TYPOLOGY OF CULTURAL TOURISTS: AN ISLAND STUDY

DONGKOO YUN, SEAN HENNESSEY, ROBERTA MACDONALD and MELISSA MACEACHERN

(Tourism Research Centre, University of Prince Edward Island, Charlottetown, Canada)

Introduction

Many research studies suggest that a substantial percentage of tourists seek cultural experiences, such as visiting cultural attractions and participating in diverse cultural activities that are *not* 'sun, sand and sea' related. The World Tourism Organization suggests that more than 40% of all international tourists are 'cultural tourists' (Richards, 1996). The Travel Industry Association of America has estimated that two-thirds of U.S. adults visit a cultural or heritage site or attraction when they travel (Silberberg, 1995). Based on this data, it has been argued that cultural tourists represent a new type of mass tourist who seeks meaningful travel experiences (McKercher and Du Cros, 2003).

There is little doubt that culture is an important part of the tourism 'product' and is one of the factors that can improve the competitiveness of a tourism destination. An examination of the forces shaping the cultural 'product' will help identify the reasons why cultural tourism is critical at destinations. For this study, cultural tourism covers all aspects of travel where visitors can learn about another area's history and way of life. Thus, cultural factors in the context of tourism include the entertainment, food, drink, hospitality, architecture, and manufactured and hand-crafted products of a destination, and all other characteristics of a destination's way of life (McIntosh and Goeldner, 1990). McNulty (1991) and Weiler and Hall (1992) consider culture to include family patterns, folklore, social customs, museums, monuments, historical structures, and landmarks. Others include wilderness areas, valued landscapes, natural history buildings, and artifacts as part of cultural tourism (Tassell and Tassell, 1990; Prentice, 1993). Tourists travel to be informed and to experience folklore, customs, natural landscapes and historical landmarks as well as being involved in other activities such as nature, adventure, sports, festivals, crafts and sightseeing (MacDonald and Jolliffe, 2002). In addition, many activities at destinations that are not educational or cultural in a narrow sense provide opportunities for tourists to get to know each other (Richards, 1996). However, it has been difficult to demonstrate how important cultural tourism and cultural tourists are for a specific destination.

Who are the tourists that visit cultural attractions or engage in cultural activities, and why? What specific travel behaviours make them distinct from other travellers? How large is the demand for cultural tourism and what elements of culture attract tourists? How can cultural tourism be successfully developed and promoted? The answers to these types of questions may be quite different among destinations due to the different elements that create the culture of each destination. This paper's objective is to examine the meaning and significance of cultural tourism on Prince Edward Island. In doing so, the paper attempts to identify cultural tourists and profile trip characteristics of cultural tourists in an island setting.

What Is Cultural Tourism?

The terms 'cultural tourism' and 'cultural tourists' are widely used, but also misunderstood. In addition, the definition of cultural tourism and cultural tourist remains vague (Aluza, O'Leary and Morrison, 1998). Academics, practitioners, and policy-makers have been quick to identify cultural

tourism as a significant and growing market, but have been hesitant or unable to describe and define the market. Most attempts at defining cultural tourism agree that it consists of the consumption of culture by tourists (Richards, 1996). However, this approach also produces new problems because it includes a wide range of cultural elements. For example, what kinds of cultural experiences should be included within the scope of cultural tourism? Does a three-hour visit to a museum turn an entire two-week holiday into a cultural tourism experience? Are tourists who engage in cultural activities initially motivated to travel because of cultural attractions? Or, do they find out about the cultural product after arriving at a destination and engage in the activity 'for something to do'? It is clear that defining cultural tourism and cultural tourists is complex because it can mean different things to different people (McKercher and Du Cros, 2003). For many tourists, travelling to experience different cultures equates to cultural tourism. For these travelers, encountering different cultures is synonymous with a cultural tourism experience. They consume the different sights, sounds, tastes and smells of an unfamiliar culture. On the other hand, academics and tourism marketers define cultural tourism as a discrete product category that is differentiated from other tourism activities or attractions by consumption of a destination's tangible and intangible cultural heritage (Richards, 1996; Shackley, 1998; Hall and MacArthur, 1998; Leask and Yeoman, 1999). A growing body of literature indicates that some people are more highly motivated to participate in cultural tourism than others. McKercher (2002b) suggests that a definition of cultural tourists can be developed by considering two issues: the main reasons for a trip and the level of experiences at the destinations. A number of both conceptual and empirical studies have attempted to implement this process and explore the typology of cultural tourists.

