

Deakin Research Online

This is the published version:

Kay, Pandora 2006, Tourist benefits research : old and new issues and uses in a cultural tourism context, in *CAUTHE 2006 : To the City and Beyond : Proceedings of the 16th Council for Hospitality and Tourism Educators Conference*, Victoria University - School of Hospitality, Tourism and Marketing, Melbourne, Vic., pp. 809-824.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30036663>

Reproduced with the kind permission of the copyright owner.

Copyright : 2006, CAUTHE

**TOURIST BENEFITS RESEARCH:
OLD AND NEW ISSUES AND USES IN A CULTURAL TOURISM CONTEXT**

Pandora Kay
Victoria University
Australia
Email: [Pandora.Kay@vu.edu.au](mailto: Pandora.Kay@vu.edu.au)

ABSTRACT

Benefits sought and gained by tourists are relevant to developing tourist markets for cultural attractions and experiences as this paper will demonstrate. The main objectives of this paper are to identify benefit variables commonly used in tourism marketing, their purpose of use, and associated issues by reviewing existing empirical research of tourism benefits and specifically examining the applications to date in cultural tourism contexts. For the benefits most commonly found in tourist benefit research and of relevance to tourists' cultural experiences, a benefits typology from the allied area of leisure (Driver & Bruns, 1999) is applied to categorise these benefits and develop a conceptual typology for consideration. Research propositions for future research of tourists' cultural experiences are also proposed including new uses for benefit variable dimensions.

Key Words: benefit segmentation; benefits sought; benefits gained; tourist motivation; tourist satisfaction; cultural experience tourists

INTRODUCTION

One of the earliest uses of benefit variables was for market segmentation purposes in the late 1960s and this dominant use continues today. Benefit segmentation is considered a superior approach to market segmentation. An early rationale for benefit segmentation (Haley, 1968) was, “the benefits which people are seeking in consuming a given product are the basic reasons for the existence of true market segments” (p.198). A strength of benefit segmentation identified from its application to various consumer products and brands since 1961 is that it relied on causal factors than descriptive factors and therefore was a good predictor of future consumer behaviour (Haley 1961 cited in Haley, 1971). While benefit segmentation has been applied to many other markets and studies particularly from the 1980s onwards, its greatest attention and application has been in the fields of travel, tourism, leisure and recreation. Suggested reasons for this interest in benefit segmentation by these sectors include a widely held belief of some association between tourists' motivations and benefits sought, although the exact link is still to be tested and proven (Frochot & Morrison, 2000), and travellers' motivations, in turn, have always been portrayed as a critical variable in the tourist decision making process (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Lundberg, 1971). A recent review of research in hospitality and tourism journals (Oh *et al.*, 2004) noted that market segmentation research continues to take more space than any other single research topic in hospitality and tourism journals, however, limitations of tourism segmentation research are also noted in this review and several others (Dolnicar, 2002b, c; Frochot & Morrison, 2000).

Benefits based tourism segmentation in particular, has been noted for its advantages as well as some issues and limitations (Frochot, 2005; Frochot & Morrison, 2000) and an aim of this paper is to review the existing empirical research to analyse the benefit research dimensions, especially what has been measured, when it has been measured and how it has been analysed and measured. A specific objective is to consider the extent to which standards or consensus may exist in approaches to using and measuring tourist benefit dimensions and particularly to identify a set of commonly found benefit dimensions.

In particular, the application of benefit variables in cultural experience tourism research and marketing is a further focus of this paper. Despite the categorisation of cultural tourism as a separate tourism product since the late 1970s, the study of cultural tourism activity, and of the cultural tourism market in particular, is still in its infancy (McKercher, 2002). Various dimensions have been used to segment cultural tourist markets in pioneering work of cultural tourist motivation, behaviour and market segmentation that has been undertaken since the mid 1990s (Alzua *et al.*, 1998; Dolnicar, 2002a; McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher *et al.*, 2002; Silberberg, 1995). Some of these studies focus on motivation-based dimensions, others on activities-based dimensions. In the allied area of festival and event tourist motivation and segmentation, no studies refer to benefits as a motivation or segmentation dimension, although some of the motivation statements could be categorised as statements of benefits (e.g., Formica & Uysal, 1998). Four empirical studies that focus on the benefits of tourists' cultural experiences have been identified and they are included in the subsequent analysis of benefit research dimensions.

