

Exploring the Differences between Tourists Visiting Heritage Sites and Those Visiting Cultural Events: A Cognitive Perspective

Shengnan Zhao PhD Student

School of Community Resources & Development, Arizona State University

Gyan P. Nyaupane PhD

School of Community Resources & Development, Arizona State University

Kathleen Andereck PhD

School of Community Resources & Development, Arizona State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra>

Zhao, Shengnan PhD Student; Nyaupane, Gyan P. PhD; and Andereck, Kathleen PhD, "Exploring the Differences between Tourists Visiting Heritage Sites and Those Visiting Cultural Events: A Cognitive Perspective" (2016). *Tourism Travel and Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*. 54.

<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttra/2011/Oral/54>

This is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Tourism Travel and Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Exploring the Differences between Tourists Visiting Heritage Sites and Those Visiting Cultural Events: A Cognitive Perspective

Shengnan Zhao

PhD Student

School of Community Resources & Development

Arizona State University

411 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

email : shengnan.zhao@asu.edu

Gyan P. Nyaupane, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor and Graduate Program Director

School of Community Resources & Development

Arizona State University

411 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Ph#602-496-0166, email : Gyan.nyaupane@asu.edu

Kathleen Andereck, Ph.D.

Professor and Director

School of Community Resources & Development

Arizona State University

411 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, AZ 85004

Ph#602-496-1056, email : kandereck@asu.edu

Exploring the Differences between Tourists Visiting Heritage Sites and Those Visiting Cultural Events: A Cognitive Perspective

Abstract

Heritage tourism, which is considered a popular form of tourism, includes two major types of attractions—sites and events. Based on the cognitive perspective, this paper aims to compare the perceptions, the socio-demographic characteristics, and the travel patterns of tourists visiting cultural sites and events. The results showed that while site visitors and event goers were homogenous in some variables, such as gender, age, number of children, education, income, accommodation, transportation mode, and travel party makeup, they were significantly different in the aspects of relationship status, employment status, information source, use of markers, repeated visit, geographic origin, and expenditure. Some management implications are discussed, including establishing more interactive activities in cultural attractions so that the social relations can be enhanced.

Keywords: cultural tourism; sites; events; perceptions; socio-demographic characteristics; travel patterns

Introduction

Heritage tourism, rapidly developing as one of the major growing segments of the tourism industry (Hollinshead, 1996), includes two major categories of attractions—sites and events. Both sites and events have been explored in the aspects of business management, market segmentation, tourist motivation, economics, social and cultural impacts, authenticity, and tourist profiles (Bendix, 1989; Delamere & Wankel, 2001). Lew (1987) developed a framework for studying tourist attractions, which includes three major approaches: ideographic, organizational, and cognitive perspectives. The ideographic approach, from the supply perspective, refers to the description of the concrete and specific characteristics of a site. The organizational approach relates to the spatial, capacity, and temporal nature of a tourist attraction. The cognitive perspective focuses on the demand component and is constituted of tourist perceptions and experiences of attractions. However, Lew's framework has been criticized for categorizing tourists as a homogeneous group in terms of motivation and behavior (Leiper, 1990). Based on MacCannell's (1976) system perspective and Gunn's (1988) nucleus perspective, Leiper (1990) defined a tourist attraction as a system including three elements: a tourist or human element, a nucleus or central element, and a marker or informative element, and modeled the relationships between these three elements. The word 'nucleus' rather than 'sight' was used because the 'nucleus' of an attraction could stand for any attribute of a place, such as a sight, an object, a person, or an event. Marker, referring to a piece of information about a site, plays a key role in the links between each tourist and the nuclear elements being sought for personal experience (leiper, 1990). From the cognitive perspective, this paper considers tourists as heterogeneous, and aims to compare tourists' perceptions, socio-demographic characteristics, and travel patterns in cultural sites and events which are two major nuclei of heritage tourist attractions. In this way, we attempt to understand the attributes of cultural tourist attractions from tourists' mind and behavior.

Literature Review

This paper attempts to explore and compare the attributes of both cultural sites and events from a cognitive perspective through understanding what are the affective outcomes (satisfaction) of tourists' travel experience, why tourists chose the attraction (motivation), what cognitive outcomes tourists get from their experience (perceived benefits), who are these tourists (socio-demographics), and what are their travel characteristics (travel pattern).