Silberberg (1995) identified four types of cultural tourists, ranging from the greatly motivated to the accidental, while Shifflet and Associates (1999) identified three types of heritage tourists: 'core', 'moderate' and 'low', with each of the segments demonstrating different behaviour and spending patterns. Stebbins (1996) suggests that the cultural tourist comes in two types: 'general' and 'specialized'. The general cultural tourist makes a hobby of visiting different geographic sites. Over time, as general cultural tourists increase their knowledge of different cultures, they may become specialized cultural tourists who focus on one or a small number of geographic sites or cultural entities. Aluza, O'Leary, and Morrison (1998) contend that the cultural and heritage tourism market consists of five distinct segments with each having different trip characteristics, suggesting that not all cultural and heritage tourists are alike and should be targeted in different ways. McKercher (2002a) also suggests that cultural tourism can be segmented into five markets based on the depth at which the tourists engage in a culture or a cultural attraction, and how central the culture or attraction was to their choice of destination. To some segments, culture or the attraction played a major role in their decision; while, to other segments, culture played either a minor role or no role in their decision making (McKercher and Du Cros, 2003).

Martin et al. (2004) report that cultural and general visitors are very different in terms of activities, expenditures, information sources used and lodging preferences. Their study found that cultural heritage visitors were different from other visitors on most measurements, implying that heritage planners and marketers should take these differences into consideration when planning and promoting cultural heritage tourism. Nyaupane and Andereck (2007) suggest that cultural tourists can be divided into two groups: 'true cultural tourist' and 'spurious cultural tourist'. Comparisons among these groups in terms of demographics, importance of attractions and motivations suggested that these two types of cultural tourists (i.e. true and spurious) are distinct. Based on the above discussion, it is clear that cultural tourists are different from general tourists but, it seems, the question of what is cultural tourism remains unresolved. This paper attempts to lend an island perspective to the debate.

Methodology

Data Source:

This study used secondary data drawn from the 2004 Tourist Exit Survey conducted on Prince Edward Island (PEI), Canada's smallest province and a major tourist destination. The survey was conducted on behalf of Tourism PEI, the provincial government department responsible for managing the tourism industry on PEI. The main purposes of the survey are to collect statistics on the volume of travellers and their expenditures and to identify detailed characteristics of their trips. In 2004, a total of 3,139 surveys were completed by overnight pleasure tourists and these were used for this study. Among respondents, nearly 61% were male, 58% worked full time, and 29% were retired. Respondents varied widely in age, education, and annual household income. Of these, 27.3% were in the 50 to 59 years of age group, 23.7% had graduated from university (undergraduate), and 25.8% had an annual household income of CDN $50,000 to $75,000, while 24% had incomes over $100,000 (Tourism PEI, 2004).

Variables:

The Exit Survey listed 28 activities that respondents could indicate they had participated in while visiting PEI. For this study, ten of these were deemed to be cultural activities: experiencing Acadian culture, visiting Canada's birthplace attractions, attending a festival or event, visiting Founders' Hall, visiting a theme fun or amusement park, attending a cultural performance (live theatre), going to a lobster supper (meal) enjoying evening entertainment (e.g. bar, pub), visiting Anne of Green Gables attractions, and visiting historical/cultural attractions. These cultural activities were used to develop a typology of cultural tourists.

