

# UNLOCKING WANDERLUST: UNVEILING THE INTRICACIES OF MBTI PERSONALITY TYPES IN SHAPING TRAVEL BEHAVIORS

## Abstract



**John YANG**

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies,  
Business School, Republic of Korea  
E-mail address: johnyang@hufs.ac.kr

**SiQi PAN**

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies,  
Business School, Republic of Korea  
E-mail address: 47wybh@gmail.com



**Sang-Uk JUNG**

(Corresponding Author)

Hankuk University of Foreign Studies,  
Business School, Republic of Korea  
E-mail address: sanguk.jung@hufs.ac.kr

*Purpose* – This research investigates the relationship between Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) personality types and travel behavior, focusing specifically on the ET, EF, IT, and IF types. *Methodology/Design/Approach* – The study employs a quantitative approach, analyzing survey data that assesses participants' travel preferences, motivations, activities, and destination choices based on their MBTI personality types.

*Findings* – The results reveal significant variations in travel product preferences among the different personality types. Primary travel motivators, preferred activities, and destination choices also vary, highlighting the influence of personality characteristics on travel decision-making.

*Originality of the research* – This study contributes to the existing literature by demonstrating how MBTI personality types affect tourism-related choices. The findings offer actionable insights for designing customized tourism products, enhancing visitor experiences, and informing marketing strategies that reflect diverse tourist profiles.

**Keywords** MBTI, Personality Type, Travel Product, Travel Motivation, Travel Activity, Travel Destination

**Original research paper**

Received 30 October 2024

Revised 30 April 2025

12 July 2025

Accepted 09 January 2026

<https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.32.4.10>

## INTRODUCTION

The global tourism industry is currently experiencing a remarkable resurgence in the post-pandemic era, marked by renewed consumer interest and evolving travel behavior. According to the World Tourism Cities Federation (2023), tourism activity in 2023 reached 10.78 billion person-trips, with revenues totalling \$5 trillion. As the sector rebounds, understanding the psychological drivers behind travel decisions becomes increasingly important.

In contemporary society, travel entails venturing beyond the routines of daily life to visit different regions or countries for various purposes. Technological advancement and increased leisure time have led more individuals to pursue travel for enjoyment and enrichment. Tourism plays a substantial role in economic, social, and cultural development, fostering employment, trade, and broader socio-economic growth (Dogru & Bulut, 2018; Habibi *et al.*, 2018). As travel becomes a more integral part of people's lives, it has further stimulated the growth of the tourism industry. Consequently, scholarly interest in tourist behavior has increased in parallel with this expansion. Researchers today are placing greater emphasis on understanding tourist behavior within the context of this evolving societal landscape.

The concept of travel behavior, as shaped by psychological processes, personal characteristics, and behavioral expressions during interactions with tourism products (Kroesen & Chorus, 2020), lies at the core of tourism research. Traditional research has often focused on demographic factors, decision-making processes, travel patterns, and spending behaviors. However, the rapid evolution of the tourism industry necessitates a more nuanced understanding of tourist behavior.

Historically, studies in this field have followed two major paths: one focusing on the behavioral aspects of tourists and the other exploring the motivations for travel. However, as the global travel dynamics continue to shift, there is a growing need for deeper exploration of the mechanisms behind tourist behavior. This paper seeks to offer a comprehensive review of tourist travel behaviors, emphasizing the complexity and dynamism that characterize the modern travel experience.

A notable trend in recent academic research is the increasing focus on the link between personality traits and travel behaviors. Scholars have recognized that stable individual personality traits can significantly predict travel preferences and decisions (Woodside *et al.*, 2006). Psychological variables are now seen as central to understanding tourist behavior (Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006). As a result, there is increasing scholarly interest in examining how personality types defined by the MBTI framework affect tourist choices and behaviors across different travel contexts.

The Big5, Plog's model, and MBTI are internationally recognized personality assessment tools that help individuals to understand the relationship between personality traits and behavioral tendencies. Among these, MBTI has been relatively underutilized in tourism studies. However, recent years have seen growing academic interest in applying MBTI to travel behavior and destination choices. MBTI classifies individuals into 16 personality types, offering a rich framework for analyzing psychological diversity and complexity.

Given its detailed classification, MBTI-based research offers the potential for meaningful insights into how different personality profiles influence travel behavior. This study, therefore, aims to conduct an in-depth analysis of MBTI personality types and their influence on tourist behaviors. The goal is to uncover distinct behavioral patterns and travel preferences associated with each personality type, ultimately contributing to more personalized and effective approaches in tourism research and practice.

