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Abstract

Tourism research deals with urban and rural management and development tourism. This research shade light on the selection process from the tourist point of view and specifically what is the mixture of rural and urban sites in the travel destination. Personally, aspects may affect the tourist combination choices for international and domestic travel.

The results indicate that tourists who have grown up in the city tend to prefer urban sited over rural sites. International tourist that prefer urban sites, desire familiarity, no connection with the local people and pre-plan of the tour. Rural sites, as an international vacation destination may focuses on the novelty, social connection and spontaneously. Travels who travel more domestically or looks for novelty prefer rural sites.

Tourism management may adopt the destination facilities and attraction to the variety of tourist characterize, such as offering international chains in rural sites and local and social establishment in rural sites.

**1. Introduction**

Tourism is one of the biggest industries that accounts for 10.4 percent of global GDP (WTTC 2020), with over 1.4 billion international tourists in 2018 (World Tourism Organization 2019). Information and research concerning tourism mostly deals with international tourism, while domestic tourism is the leading form of tourism representing 71.3 percent of the total global tourism spending in 2019 (world travel and tourism council WTTC 2020). The share of domestic tourism is expected to increase due to the Covid-19 effect on airline travel. Urban tourism account of 44 percent of international tourism <https://wttc.org/Research/Economic-Impact/Cities> , however, the economic and social importance of rural tourism is crucial to the country's welfare. In order to improve the development, management and marketing strategies for urban and rural sites, it is important to understand the tourist preferences about them. Especially, research concerning the personality aspects that determine the preferences is missing.

UNWTO describes urban tourism as trips to cities or places with high population density. Since those trips are usually short (one to three days), urban tourism is closely linked to the short break market. Several researchers have tried to develop a framework for understanding urban tourism, which is highly important to cities' economies but also requires significant urban infrastructures. According to WTTC a reserch based on 73 cities found that cities are more reliant on international travel demand than wider economies, with international visitor spending accounting for 45% of tourism spending, compared to 29% of the total global tourism spending in 2019 (world travel and tourism council WTTC 2020).

The terms ‘rural tourism’ and ‘countryside tourism’ are often used synonymously, and defined tourism that takes place in the countryside or a rural area. Moreover, Lane (1994) argued that rurality is the principal appeal and that as a concept can be connected to low population densities with open space and small scale settlements, generally with less than 10,000 inhabitants. In addition, the land use is dominated by farming, forestry and natural areas.

Tourism cannot be categorized as urban or rural site, as Patmor (1983,122) claimed that "no sharp discontinuity between urban and rural resources for recreation, but rather a complete continuum from local park to remote mountain pick". In particular, Hall and Page (2014) emphasize the concept of an urban-rural continuum as a means of establishing differing degrees of rurality and the essential qualities of ‘ruralness’.

Similarly, to the difficulty to classify tourism or destination, there is a difficult to define the vacation type. Most tourists combine urban and rural sites during their vacation, and do not choose only city or rural vacations. In international vacation the tourist choose how to allocate his time abroad between cities and rural areas. Concerning domestic vacations, the tourist usually choose between urban or rural site for each travel. The tourist choice between rural and urban sites is even more curtail nowadays, due to the overtourism problem many destinations suffer from, and the social distancing requirements caused by Covid-19.

There are a diversity of perspective and approaches related to tourist destination choice. The research can be grouped into a. decision process, b. motivation factors c. Influence of personal characteristics on destination choice d. Influence of information and communication on destination choice (Sunao Saito & Iara Strehlau, 2018 ).

Research concerning culture and personality charachteristics found that income and religouse has a significant effect on destination selection (Cruz, et al . 2018), and national culture is an internal variable affecting destination choice (Patel 2013). Culture drives the attributed by tourists to destination selection generally and the specific feature within the destination through differences in travel motivation (Stylos et al 2016). In addition, personality is used as one part of the person self-concept and it has a significant part in shaping tourists’ motivation, perception and behavior (Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. 2011).

Sirgy & Su (2000) apply the self-congruity theory within the context of tourism destinations, and claimed that the greater the match between the destination personality and the visitor’s self-concept, the more likely it is that the visitor will have a favorable attitude toward that destination. This attitude might result in a visit or word of mouth.