To profile characteristics of cultural tourists, eight trip-related variables were used: geographical market, types of visitation, travel information sources used, travelling party size, trip duration, recall of communities visited, travel activities, and expenditures. Of these trip-related variables, the two multiple-response variables (that is, travel information sources used and recall of communities visited), were reproduced as index scores. An index of travel information sources was developed by dividing the number of information sources used by the number of total selectable information sources (13), and multiplying by 100. Likewise, an index of recall of communities visited in Prince Edward Island was calculated using the number of communities recalled divided by the number of total selectable communities (9 clusters), and multiplying by 100.

Data Analysis:

The data analysis in this study proceeded in three stages. First, all respondents were grouped by using a K-means clustering procedure whereby a set of points is partitioned into k groups (Pollard, 1981). This clustering method was employed to find disjoint clusters (SAS Institute, Inc., 1990) with the means of each cultural activity item serving as an input. In the second stage of the study, an analysis of variance (ANOVA), a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), and discriminant analysis were performed. First, separate ANOVAs were conducted on each cultural activity item to determine whether the variables in each cluster group differed. Next, MANOVA and discriminant analysis were run to check the overall significance of cluster group differences that statistically confirm the results of cluster analysis. Discriminant analysis was used to identify the cultural activity variable's influence on the cluster.

A Typology of Cultural Tourists

Table 1 clearly illustrates that the 3,139 overnight pleasure tourists could be neatly partitioned into two cluster groups based on the ten cultural activity items. Determination of the number of clusters is based on the examination of the F-statistics from a two-, three-, four-, and five-cluster solution derived from a K-means cluster analysis (Milligan and Cooper, 1985; Reynolds and Beatty, 1999). The two-cluster solution was the most meaningful and interpretable.

Panel A of Table 1 reports the clustering statistics, indicating that of the 3,139 overnight pleasure tourists 1,996 (63.6%) reported low involvement in cultural activities and were termed 'non-cultural

tourists', while 1,143 (36.4%) were highly involved in cultural activities and were termed 'cultural tourists'. The remaining clustering statistics indicate that the clustering model was an excellent fit for the data.

Panel B of Table 1 presents the ANOVA statistics for the two clusters. The numbers indicate the percentage of the respondents in each cluster that reported participating in the stated activity. For example, only 11% of the visitors in Cluster 1 reported that they experienced Acadian culture, while 60.5% of Cluster 2 reported this activity. A review of Panel B clearly illustrates that Cluster 1 has much lower levels of participation for nine of the ten activities, thus supporting the labels used to describe the clusters.

Table 1. Summary of Clustering, ANOVAs, MANOVA and Discriminant Analysis

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Total	F-value	R-square
Panel A: Clustering Statistics					
Number of observations in cluster	1,996	1,143	3,139		
Percent of observations in cluster	63.6%	36.4%	100%		
RMS Std. Deviation	32.4	44.3			
Maximum distance from the seed to observation	90.8	83.5			
Nearest cluster	2	1			
Distance between cluster centroids	129.5	129.5			
Panel B: ANOVA Statistics					
Experiencing Acadian culture	11.0	60.5	29.0	1187.91***	.275
Visiting Canada's birthplace attractions	6.4	60.5	26.1	1707.48***	.352
Attending a festival or event	9.3	31.4	17.4	268.14***	.079
Visiting Founders' Hall	3.3	40.2	16.7	914.69***	.226
Visiting a theme, fun or amusement park	14.7	16.3	15.3	1.43	.000
Attending a cultural performance (live theatre)	7.3	29.4	15.4	298.41***	.087
Going to a lobster supper (meal)	24.6	64.1	39.0	562.71***	.152
Enjoying evening entertainment (bar, pub, etc.)	7.5	19.2	11.8	99.20***	.031
Visiting Anne of Green Gables attractions	25.2	74.0	43.0	911.48***	.225
Visiting historical/cultural attractions	17.0	87.5	42.7	2779.41***	.470
Panel C: MANOVA Statistics	Value	df	F-value	p-value	
Wilks' Lambda	0.251	10	935.15	<.0001	
Pillai's Trace	0.749	10	935.15	<.0001	
Hotelling-Lawley Trace	2.990	10	935.15	<.0001	
Panel D: Discriminant Statistics					
Posterior Probability Error Rate Estimates for Cluster	.0548	.0480	.0514		
Hit Ratio (%)	(94.5%)	(95.2%)	(94.9%)		