## 1. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Personality Psychology

Research in personality psychology suggests that individual psychological profiles influence various aspects of life, including decision-making (Lauriola & Levin, 2001), communication styles (De Vries *et al.*, 2013), and preferences in leisure activities (Furnham, 1981). Personality psychology is a multifaceted field that seeks to understand individual differences in behavior, cognition, and emotion. Numerous theoretical frameworks and measurement tools have been developed to capture the complexity of personality.

The Big Five model, also known as the Five-Factor Model (FFM), is one of the most widely accepted and extensively researched frameworks for understanding personality (McCrae & Costa, 1997). The model includes five broad dimensions: Openness to Experience (O), Conscientiousness (C), Extraversion (E), Agreeableness (A), and Neuroticism (N). It is recognized for capturing the major dimensions of personality and offers a comprehensive framework to describe individual differences in personality traits. Research utilizing the Big Five framework has demonstrated its cross-cultural validity and applicability across various fields, including psychology, organizational behavior, and personality assessment (Schmitt *et al.*, 2007). It is also widely employed in marketing and tourism studies to analyze consumer and tourist behavior, preferences, satisfaction, and loyalty (Schmitt *et al.*, 2007; Taihong, 2017).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) has also been a prominent topic in the literature, offering valuable insights into personality psychology and its applications. Developed in the early 20th century by Katharine Cook Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers, the MBTI is grounded in the idea that individual traits are shaped by how individuals perceive and judge information. The instrument classifies individuals into 16 distinct MBTI types based on four dichotomies: Extraversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, and Judging/Perceiving. This classification reflects individuals' preferences in the dimensions of extraversion/introversion, sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving. These dichotomies reflect individuals' preferences for how they interact with the world, process information, and make decisions. Isabel Briggs Myers' work in the mid-1900s laid the groundwork for applying these psychological preferences to understand individual differences more comprehensively (Briggs *et al.*, 1995).

The MBTI has gained global recognition as one of the most well-known personality assessment tools. Ongoing research continues to explore its cross-cultural applicability and its effectiveness in differentiating personality types (Yoo *et al.*, 2013). Despite criticisms regarding its scientific validity, reliability, and potential oversimplification of personality (Boyle, 1995), the MBTI remains resilient and relevant across multiple domains, ranging from education to organizational development. Its enduring popularity is attributed to its practical utility in understanding cognitive preferences, decision-making styles, and interpersonal dynamics. Furthermore, ongoing efforts by scholars and practitioners aim to refine the theoretical foundations of the MBTI, address its limitations, and expand its applications to meet the evolving needs of individuals and institutions. This continuous process of refinement ensures that the MBTI remains a subject of academic inquiry and a valuable tool for practitioners seeking to gain deeper insights into human behavior and interaction.

### 1.2 Linking Personality Types and Travel Behavior

In this section, we meticulously examine key findings from studies exploring the impact of distinct personality types on various facets of travel behavior, including preferences for travel products, motivations, activities, and destinations. The analysis focuses on four specific MBTI personality types: Extraversion-Thinking (ET), Extraversion-Feeling (EF), Introversion-Thinking (IT), and Introversion-Feeling (IF), with the goal of exploring how these personality types shape individuals' travel choices.

Extraversion (E) and Introversion (I) are fundamental dimensions that distinguish individuals based on their orientation toward the external or internal world. Extraverts tend to engage with their surroundings and other people, while introverts direct their attention toward internal emotions and thoughts. These traits influence how individuals acquire energy, communicate, and express preferences in everyday life and leisure activities. Thinking (T) and Feeling (F) describe how individuals make decisions either through logic and objective analysis (T) or through emotion and personal values (F). Thinking types tend to evaluate causes, developments, and consequences rationally, while Feeling types prioritize empathy and relationships in their decision-making processes.

Travel behavior encompasses the actions and decisions made during journeys, including destination choices, activity preferences, and overall experience (Choi & Lee, 2009). Understanding the psychological factors that drive travel choices is essential for interpreting tourist behavior. Personality traits have been shown to significantly influence leisure preferences (Diener & Emmons, 1984), as well as emotional attachment to destination (Lew, 1987; Hosany *et al.* (2007). In the context of

a competitive tourism landscape and evolving traveler motivations, personality-based segmentation offers valuable insights for predicting consumer behavior (Hosany et al., 2007; Jani, 2014a; Jani, 2014b). More recent studies (Langan-Fox & Shirley, 2003; Zhao et al., 2020; Leri and Theodoridis, 2020; Gross et al., 2023) further support the relevance of MBTI personality dimensions in understanding diverse tourist preferences and behaviors.