Satisfaction

The analysis of customer satisfaction has been one of the most important research topics in the past decades due to its importance for marketing (Oliver, 1997). In the tourism field, some studies have been conducted to compare satisfaction levels based on the intensity of social relationship between hosts and tourists (Pizam, Uriely, & Reichel, 2000), demographic characteristics (Master & Prideaux, 1998), and nationalities (Chaudhary,

2000). Among many studies that have attempted to develop theoretical and methodological frameworks to analyze customer satisfaction, the perspective of expectation discrepancy is most dominant. *Satisfaction*, an overall affective response due to the purchase of a product/service (Oliver, 1980), is a function of an initial/subjective standard (prior expectation) and the perceived discrepancy from the initial reference point (Erevelles & Leavitt, 1992; Oliver, 1980). In the field of tourism, satisfaction is defined as a function of the pre-travel expectation and the post-travel perceived performance. Many researchers suggest that its evaluation needs to be considered in multiple dimensions (Oliver, 1980; Petrick, 2004). A single measure could make satisfaction more likely to have an error variance than a measure with multiple items (Ullman, Tabachnick, & Fidel, 1996). However, some scholars argue that there are several deficits of applying the comparison paradigm in evaluating customers' satisfaction. For example, if one's expectations are decreased, his or her satisfaction will increase, in this way, even a poor travel experience could make one satisfied as he or she expected poor performance (Petrick & Backman, 2002). It is unnecessary to include the disconfirmation process as a variable in the measurement of satisfaction in that satisfaction can be related to the performance evaluations alone (Westbrook & Oliver, 1991). Therefore, in the current study, satisfaction will be measured as performance, without measuring the mismatch between the pre- and the post-purchasing perceptions.

Motivation

Tourism has been widely considered as a social psychological experience which includes the individual's cognitions and feelings about the trip that has been taken. Motivation is one of the central concepts in attempts to understand tourists' perceptions due to its function of arousing, directing and integrating travel behavior which is expected to produce personal satisfaction (Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991). The tourism literature has long recognized that tourists' motivations tend to be multi-dimensional (Crompton, 1979). Many studies have applied motivation theories in various forms of tourism to find out what the corresponding dominant and less dominant motivational factors are in different scenarios, such as sightseeing (Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991), festival events (Formica & Uyal, 1998), and ecotourism (Brown, 2005). The relationship between motivation and other variables, such as the destination image, satisfaction, affective component, and environmental values (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999), have been explored with different conceptual models and statistical analysis. In this paper, we compared tourists' motives between sites and events in attempts to find out how these two nuclei meet tourists' different motives.

Perceived Benefits

Benefit has been suggested by past researches as an important antecedent of satisfaction and behavioral intention (Dodds, Monroe, & Grewal, 1991). In the field of tourism, there is a lack of widely accepted definition of benefit. Generally speaking, the various definitions of benefit can be generalized into two main perspectives—the motivation which is able to facilitate the desired psychological benefit outcomes (Crompton, 1979; Formica & Uysal, 1998) and the perception which is defined as tourists' rating of desired amenities, service, and activities (Tian, Crompton, & Witt, 1996). Studies have been done on benefits from the economic point of view and the perspective of market segmentation, and most of them are more or less business-dimension oriented. However, the human-dimension benefits, which might be useful in facilitating personal development and enhancing social capitals, have been ignored. In this paper, after slightly adapting McIntosh's (1999) definition, we define benefits as the positive psychological outcomes of experience which are perceived as important by tourists themselves. The outputs gained may also be implied as beneficial to society, groups, as well as the individual. This study aims to analyze tourists' benefits from perspective of their own perceptions and explores the contributions of different attraction nuclei to visitors' benefits.

Demographic Characteristics of Cultural Heritage Tourists

Tourists' demographic profile has been widely explored based on various tourist attractions and/or their nationalities (Formica & Uysal, 1996). Studying tourists' socio-demographic characteristics could help to better understand their role in the attraction system (Richards, 2002), to achieve more effective development and marketing of cultural tourism (Craik, 1997), and to learn more about how the destination image is formed with the effect of personal characteristics which are able to influence people's cognition of external stimuli

(Stern & Krakover, 1993). Generally speaking, cultural tourists tend to be middle-aged, married with older children, highly educated, full-time employed with good income, and higher social-class (Craik, 1997; Hall & Zeppel, 1990). Yet, socio-demographic characteristics alone cannot offer a salient picture of tourists and the findings have proven to be so self-evident that they are of little help for explaining or predicting behavioral tendencies (Chandler & Costello, 2002). Travel pattern is another important component to understand tourists' characteristics and thus is able to offer references for destination marketing and program design, and to help understand the attributes of different attraction nuclei.