Note: Cluster 1 was labelled 'Non-cultural Tourists' while Cluster 2 was termed 'Cultural Tourists' based on the mean scores of the ten cultural activity items; *** $p < .001$

The F-values in Panel B reveal that the mean scores for nine of the ten cultural activities are significantly different at $p < 0.001$ level for the two clusters. The one exception is visiting a theme or amusement park, which does not seem to be a cultural activity based on the visitors' participation

levels. This result supports the method used to analyze the data. To further confirm the clusters, three types of MANOVA analyses testing the group differences in the cultural activity items were completed. The MANOVA statistics provided in Panel C of Table 1 were all significant at $p < 0.001$ so there are two distinct groups in this data.

Discriminant analysis was performed to examine which cultural activity items highly contributed to the clusters (the R-square and F-value in Panel B) and what percentage of hit ratio (or posterior probability error rates) exists in the identified clusters (Panel D). The results indicate that the model correctly classified 94.9% of the survey respondents into cluster groups. Of the nine cultural activity measures, 'visiting historical/cultural attractions' was the most significant contributor to the clustering segments, closely followed by 'visiting Canada's birthplace attractions'. The next three activities (experiencing Acadian culture, visiting Founders' hall, and visiting Anne of Green Gables attractions) were all very similar in terms of their contribution to the clustering model. The remaining four activities were significant but more minor contributors.

Trip-related Characteristics

The next stage of the study investigated whether there were any significant differences between the two groups of tourists with respect to trip-related characteristics. These characteristics included geographical markets, types of visitation, travel information used, recall of communities visited, travelling party size, trip duration, travel activities, and travel expenditures.

Geographical Markets and Types of Visitation:

As shown in Table 2, statistically significant differences between the two groups were found in geographical markets and types of visitation. The members of cluster 1 (non-cultural tourists) were the most likely to be from Atlantic Canada (41.3%), while Cluster 2 (cultural tourists) were the most likely to be from U.S., Ontario and 'other' Canada. It was also found that cultural tourists were more likely to be first-time visitors (63.8%) whereas non-cultural tourists were more likely to be repeat visitors (64.5%).

Table 2. Comparison of Geographical Markets and Types of Visitation across Cultural Tourists' Segment

	Cluster1 (n=1,996)	Cluster2 (n=1,143)	Total (n=3,139)	χ^2 value
Geographical Markets				
Atlantic Canada	41.3%	11.9%	30.6%	336.98***
U.S.	24.8%	39.5%	30.2%	
Ontario	14.7%	16.5%	15.4%	
Quebec	7.5%	7.3%	7.4%	
Other Canada	8.7%	16.7%	11.6%	
Other Countries	3.1%	8.0%	4.9%	
Types of Visitation				
First-time Visitors	35.5%	63.8%	45.8%	234.65***
Repeat Visitors	64.5%	36.2%	54.2%	

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); *** $p < .001$

Travel Information Sources Used:
Statistically significant differences between the two groups of tourists were found in an index variable of travel information sources used and the nine individual variables of information sources (Table 3). Overall, it was found that cultural tourists were much more likely to use travel information to plan the trip. Of information sources available, all tourists were the most likely to use the Internet, followed by the PEI travel information package, friends, relatives, and co-workers; and the AAA/CAA package or other travel books or tourist information centre materials. Least likely to be used were newspaper story or advertisement; travel agent; and television program or advertisement.