The interaction between personality types and travel behavior is complex, affecting motivations, decisions, and preferences. Studies such as Ekinçi & Hosany (2006) and Kumar & Nayak (2018) show that psychological types can influence destination preferences. Other researchers (Hsu & Lam, 2003; Park, 2005; Jackson & Inbakaran, 2006; Scott & Mowen, 2007; Leung & Law, 2010) have found that personality types affect travel motivations, decision-making processes, behavioral styles, and subsequent actions. Individuals' unique personality traits contribute to diverse reactions even in similar environments (Minderman et al., 2009). Consequently, measuring tourists' MBTI personality types becomes a crucial tool for understanding individual differences and predicting their travel behaviors.

Several empirical studies support this approach. Kim (2004) found that MBTI types significantly influenced leisure preferences and satisfaction. Jo (2006) identified differences in tourism behavior based on MBTI types, while Ryu & Kim (2011) used MBTI types to inform tourism marketing strategies. Kwon & Park (2019) demonstrated the correlation between MBTI traits and tourist experiences, underscoring the impact of personality on travel behavior.

A growing body of literature exploring the link between personality types and travel behavior offers valuable insights into how these traits influence travel decisions. Understanding how personality types interact with travel behavior highlights the importance of personalized strategies in tourism marketing, product development, and destination planning to accommodate the unique preferences of different MBTI profiles.

### 1.3 Hypothesis Development

Previous studies consistently indicate that personality types significantly influence individual preferences, behaviors, and choices (Stumpf & Dunbar, 1991). The four personality types identified by MBTI, namely ET, EF, IT, and IF, reflect distinct psychological traits that can influence various activities and consumption patterns. Bekk et al. (2016) and Kumar and Nayak (2018) have shown that travel preferences differ across personality types, emphasizing the role of psychological traits in travel-related decisions. Similarly, Schneider & Vogt (2012) highlight that personality traits, including behavioral tendencies and communication styles, plays a crucial role in influencing travel and tourism behaviors. Tan (2020) stresses the need to identify individual personality types in order to accommodate diverse travel needs.

Variations in personality types help explain the diverse ways individuals experience and derive satisfaction from travel, especially in relation to autonomy, emotional engagement, intellectual stimulation, and social connection. ET individuals, known for their outgoing nature and logical decision-making, tend to prefer independent and structured travel. They are often drawn to solo travel, which allows them to plan and execute their trips according to their personal goals and efficiency-oriented mindset, without compromising with others.

In contrast, EF individuals prioritize emotional connection and social engagement, which makes them more inclined toward group travel experiences. They value shared activities with family or friends, finding fulfillment in meaningful interpersonal interactions and emotionally rich experiences.

IT individuals, characterized by introspection and analytical thinking, tend to prefer solo or small-group travel that offers opportunities for reflection and intellectual stimulation. Solo backpacking trips, for example, offer the flexibility and mental space that align with their independent and thoughtful disposition.

IF individuals seek emotionally resonant travel experiences that align with their personal values. They often prefer to travel with close companions, valuing meaningful shared experiences and the emotional depth that comes from connecting with others during the journey. Based on these distinctions, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 1:* Preferences for travel products will vary among individuals based on their personality types.

Incorporating insights from Dann's (1977) Push and Pull Theory, which underscores the interaction between internal needs and external stimuli in shaping travel motivations, we further explore how distinct personality traits influence specific motivations for travel.

ET individuals, driven by their energetic nature and goal-oriented mindset, are likely to engage in travel that involves physical activities or wellness-related goals. They tend to prefer active experiences that align with a structured and purposeful travel style.

EF individuals, by contrast, often seek vacations that provide an escape from busy lifestyles. Their emphasis on emotional engagement and interpersonal connection leads them to favor relaxing, leisure travel experiences that foster meaningful social interactions and create lasting memories.

IT individuals may be more inclined to engage in medical or wellness travel. Their preference is influenced by their introspective nature and reliance on logical reasoning. Valuing personal space and independence, they seek environments that allow them to focus on their well-being without external distractions. The structured and solitary nature of such travel aligns with their need for thoughtful planning and independent decision-making.

IF individuals are more likely to seek out different cultures through travel. This inclination is driven by their emotional depth and strong value orientation. IF individuals find fulfillment and personal enrichment in engaging with diverse cultural atmospheres, as this provides them with opportunities to connect with their emotions, experience meaningful interactions, and deepen their understanding of various traditions. Travel becomes a significant avenue for IF individuals to engage with their inner values, fostering personal growth and creating lasting memories through cultural immersion. In light of these insights, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 2:* Travel motivations will vary among individuals based on their personality types.

Drawing from existing research, it is well established that tourists' personality traits significantly influence their choices in leisure activities (Kuper et al., 2023). Accordingly, hypotheses regarding individual preferences for various leisure activities based on distinct personality types can be formulated.

