

revista de ANÁLISIS TURÍSTICO



AECIT
ASOCIACIÓN ESPAÑOLA DE
EXPERTOS CIENTÍFICOS EN TURISMO

Segundo semestre de 2006

Núm. 2

SUMARIO

AGUA Y TURISMO

Enrique Torres Bernier

ARTÍCULOS

“Impacto de las instalaciones sobre el desempeño del sector hotelero español”

Enrique Claver Cortés, Jorge Pereira Moliner y Rosario Andreu Guerrero

“Segmenting future visitors to heritage sites: perceptions, motivations and expectations”

Avital Biran, Yaniv Poria y Arie Reichel

“El desempeño de un destino turístico. ¿Quién gestiona el destino?

¿Quién realiza el rol auditor?”

Angelo Presenza

“¿Qué indica un indicador? Análisis comparativo en los destinos turísticos”

Amparo Sancho Pérez y Gregorio García Mesanat

“Turismo e historia: formación e información en el turismo. Un estado de la cuestión”

Nuria Morère Molinero

DEBATE

“¿Está la investigación en turismo suficientemente reconocida y valorada en España?”

Juan Ignacio Pulido Fernández (coord.)

NOTA

“Actividad investigadora de los socios de AECIT”

Amparo Sancho Pérez

RESEÑA

HUGHES, Edward. “Arts, Entertainment and Tourism”

Editorial Butterworth Heinemann, 2000

Robert Valls Tuñón



REVISTA DE ANÁLISIS TURÍSTICO, nº 2, 2º semestre 2006, pp. 21-41

SEGMENTING FUTURE VISITORS TO HERITAGE SITES: PERCEPTIONS, MOTIVATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

Avital Biran

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Yaniv Poria

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Arie Reichel

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Revista de Análisis Turístico

ISSN: 1885-2564 Depósito Legal: B-39009

©2006 Asociación Española de Expertos Científicos en Turismo (AECIT)

www.aecit.org email: analisisTurístico@aecit.org

SEGMENTING FUTURE VISITORS TO HERITAGE SITES: PERCEPTIONS, MOTIVATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS¹

Biran, A.

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev,
Department of Hotel and Tourism Management
birana@bgu.ac.il

Poria, Y.

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev,
Department of Hotel and Tourism Management
yporia@som.bgu.ac.il

Reichel, A.

Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, The School of Management
arier@som.bgu.ac.il

abstract

This study attempts to explore the significance of visitors' perceptions of a site in relation to their own heritage as an important factor for understanding tourist behaviour and for the management of heritage settings. The Anne Frank House in Amsterdam, The Netherlands was chosen as the focus of the current research, which is composed of two field studies. The first, relates to tourists who have already made a decision to visit and was conducted at the entrance line to the site. The second field study, conducted on different locations in Amsterdam, referred to potential visitors (has not yet decided to visit the site). The results indicate that the individual's perception of the site in relation to his/her own heritage is a key factor in understanding both motivation to visit and expectations of the interpretation provided. Implications of the findings for researchers and practice are presented.

Key words: Anne Frank House, Heritage, Interpretation, Motivation, Perception.

resumen

Este estudio trata de explorar el significado que nace de la relación entre la percepción que tiene un visitante de su destino y el propio patrimonio del visitante como factor clave para entender el comportamiento turístico y para poder administrar los distintos destinos turísticos. La Casa de Anna Frank, en Ámsterdam (Holanda), fue escogida como el centro de dicho estudio, que se basa en dos líneas de trabajo: La primera, enfocada en la conducta de aquellos turistas que visitaron este destino que previamente ya habían escogido. La segunda, centrada en diferentes lugares de Ámsterdam visitados por aquellos turistas potenciales que no habían decidido su destino específico. El resultado indica que la relación entre las percepciones individuales ante un destino y el propio lugar de origen de dichos individuos es el factor determinante para entender, por una parte, la motivación de visitar un lugar y, por otra, las expectativas que aparecen de esta interpretación.

Palabras clave: Anne Frank House, Patrimonio, Interpretación, Motivación, Percepción.

1. This paper was presented at: *The Third International Doctoral Tourism and Leisure Colloquium ESADE*, Barcelona, Spain, May 2005.
2. The paper is based partially on two studies that have recently been published:
 - Poria, Y., Reichel, A. and Biran, A. (2006a). Heritage Site Management: Motivations and Expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30 (1), 162-178.
 - Poria, Y., Reichel, A. and Biran, A. (2006b). The Relationships between Perception of the Site and the Motivations to Visit amongst Potential Visitors to Heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43 (1), 1-9.

1. introduction

Heritage tourism is considered to be the main and fastest growing component of the tourism industry today (Alzua et al. 1998). Currently, researchers and practitioners in the field of heritage tourism management commonly ignore the link between the individual and the heritage presented (Apostolakis 2003). Moreover, while understanding visitors' motivations and preferences is a key element in designing the tourists' experience, (Reynolds 1999; Sharples et al. 1999), the current studies in the field of heritage management usually ignore these topics (Goulding 1999).

In contrast to the supply-side perspective, and in line with the "experientially based" approach (Apostolakis 2003:799) to the understanding of visitors' behaviour, this paper contends that comprehending visitors' perception of the heritage presented could be beneficial to the segmentation of visitors to heritage settings. This type of segmenting could be significant to heritage tourism management, since it may be relevant to the understanding of tourists' motivations and behaviour at heritage settings.

The current paper investigates the relationships between the visitors, the heritage presented, and tourists' behaviours of significance to heritage site management. In particular, it aims to explore the link between visitors' perceptions of the site in relation to their own heritage, and motivations for the visit. Additionally, the study explores the relationship between visitors' perception of the site as part of their own heritage, and their expectations of on-site interpretation, a major component in heritage sites management (Ashworth 1998). Finally, an attempt was made to provide a deeper understanding of the notions suggested by investigating the link between visitors' perception and their behaviours in different contexts: 1) among tourists who already decided to visit a particular site, and 2) among potential visitors (latent demand). As such, the paper attempts to integrate findings from two previous studies (Poria et al. 2005a, 2005b).

2. literature review

There have been several attempts to define and explain heritage tourism in the literature (Apostolakis 2003). According to Timothy and

Boyd (2003) there are two main approaches that address the definition of "heritage tourism". The first emphasises the presence of the individual in spaces exhibiting historic artefacts, or at sites classified as heritage spaces (e.g. Garrod and Fyall 2000). The second approach, (adopted in this study), emphasises the link between the individual and the heritage presented (Apostolakis 2003). This approach originates from environmental psychology and human geography studies which point to the perception of a space by the individual as a key factor in understanding human behaviour within that space (Jones 2000).

The fact that the same historic artefact or space is perceived differently by different people can not be ignored. Ashworth (1998), for example, highlighted this point and suggested that individuals perceive and encounter heritage spaces in different ways based on their own cultural background. Moreover, the heritage displayed may bring forth an emotional experience (Poria et al. 2004) or allow one to "feel connected to ancestors and ancestral roots" (McCain and Ray 2003:713). It seems that heritage attractions have different meanings for different individuals.

Relating the personal meanings assigned to the heritage presented, Poria et al. (2003a, 2003b, 2004) argued that tourists' perceptions are important for understanding visitors' behaviour at heritage sites. Their research emphasised the individual perception of the site as part of his own heritage, rather than the displayed heritage per se, as the core element of heritage tourism. They indicate that different individuals display diverse behaviours according to their perception of the site as part of (or not part of) their own personal heritage. However, the studies by Poria et al. are subject to a number of limitations. First, their studies included visitors after the visit took place. Clearly, this sampling is problematic when exploring pre-visit behaviours (e.g. motivations), as explored in Poria's said studies. Moreover, one of their concluding recommendations is that individual perceptions of the site should be investigated before the visit takes place. Second, their studies related to sites of religious significance (the Wailing Wall and Massada, Israel). Finally, the design of their studies relied on exciting literature only.

2.1 Motivations for heritage tourism

Understanding the motivations for a visit is an important theme in heritage tourism research

(Richards 2002). Various authors offer a wide range of reasons for visiting historic places. Shackley (2001), for example, argues that apart from worship, sacred historic sites are visited because they present great works of art, architectural merit, provide attractive settings and atmosphere, and "simply as part of a great day out" (2001:1). McCain and Ray (2003) identified the motives for engaging in genealogical endeavours- to search for information on or simply feel connected to ancestors and ancestral roots (i.e. legacy tourism). According to Uzzell (1996), the same historic site (battlefield) is visited for different reasons at various points in time. Visitors from one generation may come to pay homage and remember, while younger visitors may view it as a day trip or excursion.