Travel Patterns of Cultural Heritage Tourists

Travel pattern has been studied from the perspectives of cross-culture (Sussmann & Rashcovsky, 1997), multi-destination (Tideswell & Faulkner, 1999), and life cycle (Oppermann, 1995). This paper attempts to compare several travel patterns to understand how differently people behave in sites and events in terms of accommodation, transportation, information resource, marker use, travel party, geographic origin, repeated visit, and expenditure. The marker includes three types: generating marker (the information received before going to a nucleus), transit marker (the information found along an itinerary path leading the nucleus to which it refers), and contiguous marker (the information at the nucleus to which they refer) (Leiper, 1990).

Research Methods

Sampling and Data Collection

This study was a cooperative effort between the Arizona Office of Tourism, the Arizona Humanities Council and Arizona State University. Diverse geographic locations and sites with high enough visitation were considered to gather an adequate number of questionnaires. A total of sixteen cultural attraction sites and three cultural events were included. The target sample size was 200 at each site. For the sites, data collection was conducted so that twenty random survey days were selected throughout the year with ten prospective respondents as the daily target for sampling. At the events, participants were selected randomly for the study during the event. In addition to the on-site survey, a mail survey was also conducted. On-site questionnaires were one page and completed at the venue, then prospective respondents were given a mail-back questionnaire to take home and send in at a later time. Reminder postcards were sent to the homes of non-respondents about two weeks after the initial contact. For those who still had not returned the mail-back questionnaire after another two weeks, a second questionnaire with a cover letter and reply envelope were sent. A total of 4,015 visitors were contacted with a response rate of 48% for a final sample of 1,938. Since the whole survey included different types of cultural travel activities in Arizona, such as attending the theater or concerts, in this paper, we only focus on the tourists whose primary activity was either visiting heritage sites or attending cultural events, with a final sample of 1,351.

Measurement

The questionnaire included several sections. Section one asked respondents about their perceptions and travel patterns during their trip in Arizona. The second section included questions about socio-demographic information of respondents. To measure satisfaction, three items were used including tourists' general satisfaction and satisfaction with the variety/quality of cultural, historic and heritage attractions in Arizona. These items were measured on a Likert-type scale (1=*not satisfied* to 5=*extremely satisfied*). *Motivation* was measured by asking how important was each reason to the decision to travel to Arizona (1=*not important* to 5=*extremely important*). A total of fifteen motives, which refer to aspects of nature, culture, physical activity, environment, relaxation, escape, and enjoyment, were included. Based on the importance-performance analysis framework (IPA), Brown, Raphael, and Renwick's (1999), and Andereck and Nyaupane's (in press) measurement of Quality of Life (QOL), this paper measured *perceived benefit* by incorporating two variables, importance and achievement. The rationale behind this is that people consider the outcome as beneficial only when they value the attribute. This method has been previously used by Brown, Raphael, and Renwick (1998) and modified by Andereck and Nyaupane (2010) to measure Tourism Quality of Life (TQOL) (Table1).

Table 1. Calculation of Perceived Benefits Using Importance and Satisfaction.

Imp	Ach	Perceived Benefits (Brown, Raphael, & Renwick's Calculation)	Perceived Benefits (Andereck &Nyaupane's Calculation)	Imp	Ach	Perceived Benefits (Brown, Raphael, & Renwick's Calculation)	Perceived Benefits (Andereck &Nyaupane's Calculation)
5	5	10	20	3	5	6	16
	4	5	15		4	3	13
	3	0	10		3	0	10
	2	-5	5		2	-3	7
	1	-10	0		1	-6	4
4	5	8	18	2	5	4	14
	4	4	14		4	2	12
	3	0	10		3	0	10
	2	-4	6		2	-2	8
	1	-8	2		1	-4	6
				1	5	2	12
					4	1	11
					3	0	10
					2	-1	9
					1	-2	8

Adapted from Andereck and Nyaupane in press, p.5.

Findings

To compare the two groups with respect to visitors' perceptions towards the travel experience at both sites and events, a series of *t*-tests were conducted (Table2). Comparison of these groups in terms of satisfaction showed that while there was not much difference in the perception of the variety and quality of heritage attractions in Arizona between site visitors and event goers, the general satisfaction levels about their Arizona trip were significantly different among these two groups ($p < .05$). Site visitors tended to be more satisfied ($M=4.12$) with their trips to Arizona in general than were event goers ($M=3.96$) ($t=2.507$).

Table2. Mean Differences between Satisfaction of Tourists in Sites and Events.