ET individuals are likely to attend food festivals or visit local markets to explore regional culinary cultures. This preference reflects their outgoing nature and interest in logically engaging with their surroundings. ET individuals seek opportunities to engage with the vibrant local food experiences during their travels.

EF individuals are more inclined to participate in stimulating activities such as hiking or skiing. This tendency reflects their prioritization of emotional engagement and exciting experiences. EF individuals, who enjoy adventurous pursuits, are drawn to activities that provide a sense of thrill and foster emotional connections. Outdoor experiences like hiking or skiing allow them to engage with their surroundings while fostering meaningful interactions.

IT individuals tend to prefer visiting amusement parks or participating in local recreational activities with residents or other tourists. This inclination is influenced by their introspective nature and logical decision-making style. IT individuals enjoy the structured and predictable environment of amusement parks, which enables them to experience leisure in a calm, organized, and reflective manner.

IF personalities are more likely to seek out historical and scenic attractions. This inclination is driven by their inward-focused and emotionally attuned personalities. IF individuals value emotional connections and meaningful experiences and are particularly drawn to the depth and cultural richness of historical landmarks. Their preference for exploring local landmarks aligns with their desire to create lasting memories and emotionally resonate with the places they visit. Based on these considerations, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 3:* Preferences for travel activities will vary among individuals based on their personality types.

ET individuals are likely to enjoy attending food festivals or visiting local markets to explore regional food culture. This inclination is driven by their outgoing nature and preference for logical exploration, seeking to understand and immerse themselves in the local food scene. ET individuals are drawn to the sensory experiences and cultural insights offered by food festivals and markets.

EF individuals, as previously noted, prefer physically engaging and emotionally stimulating activities such as hiking or skiing. These activities provide emotional excitement and opportunities for shared adventure, which resonate with their sociable and empathetic nature.

IT individuals show a preference for organized recreational environments such as amusement parks or structured local activities. These settings offer familiar patterns, predictability, and opportunities for quiet enjoyment. These qualities align with their analytical mindset and appreciation for order.

IF individuals are drawn to destinations with rich historical or scenic value. Their preference for meaningful and introspective experiences leads them to explore cultural landmarks, heritage sites, and natural landscapes where they can form emotional connections and engage deeply with their surroundings. Based on these considerations, we propose the following hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 4:* Preferences for travel destinations will vary among individuals based on their personality types.

## 2. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

### 2.1 Research Methodology

This study adopted a quantitative research design employing an online structured survey to investigate the relationship between MBTI personality types and travel preferences across four dimensions: travel products, motivations, activities, and destinations. The survey instrument was divided into three sections with a total of 22 questions. In the first section, respondents' MBTI personality types were assessed using a short-form, self-report version of the MBTI, based on four dichotomous dimensions (Extraversion–Introversion and Thinking–Feeling). This simplified classification method has been used in previous academic studies where the full MBTI instrument was not feasible (Langan-Fox & Shirley, 2003). Participants were categorized into one of four composite types: ET, EF, IT, and IF. Here, ET represents an extraverted and thinking-oriented personality, EF indicates an extraverted and feeling-oriented personality, IT signifies an introverted and thinking-oriented personality, and IF denotes an introverted and feeling-oriented personality.

In the second section, single-choice questions were used to assess preferences for travel products (e.g., solo travel, family travel), travel motivations (e.g., "I travel to escape from routine"), and travel activities (e.g., "I enjoy visiting historical landmarks"). The travel motivation items were adapted from prior validated scales in tourism psychology (Pearce & Lee, 2005), reflecting established motivational constructs while aligning with MBTI dimensions. The activity and destination preference items were newly developed based on exploratory interviews with domestic tourists and a literature review on MBTI-based travel segmentation (e.g., Jani, 2014a; Pearce & Lee, 2005). The third section reassessed questions using a Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) to obtain more nuanced attitudinal data. All items were pretested with a pilot group (n=15) to ensure clarity and face validity.

Participants were recruited through random convenience sampling via an online platform (Questionnaire Star), resulting in 305 initial responses. After removing 29 incomplete or invalid submissions, 286 valid responses were analyzed. Although this sampling method allowed for efficient data collection, it may have limited the generalizability of the findings.

To test the hypothesized relationships between personality types and travel preferences, cross-tabulation analyses were conducted. These analyses revealed statistically significant relationships between MBTI personality types and categorical preference variables. The survey responses, which included personality type measurements (ET, EF, IT, IF) and corresponding preferences, were cross-tabulated to examine how preferences were distributed within each personality type. Additionally, Chi-square tests were used to determine statistical significance, while Cramér's V was reported to assess effect sizes. This analytic approach enabled a structured investigation of the influence of personality on travel behavior, offering both descriptive and inferential insights into preference patterns across MBTI types.