Research into the motivation for visiting heritage sites is in itself subject to criticism. Firstly, such studies are often based on spaces classified as "heritage", but may have nothing to do with the individual's own heritage. As such, it is possible that some of the key motivations for visiting have not yet been fully explored. Secondly, a common assumption in "motivation studies" is that visits to heritage sites are perceived as recreational experiences occurring in a time frame perceived as leisure. It is argued here that studies based on recreation and leisure literature may ignore aspects relevant to the understanding of the individual's behaviour in heritage spaces. Examples such as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Auschwitz memorial site illustrate the need to study heritage sites in ways other than those based only on recreation and leisure concepts.

2.2 Interpretation of heritage settings

The interpretation provided at a heritage site is a key element in a tourist's experience, linked to his or her satisfaction with the visit (Ashworth 1998; Goulding 1999). The literature assigns to the interpretation at heritage settings three main objectives (Timothy and Boyd 2003). First, to educate and provide visitors with knowledge of the site. Second, to entertain. Third, to increase visitors' awareness of the need to preserve the heritage presented.

The definitions of the interpretation's goals provided by the literature raise two critical issues relevant to the current study. First, as reflected in the literature, a great deal of

attention, both by researchers and practitioners, is devoted to the interpretation in heritage settings as an educational experience. Since a visit to a heritage site is not merely a cognitive experience, interpretation aimed only to educate, provides visitors with only a partial understanding of the site (Uzzell and Ballantyne 1998). Relevant to this research is Uzzell and Ballantyne's suggestion that sites hold personal values, beliefs and memories for the visitor. These elements affect visitors' emotional reactions to the heritage presented and should be included by the interpretation provided. Despite the aforementioned, the emotional dimension is usually ignored by the interpretation provided at heritage settings. Second, by emphasizing the educational experience (e.g. Moscardo 1996; Light 1995) researchers and site managers perceive visitors as homogenous in their preferences and expectations. There is very limited research that examines the link between the visitor and the heritage presented. Specifically lacking are studies that explore visitors' expectations of the interpretation at heritage sites. Consequently, visitors' expectations have remained largely unknown until now (Prentice 1993). Nevertheless, few studies provide evidence that different people are interested in different kinds of interpretation. Stewart et al. (1998) distinguish four types of visitors based on the interpretive media they chose to use, and the type of information that interests them ("seekers", "stumpers", "shadowers" and "shunners"). Referring to the content of the interpretation, Sheriff (2003) notes that some would prefer an interpretation providing many facts- and perceived as more authentic- while others might prefer a more entertaining interpretation. Bruner (1996), who investigated visitors to Elmina Castle in Ghana, noticed that different visitors are interested in different aspects of the interpretation, according to the subjective meaning the site holds for them. For example, Dutch visitors prefer to hear about the period under Dutch rule and visit the Dutch cemetery, while British visitors are more interested in the colonial rule of the Gold Coast.

2.3 Research objectives

In an attempt to provide a better understanding of an individual's behaviour at heritage settings, three major research objectives have been defined: First, to explore the link between

visitors' perception of the site in relation to their own heritage and their motivations for the visit. In contrast to previous studies in which motivations for visiting heritage sites were explored following the visit, this study investigates motivations before the visit takes place. Moreover, the current study aspires to clarify both the specific reasons for the visit and the overall motivation for the visit, an element that has not yet been explored in the literature. In this context based on the studies conducted by Poria et al. (2003a, 2003b, 2004) it is hypothesised that visitors will differ in their overall motivation as well as their reasons for the visit based on their perception of the site as part of their own heritage. In the context of tourists' overall motivation, it is hypothesised that the more tourists perceive the site to be part of their own heritage, the greater their willingness to visit. Additionally, visitors who perceive the site to be part of their own heritage would be more motivated to visit the site in search of an emotional experience, in comparison to those who do not regard it as part of their own heritage.

In the context of on-site interpretation, it is suggested that visitors will display different expectations of on-site interpretation according to their perceptions. Specifically, visitors who perceive the site as part of their own heritage will display a greater willingness for the interpretation to provide an emotional experience.

Finally, to develop a deeper understanding of visitors' behaviour the link between their perceptions and behaviour is investigated in two contexts: 1) among tourists who already decided to visit a particular site, and 2) among potential visitors (latent demand).

3. study methods

One of the key requirements of the study's location was that it should present a diversity of visitors. The Netherlands and Amsterdam in particular, are noted as cosmopolitan destinations and often featured in the tourism literature as historic spaces (Dahles 1998). The specific site chosen for the focus of the study is the Anne Frank House, in Amsterdam. At this site Anne Frank hid from the Nazis and wrote her diary about events surrounding her. Anne Frank was a German- Jewish teenager who went into hiding during the Holocaust. She and her family, along with four others, spent 25 months dur-

ing World War II in an annex of rooms above her father's office. Since its publication in 1947, Anne Frank's Diary has been translated into at least 67 languages, with over 31 million copies sold worldwide. On May 3rd, 1960, the "Anne Frank House" opened its doors as a museum. The museum is now considered one of the most famous heritage sites in Amsterdam. (In 2003 more than 900,000 people visited the site (<http://www.annefrank.org>)).

The study was conducted in two stages: first, a qualitative research approach was implemented, the purpose of which was to discover tourists' motivations and expectations of on-site interpretation (in the general context of heritage setting and specifically to the Anne Frank House). This stage included 60 interviews conducted in The Netherlands and Israel. To obtain a variation of responses, interviews included people who had visited the Anne Frank House, and those who had not, but were familiar with the site. In these interviews, participants were asked to mention possible reasons for visiting the site and expectations of on-site interpretation. Next, a quantitative research approach was adopted. To obtain a diversity of responses and validation of the results, this stage was composed of two field studies (referred hereafter as Study 1, see Poria et al. 2006a, and Study 2, see Poria et al. 2006b).

4. study 1

To examine the above research objectives a questionnaire was designed. The questionnaire used on the first study opened with a series of questions about visitors' perception of the site in relation to their own heritage. These questions were based on previous studies (Poria et al. 2003a, 2003b, 2004). Another set of questions was concerned with the specific reasons for the visit and the overall motivation for the visit. The reasons listed were based on a literature review and the results of the exploratory study mentioned above. In addition, the questionnaire included questions about respondents' expectations concerning the nature of the interpretation provided. This section was largely based on the results of the interviews conducted as part of the exploratory study. Participants were provided with an even (i.e. six point) scale, as it was assumed that no neutral point existed in the context of these questions. Zero was utilized as an anchor based on its use in consumer behav-

our and psychology-related research, as equivalent for "nothing" or "not at all" (Schwarz et al. 1995). Finally, socio-demographic questions were also included in the questionnaire.

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews conducted by the author. The questionnaire was completed using systematic sampling (every N'th visitor was approached) while participants waited in line to enter the museum. The objective of the sampling strategy (a theoretical sample) was to ensure diversity of responses- which in turn enables generalization of the findings to other heritage sites. It is important that diversity be found in the perception of the site relative to someone's own heritage (i.e. some perceive the site as part of their own heritage, some do not, and some are in between), as this may be the situation in other heritage settings. The sample comprised both domestic and international tourists above the age of 15 (Apter et al. 1998), who were able to speak and understand English. The pilot study took place in December 2002. The main study took place between December 2002 and January 2003. Approximately 10% of the visitors approached chose not to participate, claiming to be unfamiliar with the English language.

4.1 Findings

The entire sample comprises 208 participants (57.8% female and 42.2% male). Of the sample, 153 were Christian (74.6%), 33 identified themselves as "no affiliation" (16.1%), seven were Jewish (3.4%), and 12 were of other religions (5.9%). The three most common places

in which participants spent most of their lives were the USA (24.5%), Britain (19.2%), and The Netherlands (15.9%). Among those who indicated their age group, the mode answer was 20-29 (51.9% of the sample). Of the sample 31.3% had completed an undergraduate course and 41.3% had completed a postgraduate course. Of the sample, 82.6% (172 participants) had not visited Anne Frank House before and 56.3% (117 participants) had read The Diary of Anne Frank.

Visitors were asked to reply to six questions aimed at capturing their perception of the site in relation to their own heritage. A zero to five scale was used, where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 indicates "agree". Table 1 presents four of the six questions used alongside the distribution of answers.

Several issues emerge from Table 1. First, the disparate nature of responses indicates that participants differ in their perception of the site in relation to their own heritage. Second, a substantial number of participants are ambivalent in their perception of the site as part of their own heritage (those who selected answers 2 and 3). In addition, the value of the Cronbach's Alpha statistic was relatively high, suggesting that the questions used measure the same latent variable.