Early life experience can have a dominant influence on the personality and according to the continuity theory early-life experiences can bridge between individual past present and future (Atchley, 1999). In the sense of rural tourism, frequent contact with nature in the early years have an influence on interaction and attitudes toward the environment (Tapps & Fink, 2009; Thompson et al., 2008).

Another well-established approach regarding tourist personality is Cohen's typology (Cohen 1972), which includes four groups of tourists, distinguished by the degree to which they search for novelty as opposed to familiarity: organised mass tourists, independent mass tourists, explorers, and drifters.

The *o*rganised mass tourist include tourists that looks for familiar destinations, travels on package tours, desire for familiar things while travelling (such as international hotel chains), and have no interaction with the local community. Anothergroup is the independent mass tourists. These tourists travel to the regular tourist routes, while making their own arrangements and travel individually. The third group includes the explorers who travel to lesser-known destinations and explore local culture, but do not get very involved with the local population. The last group of tourists includes the drifters who travel to less developed and less known destinations, stay with local residents, eat local food, and try to learn as much as they can about the culture.

Mo. Havitz and Howard (1994) developed a scale to measure the three dimensions used by Cohen. *The 'Destination Oriented Dimension' (DOD),* considers the tourist's preference with regard to novelty and familiarity in the destination. This dimension focuses on the destination and the degree to which the tourist's choice is driven by the desire for new and different experiences. *The second dimension, 'Travel Service Dimension' (TSD),* focuses on the degree to which tourists seek standardized tourism services in a foreign country. *The third dimension, 'Social Contact dimension' (SCD),* examines the degree to which tourists want to interact with the local culture or observe it from the outside.

Some research concerning destination choice distinguish between the decisions for travel domestically and for travel abroad. Eugenio-Martin and Campos-Soria (2011) found that willingness to travel is not only related to income level but also to the characteristics of the tourist's region of residence like climate, size and tourist attractions. They found that those that live in larger communities travel more, probably, according to their explanation because of the larger variety of transportation. When age increases so does the likelihood to travel internationally, however when the number of children increase the likelihood to travel domestically increases. According to that research international and domestic traveling are substitute with a preference to international traveling when income increases.

Machinda, Serirat and Gulid (2009) showed that domestic and international tourists are different in all the motivations to choose the destination and in the perception of the destination. For example, domestic tourists were attracted to the destination because of the nature and the climate while the international tourists choose the destination because of the friendliness of the local people. In addition, visits of domestic tourist to the destination are more frequent, but their length of stay and level of expense is lower.

This research is the first attempt to analyze the preferences for urban or rural sites from the tourist’s point of view. The mixture over urban and rural sites is affected by personality characteristic and may distinguish between international and domestic travel. The association between childhood settlement, Mo's dimensions to measure Cohen's typology and socio-demographic variables and tourist mixture of urban and rural destination are tested.

This research included a hierarchical multiple regression that examine whether the association between childhood residences, gender and rural and urban preference is mediated by novelty, local relationship, level of pre-organized tours and number of trips.

**3. Methods**

**3.1 Sample**

We conducted a quantitative cross-sectional study among 269 Israeli participants, 225 travel abroad with an average of 1.56 trips per year and 239 made domestic tours with an average of 4.4 vacations per year (vacation includes day trips).

Prior to distributing the self-administered questionnaires, we briefly explained the purpose of the study and indicated that participation was voluntary. The study was conducted from April to June 2018 recruited by convenience sampling. The sample comprised, 74 percent who grow up in a city and 26 who grow up in other type of settlement. Table 1 represents the participants' demographic characteristics.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable |  | N | Percentage |
| Gender | Male | 124 | 46.3% |
|  | Female | 144 | 53.7% |
| Marital status | Single | 204 | 79.3% |
|  | Married | 53 | 20.7% |
| Religion | Jewish | 213 | 81.3% |
| Non-Jewish | 49 | 18.7% |
| Income | Below average | 107 | 53.8% |
|  | Average and above | 73 | 36.7% |
| Education | High school or certificate | 117 | 44.2% |
|  | Academic degree | 148 | 55.8% |

**3.2 Procedure**

The research questionnaire was partially based on the questionnaire developed by Mo. Havitz and Howard (1994) translated into Hebrew by one of the authors and back-translated by the other author. The institutional Ethics Committee of the higher education institution with which the authors are affiliated approved this study.

**3.3 Questionnaire**

Participants were informed that the survey is anonymous, and the results would only be used for research purposes.