### 2.2 Results

The analysis results indicate the presence of four distinct MBTI personality types, with the distribution outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Distribution of MBTI Personality Types

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
ET	74	24.3
EF	66	21.6
IT	78	25.6
IF	87	28.5
Total	305	100.0

#### 2.2.1 Preferences for Travel Products

The results of the cross-tabulation analysis in Table 2 confirmed statistically significant differences in travel product preferences across MBTI personality types. The Cramér's V value of 0.29 indicates a moderate effect size, suggesting a meaningful relationship between personality type and travel product preferences. Specifically, ET individuals showed a marked tendency toward solo travel, reflecting their desire for autonomy and logically organized experiences, while EF types exhibited a strong preference for family or group travel, emphasizing their need for emotional engagement and interpersonal connection.

On the introverted side, IT participants favored solo backpacking, consistent with their introspective and independent nature, seeking intellectual stimulation and personal freedom. Meanwhile, IF individuals leaned toward backpacking with close companions, suggesting a desire for emotionally meaningful and intimate shared experiences. These findings highlight the nuanced interplay between personality traits and travel behavior, with each type's preferences aligning closely with their psychological profiles.

**Table 2: MBTI Personality Types and Travel Products Preferences**

Travel Products	Most Common MBTI Personality Type & Percentage (%)	$\chi^2(p)$
Traveling Alone	ET (94.6%)	236.25 ( $p < .001$ )
Family or Group Travel	EF (98.41%)	234.58 ( $p < .001$ )
Solo Backpacking Trips	IT (82.71%)	361.57 ( $p < .001$ )
Backpacking with Family or Friends	IF (82.76%)	319.43 ( $p < .001$ )

These patterns support Hypothesis 1, affirming that travel product preferences vary significantly based on MBTI personality type. Moreover, the findings echo prior studies (e.g., Kim, 2004), reinforcing that personality traits play a pivotal role in shaping tourists' behavior and decision-making. The statistical and psychological evidence together suggest that incorporating MBTI-informed segmentation can meaningfully enhance tourism marketing strategies and personalized travel service design.

### 2.2.2 Travel Motivations

The analysis of travel motivations, as presented in Table 3, reveals the statistically significant differences across MBTI personality types, indicating that personality traits meaningfully shape individuals' underlying travel motivations. These findings align with and extend the motivational framework proposed by Assiouras et al.

(2015), who identified both push factors (e.g., knowledge-seeking, ego-enhancement, escape & relaxation, novelty) and pull factors (e.g., cultural heritage, safety, leisure) as key drivers of international tourist behavior. While Assiouras et al. (2015) emphasized cross-cultural segmentation, the present study contributes by highlighting intra-personality segmentation, showing that travel motivations are not only culturally but also psychologically differentiated.

Building on this groundwork, the current study reveals that ET individuals, characterized by assertiveness and a goal-oriented mindset, show a distinct inclination toward physical activity and body management as travel motivators. This reflects their preference for dynamic, health-conscious experiences aligned with their structured and achievement-driven personality. In contrast, EF individuals are primarily motivated by a desire to escape daily stress and seek emotional rejuvenation. Their travel motivations center on relaxation and emotional well-being, often pursued through shared experiences with family or friends—consistent with their sociable and empathetic disposition.

IT types show a unique motivational profile, with a higher tendency to travel for health and medical care purposes. Their introspective and analytical traits drive them toward destinations that support personal well-being and solitary reflection, suggesting a more utilitarian and health-focused approach to travel.

Meanwhile, IF individuals are predominantly motivated by the desire to experience different cultures, seeking deep emotional connections and personal growth through cultural immersion. For them, travel becomes a medium for self-expression and value exploration.

Taken together, these results substantiate Hypothesis 2, reinforcing that travel motivations are closely tied to personality-based psychological needs. They also offer practical insights for the tourism industry—emphasizing the value of personality-informed segmentation strategies when designing marketing campaigns, wellness tourism programs, or cultural tourism packages.

**Table 3: MBTI Personality Types and Travel Motivations Preferences**

Travel Motivations	Most Common MBTI Personality Type & Percentage (%)	$\chi^2(p)$
Physical Activities and Body Management	ET (98.65%)	186.05 ( $p < .001$ )
Escape from a Busy Lifestyle	EF (93.65%)	45.84 ( $p < .001$ )
Seek Environments Conducive to Well-being and Introspection	IT (88.89%)	274.97 ( $p < .001$ )
Seek Different Cultures through Travel	IF (98.65%)	458.97 ( $p < .001$ )

### 2.2.3. Preferences for Travel Activities

As posited in Hypothesis 3, the study anticipated that preferences for travel activities would significantly differ based on MBTI personality types. The results presented in Table 4 affirm this hypothesis, with the analysis indicating statistically significant variation in activity preferences across the four personality profiles.