Communities Visited:

As presented in Table 4, statistically significant differences between the two groups of tourists were found in an index of recall of communities visited and in the percentage of tourists visiting the eight communities/community clusters. Overall, it was found that cultural tourists were much more likely to recall communities visited on Prince Edward Island than non-cultural tourists. Of these PEI communities, cultural tourists were most likely to have spent time in Charlottetown, followed by Kensington, Stanley Bridge, Cavendish, and Stanhope and Summerside.

Table 3. Comparison of Travel Information Sources used across Cultural Tourists' Segment

	Cluster1 (*n*=1,996)	Cluster2 (*n*=1,143)	Total (*n*=3,139)	χ2 value
Index of Travel Information Sources used [a]	12.9	19.2	15.2	-14.57***
AAA/CAA Package	15.2%	30.3%	20.7%	100.14***
Geography or travel book on PEI or Canada	16.2%	28.5%	20.7%	66.85***
Friends, relatives, co-workers	30.2%	36.9%	32.6%	15.11***
Tourist information centre in NS or NB	18.0%	26.4%	21.1%	30.71***
Newspaper story or advertisement	4.0%	6.2%	4.8%	7.71**
Travel agent	1.8%	3.3%	2.3%	7.89**
Television program or advertisement	4.8%	6.6%	5.4%	5.04*
PEI travel information package	33.1%	49.4%	39.0%	81.80***
Internet/PEI Homepage/Tourism Web Site	41.0%	58.4%	47.4%	88.37***
Maps/Atlas	0.5%	0.3%	0.4%	1.00
Past experience	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%	0.15
Obtained information in PEI	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.01
Other	0.8%	1.4%	1.0%	3.12

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); [a] = *t*-test result; * *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01; *** *p* < .001

Table 4. Comparison of Recall of Communities visited across Cultural Tourists' Segment

	Cluster1 (*n*=1,996)	Cluster2 (*n*=1,143)	Total (*n*=3,139)	χ2 value
Index of Recall of Communities visited [a]	12.9	19.2	15.2	-14.57***
Tignish, Alberton, Mill River, O'Leary, West Point	20.8%	37.6%	27.0%	103.93***
Tyne Valley, Wellington, Mont Carmel, Miscouche	14.6%	27.1%	19.2%	73.18***
Summerside	38.4%	61.4%	46.8%	154.98***
Kensington, Stanley Bridge, Cavendish, Stanhope	53.1%	80.1%	62.9%	228.51***
Gateway Village, Victoria-by-the-Sea, Cornwall, Fort Amherst	29.2%	45.1%	35.0%	81.12***
Charlottetown	58.9%	82.4%	67.5%	182.84***
Mount Stewart, Crowbush, St. Peter's, Souris	22.5%	30.7%	25.5%	25.48***
Brudenell, Georgetown, Montague, Murray River, Wood Islands	38.8%	56.3%	45.2%	89.13***
Any other areas that you recall visiting	1.0%	1.7%	1.2%	3.07

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); [a] = *t*-test result; * *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01; *** *p* < .001

Travelling Party Size and Trip Duration:

While the travel party size was essentially identical between the two clusters, cultural tourists spent more time on PEI as shown in Table 5. While the difference is statistically significant, the difference from a practical perspective, 4.9 versus 4.2 nights, is modest.

Travel Activities:

Results of independent t-tests indicated that the level of activities, other than cultural, were also significantly different between cultural and non-cultural tourists (Table 6). This was the case for all but four of the activities: camping, deep sea/salt water fishing, participating in a sports game, and attending a sport event as a spectator.

Participation rates in some of the activities were high for all overnight pleasure tourists. For example, all visitors were likely to participate in sightseeing, visiting beaches, and shopping for crafts and souvenirs, while relatively view attended a sport event as a spectator, fished, or cycled. The mean values of most variables were higher for the cultural tourists than for the non-cultural tourists. As a result, cultural tourists were more likely to be active in terms of the level of travel activity participation, while non-cultural tourists were much more likely to visit friends or relatives or play golf.