The questionnaire included the following sections:

1) *Socio-demographic details and vacation details*, including gender, age, education, type of residence settlement in the past (1- city, 0 other), number of domestic and international vacations, etc.

2) *tourist type* *on international vacations*: Subjects were asked questions in order to identify their tourist type while traveling abroad based on Mo at el (1994), on a Likert-scale of 1 to 5 (1 – very much agree, and 5 – Do not agree).

3) *tourist type on domestic vacations*: Subjects were asked questions in order to identify their tourist type while traveling domestically based on Mo at el (1994), ranked on a 5-point Likert-scale (1 – very much agree, and 5 – Do not agree).

Mo at al’s (1994) scale included three dimensions. *The 'Destination Oriented Dimension' (DOD),* considers the tourist's preference with regard to novelty and familiarity in the destination. The Likert-scale was 1 to 5 (1 – familiarity, and 5 – novelty) *The second dimension, 'Travel Service Dimension' (TSD),* looks at the degree to which tourists seek standardized tourism services in a foreign country. While the third dimension*, 'Social Contact dimension' (SCD),* examines the degree to which tourists want to observe local culture from the outside or whether they instead want to become involved in it, ranked on a 5-point Likert-scale (1 – observe locals, and 5 – involved with local culture). However, due to inconsistency reliability of the Travel service dimension, this paper defined part of the travel service dimension as the Organized Plans dimension (OP) that looks at the level of making plans before the trip ranked on a 5-point Likert-scale (1 – makes plans beforehand, and 5 – Do not make plans). For each one the dimensions a combined score was calculated based on the average of responses for the questions related to this dimension.

4) *Tourist preference in international and domestic vacations*, mixture of urban and rural site ranked on a 5-point Likert-scale (1-urban only, 2- more urban than rural, 3- urban and rural equally, 4 -more rural than urban to 5 -rural only).

**3.4 Data Analysis**

The statistical package SPSS 25 was used for statistical analysis of the data. Pearson's correlations examined direct effects and paired t-tests for independent samples examined international vs. domestic differences. PROCESS macro examined mediation effects. This research tested total effect and direct effect to determine whether the effect of the initial variable on the outcome variable is completely/partially/inconsistently mediated. Partial mediation occurs when the indirect effect and the corresponding direct effect are of the same sign. Complete mediation occurs when the indirect effect is nonzero and the direct effect is zero. Inconsistent mediation (sometimes called suppression) occurs when the indirect effect and the direct effect are nonzero but have opposite signs (Maassen & Bakker, 2001; MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000). The significance of the mediation effects was examined by calculating 5,000 bootstrapped samples to estimate the 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence intervals (CIs) of indirect effects of the predictor on the outcome through the mediator A.F. Hayes, (2013).

**4. Results**

The tourist characteristics for international and domestic trips and the reliability and correlation between them are represented by tables 2a and 2b.

**Table 2**a

International tourist characteristics and correlations of the study variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tourist characteristics | | |  | |  | | Correlations | | | | |
|  | M (SD) | Range | Cronbach's alpha | N | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. UNabroad | 2.86  (0.82) | 1-5 | - | 219 | - | | 0.20\*\* | | 0.33\*\*\* | -0.06 | -0.09 |
| 1. SCD | 2.93 (0.92) | 1–5 | 0.902 | 225 |  | | - | | 0.30\*\*\* | 0.45\*\*\* | -0.04 |
| 1. DOD | 3.44 (0.76) | 1–4.9 | 0.869 | 225 |  | |  | | - | 0.18\*\* | -0.11 |
| 1. OP | 2.46 (1.14) | 1–5 | 0.872 | 225 |  | |  | |  | - | -0.07 |
| 1. City child | 0.76  (0.43) |  |  | 225 |  | |  | |  |  | - |

\*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

Table 2a indicates that SCD and DOD were positively associated with the chosen mixture of urban and rural sites abroad, while OP and type of childhood residence have no significant correlations with it.