The data show that ET individuals demonstrate a marked preference for attending food festivals or visiting local markets, likely due to their outgoing disposition and structured approach to exploring local cultures through sensory and logical engagement. EF participants are more drawn to physically stimulating activities such as hiking or skiing, reflecting their emotional energy and a desire for shared adventure and excitement.

In contrast, IT individuals tend to favor structured recreational environments, such as amusement parks or planned local activities, which allow for intellectual stimulation within a predictable and controlled setting. Meanwhile, IF personalities show a stronger preference for visiting historical sites and scenic attractions, suggesting a desire for emotionally resonant and reflective travel experiences.

These differentiated preferences illustrate the close relationship between cognitive-emotional orientations and leisure behavior, substantiating Hypothesis 3 and offering strong implications for designing activity-based travel packages that align with distinct personality profiles.

Table 4: MBTI Personality Types and Travel Activities Preferences

Travel Motivations	Most Common MBTI Personality Type & Percentage (%)	$\chi^2(p)$
Attend Food Festivals or Visit Local Markets	ET (97.3%)	217.54 ( $p < .001$ )
Participate in Stimulating Physical Activities, such as Hiking or Skiing	EF (98.41%)	223.23 ( $p < .001$ )
Go to Amusement Parks	IT (87.65%)	252.45 ( $p < .001$ )
Explore Local Historical and Scenic Attractions	IF (91.96%)	266.94 ( $p < .001$ )

### 2.2.4. Preferences for Travel Destinations

Continuing from this, Hypothesis 4 proposed that travel destination preferences would also significantly vary by personality type. The findings summarized in Table 5 clearly support this hypothesis, revealing statistically significant associations between MBTI types and destination choices.

Table 5: MBTI Personality Types and Travel Destinations Preferences

Travel Motivations	Most Common MBTI Personality Type & Percentage (%)	$\chi^2(p)$
Visit Technological Innovation Hubs and Research Centers	ET (98.65%)	306.91 ( $p < .001$ )
Explore the Jungle	EF (93.65%)	210.73 ( $p < .001$ )
Tour Historical Landmarks	IT (88.88%)	284.25 ( $p < .001$ )
Visit Museums and Art Exhibitions	IF (85.06%)	360.99 ( $p < .001$ )

Participants with ET personalities showed an overwhelming preference (98.65%) for destinations centered around technological innovation and research, such as science museums, industrial tours, or tech hubs. This preference aligns with their future-oriented, analytical mindset and appreciation for progress and structure. EF individuals (93.65%) gravitated toward immersive and adventurous environments, such as jungles or nature expeditions. These destinations offer high emotional engagement and shared social experiences—central to the EF profile. On the introverted end, IT respondents preferred destinations rich in historical landmarks (88.88%), reflecting their cognitive curiosity and desire for intellectual enrichment. IF participants showed a strong affinity (85.06%) for culturally and emotionally expressive places, such as museums or art galleries, consistent with their reflective and value-driven personalities. These patterns underscore how destination preferences are deeply intertwined with the motivational and perceptual orientations of each personality type. The findings not only validate Hypothesis 4, but also suggest that destination marketing strategies can benefit significantly from psychographic segmentation.

Table 6: Summary of Hypothesis Results

Hypothesis	Result
1	Supported – Preferences for travel products vary based on personality types
2	Supported – Travel motivations vary based on personality types
3	Supported – Preferences for travel activities differ based on personality types
4	Supported – Preferences for travel destinations differ based on personality types

## CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In interpreting the findings within the context of existing literature, this study supports the growing body of research emphasizing the influence of personality types on travel behavior. Integrating MBTI into travel studies offers a more nuanced understanding of how individual differences shape preferences for travel products, motivations, activities, and destinations. While prior research has primarily focused on demographic factors and decision-making processes, our study highlights the significant role of personality traits in travel-related choices.

The findings confirm the validity of all four proposed hypotheses. Preferences for travel products, motivations, activities, and destinations vary significantly among individuals based on their personality types. For example, ET individuals, who tend to be outgoing and logical, prefer structured, self-directed travel experiences. EF types gravitate toward emotionally fulfilling and socially engaging trips. IT individuals prefer solo or small-group travel that allows for introspection, whereas IF individuals seek cultural exploration for emotional resonance.