Table 5. Comparison of Travel Party Size and Trip Duration across the Cultural Tourists' Segment

	Cluster1 (n=1,996)	Cluster2 (n=1,143)	Total (n=3,139)	t-value
Average Travelling Party Size (n)	2.9	3.0	2.9	-0.92
Trip Duration (average number of nights stayed)	4.2	4.9	4.5	-3.63***

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); *** $p < .001$

Table 6. Comparison of Travel Activity Participation across the Cultural Tourists' Segment

Travel Activities participated in (%)	Cluster1 (n=1,996)	Cluster2 (n=1,143)	Total (n=3,139)	t-value
Sightseeing	61.9	90.5	72.3	-20.50***
Driving tour	33.8	65.4	45.3	-18.01***
Harbour/city/land tours	10.2	29.4	17.2	-12.75***
Craft/souvenir shopping	50.1	82.7	62.0	-20.57***
Shopping (general merchandise)	32.1	48.8	38.2	-9.25***
Visiting a national park	36.0	72.9	49.4	-21.70***
Beach visits	55.6	82.8	65.5	-17.25***
Camping	17.8	17.0	17.5	0.61
Confederation trail	12.6	39.0	22.2	-16.26***
Hiking	11.0	30.0	17.9	-12.47***
Cycling	5.4	7.9	6.3	-2.66**
Bird watching	11.4	26.2	16.8	-9.94***
Boating/canoeing/kayaking/sailing	5.8	11.5	7.9	-5.36***
Deep sea/salt water fishing	3.9	5.2	4.4	-1.60
Playing golf	13.6	10.5	12.5	2.63**
Participating in a sports game (participant)	5.5	5.9	5.6	-0.41
Attending a sport event as a spectator	3.0	3.2	3.1	-0.44
Visiting friends or relatives	30.2	20.3	26.6	6.27***

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Travel Expenditures:

As shown in Table 7, statistically significant differences were also found in most of the travel expenditure variables across the clusters. Overall, cultural tourists spent significantly more money than non-cultural tourists. When calculated on a per person per night basis so as to negate the effects of travelling party size and trip duration, cultural tourists were also more likely to spend more money than non-cultural tourists.

When considering the expenditure categories, the largest percentage difference was on admission fees, spending on souvenirs and crafts, and at restaurants and bars. Cultural tourists spent more on most categories of travel expenditures than did non-cultural tourists. Non-cultural tourists were more likely to spend money on 'groceries and liquor' and 'sports and recreation'.

Table 7. Comparison of Travel Expenditures across the Cultural Tourists' Segment

Travel Expenditures	Cluster1 (n=1,996)	Cluster2 (n=1,143)	Total (n=3,139)	t-value
Average total spending per party per trip	$825.1	$1186.2	$957.9	-8.98***
Average spending per person per night	$100.5	$122.3	$108.5	-6.21***
Spending on accommodations [a]	$35.2	$42.1	$37.8	-4.63***
Spending at restaurants and bars [a]	$23.1	$29.1	$25.3	-5.82***
Spending on groceries and liquor [a]	$6.1	$5.3	$5.8	2.60**
Spending on admission fees [a]	$5.2	$7.9	$6.2	-6.77***
Spending on shopping for souvenirs and crafts [a]	$8.9	$12.8	$10.3	-5.41***
Spending on shopping for other merchandise [a]	$5.1	$5.1	$5.1	0.11
Spending on auto/cycle related [a]	$11.8	$14.1	$12.7	-2.00*
Spending on sports and recreation [a]	$3.6	$2.3	$3.2	3.03**
Spending on night entertainment [a]	$1.0	$2.1	$1.4	-4.41***
Other spending [a]	$1.4	$1.8	$1.5	-1.09

Note: Cluster 1 = Non-cultural Tourists (63.6%); Cluster 2 = Cultural Tourists (36.4%); [a] = average spending per person per night; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Discussion and Limitations

The purpose of this study was to provide a preliminary analysis of cultural tourists to an Island destination. For this study, a cultural tourist was defined in terms of performance, as someone who visited a cultural attraction, art gallery, museum or historic site, attend a performance or festival, and/or participated in other cultural activities at any time during their trip per Table 1. They enter the 'culture' category by virtue of having a greater than average score in terms of numbers of commercially available (as opposed to family affiliated) cultural activities engaged in, regardless of their main reason for travelling.