**Table 2**b

Domestic tourist characteristics and correlations of the study variables

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tourist characteristics | | |  | | |  | | Correlations | | | |
|  | M (SD) | Range | Cronbach's alpha | N | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | 5 |
| 1. UNdomestic | 3.2  (1.05) | 1-5 | - | 234 | - | -0.08 | | 0.21\*\*\* | | 0.23\*\*\* | -0.13\* |
| 1. SCDd | 2.61 (1.03) | 1–5 | 0.911 | 233 |  | - | | -0.16\* | | 0.09 | -0.01 |
| 1. DODd | 3.04 (0.96) | 1–5 | 0.709 | 236 |  |  | | - | | 0.04 | -0.01 |
| 1. #TRIPd | 4.36 (5.76) | 0.33–50 | - | 239 |  |  | |  | | - | -0.25\*\*\* |
| 1. City child | 0.74  (0.44) |  |  | 239 |  |  | |  | |  | - |

\* p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001

Table 2b indicates that SCDd and DODd were positively associated with the chosen mixture of urban and rural sites abroad. Morover, growing in a city is associated with prefering urban sites. Number of domestic trips is not associated with urban and rural preferences.

Table 3 compares the characteristics of the tourist in international and domestic vacations.

**Table 3**

Tourist characteristics and international vs. domestic differences in the study variables[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Abroad | | Domestic | | t-test(df) |  |
|  | | M (SD) | M  (SD) |  | |  |
| SCD | | 2.95 (0.92) | 2.54 (1.0) | 5.649(202)\*\*\* | |  |
| DOD | | 3.42 (0.74) | 3.12 (0.94) | 5.12(203)\*\*\* | |  |
| Urban or Rural | | 2.85 (0.84) | 3.24 (1.02) | -5.78(199)\*\*\* | |  |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

The above results indicate that on international trips the tourists are looking for more novelty and contacts with the local people than on domestic trips. The mixture of urban and rural sites differ between international and domestic trips. The share of rural sites is higher in domestic tours than on international tours.

This research included a hierarchical multiple regression that examined whether the association between childhood residence, education, income, religion, and gender and rural and urban preference is mediated by novelty (DOD), local relationship (SCD), level of pre-organized tours (OP) and the number of trips.

Several models were tested in order to find the model with the best fit for international tourism, which is illustrated by figure 1a including DOD, SCD and OP as mediator variables and gender as covariate.

**Figure 1a**

The study model: The association between international urban and rural preferences and childhood residence mediated by: DOD, SCD, OP and a covariate variable: gender.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | a1=-0.24\* | DOD | b1=0.31\*\*\* |  |
| City \_child | c=-0.14 c'=-0.19 |  |  | UNabroad  **R2=0.1553**\*\*\* |
|  | a2=-0.02 | SCD | b2=0.18\*\* |  |
|  | a3=-0.17 |  | b3=-0.14\*\* |  |
|  |  | OP |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

Table 4a shows the results of the analytical model for international tourism.

**Table 4a: Regression analysis: Factors affecting the choice of rural and urban tourism on international trips. N=219**

Total, direct, and indirect effects of city child on time allocation between rural and city on vacations abroad through DOD, SCD and OP

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | B | SE | T | LLCI,ULCI | |
|  | Dependent variable: UNabroad | | | | |
| City\_child  (path c=total effect) | -0.19 | 0.13 | -1.44 | -0.45, -0.07 | |
|  | Mediator: DOD | | | | |
| City \_child  (path a1) | -0.24 | 0.12 | -2.00 | -0.48, -0.01 | |
| Gender | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.07 | -0.19,0.21 | |
|  | Mediator: SCD | | | | |
| City\_child  (path a2) | -0.02 | 0.15 | -0.12 | -0.31, 0.27 | |
| Gender | -0.37 | 0.12 | -2.97 | -0.61,-0.12 | |
|  |  | Mediator: OP | | |  |
| City\_child  (path a3) | -0.17 | 0.18 | -0.97 | -0.53, 0.18 | |
| Gender | -0.44 | 0.15 | -2.86 | -0.74,-0.14 | |
|  | Dependent variable: UNabroad | | | | |
| DOD  (path b1) | 0.31 | 0.07 | 4.31 | 0.17, 0.46 | |
| SCD  (path b2) | 0.18 | 0.07 | 2.72 | 0.05, 0.31 | |
| OP  (Path b3) | -0.14 | 0.05 | -2.80 | -0.25, -0.04 | |
| City child  (path c'=direct effect) | -0.14 | 0.12 | -1.09 | -0.38, 0.01 | |
| DOD  (path a1b1=indirect effect) | -0.08 | 0.04 |  | -0.17, -0.01 | |
| SCD  (path a2b2=indirect effect) | -0.003 | 0.03 |  | -0.06, 0.06 | |
| OP  (path a3b3=indirect effect) | 0.03 | 0.03 |  | -0.03, 0.09 | |
| Gender | 0.05 | 0.11 | 0.49 | -0.16,0.26 | |

B=unstandardized beta;

SE=standard error for the unstandardized beta (boot standard error);

T=t test statistic;

LLCI–ULCI=lower limit of the confidence interval–upper limit of the confidence interval (boot LLCI–ULCI).