The results not only validate all four hypotheses but also illuminate the complex ways in which psychological profiles affect travel decisions. By employing both categorical and scaled analysis, this study provides robust empirical evidence supporting the value of personality-based segmentation in tourism marketing. The findings are consistent with prior research while offering new implications for more personalized travel experiences.

These results have practical implications for the travel industry. Acknowledging the diverse preferences linked to personality types enables businesses to design more targeted marketing strategies and personalized travel offerings. For instance, knowing that EF individuals enjoy group-based emotional experiences can inform the development of curated travel packages that emphasize shared moments and connection.

The relevance of personality-based insights extends beyond marketing to destination planning and travel product development. Tourism boards and destination managers can use these findings to shape experiences that resonate with different psychological profiles. Likewise, travel product designers can leverage this knowledge to diversify offerings, thereby enhancing appeal across distinct market segments.

Overall, this study establishes a clear link between MBTI personality types and travel preferences. It demonstrates that travel choices are driven by psychological differences rather than a universal decision-making pattern. People choose travel products, activities, and destinations based on their own personalities, not a single, universal pattern.

This research contributes to the broader literature by incorporating MBTI into the study of travel behavior, providing a more detailed understanding of the psychological foundations of travel choices. While personality psychology has been studied extensively in various domains, its application in tourism remains limited. This study fills that gap by demonstrating the relevance of personality traits in shaping travel behaviors.

Future research should further investigate how personality interacts with specific trends in tourism, such as sustainable travel, digital nomadism, or immersive experiences. Longitudinal studies tracking how travel preferences evolve over time within the same personality type could also provide dynamic insights into behavioral development and lifestyle shifts. In conclusion, this study further highlights the practical importance of incorporating personality profiles into tourism planning and strategy, building upon the validated hypotheses. The dynamic interaction between individual traits and travel behavior opens avenues for innovation, personalization, and industry growth in a rapidly evolving travel landscape.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund.