Based on the mean score of the six questions used to measure visitors' perception of the site, an index was created representing tourists' perception of the heritage presented as their own heritage. The respondents were classified into three groups: those who perceive the site as being part of their personal heritage (average answer above 3.4); those who do not perceive the site as

Tabla 1
Perception of the Site in Relation to Visitors' own Heritage (N = 208)

| Beneficio bruto total | Beneficio bruto por habitación y día | | | | | Agree 5 |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Disagree 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| The site represents something which relates to your identity | 27.5% (n=57) | 16.4% (n=35) | 23.2% (n=48) | 20.3% (n=42) | 7.2% (n=15) | 5.3% (n=11) |
| The site generates a sense of belonging for you | 23.8% (n=50) | 15.5% (n=32) | 21.8% (n=45) | 22.3% (n=46) | 10.7% (n=22) | 5.8% (n=12) |
| You consider the site to be part of your own personal heritage | 34.3% (n=72) | 18.8% (n=38) | 15.0% (n=31) | 13.0% (n=27) | 13.5% (n=29) | 5.3% (n=11) |
| Anne Frank House represents part of your own personal heritage | 23.7% (n=49) | 16.4% (n=35) | 17.9% (n=37) | 17.9% (n=37) | 14.0% (n=29) | 10.1% (n=21) |

Cronbach's Alpha (based of six statements)= 0.848

Tabla 2
Motivations for Visiting the Site

| You have decided to visit the Anne Frank House because... | Mean* | Std. |
|---|-------|------|
| Of its historic background | 4.31 | 0.92 |
| You think it is important to visit this site | 3.72 | 1.16 |
| You feel that you should visit this site | 3.29 | 1.50 |
| You want to learn about the history of the Jewish people | 3.16 | 1.37 |
| You want to learn about WW II | 3.00 | 1.52 |
| You want to feel emotionally involved | 2.78 | 1.57 |
| It is a famous tourist attraction | 2.35 | 1.59 |
| It is part of your own heritage | 1.93 | 1.68 |
| You feel a sense of obligation to visit this site | 1.83 | 1.58 |
| You feel a sense of belonging to the site | 1.71 | 1.41 |
| You want to have a day out | 1.56 | 1.58 |
| You want to have some entertainment | 1.14 | 1.37 |
| It is on your way to another site | 0.95 | 1.43 |
| You want to relax | 0.75 | 1.06 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

being part of their personal heritage (average answer below 1.7); and those who are "in between" (average answer between 1.7 and 3.4).

Following the questions dealing with visitors' perception, participants were asked to state their agreement with a list of motivations for visiting the site. Table 2 illustrates participants' responses.

As seen in Table 2, the most important motivations for visiting the Anne Frank House are as follows: historic background; thinking it is important to visit; feeling that one should visit. The less meaningful reasons for visiting are: to relax; because it is on the way to another site; and for entertainment. It is clear from Table 2 that participants have other reasons for visiting a heritage site than merely willingness to learn or engage in recreational activity.

To further explore whether underlying common motivation dimensions for visiting can be found, a Factor Analysis was undertaken. Due to the exploratory nature of this study and as commonly done in social studies (Malhotra and Birks 2003); Principal Component Analysis was employed using oblique rotation. This is based on the assumption that the factors may be correlated. The determination about the number of factors was made according to Eigenvalue larger than one and the Scree plot (Tabachnick and Fidell 1996). In order to determine which variables are included in each factor, it was decided to include those loaded above 0.4 (Hatcher 1994). Table 3 presents the loading

values of the various motivations. As can be seen, three factors were identified, explaining 53.52% of the variance.

As seen in Table 3, the motivations for visiting the site can be grouped into three main factors. The first factor, termed "heritage experience" is composed of statements related to the link between the visitor and the heritage presented. The second factor is termed "educational experience" and is composed of reasons relating to the interest of visitors in learning from the visit. The third factor identified is referred to as "recreational experience". It is composed of reasons not associated with the heritage presented, and which represents motives of leisure pursuit. As can be seen from Table 3, relatively high levels of Cronbach's Alphas were observed, suggesting high and moderate levels of reliability. It should be noted that the statement relating to the visitor's willingness to feel emotionally involved is loaded on the second factor, which comprises educational motives. This suggests that visitors see the educational experience at the Anne Frank House also as facilitating an emotional involvement.

To explore differences between visitors' motivations based on their perception of the site, One-Way Anova tests were employed. The One-way Anova test was preferred over a MANOVA test, due to the weak relationships between the factors and the fact that the DVs used are statistical means of the questions

Tabla 3
Factor Analysis of Motivations for Visiting the Site

| | Heritage experience | Educational experience | Recreational experience |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| You feel a sense of belonging to this site | 0.889 | | |
| It is part of your own heritage | 0.785 | | |
| You feel a sense of obligation to visit this site | 0.775 | | |
| You feel that you should visit this site | 0.458 | | |
| Of its historic background | | 0.819 | |
| You want to learn about the history of the Jewish people | | 0.741 | |
| You want to learn about WW II | | 0.693 | |
| You think it is important to visit this site | | 0.560 | |
| You want to feel emotionally involved | | 0.447 | |
| You want to have some entertainment | | | 0.782 |
| You want to have a day outing | | | 0.778 |
| It is on your way to another site | | | 0.645 |
| It is a famous tourist attraction | | | 0.644 |
| You want to relax | | | 0.614 |
| Eigenvalue | 3.752 | 2.484 | 1.256 |
| % of Variance | 26.803 | 17.744 | 8.973 |
| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.749 | 0.724 | 0.726 |

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

based on the results of the Principal Component Analysis (Tabachnick and Fidell 2001). Table 4 presents the three categories of visitors based on their perception of the site and the three factors of motivations identified in Table 3.

As seen in Table 4, the findings are in line with the proposed hypothesis relating to visitors' motivations for the visit. Significant differences were found between the three groups in rela-

tion to their interest in a heritage experience, and educational experience. The pattern revealed by the post-hoc analysis indicates that the more visitors perceive the site to be part of their own heritage, they show greater interest in feeling connected to the heritage on display and in learning about the historical events relating to the site. Differences were not found in motivations relating to recreational experience.

Tabla 4
Motivations to Visit in Relation to Perception of the Site

| | Group 1 (n=78) | Group 2 (n=98) | Group 3 (n=32) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Heritage experience | 1.46 | 2.36 | 3.46 | F=52.33 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 0.000 |
| Educational experience | 3.05 | 3.48 | 3.98 | F=13.668 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 1 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.006 0.000 0.022 |
| Recreational experience | 1.24 | 1.44 | 1.32 | F=0.938 Sig. 0.393 | NS | |

Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"
Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"
Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"

Tabla 5
Overall Motivation to Visit in Relation to Perception of the Site

| | Group 1 (n=78) | Group 2 (n=98) | Group 3 n=32) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Your overall Anne motivation to visit Frank House | 3.66 | 4.10 | 4.59 | F = 11.132 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.013 0.000 0.049 |
| Sig. 0.000 | | | | | | |
| <i>Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the heritage to be part of their own"</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"</i> | | | | | | |

This could be explained, given that the site is not associated with fun or recreation. Another interesting issue revealed in Table 4 is that participants who do not perceive the site as part of their own heritage (Group 1), illustrated a higher level of willingness to learn (mean=3.05) than to connect with the heritage displayed (mean=1.46), or be entertained (mean=1.24).

Participants were also asked to estimate their overall motivation to visit the site (using a 6-level scale, where 0 indicates "not at all motivated to visit the site" and 5 "highly motivated to visit the site"). As can be seen from Table 5, the more visitors perceive the site as part of their heritage, the more motivated they are to visit the site. This finding is in line with the research hypothesis noted previously relating to visitors' overall motivation.

In addition, the correlation between the motivation factors identified and the overall motivation were examined. The results indicate a relatively strong relationship between visitors'

overall motivation and the factor "educational experience" (Pearson's $r=0.504$, Sig.=0.000). There is a moderate relationship between visitors' overall motivation and the "heritage experience" (Pearson's $r=0.317$, Sig.=0.000). No relationships were found between overall motivation and the factor "recreational experience" (Pearson's $r=-0.101$, Sig.=0.150). In sum, the findings illustrate that there is a clear link between tourists' perceptions of the site, and specific, as well as overall motivations for the visit.