Women and men are significantly differ concerning SCD and OP. Men prefer to have more contact with the local community than women, in addition men tourists behavior is more spontaneously compare to women. The combination of rural and urban sites significantly depend on DOD, SCD, OP (paths b1, b2, b3 respectively). Tourist that tend to create connection with the local people or desire for novelty in their trip abroad choose more rural sites. Tourists that travel with less plans will prefer more urban sites.

Growing up in the city has indirect effect on the urban sites preference through the DOD (path a1b1). Tourist that grow up in the city prefer more urban sites. There is no direct effect of growing up in the city (path c'). The effect of growing up in the city on the urban sites preference is completely mediated. The overall model was significant p=0.000, R2=0.1553, F(5,213)=7.8334.

Several models were tested in order to find the model with the best fit for domestic tourism, which is illustrated by figure 1b including DOD, SCD and number of domestic trips as mediators variables.

**Figure 1b**

The study model: The association between domestic urban and rural preferences and childhood residence mediated by DOD, SCD and number of domestic trips.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | a1=0.03 | DODd | b1=0.15\* |  |
| City \_child | c=-0.25 c'=-0.13 |  |  | UNDomestic  **R2=0.090**\*\*\* |
|  | a2=0.05 | SCDd | b2=-0.07 |  |
|  | a3=-3.10\*\*\* |  | b3=0.04\*\*\* |  |
|  |  | #TRIPd |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

Table 4b shows the results of the analytical model for domestic tourism.

**Table 4b: Regression analysis: Factors affecting the choice of rural and urban tourism on domestic trips. N=229**

Total, direct, and indirect effects of city child on time allocation between rural and city on domestic vacations through DOD, SCD and OP

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Predictor | B | SE | T | LLCI, ULCI | |
|  | Dependent variable: UNdomestic | | | | |
| City\_child  (path c=total effect) | -0.25 | 0.15 | -1.65 | -0.55, 0.05 | |
|  | Mediator: DODd | | | | |
| City \_child  (path a1) | 0.03 | 0.14 | 0.20 | -0.25, 0.31 | |
|  | Mediator: SCDd | | | | |
| City\_child  (path a2) | 0.05 | 0.15 | 0.35 | -0.25, 0.36 | |
|  |  | Mediator: No of domestic trips | | |  |
| City\_child  (path a3) | -3.10 | 0.85 | -3.67 | -4.77, -1.44 | |
|  | Dependent variable: UNdomestic | | | | |
| DODd  (path b1) | 0.15 | 0.07 | 2.18 | 0.02, 0.29 | |
| SCDd  (path b2) | -0.07 | 0.06 | -1.08 | -0.2, 0.06 | |
| No of domestic trips  (Path b3) | 0.04 | 0.01 | 3.48 | 0.02, 0.06 | |
| City child  (path c'=direct effect) | -0.13 | 0.15 | -0.84 | -0.42, 0.17 | |
| DODd  (path a1b1=indirect effect) | 0.004 | 0.02 |  | -0.04, 0.06 | |
| SCDd  (path a2b2=indirect effect) | -0.004 | 0.02 |  | -0.04, 0.03 | |
| No of domestic trips  (path a3b3=indirect effect) | -0.13 | 0.05 |  | -0.23, -0.05 | |

B=unstandardized beta;

SE=standard error for the unstandardized beta (boot standard error);

T=t test statistic;

LLCI–ULCI=lower limit of the confidence interval–upper limit of the confidence interval (boot LLCI–ULCI).