Satisfaction	Sites	Events	<i>t</i> -Value	2-Tail Sig.
My visit to Arizona in general	4.12	3.96	2.507	.012
The VARIETY of cultural, historic and heritage attractions in Arizona	3.94	3.87	.966	.334
The QUALITY of cultural, historic and heritage attractions in Arizona	3.96	3.87	1.279	.201

A principal component factor analysis was used to classify the underlying dimensions of motives. The calculation of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistics was .881, indicating that the data seemed very suitable for factor analysis. While fourteen items loaded saliently on two factors with eigenvalues greater than one which explained 53.764% of the total variance, the item "do many different things/activities" did not load very well with any of the domains, and thus was excluded. The two domains are: (1) *natural, cultural, and physical attractions*, which includes seven items related to the motives to view the nature, experience the culture, and be physically active; (2) *relaxation, escape, and social relationships*, which includes seven items related to relaxation, escaping from daily life, and enhancing their social relationships. Chronbach's α of these two factors were .875 and .805, indicating the measurement had satisfactory reliability. An independent sample *t*-test was then carried out on factor items as well as each individual item to determine whether the site visitors and the event goers were significantly different in terms of motives (Table 4). While site visitors appeared to be

more motivated by cultural, natural, and physical motives ($t=5.325$), event goers tended to visit mainly for relaxation, escape, and social motives ($t=-2.614$).

Table3. Factor Analysis of Motivations Domains.

Domains	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
<i>Factor 1: Cultural, Natural, and Physical Attraction (CNPA)</i>			
See interesting sights	.795		
View scenery	.781		
Experience new and different places	.774		
Experience nature	.773		
Learn about AZ history/culture	.726		
Experience other cultures	.634		
Be physically active	.615		
$\alpha=.875$		5.716	30.269
<i>Factor 2: Relaxation, Escape, and Social Attraction (RESA)</i>			
Take it easy/rest/relax	.816		
Get away from everyday life	.776		
Have fun	.652		
For the nice weather	.625		
For excitement/adventure	.573		
Be entertained	.556		
Spend time with family/friends	.531		
$\alpha=.805$		1.811	23.495
<i>Excluded Variables</i>			
Do many different things/activities			

1= not important, 5=extremely important. KMO=.881. Barlett's test of sphericity $p<.000$

Table4. Mean Differences between Motivations of Tourists in Sites and Events.

Motivations	Sites	Events	t -Value	2-Tail Sig.
<i>Factor1: Cultural, Natural, and Physical Attraction (CNPA)</i>				
Attraction (CNPA)	3.41	2.98	5.325	.000
See interesting sights	3.90	3.29	5.911	.000
View scenery	3.83	2.79	9.123	.000
Experience new and different places	3.55	2.90	6.264	.000
Experience nature	3.34	2.55	7.171	.000
Learn about AZ history/culture	3.31	3.14	1.715	.087
Experience other cultures	3.14	3.78	-6.981	.000
Be physically active	2.89	2.68	1.920	.055
<i>Factor 2: Relaxation, Escape, and Social Attraction (RESA)</i>				
Attraction (RESA)	3.28	3.48	-2.614	.009
Take it easy/rest/relax	3.41	3.58	-1.584	.113
Get away from everyday life	3.45	3.50	-.409	.682

Have fun	3.94	4.06	-1.357	.175
For the nice weather	3.09	3.28	-1.634	.102
For excitement/adventure	2.98	2.83	1.270	.204
Be entertained	2.63	3.56	-8.720	.000
Spend time with family/friends	3.60	3.70	-.775	.439

Visitors were asked to rate how important various benefit items were to their visit, and the extent to which they were able to achieve these items by visiting the sites or attending the events. A principal component factor analysis was then conducted to identify major domains of perceived benefits. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin statistic was .910, suggesting the data was good for factor analysis. Two factors that emerged from the perceived benefits were 'cultural benefits' and 'social benefits', explaining 37.841% and 27.114% of the total variance, respectively. Chronbach's α of these two factors were .926 and .826 respectively, indicating the measurement had satisfactory reliability. The results of the independent sample *t*-tests suggested that the site visitors tended to receive significantly more cultural benefits ($M_1=13.74$, $M_2=13.42$) and less social benefits ($M_1=12.77$, $M_2=13.49$) than the event goers. However, the difference of cultural benefits was not significant at 0.05 level. Within the cultural-benefit domain, while there was no significant difference between the site visitors and the event goers on most items, the items of "Learned more about the area's culture/history/ heritage" and "Enhanced the visit to Arizona" were the exceptions. It seems that the cultural sites offer more cultural learning opportunities to visitors and better enhance their visit to Arizona. In the domain of social benefits, while events were able to bring more social benefits for visitors than sites on most items, there was not much difference in the item of "Appealed to the whole family/group."

Table5. Factor Analysis of Perceived Benefits Domains.