Following the questions dealing with visitors' motivations, participants were asked to state their expectations concerning the content of the interpretation provided on-site. The mean scores of visitors' expectations are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 shows that overall, visitors stated a high willingness that the interpretation provided would allow them to learn something new, and provide them with information about Dutch Jewry during the WW II period. Moreover, it is

Tabla 6
Visitors' Expectations of On-Site Interpretation

| You would like the interpretation at this site..... | Mean* | Std. |
|---|-------|------|
| To allow you to learn something new | 3.86 | 1.24 |
| To provide you with information about Jewish people in Holland during WW II | 3.72 | 1.16 |
| To deal with racism today | 3.24 | 1.45 |
| To emphasize the role of the Dutch during WW II | 3.20 | 1.36 |
| To provide you with information about WW II in general | 3.17 | 1.34 |
| To make you feel emotionally involved | 3.11 | 1.39 |
| To be interactive | 3.04 | 1.42 |
| To provide you with information about other groups who have suffered racism | 2.83 | 1.48 |
| To emphasize the link between you and those who lived in Anne Frank House | 2.82 | 1.40 |
| To involve multimedia | 2.82 | 1.52 |
| To make you feel connected to your own heritage | 1.97 | 1.56 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

Tabla 7
Factor Analysis of Visitors' Expectations of On-Site Interpretation

| | Emotional experience | Information about WW II | Independent learning |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| To provide you with information about other groups who have suffered racism | 0.824 | | |
| To emphasize the link between you and those who lived in Anne Frank House | 0.751 | | |
| To deal with racism today | 0.741 | | |
| To make you feel emotionally involved | 0.664 | | |
| To make you feel connected to your own heritage | 0.661 | | |
| To provide you with information about Jewish people in Holland during WW II | | 0.904 | |
| To provide you with information about WW II in general | | 0.897 | |
| To emphasize the role of the Dutch during WW II | | 0.578 | |
| To be interactive | | | 0.818 |
| To involve multimedia | | | 0.807 |
| To allow you to learn something new | | | 0.783 |
| Eigenvalue | 4.024 | 1.610 | 1.208 |
| % of Variance | 36.578 | 14.638 | 10.983 |
| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.785 | 0.762 | 0.737 |

*Extraction method: Principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations*

noticeable that the statement referring to the visitors' expectation that the interpretation will make them emotionally involved, is ranked relatively high (mean score over 3). This suggests that visitors to heritage settings seek more than a merely educational experience. This, as explained later, may be useful to the segmentation of visitors to heritage settings.

To explore whether underlying common dimensions of expectations can be found, a Factor Analysis technique was utilized. Table 7 presents the loading values of the various expectations. As can be seen, three factors were identified, explaining 62.2% of the variance.

Based on Table 7, there is a clear distinction between three factors. The first, named "emotional experience", relates to visitors' willingness that the interpretation will generate an emotional involvement with the heritage presented. It should be noted that visitors' expectations that the interpretation will refer to the issue of racism is associated with the emotional experience factor. The second factor highlights participants' interest in information about the period surrounding WW II. This factor was termed "information about WW II". The third factor, called "independent learning", involves

independent and active processes that allow the visitor to engage in an educational activity.

Table 8 presents the differences between the three categories of visitors based on their perception of the site, and the three factors identified in Table 7.

As seen in Table 8 and in line with the research hypothesis relating to expectations of on-site interpretation, clear differences can be found between visitors based on the extent to which they perceive the site as part of their own personal heritage. It appears that the more participants perceive the site to be part of their own heritage, the more they prefer on-site interpretation to provide an emotional experience. However, visitors appear not to differ in their expectations for information about WW II, or for an independent learning experience.

5. study 2

Empirical studies on the behaviour of heritage sites' visitors tend to be influenced by context. Specifically, several studies explored the motivations for visiting a heritage site after the visit

Tabla 8
Visitors' Expectations of On-Site Interpretation in Relation to Perception of the Site

| | Group 1 (n=78) | Group 2 (n=98) | Group 3 (n=30) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Emotional experience | 2.23 | 2.98 | 3.62 | F=3.174 Sig. 0.044 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 0.009 |
| Information about WW II | 3.14 | 3.47 | 3.62 | F=3.174 Sig. 0.044 | NS | |
| Independent learning | 3.12 | 3.32 | 3.36 | F=0.842 Sig. 0.432 | NS | |

Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the heritage to be part of their own"
Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"
Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"

took place (e.g. Poria et al. 2003a, 2003b, 2004) or during the visit (e.g. Jansen-Verbeke and Rekom 1996; Chen 1998). On the first study presented here, visitors were interviewed while waiting in line to enter a site. Clearly, such samples represent those who have made the decision to visit a heritage site and not potential visitors—a group of major relevance for the management of heritage attractions (Davis and Prentice 1995). Consequently, it was decided that the second field study would focus on potential visitors.

Similar to the first study, the questionnaire used on the second study included questions regarding tourists' perception of the site in relation to their own heritage, motivations for visiting the site, and expectations regarding the nature of on-site interpretation. Since the design of the second questionnaire relied on the results of the first study (in addition to the exploratory study conducted in the first stage) and was intended to apply to potential visitors rather than actual visitors, few changes were made. The scale used to measure tourists' perception of the site is composed of eight questions (rather than six questions, as used in the first study). Based on remarks made by participants in Study 1 during interviews, two phrases were added: "This site makes you feel emotionally involved in regard to your own heritage" and "This site is an integral part of your personality". Additionally two of the statements used on Study 1 were rephrased since participants considered them ambiguous. "This site represents something that relates to your present existence" was changed to "This site is part of how you are". "This site has symbolic meaning to you" was changed to "This site makes

you feel connected to your own heritage". Additionally, the statements referring to visitors' specific reasons for visiting and expectations of on-site interpretation were modified to a more generic phrasing. Finally, a series of questions were added, designed to exclude those not familiar with the site or heritage presented.

Data were collected by the author through face-to-face interviews. The interviews were conducted in different locations in Amsterdam (e.g. Dam Square, Bloemenmarkt, Museumplein, Leidseplein, Prinsengracht) to ensure the diversity of respondents. As in Study 1, a theoretical sample was utilized and interviewees were quasi-randomly sampled on the selected sites. This was done by approaching every N'th participant at a certain area of the site (e.g. at Dam Square near the monument). When couples or groups were sampled, the author selected the same proportion of males and females. The sample comprised visitors to Amsterdam (domestic and international tourists) able to speak and understand English, and over the age of 15 (Apter et al. 1998). A pilot study was conducted at the beginning of August 2003. The main study took place between August and September 2003. Approximately 15% of those approached chose not to participate, often explaining that they did not have sufficient English skills.

5.1 Findings

The sample consisted of 282 individuals who had not previously visited the Anne Frank House, but were familiar with the site and its history.

Of the population, half were male (141 participants) and half were female. As far as religious affiliation is concerned, over half (61.3%, 173 participants) identified themselves as Christian, 27.3% (77 participants) identified themselves as "no affiliation", and 6.7% (19 participants) said they belonged to other religions. Among those who indicated their age group, the mode answer was 20-29 (44.3% of the sample, 125 participants). The three most common countries of origin were the UK (19.5%), USA (12.1%), and The Netherlands (14.2%). Of the sample, 30.9% had completed an undergraduate degree, and 39% had completed a postgraduate degree. More than half (52.1%, 147 participants) had read all or part of The Diary of Anne Frank.

First, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with eight statements aimed at capturing their perception of the site in relation to their own heritage. Table 9 presents the distribution of the answers to four of the statements used. For considerations of consistency Table 9 presents the statements used both in Study 1 (see Table 1, page 6) and Study 2.

Several issues emerging from Table 9 are noteworthy. First, the disparate nature of the responses indicates that participants differ in their perception of the site. Note that the response pattern is similar for all questions. Moreover, the distribution of participants' responses resembles those observed on Study 1 (see Table 1, page 6). Additionally, the Alpha value found indicates that the statements are closely related and measure the same concept, i.e. participants' perceptions of the site as part of their own heritage.

Similar to the analysis applied on Study 1, based on the mean score of the eight questions

used to measure tourists' perception of the site, an index was created indicating tourists' perception of the heritage presented. As in Study 1, respondents were classified into three groups: those who perceive the site as being part of their personal heritage (average answer above 3.4); those who do not perceive the site as being part of their personal heritage (average answer below 1.7); and those who are "in between" (average answer between 1.7 and 3.4).

Participants were asked to state their agreement with a list of motivations for a potential visit. Table 10 illustrates participants' average responses.

Table 10 shows that the most important motives for a future visit to the Anne Frank House are as follows: important for children; contribution to education; learn history; historic background. Similar to the results of Study 1 (see Table 2, page 7) it seems that although, the educational motives appear to be the most important, participants are interested in visiting heritage settings for other reasons as well.

As in the first study, in order to discover whether there are several common dimensions of motivation, participants' responses were subjected to Factor Analysis. Table 11 presents the loading values of the various motivations. As can be seen, four factors were identified, explaining 67.195% of the variance.