The combination of rural and urban sites in domestic trips significantly depend on DOD and the number of domestic trips (paths b1, b3 respectively). Travelers that take more domestic trips or desire novelty in the domestic trip choose more rural in the trip. Growing up in the city has indirect effect on the urban sites preference through number of domestic trips (path a3b3). Tourists that grow up in the city tend to travel less domestically and therefore prefer more urban sites. There is no direct effect of growing up in the city on urban and rural preferences (path c'). Therefore, the effect of growing up in the city on the urban sites preference is completely mediated. The overall model was significant p=0.000, R2=0.0119, F (4,224)=0.09.

**Discussion and conclusions**

Tourism became one of the leading industries in the world with a large contribution to the country's GDP. Tourism management concerning the flow of tourism in the country in order to prevent over-tourism (mostly on urban sites) and to enhance economic development of rural sites. Therefore, a research that shade light on the selection process from the tourist point of view and specifically what is the mixture of rural and urban sites in the destination is extremely important. The tourist combination choice may distinguish between international and domestic travel. The association between personality aspects: childhood settlement, Mo's dimensions to measure Cohen's typology and socio-demographic variables like gender, religion, income, education, number of trips, and marital status and tourist mixture of urban and rural destination is tested. Moreover, the effect of the childhood settlement on Mo's dimensions to measure Cohen's typology is tested as well.

The current model was consistent with the continuity theory and the self-congruity theory and expand Tapps & Fink, (2009); Thompson et al., (2008); Sirgy & Su, (2000); Stokburger-Sauer, N. E. (2011) implication concerning tourism to the effect of childhood resident type on the combination of rural and urban sites in domestic and international tourism. Tourists that grow up in the city tend to prefer urban sited over rural sites. Although the results for international and domestic trips are in the same line, the reasons of each one of them are different. In international trips, travelers who grow up in the city desire for more familiarity in their trips, which in turn cause the preference of urban sites. The number of domestic trips for tourist that grow up in the city is smaller than the number of trips for those who grow up in rural sites, which in turn cause the preference of urban sites.

Concerning international trips, all of Mo's dimensions has a significant effect on urban site preference, while for domestic trips only the DOD has a significant effect. Traveler who desires novelty prefer rural sites over urban site for both international and domestic trips. On international trips tourist who would like to be involved in the local culture prefer more rural site, on the other hand tourists that carefully plan their trip in advance prefer urban sites.

The tourist gender has a significant effect on the urban sites preference in international trips, i.e. men (compared to women) prefer to have more contact with the local community and show more spontaneous behavior, which in turn leads to a higher preference for rural sites.

 Number of domestic or international trips has no effect on international preferences, while the number of domestic trips has a significant effect on urban preferences concerning domestic trips. Tourists that take more domestic trips prefer rural sites.

Early life experiences outside of the city increase the number of domestic trips as an adult and the intention to desire novelty in international trips. This result is consistent with Eugenio-Martin and Campos-Soria (2011) claim concerning the effect of tourist's region of residence; however, income has no significant effect on the urban/rural preferences.

The tourist typology is different for international and domestic tours. The tourist desires for more novelty and more social interaction in international tours. In addition, in domestic tours compare to international tours, the tourist preferences to rural sites is bigger. This may explain the previous result of Machinda, Serirat and Gulid (2009) .

Tourism mangers and developments may concern the differences between the international and domestic tourist preferences. International tourist which prefer urban sites, desire familiarity, no connection with the local people and pre-plan of the tour. Therefore, it is important for urban site to have: well known chains of hotels, restaurants and shops in the cites, tools to plan in advance the vacation and real time support and recommendation for the travelers. Rural sites that market as an extension to urban site vacation for international tourist, may supply some well-known chains of hotels and restaurants as well. In addition, rural sites may offer a full-organized package from the city to their place with standard facilities and attractions (women only tours may be considered as well). Rural sites, which can stand alone as an international vacation destination may focuses on the novelty and social connection. For example, with cooking and handicraft courses and home resorts.

Domestic tourism is the leading form of tourism, and the preference concerning rural or urban sites depend on desire for novelty and the number of domestic trips. Those who travel more prefer rural sites and therefore combine annual package for travel in rural sites may increase the number of domestic travelers. In addition, rural sites may offer some novelty attractions and focuses the marketing in rural settlements. Cities may continue to offer the domestic tourist the familiar urban experience and do not have to worry about novelty.

The research define the concept of urban/rural preferences and consider the effect of the personality aspects on them. Further research may consider the preferences in some other aspects of tourism including destination choice, motivation factors and expenditures.

