segmentation by reasons and influences to visit a destination: the case of international visitors to Australia. *Tourism Analysis* 11(4): 241–249.

Lee C-K, Lee Y-K and Wicks B (2004) Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and

satisfaction. *Tourism Management* 25(1): 61–70.

Leiper N (1990) Tourist attraction systems. *Annals of Tourism Research* 17(3): 367–387.

Manfredo M, Driver B and Tarrant M (1996) Measuring Leisure Motivation: A Meta-Analysis of the Recreation Experience Preference Scales. *Journal of Leisure Research* 28(3): 188–213.

Matzler K, Pechlaner H and Hattenberger G (2004) *Lifestyle-Typologies and Marketing Segmentation: The Case of Alpine Skiing Tourism.* Bozen: European Academy.

May J, Bastian C, Taylor D and Whipple G (2001) Market segmentation of Wyoming snowmobilers. *Journal of Travel Research* 39(3): 292–299.

Mok C and Iverson T (2000) Expenditure-based segmentation: Taiwanese tourists to Guam. *Tourism Management* 21(3): 299–305.

Molera L and Albaladejo I (2007) Profiling segments of tourists in rural areas of South-Eastern Spain. *Tourism Management* 28(3): 757–767.

Morrison A (1996) *Hospitality and Travel Marketing* (2nd Edition). New York: Delmar Publishing Inc.

Palacio V and McCool S (1997) Identifying ecotourists in Belize through benefit segmentation: a preliminary analysis. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 5(3): 234–243.

Park D-B and Yoon Y-S (2009) Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: a Korean case study. *Tourism Management* 30(1): 99–108.

Pesonen J and Komppula R (2010) Rural wellbeing tourism: motivations and expectations. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* 17(1): 150–158.

Raaij F and Verhallen T (1994) Domain-specific market segmentation. *European Journal of Marketing* 38(1): 49–66.

Ryan C and Gendon I (1998) Application of leisure motivation scale to tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 25(1): 16–184.

Sarigöllü E and Huang R (2005) Benefits segmentation of visitors to Latin America. *Journal of Travel Research* 43(3): 277–293.

Saunders J (1994) Cluster analysis. *Journal of Marketing Management* 10(1): 13–28.

Sheldon P and Bushell R (2009) Introduction to wellness and tourism. In: Bushell R and Sheldon PJ (eds) *Wellness and Tourism. Mind, Body, Spirit, Place.* New York: Cognizant Communication, 3–18.

Smith M and Kelly C (2006) Wellness tourism. *Tourism Recreation Research* 31(1): 1–4.

Smith M and Puczko L (2009) *Health and Wellness Tourism.* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Snepenger D, King J, Marshall E and Uysal M (2006) Modeling Iso-Ahola's motivation theory in the

tourism context. *Journal of Travel Research* 45(2): 140–149.

Weaver D and Lawton L (2002) Overnight ecotourist market segmentation in the Gold Coast Hinterland of Australia. *Journal of Travel Research* 40(3): 270–280.

Wu S (2001) Benefit segmentation: an empirical study for on-line marketing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics* 13(4): 3–13.

Yannopoulos P and Rotenberg R (1999) Benefit segmentation of the near-home tourism market: the case of Upper New York State. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 8(2): 41–55.

Yuksel A (2003) Market segmentation based on customers' post-purchase performance evaluation: a case of tourist diners. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing* 15(1): 1–18.