The primary aim of this paper is to identify a set of commonly used benefit dimensions from the tourism benefit research literature. This set will be of particular relevance to future uses of benefit variables in research of tourist's cultural experiences for it is widely acknowledged that knowledge of tourist benefits is relevant to understanding and predicting buying behaviour and has implications for marketing (e.g., Frochot & Morrison, 2000; Kotler *et al.*, 2006) following on from Haley's first work on benefit segmentation and consumer product attributes in 1968. One of the earliest tourist benefit segmentation studies reviewed in this study (Woodside & Jacobs, 1985) used benefits realised segmentation to differentiate groups of visitors of various nationalities in Hawaii and implied that the advertising strategy for each nationality should be differentiated and suggested that the results should also be useful in improving destination tourism facilities. Kotler *et al.*, (2006) also emphasise two marketing implications of benefit segmentation and knowing the benefits sought by customers: “First, managers can develop products with features that provide the benefits their customers are seeking. Second, managers communicate more effectively with their customers if they know what benefits they seek” (p. 274). Cross-tabulating benefits sought segments with various behavioural information has the further advantage of identifying vacation styles which provide a complete profile of the segments (Dolnicar & Leish, 2003).

For the benefits most commonly found in tourist benefit research and of relevance to attracting tourists to cultural experiences, they will be categorised in relation to a relevant theoretical typology identified from the literature to develop a conceptual typology for discussion. It will be argued in this paper that benefits sought and gained by tourists are relevant to developing tourist markets for cultural attractions and experiences, and new uses will be proposed for benefit variable dimensions in future research of tourists' cultural experiences.

Prior to undertaking the primary aim, three main issues associated with benefit research have been identified as essential further background to be briefly discussed in the next section and these are: what to research, when to research and how to research issues in benefit research.

WHAT TO MEASURE ISSUES IN BENEFIT RESEARCH

In his pioneering work, Haley (1968) never proposed a precise definition of benefits which has led to some mixed interpretations since the late 1960s with the application of his benefit segmentation technique to various products. Initially the benefits identified were mainly utilitarian (e.g. Haley, 1968) such as attribute-based benefits or in a tourism context, specific features of the destination or service. Since the 1980s, others associate benefits with, “sensory, rational and emotional benefits” which are referred to as psychologically-based benefits (Lewis, 1981). In several consumer product studies, hedonic attitudes have been contrasted with utilitarian attitudes (Spangenberg *et al.*, 1997; Voss *et al.*, 2003). In significant work on hedonic benefits (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982; Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982), hedonic benefits are considered more relevant to cultural and experiential products than utilitarian benefits. By the 1990s, a conceptual shift within the operationalisation of benefits has been noted, away from activities and amenities and toward experiential and psychological outcomes (Tian *et al.*, 1996).

A precise definition of what is being measured in tourism benefit research is an ongoing problem with many studies not specifically defining benefits for the purpose of their studies. Of the 13 key studies to be reviewed in this paper, the majority measure benefits sought and only two measure benefits gained or realised. No studies measure both. While there has been considerable use of benefit research largely for market segmentation purposes in the context of tourism and allied areas of recreation, leisure and travel, there is no consensus among researchers on definitions of benefits, a typology of benefit categories, nor is there an identified set of commonly used dimensions or benefit statements. Furthermore it could be said that there is some confusion and mix of interpretations in the tourism benefit literature between benefits and other consumer motivation and behaviour constructs such as attitudes, motivations, motives, expectations and satisfaction. While some studies theoretically distinguish between some of these constructs and refer to relationships between them but very few studies have conceptualised or tested these relationships.