As seen in Table 11, the motivations for visiting the site can be grouped into four main factors. The first factor, called "heritage experience", is composed of statements relating to the link between the tourist and the heritage presented. The second factor is termed "educational experience" and comprises reasons relating to the interest of tourists in learning from the

Tabla 9
Perception of the Site in Relation to Potential Visitors' own Heritage (N=282)

| | 0 | Disagree 1 | Agree 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| This site represents something which relates to your identity | 26.2% (n = 74) | 21.6% (n = 61) | 13.1% (n = 37) | 22% (n = 62) | 10.6% (n = 30) | 6.4% (n = 18) |
| This site generates a sense of belonging for you | 30% (n = 84) | 22.5% (n = 63) | 18.9% (n = 53) | 16.1% (n = 45) | 8.6% (n = 24) | 3.9% (n = 11) |
| You consider this site as part of your own personal heritage | 25.5% (n = 72) | 16.7% (n = 47) | 16.7% (n = 47) | 20.9% (n = 59) | 10.6% (n = 30) | 9.6% (n = 27) |
| Anne Frank House is part of your own personal heritage | 21.8% (n = 61) | 21.1% (n = 59) | 17.1% (n = 48) | 18.2% (n = 51) | 11.8% (n = 33) | 10% (n = 28) |

Cronbach's Alpha (based on eight statements) = 0.897

Tabla 10
Motivations for a Future Visit to the Site

| You would like to visit Anne Frank House because..... | Mean* | Std. |
|--|-------|------|
| You want to pass the story of Anne Frank to your children | 3.66 | 1.87 |
| You think it is important for your child(ren) to visit this site | 3.64 | 1.93 |
| The visit to this site will contribute to your education | 3.51 | 1.25 |
| You want to learn about the history of the site | 3.51 | 1.32 |
| Of its historic background | 3.49 | 1.25 |
| You want to enrich your knowledge regarding the site | 3.44 | 1.25 |
| It is a famous tourist attraction | 3.16 | 1.50 |
| You feel that you should visit the site | 3.05 | 1.54 |
| You want to feel emotionally involved | 2.34 | 1.52 |
| This site is relevant to your present existence | 1.97 | 1.55 |
| You want to have a day's outing | 1.88 | 1.48 |
| This site is an important part of who you are | 1.68 | 1.50 |
| This site is an important part of your personal identity | 1.67 | 1.47 |
| It is part of your own heritage | 1.65 | 1.53 |
| You want to have some entertainment | 1.58 | 1.43 |
| You feel a sense of belonging to the site | 1.51 | 1.41 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

visit. The third factor identified is named "bequeathing" and is composed of two reasons involving the desire to pass the story of Anne Frank on to children. The fourth factor identified is composed of three reasons not associated with the heritage presented, and is referred to as

Tabla 11
Factor Analysis of Motivations for a Future visit

| | Heritage experience | Educational experience | Bequeathing | Recreation experience |
|--|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| This site is an important part of your personal identity | 0.926 | | | |
| It is part of your own heritage | 0.900 | | | |
| You feel a sense of belonging to this site | 0.892 | | | |
| This site is an important part of who you are | 0.888 | | | |
| This site is relevant to your present existence | 0.801 | | | |
| You want to learn about the history of this site | | 0.865 | | |
| You want to enrich your knowledge regarding this site | | 0.812 | | |
| You feel that you should visit the site | | 0.758 | | |
| Of its historic background | | 0.702 | | |
| The visit to this site will contribute to your education | | 0.565 | | |
| You want to feel emotionally involved | | 0.416 | | |
| You think it is important for your child(ren) to visit this site | | | 0.957 | |
| You want to pass the story of Anne Frank on to your child(ren) | | 0.955 | | |
| You want to have a day's outing | | | | 0.792 |
| You want to have some entertainment | | | | 0.782 |
| It is a famous tourist attraction | | | | 0.663 |
| Eigenvalue | 5.288 | 2.422 | 1.714 | 1.328 |
| % of Variance | 33.048 | 15.139 | 10.711 | 8.297 |
| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.927 | 0.801 | 0.891 | 0.612 |

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

Tabla 12
Motivations for a Future visit in Relation to Perception of the Site

| | Group 1 (n = 142) | Group 2 (n = 118) | Group 3 (n = 22) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Heritage experience | 0.76 | 2.43 | 4.00 | F=224.712 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 0.000 |
| Educational experience | 2.96 | 3.44 | 3.79 | F=13.512 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 |
| Bequeathing | 3.13 | 4.06 | 4.82 | F=15.003 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 |
| Recreational experience | 2.09 | 2.39 | 2.26 | F=2.299 Sig. 0.102 | NS | |

Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"
Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"
Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site as being part of their own heritage"

"recreational experience". Note that relatively high levels of Cronbach's Alphas were observed, suggesting high levels of reliability. Attention should also be given to the fact that three of the four factors identified are essentially similar to those identified among actual visitors (see Table 3, page 8). However, on the second study the statement relating to the tourist's willingness to visit the site because "you feel that you should" is included in the factor relating to tourists' "need to feel connected to their own heritage" (on the first study this statement was included on the "educational experience" factor). Another interesting issue arising from the results is the fact that in both studies tourists' motive to feel emotionally involved is associated with their willingness to learn about the site. In addition, it should be noted that the second study revealed a fourth motive for visiting heritage sites, not referred to on the first study; namely tourists' wish to bequeath the narrative to their offspring.

To explore the link between tourists' perception of the site, and their motivations for a potential visit One-Way Anova tests were employed. The results are presented on table 12.

As presented in Table 12, the general pattern emerging on the second study is similar to that revealed in the first study (see Table 4, page 9). As predicted, the more participants perceive the site to be part of their own heritage; they reported a greater wish to feel connected to the heritage on display, to learn, and to

bequeath the narrative. Also of interest is that participants who do not perceive the site as part of their own heritage (Group 1) illustrated a higher desire level to bequeath the story (mean=3.13) than to learn about the history surrounding the site (mean=2.96).

Participants were also asked to estimate their overall motivation to visit the site (using a 6-level scale, where 0 indicates "not at all motivated to visit the site" and 5 "highly motivated to visit the site"). As in Study 1 (see Table 5, page 9) and conform to the research hypothesis on visitors' overall motivation, it can be seen (Table 13) that the greater tourists' perception of the site as being part of their heritage, the more they are motivated to visit.

Examination of the correlations between overall motivation and the identified motivation factors revealed a high positive correlation with the factor "educational experience" (Pearson's r=0.587 Sig.=0.000). Weak relationships were observed between tourists' overall motivation to the factors of "heritage experience" (Pearson's r=0.191 Sig.=0.001) and "bequeathing" (Pearson's r=0.181 Sig.=0.002). No relationship were found between overall motivation and the factor "recreational experience" (Pearson's r=0.111 Sig.=0.063). It should be noted that the pattern of the relations between tourists' overall motivations and the motivation factors identified on both field studies are very similar. However, on the first study, the correlation between the factor representing willingness to "feel connected" to the heritage

Tabla 13
Overall Motivation for a Future Visit in Relation to Perception of the Site

| | Group 1 (n = 142) | Group 2 (n = 118) | Group 3 (n = 22) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Your overall motivation to visit Anne Frank House | 2.88 | 3.14 | 3.81 | F = 4.429 Sig. 0.013 | 1 & 3 | 0.017 |
| <i>Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the heritage to be part of their own"</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"</i> | | | | | | |
| <i>Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"</i> | | | | | | |

presented, and tourist's overall motivation, is slightly stronger than found in the second study. Moreover, the correlation between the "educational experience" factor and overall motivation found on the second study is somewhat stronger than established on the first study. These differences could be explained by the variation in the samples.

Participants were asked to estimate their agreement to a series of statements regarding their expectations of on-site interpretation. Tourists' average responses are presented on Table 14.

It is clear from Table 14 that tourists place great importance on the interpretation provided, as an instrument to enrich their knowledge of the site. However, participants also showed interest in the interpretation as a facilitator of an emotional experience regarding the heritage presented. Note that the statements regarding on-site interpretation as providing an entertaining experience (such as "to be fun", "to provide you with entertainment") received relatively low grades.

As in Study 1, participants' responses regarding their expectations of on-site interpretation were subjected to a Factor Analysis. The analysis revealed

the existence of three factors, accounting for 74.243% of the variance. The loading values of the various expectations are presented on Table 15.

As Table 15 presents, tourists' expectations of on-site interpretation can be grouped by three distinguished factors. The first factor, referred to as "recreational experience", represents tourists' expectation that the interpretation will provide them an entertaining visiting experience. The second factor, termed "educational experience" is composed of statements referring to the tourist's wish that on-site interpretation will allow him/her to learn and enrich his/her knowledge. The third factor identified is named "emotional experience". This factor relates to tourists' willingness that the interpretation provided will facilitate an emotional reaction to the heritage on display. Again, it is clear that visitors to heritage settings are not interested in a merely educational or recreational experience, but also seek an emotional experience.