Domains	Factor Loadings	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained
<i>Factor1: Cultural Benefits</i>			
Learned more about the area's culture/history/ heritage	.906		
Experienced a quality cultural heritage attraction	.853		
Increased appreciation of the area's culture/ history/heritage	.851		
Had a significant cultural learning experience	.813		
Felt "connected" to Arizona's cultural heritage	.783		
Enhanced the visit to Arizona	.687		
$\alpha=.926$		6.136	37.841
<i>Factor2: Social Benefits</i>			
Enhanced family relationships	.825		
Contributed to a fulfilling lifestyle	.787		
Contributed to my quality of life	.652		
Enhanced relationships with my friends	.643		
Had fun/Enjoyed the visit	.610		
Appealed to the whole family/group	.587		
$\alpha=.826$		1.659	27.114

1= Strongly disagree, 5=Strongly agree. KMO=.910. Barlett's test of sphericity $p<.000$

Table6. Mean Differences between Perceived Benefits of Tourists in Sites and Events (t-test).

Perceived Benefits	Sites	Events	t-Value	2-Tail Sig.
<i>Factor1: Cultural Benefits</i>				
Learned more about the area's culture/history/ heritage	13.74	13.42	1.201	.230
	14.34	13.47	3.018	.003

Experienced a quality cultural heritage attraction	13.71	14.13	-1.464	.143
Increased appreciation of the area's culture/history/heritage	14.24	13.83	1.466	.143
Had a significant cultural learning experience	13.46	13.14	1.084	.279
Felt "connected" to Arizona's cultural heritage	12.81	13.12	-1.037	.300
Enhanced the visit to Arizona	13.74	12.65	3.701	.000
$\alpha = .926$				
<i>Factor2: Social Benefits</i>	12.77	13.49	-3.276	.001
Enhanced family relationships	12.40	13.18	-2.497	.013
Contributed to a fulfilling lifestyle	12.24	13.31	-3.970	.000
Contributed to my quality of life	12.45	13.33	-3.180	.002
Enhanced relationships with my friends	11.89	12.71	-2.685	.007
Had fun/Enjoyed the visit	14.72	15.60	-3.067	.003
Appealed to the whole family/group	13.38	13.22	.525	.600
$\alpha = .826$				

A series of Chi-square tests were conducted to compare two groups of people based on socio-demographic variables. The results indicated that site visitors and event goers were similar for most demographic variables, including gender, age, number of children, education, and household income. However, they were significantly different in terms of relationship status and employment status. For both nuclei, there were slightly more female visitors than male visitors. More than 70% of site visitors as well as event goers were older than 46 and the former were slightly older than the latter. Most visitors at both sites and events had a spouse/partner; however, the proportion of the former was significantly greater than that of the latter ($P_1=83.3\%$, $P_2=74.5\%$, $\chi^2=7.642$). For both groups of people, more than 80% did not have children who were under 18, yet we cannot be sure whether most of visitors had older children or do not have children. For both groups, more than 80% of visitors had 'some college/tech school', 'four year degree', or 'master degree', suggesting that the high-educated people were the primary market for heritage tourism. Approximately 70% of both groups had US\$50,000 or higher income, revealing that high income group was more likely to participate in cultural tourism. All of these findings support past research, which suggests that cultural tourists tend to be female, mature, highly educated, wealthy, and in a relationship and/or married (Craik, 1997; Light, 1996; Urry, 1994). These demographic similarities may be a result of the homogeneous characteristics that are shared by the destinations themselves (Chandler & Costello, 2002). In addition, as most visitors were middle and older aged with higher income, we would expect that they have life partners and have the financial ability for travelling which could be consistent with their education level. In terms of employment status, interestingly, there were significantly more full-time employees and less retirees at events than sites ($\chi^2=19.039$). This is perhaps because the crowded surroundings and the temporary facilities, which are usually lower quality at events, were not favored by retirees who may be more concerned with the issues of convenience and safety.

Table 7. Socio-Demographics by Two Groups of Visitors (%).

Socio-Demographics Items	Site	Event	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Gender			2.863	.091
Male	39	32.1		
Female	61	67.9		
Age			7.127	.068
30 and younger	4.9	6.8		
31-45	15.7	21		
46-60	38.8	41.4		
older than 60	40.7	30.9		
Relationship Status			7.642	.006

Have a spouse/partner	83.3	74.5		
Do not have a spouse/partner	16.7	25.5		
Number of Children			2.438	.295
No under 18 years old children	82.2	83.3		
one or more under 18 years old children	7.1	9.3		
Education Level			9.852	.080
Less than high school	0.6	1.2		
High school graduate	9.9	8.5		
Some college/tech school	28.9	39.4		
Four year degree	32.6	27.3		
Masters degree	21.7	16.4		
Doctoral degree	6.3	7.3		
Employment Status			19.039	.002
Employed full time	41.1	53.8		
Employed part time	12.3	10		
Full time student	2.2	1.9		
Retired	43	30.6		
Homemaker	8.1	9.4		
Household Income			2.135	.830
\$25,000 or less	8	10.3		
\$25,001-50,000	22.2	21.4		
\$50,001-75,000	25.8	23.4		
\$75,001-100,000	20.4	22.8		
\$100,001-125,000	10.4	8.3		
\$125,001 or more	13.3	13.8		