Despite the lack of consensus in the tourism benefit literature and even considerable confusion and mix of interpretations, there has been extensive use of tourist benefit research for more than 20 years and so there is a large body of relevant literature from tourism benefit research as well as from allied areas such as marketing and leisure which allows major uses, and associated issues, and any trends, standards or consensus to be identified.

Also of relevance to the issue of what benefits to research and defining benefits for the purpose of one’s research are typologies of benefit categories. Only two typologies of relevance to tourism benefits been identified from the literature. Frochot and Morrison (2000) note the lack of consensus among researchers on benefits in their review of benefit segmentation and its applications to travel and tourism research. They propose that three possibilities exist: attribute based (with the nature of benefits often reflecting the attributes or features of the destination or service), psychologically based (with these benefits often associated with travellers’ motivations or emotional expectations), or a combination of both. They further note a tendency for psychologically based benefits to be used in travel and tourism research studies and other authors have also noted a conceptual shift within the operationalisation of benefits away from activities and

amenities and toward experiential and psychological outcomes, especially since the 1990s (Tian *et al.*, 1996). One other relevant typology for experiential benefits derives from the allied area of leisure research and identifies five major general categories from an overview of specific types and general categories of benefits that have been attributed to leisure by research: psychological, psycho-physiological, sociological (social and cultural), economic and environmental (Driver & Bruns, 1999). The first two categories are personal benefit related with psychological benefits including the further sub-categories of better mental health and health maintenance, personal development and growth, and personal appreciation and satisfaction; and psycho-physiological benefits deriving from participation in activities. Economic benefit is defined as the monetary worth of the improvements as measured by the prices that people are willing to pay for goods, services, and conditions that comprise the improvements. This typology of leisure benefits is considered relevant and useful to tourism benefit research as leisure is a closely allied area to tourism especially when the latter is undertaken for pleasure (Driver *et al.*, 1991). A major strength of this typology is that it acknowledges a range of benefits that can accrue from leisure activities some of which are directly personal benefits and largely psychological related but might also involve physiological benefits, while others involve a larger external entity such as the external physical or economic environment or another social entity such as a group or society.

WHEN TO MEASURE ISSUES IN BENEFIT RESEARCH

One further issue in tourism benefit research is the timing of the collection of benefit statement ratings with some based on benefits sought or pursued (i.e., prior to the consumption experience) and others on benefits gained or realised (i.e., after the consumption experience or based on past experiences). This timing difference results in two separate constructs of benefits that have been defined for the purpose of this paper as follows. Benefits sought can be considered a type of normative expectation, that is forward directed, intentional charged, tentative attitude towards a particular consumption goal that contains a more or less definite element of knowledge about the cultural experience and the benefit to be gained by having the experience, driven by motives for attending the experience. In contrast, benefits realised or gained can be defined as, an improved psycho-physiological outcome resulting from the cultural consumption experience, the performance of tangible and intangible attributes experienced, and the consequences of visitor's behaviours during the consumption experience. In summary, benefits sought are particularly relevant to visitor's motivation and expectations within the decision making process to attend experiences, while benefits gained or realised are of particular relevance to visitor's behavioural outcomes from experience consumption, especially satisfaction. Of the 13 key studies to be reviewed in this paper, the majority measure benefits sought including the four cultural tourism related benefit studies, only two measure benefits gained or realised, and no studies measure both.

HOW TO MEASURE ISSUES IN BENEFIT RESEARCH

Methodological issues abound in tourism benefit research and benefit segmentation research generally. Most are beyond the scope of this paper other than issues relevant to the types of methodological approaches used in tourism benefit research. These will be briefly noted here from the literature for further comparative discussion with the overview of the methodological approaches used in the 13 studies that will be reviewed in the next section of this paper to determine whether a set of commonly used benefit dimensions can be identified from the existing research.