In addition, the research was made on a relatively small sample and in a specific location; future research should include a larger sample from different countries in order to validate the results.
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**Summary of main suggestions**

•This research was conducted well before the outbreak of the Coronavirus (April-June 2018). The *Journal of Travel Research* guidelines state that papers **must acknowledge and discuss the relevance and usefulness of this earlier research in light of COVID-19 developments**: “Researchers who have already collected or used pre-COVID-19 primary data… but are yet to finalise their analysis and complete the writing of their manuscript, must consider how they may need to address the effect of COVID-19 on their interpretations and conclusions for a post-COVID-19 travel and tourism world.” To this effect, I would recommend that the entire paper should be reworked, especially the discussion and conclusions section, in order to meet this requirement for being considered for publication.

•According to the Journal’s style guide: empirical research articles should be “problem based”, with a focus on practical tourism development, management, marketing or economics. The ‘problem’ on which this paper is based needs to be more clearly stated. As far as I understand, it could be presented as the need to be able to predict the urban/rural preferences of tourist consumers, taking into account personality characteristics and personal experience, in order to help guide tourism management/development in a constantly changing world effected by COVID-19. The standard for acceptance of a manuscript is that it must make a substantive theoretical and/or methodological contribution to the tourism research literature. Can you make absolutely clear how your research fills a gap in the literature (especially in the light of the coronavirus pandemic)?

•The *Journal of Travel Research* style guide asserts that “It is important to explain and justify why the selected methodology is the most appropriate from among the various approaches available, given the research aims and objectives.” At the moment, I’m not sure that the paper fulfils this requirement. In section 3 (Methods), I would consider adding text to explain/justify your chosen methodology to show how it is robust.

•Please provide all authors’ names, position, affiliation and contact details (addresses, telephone numbers, e-mail addresses) in a separate cover page. The Journal stipulates that “There should be nothing in the manuscript file that identifies the authors by name or institution.”

•I would suggest rewriting the abstract in order to convey the messages more effectively. Plus, the aim of the study should be explicitly formulated. What research hypothesis is being tested; what is the fundamental problem being addressed? How will the results be useful in the current climate (which has changed since the research was carried out) in concrete terms?

•The Journal states that: “Tables and figures are not to be embedded in the manuscript – each table and figure should be provided as a separate page at the end of the manuscript. Tags should be inserted in the manuscript indicating approximately where tables and figures should be located.” Please make the necessary changes to this effect.

•Please follow the Journal’s reference style for in-text citations in every instance: the in-text citations can be set without a comma preceding the year, e.g., "Smith 1990" instead of "Smith, 1990" and the "pp." or "p." can be omitted when citing page numbers in the text, "Smith 1990, 23-24" instead of "Smith, 1990, pp. 23-24" (see section 3.4 of the Manuscript Submission Guidelines).

•I’ve corrected several spelling mistakes in the body text, but it will be helpful to run an American English spell check before submitting the revised version. (Of course, at the editing stage errors of spelling and grammar will be addressed.)

•There is occasionally a problem of agreement between subject and verb (e.g. sometimes a plural verb is used when the subject is singular, or vice versa). Please pay attention to this in your revisions.

•The expression ‘to desire for’ is used frequently throughout. This should be ‘to desire (something)’, without a preposition. There is also a danger of overusing this verb. For lexical variety, consider using other verbs too, e.g. to seek/look for/long for/wish for/yearn for/prefer, etc.

•‘Preferences over’ is frequently used. This should be ‘preferences for’ (‘over’ would be used when we talk about a preference for something over something else).

•Please address the general problem of spacing between words. There are often two or more spaces between words in the body text.

•The use of ‘city child’ could be misleading. I would suggest using another term, e.g. Childhood city residence.

•As regards acronyms (WTTC, UNWTO, etc.), I would write the name in full the first time it appears (with the abbreviation in brackets after), and then use the abbreviation thereafter.

•The references list needs to be reworked; at the moment, it does not follow the Journal’s style requirements (please see section 3.4 of the Manuscript Submission Guidelines available online at <https://journals.sagepub.com/author-instructions/JTR>). There are also inconsistencies regarding typeface and font size, which should be Times New Roman and 12 point. Everything should be left justified.

1. Calculated for those who travel both abroad and domestic. There are not supposed to be any footnotes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)