The primary analytical tool used in the study was cluster analysis. The first cluster was labelled 'non-cultural tourists' who accounted for the majority of overnight visitors to PEI in 2004 (63.6%). These visitors had relatively lower involvement in the selected, commercial cultural activities. The second cluster, 'cultural tourists' accounted for 36.4% of the overnight visitors to PEI in 2004. They were moderately to highly involved (i.e. participation rates of 19−87%) in nine of the ten cultural activities selected for the purposes of this study.

The survey results indicated that there are significant differences between the two clusters with respect to trip characteristics. Cultural tourists were more likely to be from geographically distant markets (i.e., Ontario and other parts of Canada) or different countries (U.S. and other countries), be first-time visitors, use travel information sources, stay more nights, have better recall of the communities visited, engage in other travel activities, and spend more money than the non-cultural tourists. On the other hand, the non-cultural tourists tended to be from closer markets (the other two Maritime Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia); be repeat visitors; visit friends or relatives;

play more golf than cultural tourists; and spend more money on 'groceries and liquor' and 'sports and recreation'.

One of the limitations of the study is that the only variables available to define cultural tourists were commercial cultural activity items. As was discussed in the literature review, there is no evidence that cultural tourists in this study are 'true' cultural tourists who are highly motivated to travel for cultural reasons and who seek a deep experience. Different people will participate in cultural activities and visit cultural attractions at different levels, depending on their own interests, travel motivation, cultural distance, preferred experiences or activities, level of knowledge, perceptions of destination, amount of learning, trip-related characteristics, socio-demographic background, and other factors (Stebbins, 1996; Timothy, 1997; Prentice, Witt and Hamer, 1998; McKercher and Cros, 2003). Therefore, these related variables should be included in any future research on cultural tourists.

In Prince Edward Island, culture has been something inherent in the tourism product rather than a niche market product. However, cultural tourists may nonetheless be segmented into different niche markets. More in-depth research on cultural tourism may reveal more meaningful subgroups of cultural tourists. Further research on tourism and culture should be undertaken, applying both qualitative and quantitative methods, to further investigate the importance of the cultural 'product' in attracting tourists to Prince Edward Island. This research could also be the basis for making comparisons between destinations, particularly islands, where the cultural 'product' and the underlying reasons why tourists visit may be more easily defined. Islands are a distinct type of travel market and the culture of these unique places may well be a key motivating reason why many tourists visit (Kochel, 1994; Prohaska, 1995; Jolliffe and Baum, 1999).

Conclusion

This study has identified that cultural themes are an important factor for a significant portion of tourists visiting Prince Edward Island and demonstrated that cultural tourists are valuable in terms of their economic contribution to the destination and cultural/social interaction with communities. The study provides some insights into cultural tourism and the characteristics of cultural tourists on Prince Edward Island. Based on the results, it is clear that tourism marketers and operators need to emphasize culturally unique elements of Prince Edward Island and provide a variety of travel information sources to appeal and attract more distant (mid- and long-haul) markets and first-time visitors.

Cultural tourists in this study also participated in other activities, especially those related to nature, recreation, and entertainment. Therefore, cultural tourism should be integrated with such activities in a manner that is accessible, enjoyable and easy to consume, such as package offerings and special services. Successful products that cater to these needs may lead to increased tourism demand and the growing supply of cultural attractions. Cultural products that ignore this maxim will struggle to find a sustainable consumer base.