To explore the link between potential visitors' perception of the site and their expectations of on-site interpretation One- Way ANOVA tests were employed. The results are presented on Table 16.

Tabla 14
Potential Visitors' Expectations of On- Site Interpretation

| You would like the interpretation at this site... | Mean* | Std. |
|---|-------|------|
| To enhance your general knowledge about this site | 3.97 | 1.02 |
| To allow you to learn something new | 3.96 | 1.13 |
| To contribute to your education | 3.95 | 1.08 |
| To move you emotionally | 3.11 | 1.46 |
| To make you feel emotionally involved | 2.96 | 1.47 |
| To be an enjoyable experience | 2.63 | 1.48 |
| To make you feel connected to your own heritage | 2.17 | 1.59 |
| To provide you with entertainment | 1.91 | 1.53 |
| To be fun | 1.54 | 1.58 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

Tabla 15
Factor Analysis of Potential Visitors' Expectations of On-Site Interpretation

| | Recreational experience | Educational experience | Emotional experience |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| To provide you with entertainment | 0.941 | | |
| To be fun | 0.928 | | |
| To be an enjoyable experience | 0.823 | | |
| To enhance your general knowledge about this site | | 0.894 | |
| To contribute to your education | | 0.835 | |
| To allow you to learn something new | | 0.813 | |
| To make you feel emotionally involved | | | 0.884 |
| To make you feel connected to your own heritage | | | 0.837 |
| To move you emotionally | | | 0.719 |
| Eigenvalue | 3.684 | 1.75 | 21.249 |
| % of Variance | 40.929 | 19.147 | 13.873 |
| Cronbach's Alpha | 0.873 | 0.799 | 0.766 |

Extraction method: Principal component analysis.
Rotation method: Promax with Kaiser normalization.
Rotation converged in 5 iterations.

As seen from Table 16, clear differences are found between tourists' in their expectation that the interpretation will facilitate an emotional experience, and will make them feel connected to their own heritage. The results indicate that the more potential visitors perceive the site as part of their personal heritage, the more they are interested in an interpretation that enriches their emotional experience. In contrast, differences were not found between tourists in their expectation to learn or to be entertained by on-site interpretation, based on their perception of the site. Additionally, tourists who do not perceive the site as part of their heritage (Group 1) place the greatest importance on the interpretation as a facilitator of knowledge (mean=3.89). It is worth noting

that the pattern revealed among potential visitors is similar to the one displayed by actual visitors (see Table 8, page 11).

6. using visitors' perceptions of the site as a means for segmentation

Visitors' perceptions are inferred measures (Hall and McArthur 1998) which are not easily identified by site managers. Therefore the relationships between visitors' perceptions and objective measures such as demographic characteristics should be clarified. In the current inves-

Tabla 16
Potential Visitors' Expectations of On-Site Interpretation in Relation to Perception

| | Group 1 (n = 142) | Group 2 (n = 118) | Group 3 (n = 22) | Difference found (One-Way Anova) | Differences found between groups | Scheffe test |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Recreational experience | 2.85 | 2.81 | 2.84 | F=0.044 Sig. 0.957 | | |
| Educational experience | 3.89 | 3.98 | 4.24 | F=1.500 Sig. 0.225 | NS | |
| Emotional experience | 2.14 | 3.20 | 4.15 | F=51.941 Sig. 0.000 | 1 & 2 1 & 3 2 & 3 | 0.000 0.000 0.001 |

Group 1: Those who "Do not perceive the heritage to be part of their own"
Group 2: Those who "Somewhat perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"
Group 3: Those who "Perceive the site to be part of their own heritage"

Tabla 17
Visitors' Perception in Relation to Religious Belief

| Study 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Religious belief | Mean* (perception of the site as own heritage) | Differences found (One-Way ANOVA) | Differences between groups | Scheffe test |
| Jewish (n=7) | 3.52 | | | |
| Christian (n= 153) | 2.12 | F=3.398 | Jewish & Christian | 0.020 |
| Other (n=12) | 1.79 | Sig. 0.009 | Jewish & Other | 0.019 |
| No affiliation (n=33) | 2.01 | | Jewish & No affiliation | 0.019 |
| Study 2 | | | | |
| Religious belief | Mean* (perception of the site as own heritage) | Differences found (One-Way ANOVA) | Differences between groups | Scheffe test |
| Jewish (n=11) | 3.59 | | | |
| Christian (n=173) | 1.77 | F=11.576 | Jewish & Christian | 0.000 |
| Other (n=21) | 1.95 | Sig. 0.000 | Jewish & Other | 0.002 |
| No affiliation (n=77) | 1.50 | | Jewish & No affiliation | 0.000 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

tigation, visitors' characteristics such as age, gender, education and religious belief (thought to be relevant in the context of Anne Frank House) were explored. In both studies, significant differences between visitors were found only in relation to their religious beliefs. Visitors identifying themselves as Jewish related more to

the site as their own personal heritage than did people of other religions (see Table 17). However, note that the number of Jewish participants is relatively small in both studies.

Also relevant to the current investigation are the relations between visitors' demographic characteristics, their motivations to visit, and

Tabla 18
Willingness for an Heritage Experience in Relation to Religious Belief

| Study 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Religious belief | Mean* (willingness for heritage experience) | Differences found (One-Way ANOVA) | Differences between groups | Scheffe test |
| Jewish (n=7) | 3.46 | | | |
| Christian (n= 153) | 2.15 | F=3.346 | Jewish & Christian | 0.029 |
| Other (n=12) | 2.16 | Sig. 0.020 | Jewish & No affiliation | 0.023 |
| No affiliation (n=33) | 2.01 | | | |
| Study 2 | | | | |
| Religious belief | Mean* (willingness for heritage experience) | Differences found (One-Way ANOVA) | Differences between groups | Scheffe test |
| Jewish (n=11) | 3.61 | | | |
| Christian (n=173) | 1.66 | F=8.698 | Jewish & Christian | 0.000 |
| Other (n=21) | 1.67 | Sig. 0.000 | Jewish & Other | 0.001 |
| No affiliation (n=77) | 1.55 | | Jewish & No affiliation | 0.002 |

* a 6 level scale was used where 0 indicates "disagree" and 5 "agree"

expectations of on-site interpretation. In this context, it should be noted that in both studies no meaningful or coherent patterns of behaviour were found in relation to visitor's demographic characteristics. An exception to this is the finding that participants identifying themselves as Jewish are more interested in feeling connected to the heritage on display, than visitors of other religious beliefs (see Table 18). This finding is in line with the fact that Jewish participants tend to see the site as part of their own heritage, more than other groups.

The findings presented in Table 18 emphasize individuals' perceptions of the site in relation to their own heritage as a key element in the segmentation of heritage site visitors. In the context of the current study it is clear that the usage of merely demographic characteristics as a basis for segmentation provides a partial understanding of visitors' motivations and expectations. It should be noted that although in the context of Anne Frank House, religious belief may be used as an indicator of visitors' perception, there is no complete symmetry between these two elements. Nonetheless, there are visitors who do not consider themselves Jewish but see the site as part of their own personal heritage. Additionally, it should be noted that at different heritage settings visitors' perceptions may be linked with other tourists' characteristics, such as education and place of residence.

7. discussion

The paper investigates the link between visitors' perception of the site in relation to their own heritage, and their motivations for visiting a heritage site. An effort was made to clarify these links with regard to tourists' overall motivation, as well as their specific motivations for the visit. Furthermore, the study attempted to highlight possible links between tourists' perception and expectations of on-site interpretation. These notions were investigated in different contexts, first among visitors waiting in line to enter the site, (have already made a decision to visit), and second among potential visitors (may or may not decide to visit).

Referring to specific motivations for visiting the site, four main motives were identified: "heritage experience", "educational experience", "bequeathing", and "recreational experience".

Some of the motivations are congruent with prior literature (e.g. Jansen-Verbeke and Rekom 1996; Prentice 1993) that emphasises either education or recreation as major motives for visiting heritage sites. The revealing of motives relating to the visitors' wish for a "heritage experience" is in line with previous studies (Poria et al. 2003a; 2003b; 2004) relating to the link between the visitor and the heritage on display. The current study, unlike Poria et al.'s, referred to a different, non-religious site, and was conducted before the actual visit. Note that willingness to bequeath the narrative has not been identified in previous studies. The findings are in contradiction to the traditional approach which captures a visit to a heritage site as a leisure or educational activity. For example, Dierking (1998) refers to a visit to an historic home alongside trips to a nature centre and environmental park as an "enjoyable way to spend leisure time" (p. 56). With reference to museums and environmental centres, Ballantyne (1998) suggested that "relaxation, enjoyment and entertainment rather than a learning experience" were possible reasons for visiting. It is argued here that although leisure and recreation literature is important to certain heritage settings, (such as museums, nature reserves and parks), it may be less significant in relation to heritage settings which hold personal meaning for the visitor.