## REFERENCES

- Assiouras, I., Skourtis, G., Koniordos, M., & Giannopoulos, A. A. (2015). Segmenting East Asian tourists to Greece by travel motivation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(12), 1389-1410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2014.982140>
- Bekk, M., Spörrle, M., & Kruse, J. (2016). The benefits of similarity between tourist and destination personality. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(8), 1008-1021. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287515606813>
- Boyle, G. J. (1995). Myers-Briggs type indicator (MBTI): some psychometric limitations. *Australian Psychologist*, 30(1), 71-74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-9544.1995.tb01750.x>
- Briggs, I. M., Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1995). *Gifts differing: Understanding personality type*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Choi, H. C., & Lee, S. (2009). Understanding US traveler behavior to Asian countries: A secondary analysis approach. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(3), 279-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941660903024018>
- Dann, G. M. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(77\)90037-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(77)90037-8)
- De Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F. E., & Schouten, B. (2013). The communication styles inventory (CSI) a six-dimensional behavioral model of communication styles and its relation with personality. *Communication Research*, 40(4), 506-532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650211413571>
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R. A. (1984). The independence of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(5), 1105. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.47.5.1105>
- Dogru, T., & Bulut, U. (2018). Is tourism an engine for economic recovery? Theory and empirical evidence. *Tourism Management*, 67, 425-434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.06.014>
- Ekinci, Y., & Hosany, S. (2006). Destination personality: An application of brand personality to tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 45(2), 127-139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287506291603>
- Furnham, A. (1981). Personality and activity preference. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(1), 57-68. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1981.tb00474.x>
- Gross, S., Sand, M., & Berger, T. (2023). Examining the adventure traveller behaviour - Personality, motives and socio-demographic factors as determinants for German adventure travel. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 33, 3307-3307. <https://doi.org/10.54055/ejtr.v33i.2795>
- Habibi, F., Rahmati, M., & Karimi, A. (2018). Contribution of tourism to economic growth in Iran's Provinces: GDM approach. *Future Business Journal*, 4(2), 261-271. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbj.2018.09.001>
- Hosany, S., Ekinci, Y., & Uysal, M. (2007). Destination image and destination personality. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 1(1), 62-81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506180710729619>
- Hsu, C. H. C., & Lam, T. (2003). Mainland Chinese traveler's motivations and barriers of visiting Hong Kong. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*, 2(1), 60-67.
- Jackson, M., & Inbakaran, R. (2006). Development of personality types to predict tourist behaviour towards tourist product consumption. *Tourists and Tourism*, 1-1.
- Jani, D. (2014a). Big five personality factors and travel curiosity: are they related? *Anatolia*, 25(3), 444-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2014.909366>
- Jani, D. (2014b). Relating travel personality to Big Five factors of personality. *Tourism: An International Interdisciplinary Journal*, 62(4), 347-359.
- Jo, H. (2006). A study on student's leisure choice: Focused on relationships with MBTI type. *Journal of Tourism and Leisure Research*, 18(1), 285-300.
- Kim, Y. S. (2004). A study on leisure life by MBTI character type. *Journal of Consumption Culture*, 7(2), 83-106.
- Kroesen, M., & Chorus, C. (2020). A new perspective on the role of attitudes in explaining travel behavior: a psychological network model. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 133, 82-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2020.01.014>
- Kumar, V., & Nayak, J. (2018). Destination personality: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 42(1), 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348014561027>
- Kuper, N., Kroencke, L., Harari, G. M., & Denissen, J. J. (2023). Who benefits from which activity? On the relations between personality traits, leisure activities, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 125(1), 141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000438>
- Kwon, B., & Park, E. (2019). Differences in tourist behavior according to MBTI personality type: A focus on people in their 20s. *Journal of Tourism Management Research*, 88(0), 481-495.
- Langan-Fox, J., & Shirley, D. A. (2003). The Nature and Measurement of Intuition: Cognitive and Behavioral Interests, Personality, and Experiences. *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(2-3), 207-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2003.9651413>
- Lauriola, M., & Levin, I. P. (2001). Personality traits and risky decision-making in a controlled experimental task: An exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31(2), 215-226. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(00\)00130-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(00)00130-6)
- Leri, I., & Theodoridis, P. K. (2020). How do personality traits affect visitor's experience, emotional stimulation and behaviour? The case of wine tourism. *Tourism Review*, 76(5), 1013-1049. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-05-2019-0148>
- Leung, R., & Law, R. (2010). A review of personality research in the tourism and hospitality context. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(5), 439-459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2010.499058>
- Lew, A. A. (1987). A framework of tourist attraction research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(4), 553-575. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(87\)90071-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(87)90071-5)
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066x.52.5.509>
- Minderman, J., Reid, J., Evans, P., & Whittingham, M. (2009). Personality traits in wild starlings: exploration behavior and environmental sensitivity. *Behavioral Ecology*, 20(4), 830-837. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arp067>
- Park, J. Y. (2005). A study of relations between Psychographic and tourism activity for tourist by Plog model. *International Journal of Tourism Management and Sciences*, 20(2), 71-85.
- Pearce, P., & Lee, U. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(3), 226-237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504272020>
- Ryu, S. Y., & Kim, T. H. (2011). Differences of tourist motivation and destination preference by MBTI personality types. *Journal of Tourism Sciences*, 35(6), 229-247.
- Schmitt, D., Allik, J., McCrae, R., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2007). The Geographic distribution of Big Five personality traits. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 38(2), 173-212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106297299>
- Schneider, P. P., & Vogt, C. A. (2012). Applying the 3M model of personality and motivation to adventure travelers. *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(6), 704-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287512451134>
- Scott, K., & Mowen, J. C. (2007). Travelers and their traits: A hierarchical model approach. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour: An International Research Review*, 6(2-3), 146-157. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.214>
- Stumpf, S. A., & Dunbar, R. (1991). The effects of personality type on choices made in strategic decision situations. *Decision Sciences*, 22(5), 1047-1072. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1991.tb01906.x>
- Taihong, L. (2017). 50 years of consumer behavior: Evolution and overthrow. *Foreign Economics & Management*, 39(06), 23-38. <https://doi.org/10.16538/j.cnki.fem.2017.06.003>
- Tan, W. K. (2020). Destination selection: Influence of tourists' personality on perceived travel constraints. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 26(4), 442-456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356766720942556>
- Woodside, A., Caldwell, M., & Spurr, R. (2006). Advancing ecological systems theory in lifestyle, leisure, and travel research. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(3), 259-272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287505282945>
- World Tourism Cities Federation. (2023). Report on world tourism economy trends. <https://en.wtcf.org.cn/20230512/5c49c189-2ed4-43e3-f2f2-3cfaa88745fb-i.html>

- Yoo, B., Neelankavil, J. P., de Guzman, G. M., & Lim, R. A. (2013). Personality type preferences of Asian managers: A cross-country analysis using the MBTI instrument. *International Journal of Global Management Studies*, 5(1).
- Zhao, C., Wang, J., Feng, X., & Shen, H. (2020). Relationship between personality types in MBTI and dream structure variables. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1589. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01589>

Please cite this article as:

Yang, J., Pan, S. & Jung S. (2026). Unlocking Wanderlust: Unveiling the Intricacies of MBTI Personality Types in Shaping Travel Behaviors. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*, 32(4), pp, <https://doi.org/10.20867/thm.32.4.10>



Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial – Share Alike 4.0 International