References

Aluza, A, O'Leary, J.T and Morrison, A.M (1998) 'Cultural and Heritage Tourism: Identifying Niches for International Travelers', *Journal of Tourism Studies* v9 n2: 2–13

Hall, C.M and McArthur, S (1998) *Integrated Heritage Management*, London: The Stationery Office

Jolliffe, L and Baum, T (1999) 'An Agenda for Cultural Tourism on the Periphery: The Case of Four North Atlantic Islands', CHME Conference, England

Kochel, U (1994) *Culture, Tourism and Development: The Case of Ireland*, UK: Liverpool University Press

Leask, A and Yeoman, I (1999) *Heritage Visitor Attractions: An Operations Management Perspective*, London: Cassel

MacDonald, R.M and Jolliffe, L (2002) 'Cultural Rural Tourism: Evidence from Canada', *Annals of Tourism Research* v30, n2: 307-322

Martin, B.S, Bridges, W.C and Valliere, W (2004) 'Are Cultural Heritage Visitors Really Different from Other Visitors?', *Tourism Analysis* v9 n1/2: 129–134

McIntosh R and Goeldner C (1990) *Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies* (6th ed), New York: John Wiley & Sons

McKercher, B (2002a) 'Towards a Classification of Cultural Tourists', *The International Journal of Tourism Research* v4 n1: 29–38

McKercher, B (2002b) *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*, New York: Haworth Hospitality Press

McKercher, B and Du Cros, H (2003) 'Testing a Cultural Tourism Typology', *The International Journal of Tourism Research* v5 n1: 45–58

McNulty, R (1991) 'Cultural Tourism:New Opportunities for Wedding Conservation to Economic Development', *International Congress on Architectural Conservation and Town Planning*, London: Heritage Trust

Milligan, G.W and Cooper, M.C (1985) 'An Examination of Procedures for Determining the Number of Clusters in a Dataset', *Psychometrika* v50 n2: 159–179

Nyaupane, G.P and Andereck, K.L (2007) 'An Expansion of Typology of Cultural Heritage Visitors' in *Beating the Odds with Tourism Research*, *Proceedings of TTRA 38th Annual Conference*, *Las Vegas, Nevada, USA* (June 17–20): 213–220

Pollard, D (1981) 'Strong Consistency of K-means Clustering', *The Annals of Statistics* v9 n1, 135–140

Prentice, M (1993) *Tourism and Heritage Attractions*, London: Routledge

Prentice, R.C, Witt, S.F and Hamer, C (1998) 'Tourism as Experience: The Case of Heritage Parks', *Annals of Tourism Research* v25 n1: 1–24

Prohaska, S. (1995) 'Trends in Cultural Tourism' in Conlin, M and Baum, T (eds) *Island Tourism: Management Principles and Practice*, London: Wiley: 33–51

Reynolds, K.E and Beatty, S.E (1999) 'A Relationship Customer Typology', *Journal of Retailing* v75 n4: 509–523

Richards, G (1996) *Cultural Tourism in Europe*, Wallingford: CAB International

SAS Institute Inc (1990) *SAS/STAT User's Guide Version 6 (Fourth edition) Volume 1*, Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc

Shackley, M (1998) *Visitor Management: A Strategic Focus*, London: Focal Press

Shifflet, D.K and Associates (1999) *Pennsylvania Heritage Tourism Study*, McLean, Virginia: Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Silberberg, T (1995) 'Cultural Tourism and Business Opportunities for Museums and Heritage Sites', *Tourism Management* v16 n5: 361–365

Stebbins, R.A (1996) 'Cultural Tourism as Serious Leisure', *Annals of Tourism Research* v23 n4: 948–950

Tassell, C and Tassell, M (1990) 'The Tasmanian Rural Landscape', *Heritage Australia* v9 n4: 12–15

Timothy, D.J (1997) 'Tourism and The Personal Heritage Experience', *Annals of Tourism Research* v24 n3: 751–754

Tourism PEI (2004) *Economic Impact: Tourism 2004 Final Report*, Charlottetown, PE: Tourism Prince Edward Island

Weiler, B and Hall, C (1992) *Special Interest Tourism*, London: Belhaven Press