The results of both field studies confirmed the research hypothesis in relation to visitors' motivations for the visit, indicating clear differences between the respondents based on their perception of the site as part of their own heritage and their motivations for visiting the site. The more the tourists perceive the site as being part of their own heritage, the greater interest they show in learning, being connected to their heritage and passing the legacy on to their children. These results reflect Garling's (1998) notion that the meanings assigned to an artefact have an impact on peoples' behaviour. The site has an especially relevant meaning for those who perceive it as part of their own heritage. Thus, they are interested in "feeling connected" and "passing the story on". For others, the site is "history", something of educational interest.

A unique contribution of this paper is the insight provided to the concept of overall visit motivation. Of importance to heritage site management is the finding suggesting that the greater tourists' perception of the site as being part of their own heritage, the higher their over-

rall motivation to visit. Furthermore, overall motivation seems to correlate with specific motivation factors. Yet, the strength of association varies between factors. For example, overall motivation is highly correlated with willingness to learn, and least correlated with the pursuit of leisure. This clearly indicates that overall motivation is a multifaceted construct that should be considered in future studies.

One of the research objectives was to explore whether visitors' perceptions are associated with their expectations of on-site interpretation. Three main expectations were identified: the visitors' wish for an emotional experience; for an educational experience (including willingness to engage in independent learning activity); and for a recreational experience. This is in contrast to previous studies that emphasise the educational experience facilitated by on-site interpretation (e.g. Moscardo 1996; Prentice et al. 1998). The current findings indicate that visitors to heritage settings are not interested in an educational or cognitive experience only, but also in the emotional dimension.

Another topic which arises from the findings and supports the hypothesis phrased is that tourists' expectations of the interpretation differ, based on their perception of the site. This may be explained by literature, which argues that visitors arrive at the site with their own personal agenda, which influences their experience, their reaction to the exhibits, and the effectiveness of the interpretation provided (Beeho and Prentice 1997; Uzzell and Ballantyne 1998). It was established that the more respondents perceive the site as part of their own heritage; they have higher expectations that the interpretation will facilitate emotional involvement. The different expectations of the on-site interpretation suggests that participants sought varied experiences. This gives credence to the argument that tourists to heritage sites are a heterogeneous segment, and as such, the provision of various interpretations at the site will meet their expectations more successfully.

While considering the results of the two studies presented here, several issues should be taken into account. First, attention should be given to the fact that both studies revealed the same pattern in relation to the link between visitors' perception of the site, and their behaviour thereat. Although composed of different samples, both studies indicate that the more tourists' perceive the site as part of their own heritage, the greater their willingness to visit for emotional and

educational purposes. Similarly, the more tourists' perceive the site as part of their own heritage, the greater their wish for an on-site interpretation that provides an emotional experience. Since both studies focus on the same site, the findings contribute to the validation of the research premises, and provide further support for the need to investigate the personal meaning the site holds for the visitor. Second, in contrast to previous studies exploring the link between tourists' site perception and their behaviour, the studies presented here were conducted prior to the visit. Since this paper refers to pre-visit behaviours, (e.g. motivations and expectations), and existing tourists' perceptions of the site, this sample provides a more reliable measurement, not influenced by the visiting experience itself. Third, the results of the statistical analysis indicate a high level of reliability of the tourists' perception of the site, in relation to their own heritage. Therefore, this set of questions could be utilized as a scale in further research. Moreover, the pattern of responses reveals that individuals differ in their perceptions of the site. This variation suggests that individuals' perceptions can be used for segmenting tourists to heritage settings in addition to the commonly used socio-demographic characteristics, or their means of arrival (Swarbrooke 2002).

To conclude, this study further demonstrated the significance of examining the link between the site and its tourists, rather than the site or its tourists separately. It is suggested that emphasising only site attributes or tourist characteristics, results in a partial understanding of tourist behaviour at heritage sites.

7.1 Implications

The results presented contribute both to the academic literature and to the management of heritage settings. Several issues emerging from the current findings are of interest to tourism scholars and may lead to a better understanding of the concept of "heritage tourism". First, the findings indicate the need for a more holistic view in the exploration of tourist behaviour at heritage sites. Specifically, relating to the site's attributes, tourists' characteristics, and the relationships between the two. This is in contrast to the customary approach, which highlights either the supply or the demand side perspective (Timothy and Boyd 2003; Apostolakis 2003). Although, this approach is more complicated than the investigation of the site, or the visitor only, it should lead to a better

understanding of tourist behaviour. Second, the studies conducted provide a better understanding of tourists' motivations for visiting heritage sites, and their expectations of on-site interpretation. The findings reveal other dimensions of visitors' motivations and expectations of on-site interpretation, which have received little attention from academics and site managers. The results suggest that visitors to heritage sites expect that the interpretation will generate an emotional experience. Additionally, the results indicate the existence of motives like bequeathing the narrative, emotional involvement, and "connecting" with the heritage presented. This is in contrast to most existing studies that emphasise only educational and recreational motives (e.g. Moscardo 1996; Jansen-Verbeke and Rekom 1996).

As far as heritage site management is concerned, the current paper highlights the need for visitors' segmentations according to their perception of the site. The results indicate that site operators should aim to provide different tourists with different experiences. Based on the motivations and expectations identified, it is argued that individuals differ in the visiting experiences they seek. Additionally, the existence of several segments of visitors is suggested; some are interested in being emotionally involved and educated, while others are interested in less serious activities. Heritage site managers should recognise the heterogeneous nature of visitors' perception of the site, and their desired experience. In contrast to today's visit to heritage settings, where all visitors are offered the same experience, it is suggested that different visitors should be provided with different experiences. This, as reflected by the current research, could be achieved by providing visitors with different angles of interpretation during the visit. Site managers should recognise that one form of interpretation does not suit all visitors, and it is recommended that they provide visitors with the option to choose an interpretation according to their interests and personal agendas. Moreover, although the link between motivation and actual behaviour is tenuous, the findings may provide insight to those who market heritage sites, giving them information on how to allocate their advertising resources and efforts. For example, it could be argued that there may be a rationale for allocating less effort in advertising the site to those who show a very high level of motivation to visit the site, than to those less interested in visiting the site. Another example is the possibility of marketing the site as an emotional experience for those who perceive it as their

own heritage, or as enriching visitors' knowledge of historical events, for those who seek an educational experience.

When discussing the need to segment visitors to heritage sites according to their perception of the site, one should bear in mind that perceptions are not easily recognised by site managers. Therefore, to implement this mode of visitors' segmentation, it is necessary to connect visitors' perceptions to a more recognisable characteristic such as; demographic, socio-demographic or geographic; namely, make use of these characteristics as a proxy for tourists' perception of the site. The fact that tourists' perceptions of a site may be associated with identifiable visitor characteristics (such as religion or nationality) could help management identify those who perceive the site as being part of their own heritage and those who do not, and target the different groups accordingly. Specifically, it can be applied to pre-visit information presented on heritage site websites, due to the attributes of the internet as a communication channel (Sigala 2004). Additionally it is emphasized that the link between visitors' perceptions and demographic, socio-demographic or geographic characteristics is site specific. Namely, though religious belief may be used as an indicator of visitors' perceptions of the Anne Frank House, it may not be relevant to other heritage sites, such as the Pyramids in Egypt or Yellowstone Park in the USA. At different heritage settings additional or different visitors' characteristics may be applicable to heritage site management.

7.2 Limitations and future research

Before the findings are generalised, several limitations should be taken into consideration. First, the site chosen for the focus of the research is a "must see" tourist attraction and might have unique characteristics that influenced the results. Second, it can be argued that the results of the current study reflect the fact that Anne Frank House is associated with human atrocities. In addition, this site can be classified due to its international significance as "World Heritage". This may explain the asymmetry between visitors' religious belief and their perceptions of the site. It is possible that some visitors perceive Anne Frank House as part of their own heritage since it holds a universal meaning. Hence, in relation to this specific site, few links can be found between individuals' personal characteristics and their beha-

viour. Clearly, future research should be conducted at other sites not associated with atrocities, as well as heritage sites that are not perceived as "World Heritage" to allow the general application of the findings.