To test whether significant differences exist in travel patterns between site visitors and event goers, chi-square and *t*-tests were carried out. However, there was no significant difference in the aspect of accommodation types. Resorts appeared to be the primary choice for both groups (54.6% and 53.4% respectively) and other private homes were the second option (28.1% and 34.5%, respectively). The results showed that site visitors and event goers were not significantly different in terms of the transportation. Own vehicle (not RV) and rental vehicle (not RV) ranked as top two choices for both groups. Table 8 reports that there was significant difference between these two groups in terms of the use of information source ($\chi^2=275.556$, $p<.001$). When compared to event goers, site visitors tended to make their travel decision more based on the information of their own past travel experiences in Arizona (61.9% and 46.9% respectively) and information from friends or family members (50.0% and 34.0% respectively), meanwhile, event goers relied on the information from newspaper articles more than site visitors (50.3% and 9.6% respectively). The results of marker use further reveal that while site visitors made their travel decisions on-and-off site with similar probability (36.1% for the day of the visit, 31.2% for earlier during the Arizona trip), event goers preferred to use generating marker which refers to making the decision before leaving home (60.5%). Thus the pattern of marker use was significantly different between site visitors and event goers ($\chi^2=13.858$, $p<.001$). This could be in part because the full-time employees who are the majority of event goers, tended to make their schedules, including travel plans, in advance. Also, they might be better at searching for travel information with mass media, especially the Internet, than the retired people who are the most dominant group of site visitors. No significant difference was found in the aspect of travel party between two groups. Regarding to the geographic origin, the distribution of out-of-state and in-state tourists was similar in cultural sites (53.7% and 46.3% respectively). However, the majority (80.9%) of the event goers in Arizona were in-state tourists ($\chi^2=55.473$, $p<.001$). The information sources which cover primarily local areas, could be one of the most important reasons that events tended to have a particular appeal to the people who lived nearby. While at attraction sites, most tourists were the first-time visitor (75.3%), at

events, the number of the repeated visitors was slightly more than that of the first-time visitors (52.1% and 47.9% respectively, $\chi^2=54.091$, $p<.001$). Respondents were asked to estimate how much they spent during the trip in Arizona in several categories. The t -test indicated that the total money spent on visiting sites was significantly more than on attending the events ($M_1=US\$881.14$, $M_2=US\$398.52$, $t=7.517$).

Table8. Travel Patterns by Two Groups of Visitors (%).

Travel Patterns	Site	Event	χ^2	p
Accommodation			10.297	.245
Resort	54.6	53.4		
RV/Mobile home park	10.9	6.9		
Campground	7.2	1.7		
Bed and breakfast	4.7	1.7		
Dude/Guest ranch	0.6	1.7		
Time share/2nd home	8.6	6.9		
Other private home	28.1	34.5		
Transportation			6.534	.479
Own vehicle (not RV)	44.2	54.8		
Rental vehicle (not RV)	48.3	41.9		
Own RV	8.4	0		
Rental RV	0.8	0		
Commercial airplane	2.5	0		
Motorcoach or bus	2.6	3.2		
Train	2.5	0		
Information Resource			275.556	.000
My own past travel experiences in Arizona	61.9	46.9		
Information from friends or family members	50	34		
Arizona Highways Magazine	12.8	2.7		
An article from another magazine	5	4.1		
An article from a newspaper	9.6	50.3		
A television story or program	3.1	3.4		
Travel agent	1.5	0		
Travel information packet from the Arizona Office of Tour	6.4	0		
Information from a convention and visitors' bureau	5.5	2.7		
Motor club (AAA, Mobil, etc.)	13.5	1.4		
Arizona Office of Tourism's web site	6.2	0.7		
Arizona History Traveler/Arizona Heritage Traveler webs	2.6	0		
Other web site(s)	16.4	8.2		
Travel book purchased from a book store	8.7	0		
Marker Use			13.858	.001
The day of the visit (Contiguous marker)	36.1	13.2		
Earlier during my AZ trip (Transit marker)	31.2	26.3		
Before leaving home (Generating marker)	32.7	60.5		
Travel Party			13.284	.102
Traveled alone	9.6	12.6		
Spouse/partner	67.2	58.7		
Your child(ren)	17.5	13.2		