Further research should explore the relationships between the individual and the site in relation to other behavioural patterns of importance to heritage site management (e.g. satisfaction, willingness to pay, or act towards the sites' preservation). Such studies may further develop our understanding of visitation patterns to heritage settings. Further research could explore the possibility that in addition to one's perception of the site in relation to their own heritage, another dimension should be added (e.g. whether the site is classified as "World Heritage" by UNESCO, or recognised at the local, national, or global level (Timothy 1997)). The current research underlines that in addition to willingness to learn, some tourists also seek emotional involvement. Future studies could further explore the nature of the emotions involved in the heritage experience, for instance; emotions of patriotism, nationalism, or sense of awe (Timothy 1997) in relation to the tourist experience at the site.

8. references

- ALZUA, A., J. O'LEARY AND A. MORRISON (1998). *Cultural and Heritage Tourism: Identifying Niches for International Travellers*. The Journal of Travel and Tourism Studies, 9 (2), 2-13.

- ANNE FRANK Museum official web site (2003). *Over 3 Million Visitors to 3 Major Amsterdam Museums*. Retrieved June 8, 2004, from <http://www.annefrank.org>.

- APOSTOLAKIS, A. (2003). *The Convergence Process in Heritage Tourism*. Annals of Tourism Research, 30 (4), 795-812.

- APTER, A., J. HATAB, S. TYANO AND A. WEIZIMAN (1998). *Child and Adolescent Psychology*. Dyonon Publishing, Tel- Aviv.

- ASHWORTH, G. (1998). *Heritage, Identity and Interpreting a European Sense of Place*. In *Contemporary Issues in Heritage and Environmental Interpretation*, eds. D. Uzzell and R. Ballantyne. The Stationary Office, London, pp. 112-132.

- BALLANTYNE, R. (1998). *Interpreting 'Visions': Addressing Environmental Education Goals through Interpretation*. In *Contemporary*

Issues in Heritage and Environmental Interpretation: Problems and Prospects, eds. D. Uzzell, and R. Ballantyne. The Stationary Office, London, pp. 77-97.

- BEEHO, A. J. AND R. C. PRENTICE (1997). *Conceptualizing the Experiences of Heritage Tourists*. Tourism Management, 18 (2), 75-87.

- BRUNER, E. M. (1996). *Tourism in Ghana: The Representation of Slavery and the Return of the Black Diaspora*. American Anthropologist, 98 (2), 290-304.

- CHEN, J. S. (1998). *Travel Motivation of Heritage Tourists*. Tourism Analysis, 2, 213- 215.

- DAHLES, H. (1998). *Redefining Amsterdam as a Tourist Destination*. Annals of Tourism Research, 25 (1), 55-69.

- DAVIS, A. AND R. PRENTICE (1995). *Conceptualizing the Latent Visitor to Heritage Attractions*. Tourism Management, 16 (7), 491-500.

- DIERKING, L. D. (1998). *Interpretation as a Social Experience*. In *Contemporary Issues in Heritage and Environmental Interpretation*, eds. D. Uzzell and R. Ballantyne. The Stationary Office, London, pp. 37-55.

- GARLING, T. (1998). Introduction - Conceptualizations of Human Environments. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 18, 69-73.

- GARROD, B. and A. FYALL (2000). *Managing Heritage Tourism*. Annals of Tourism Research, 27 (3), 682-708.

- GOULDING, C. (1999). *Interpretation and Presentation*. In *Heritage Visitor Attractions: An Operation Management Perspective*, eds. A. Leask and I. Yeoman. Cassell, London, pp. 54-67.

- HALL, C.M. AND MCARTHUR, S. (1998). *Integrated Heritage Management: Principles and Practice*. The Stationary Office, London.

- HATCHER, L. (1994). *A Step-by- Step Approach to Using the SAS System for Factor Analysis and Structural Equation Modeling*. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, North Carolina.

- JANSEN-VERBEKE, M. AND J. V. REKOM (1996). *Scanning Museum Visitors: Urban Tourism Marketing*. Annals of Tourism Research, 23 (2), 364-375.

- LIGHT, D. (1995). *Heritage as Informal Education*. In *Heritage, Tourism and Society*, ed. D.T. Herbert. Mansell, London, pp. 116-145.

- JONES, M. (2000). *The Elusive Reality of Landscape: Concepts and Approaches in Research*. In *Heritage: Conservation,*

Interpretation and Enterprise, ed. J.M. Fladmark. The Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, pp. 17-41.

- MALHOTRA, N. K. AND BIRKS, F. D. (2003). *Marketing Research: An Applied Approach*. 2nd European Edition. Prentice Hall, Harlow.

- MCCAIN, G. AND N.M. RAY (2003). *Legacy Tourism: The Search for Personal Meaning in Heritage Travel*. Tourism Management, 11 (8), 1859-1863.

- MOSCARDO, G. (1996). *Mindful Visitors: Heritage and Tourism*. Annals of Tourism Research, 23 (2), 376-397.

- PORIA, Y., R. BUTLER AND D. AIREY (2003a). *The Core of Heritage Tourism: Distinguishing Heritage Tourists from Tourists in Heritage Places*. Annals of Tourism Research, 30 (1), 238-254.

- PORIA, Y., R. BUTLER AND D. AIREY (2003b). *The Meaning of Heritage Sites for Tourists: The Case of Massada*. Tourism Analysis, 9 (1/2), 15-22.

- PORIA, Y., R. BUTLER AND D. AIREY (2004). *Links between Tourists, Heritage, and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites*. Journal of Travel Research, 43, 19-28.

- PORIA, Y., REICHEL, A. AND BIRAN, A. (2006a). *Heritage Site Management: Motivations and Expectations*. Annals of Tourism Research, 30 (1), 162-178.

- PORIA, Y., REICHEL, A. AND BIRAN, A. (2006b). *The Relationships between Perception of the Site and the Motivations to Visit amongst Potential Visitors to Heritage sites*. Journal of Travel Research, 43 (1), 1-9.

- PRENTICE, R. (1993). *Tourism and Heritage Attractions*. Routledge, London.

- PRENTICE, R., GUERIN AND S. MCGUGAN (1998). *Visitor Learning at a Heritage Attraction: A Case Study of Discovery as a Media Product*. Tourism Management, 19 (1), 5-23.

- REYNOLDS, P. (1999). *Design of the Process and Product Interface*. In *Heritage Visitor Attractions: An Operation Management Perspective*, eds. A. Leask and I. Yeoman. Cassell, London, pp. 110-126.

- RICHARDS, G. (2002). *Tourism Attraction Systems: Exploring Cultural Behavior*. Annals of Tourism Research 29(4):1048-1064.

- SCHWARZ, N. AND H.J. HIPPLER (1995). *The Numeric Values of Rating Scales: A Comparison of Their Impact in Mail Surveys and Telephone*

Interviews. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 7 (1), 72-74.

- SHACKLEY, M. (2001). *Managing Sacred Sites*. Continuum, London.

- SHARPLES, L., I. YEOMAN AND LEASK, A. (1999). *Operation Management*. In *Heritage Visitor Attractions: An Operation Management Perspective*, eds. A. Leask and I. Yeoman. Cassell, London, pp. 22-38.

- SHERIFF, N. (2003). *What is exactly 'Wrong' With Interpreting the Past in Order to Make it More Accessible and Interesting to the Visitor? Illustrate with Reference to an Actual Example of Heritage site*. Retrieved March 18, 2003 from <http://arasite.org/nshertge.htm>.

- SIGALA, M. (2004). *Internet Heritage and Cultural Tourism under Virtual Construction: Implications for Online Visitors' Experiences and Interpretation Management*. Tourism Today, 3, 51-67.

- STEWART, E.J., B.M., HAYWARD, P.J. DEVLIN AND V.G. KIRBY (1998). *The "Place" of Interpretation: a New Approach to the Evaluation of Interpretation*. Tourism Management, 19 (3), 57-266.

- SWARBROOKE, J. (2002). *The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions*. Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford.

- TABACHNICK, B. G. AND L.S. FIDELL (1996). *Using Multivariate Statistics*. Harper Collins College, New York.

- TIMOTHY, D. J. (1997). *Tourism and the Personal Heritage Experience*. Annals of Tourism Research, 24 (3), 751-754.

- TIMOTHY, J. D. AND S.W. BOYD (2003). *Heritage Tourism*. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

- UZZELL, D. (1996). *Creating Place Identity through Heritage Interpretation*. The International Journal of Heritage Studies, 1 (4), 219-228.

- UZZELL, D. (1998). *Interpreting Our Heritage: A Theoretical Interpretation*. In *Contemporary Issues in Heritage and Environmental Interpretation*, eds. D. L. The Stationary Office, London, pp. 11-25.

- UZZELL, D. AND R. BALLANTYNE (1998). *Heritage That Hurts: Interpretation in a Postmodern World*. In *Contemporary Issues in Heritage and Environmental Interpretation*, eds. D. L. Uzzell and R. Ballantyne. The Stationary Office, London, pp. 152- 171.