Your parent(s)	6	7.8		
Your grandchild(ren)	3.4	1.2		
Other relatives	12	11.4		
Friend(s)	20.7	25.1		
Business associates	1.1	0.6		
Geographic Origin			55.473	.000
States	Site	Event		
Out-of-state	53.7	19.1		
In state	46.3	80.9		
Repeated Visit			54.091	.000
Repeated Visitor	24.7	52.1		
First-time Visitor	75.3	47.9		
Expenditure			7.517	.000
Total Spending	881.14	398.52		

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings of this study suggest that while the tourists visiting heritage sites and cultural events are not statistically different in most of the demographic variables (gender, age, number of children, education, household income) and some travel patterns (accommodation type, transportation mode, travel party), there are several significant differences in tourists' perceptions (satisfaction, motivation, and perceived social benefits), some socio-demographic characteristics (relationship status and employment status), and several travel patterns (information source, marker use, repeated visit, geographic origin, expenditure). Heritage sites meet visitors' needs for the 'cultural, natural, and physical experience' and can offer more opportunities for people to learn local culture and history comprehensively. Cultural events are able to attract tourists who seek 'escape and relaxation', to provide opportunities for people to enhance their social relations, and to relax themselves. Therefore, cultural sites and events seem to be heterogeneous in bringing people psychological results and shaping some travel patterns, yet they are homogenous in that their target market shares most socio-demographic characteristics and some travel patterns.

Most comparative studies about tourists have been conducted from perspectives of differences of either places, activities or groups in terms of satisfaction, motivation, travel patterns, socio-demographic characteristics, and perception of environmental impact (Baysan, 2001; Field, 1999; Joppe, Martin, & Waalen, 2001; Kozak, 2002; Light, 1996; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001). Although both place/activity-based and group-based studies can offer comprehensive profiles and characteristics of tourists, most studies focus on only one or a few constructs and thus appear to be insufficient to provide a deep understanding of who they are, why they chose a specific place, how they travel, and what their benefits are. This paper contributes to current studies in terms of providing thorough and comparative analysis of tourists at both cultural sites and events, and thus offers a cognitive lens to understand the differences between sites and events, which are two major nuclei of the cultural attraction. As well, this paper has conducted a new measurement method for investigating tourists' perceived benefits via combining two variables of importance and achievement which reflects the rationale that people consider the outcome as beneficial only when they think of it as valuable.

The comparison can provide information for destination managers and policy makers to improve the quality of tourism products and develop the local cultural tourism industry better in Arizona and elsewhere. For example, the study reveals that cultural site tourists were less motivated by relaxation, escape, and social considerations. Especially, they did not think the sites could meet their needs of 'being entertained', which was a main motive of attending events. It could in part because the image of heritage attractions is generally related to 'education', 'learning', and 'knowledge' which might be less attractive to young travelers who prefer novel and interesting activities. Managers should consider how to design the tourism products in a creative way which could offer

people the special travel experience of being entertained through learning. In contrast, events appeared to be less competitive in terms of 'cultural, natural, and physical attraction'. Adding more cultural and educational elements into event products and making event tourism more meaningful can help to attract and satisfy the needs of cultural site visitors and event goers both. In addition, the study reveals that site visitors received less social benefits from their trips. Hence, attraction sites need to consider establishing more collective activities in cultural attractions so that visitors' social relations with their family and/or friends can be enhanced through the interaction. Further, although the major market of cultural tourism is middle-aged people with good income, more efforts are needed to reach out to younger people, especially students. It cannot only be useful for building cultural capital through learning history and culture, but also for enhancing the cultural awareness of young people who are the leaders for the next generation. It is extremely important for cultural conservation and historical protection as previous experience of visiting a cultural/historic place is most likely to make a difference in people's attitude, awareness, criteria for preservation, and perceptions towards the cultural/historic site (Nyaupane & Timothy, 2010). Finally, the fact that the most event goers were from Arizona could suggest that events are able to foster links and relations between heritage tourism and its local community. However, it might be the result of information sources as well. From a marketing perspective, if event organizers would like to attract more visitors from other states, several nationwide promotion channels should be adopted, such as social media and national promotion outlets.

References

- Andereck, K. L., & Nyaupane, G. P. (in press). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 1-13.
- Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. W. (1999). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(4), 868-897.
- Baysan, S. (2001). Perceptions of the environmental impact of tourism: a comparative study of the attitudes of German, Russian, and Turkish tourists in Kemer, Antalya. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(2), 218-235.
- Bendix, R. (1989). Tourism and cultural displays inventing traditions for whom? *Journal of American Folklore*, 102(404), 131-146.
- Brown, S. (2005). Travelling with a purpose: Understanding the motives and benefits of volunteer vacationers. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 8(6), 479-496.
- Brown, I., D. Raphael, and R. Renwick (1998). Quality of Life Profile Item #2. Toronto, Canada: Quality of Life Research Unit, Center for Health Promotion, University of Toronto.
- Chandler, J. A., & Costello, C. A. (2002). A Profile of Visitors at Heritage Tourism Destinations in East Tennessee according to Plog's Lifestyle and Activity Level Preferences Model. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(2), 161-166.
- Chaudhary, M. (2000). India's image as a tourist destination--a perspective of foreign tourists. *Tourism Management*, 21(3), 293-297.
- Craik, J. (1997) 'The Culture of Tourism', pp. 113-36 in C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds). *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., & Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, part I: Item generation and purification of the measure. *Event Management*, 7(1), 11-24.
- Dodds, W. B., Monroe, K. B., & Grewal, D. (1991). Effects of price, brand, and store information on buyers' product evaluations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28(3), 307-319.
- Dunn Ross, E. L., & Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1991). Sightseeing tourists' motivation and satisfaction. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(2), 226-237.
- Erevelles, S., & Leavitt, C. (1992). A comparison of current models of consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 5(10), 104-114.
- Fakeye, P. C., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the lower Rio Grande valley. *Journal of Travel Research*, 30(2), 10-16.
- Field, A.M.(1999). The college student market segment: a comparative study of travel behaviors of international and demostic students at a southeastern university. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(4), 375-381.

- Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (2006). Destination attractiveness based on supply and demand evaluations: An analytical framework. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(4), 418-430.
- Gunn, C. A. (1988). *Vacationscape: Designing tourist regions* Van Nostrand Reinhold New York.
- Hall, C. M., & Zeppel, H. (1990). History, architecture, environment: Cultural heritage and tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(2), 54-55.
- Hollinshead, K. (1996). Historical tourism in the age of historical amnesia. *World's Eye View on Hospitality Trend*, 5(2), 15-19.
- Leiper, N. (1990). Tourist attraction systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17(3), 367-384.
- Lew, A. A. (1987). A framework of tourist attraction research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14(4), 553-575.
- Light, D. (1996). Characteristics of the audience for 'events' at a heritage site. *Tourism Management*, 17(3), 183-190.
- MacCannell, D. (1976). The tourist: A new theory of the leisure class. *New York: Schocken Books*.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- Master, H., & Prideaux, B. (2000). Culture and vacation satisfaction: A study of Taiwanese tourists in south east Queensland. *Tourism Management*, 21(5), 445-449.
- McIntosh, A. J. (1999). Into the tourist's mind: Understanding the value of the heritage experience. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 8(1), 41-64.
- Nicholson, R. E. & Pearce, D. G. (2001). Why do people attend events: a comparative analysis of visitor motivations at four south island events. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39 (4), 449-460.
- Nyaupane, G. P., & Timothy, D. J. (2010). Heritage awareness and appreciation among community residents: Perspectives from Arizona, USA. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16(3), 225-239.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460-469.
- Oppermann, M. (1998). Destination threshold potential and the law of repeat visitation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 131-137.
- Petrick, J. F. (2004). The roles of quality, value, and satisfaction in predicting cruise passengers' behavioral intentions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42(4), 397-407.
- Petrick, J. F., & Backman, S. J. (2002). An examination of the determinants of golf travelers' satisfaction. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(3), 252-258.
- Pizam, A., Uriely, N., & Reichel, A. (2000). The intensity of tourist-host social relationship and its effects on satisfaction and change of attitudes: The case of working tourists in Israel. *Tourism Management*, 21(4), 395-406.
- Richards, G. (2002). Tourism attraction systems: Exploring cultural behavior. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(4), 1048-1064.
- Stern, E., & Krakover, S. (1993). The formation of a composite urban image. *Geographical Analysis*, 25(2), 130-146.
- Sussmann, S., & Rashcovsky, C. (1997). A cross-cultural analysis of English and French Canadian's vacation travel patterns. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 16(2), 191-208.
- Tian, S., Crompton, J. L., & Witt, P. A. (1996). Integrating constraints and benefits to identify responsive target markets for museum attractions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 35(2), 34-45.
- Tideswell, C. & Faulkner, B. (1999). Multidestination Travel Patterns of International Visitors to Queensland. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(4), 364-374.
- Urry, J. (1994). Cultural change and contemporary tourism. *Leisure Studies*, 13(4), 233-238.
- Westbrook, R. A., & Oliver, R. L. (1991). The dimensionality of consumption emotion patterns and consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(1), 84-91.