A recent review of research in hospitality and tourism journals noted the predominance of market segmentation research and within this research found the predominant approach was the combinational use of factor analysis for data reduction, cluster analysis for classification, analysis of variance and discriminant analysis for cross-method validations of the classification results, descriptive profiling of each cluster (Oh *et al.*, 2004). While a dominance in approach to tourism benefit segmentation has been noted, numerous other differences have been noted by Frochot and Morrison (2000). These include some researchers using either factor or cluster analysis on their own, with no consensus on one best method; different factor and cluster analysis techniques have been used and associated with this there is difficulty determining the best techniques for factor and cluster analysis, and the optimum cluster solution. For a detailed discussion of some of the other issues with methodological approaches and techniques for measuring benefits for segmentation and other purposes in marketing generally (see Hoek *et al.*, 1993) and in tourism contexts (see Dolnicar, 2002b, c; Frochot & Morrison, 2000).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There have been many applications of benefit segmentation in tourism research over the past 20 years as seen in Tables 1 and 2 which present details of 13 key studies. To consider whether differences can be distinguished between tourist benefit research in a cultural tourism context, Table 1 summarises nine key studies in the tourism area (non-cultural related), seven of which focus on benefits sought and two on benefits gained or realised, while Table 2 summarises four empirical studies identified to date of relevance to cultural tourism, all of which focus on benefits sought in cultural and heritage settings.

In terms of major research objectives, all studies use benefits for market segmentation purposes or as one dimension of multi-dimensional segmentation. Many of these studies, however, also test relationships between or influences of benefit segments and other variables as will be reported below. For the type of tourist product analysed, the majority of studies in Table 1 focus on vacation travel choice or specific destinations including three nature travel market related studies one each in the US, UK and Australian outbound travellers (Frochot, 2005; Lang & O'Leary, 1997; McCool & Reilly, 1993). Of the four cultural related studies (Table 2): one study (Alzua *et al.*, 1998) focuses on culture and heritage travel, and the other three are heritage and museum attraction related (Frochot, 2004; Tian *et al.*, 1996; Weaver *et al.*, 2002).

Different markets are represented in the populations sampled with several studies in Table 1 sampling the United States or North American market (McCool & Reilly, 1993; Shoemaker, 1994); the Australian travellers (Moscardo *et al.*, 1996) and nature travel market (Lang & O'Leary, 1997); Japanese leisure market (Hsieh *et al.*, 1997; Jang *et al.*, 2002). Only one study is cross-cultural (Woodside & Jacobs, 1985) examining North American and Japanese markets. The four cultural tourism related studies (Table 2) comprise two studies sampling the US market (Tian *et al.*, 1996; Weaver *et al.*, 2002) and two in the UK: one outbound (Alzua *et al.*, 1998) and one domestic (Frochot, 2004).

In terms of how and when tourist benefits are measured in these studies, there is wide variation in the number of benefit variables for both items measured (12-42) and dimensions found through factor analysis (3-19), highlighting that there is not a commonly agreed scale for measuring tourist benefits and many item sets include items that are site or location specific. Only one study of heritage site visitors in the US (Weaver *et al.*, 2002) uses an existing scale of Recreation Preference Scale (Driver *et al.*, 1991). Methodological approaches used are predominantly the two-step process

of factor analysis followed by cluster analysis. This methodological approach was used by seven of the nine studies in Table 1 and two of the four cultural related studies. Only four of the 13 studies did not include factor analysis. However a variety of factor and cluster techniques are used and cluster analysis solutions range from 2-6 clusters. When scale types are reported, Likert scales of importance or agreement are commonly used, in six and three studies, respectively. As previously reported, the majority of the studies measure benefits sought than benefits gained and no studies examine both. Four studies use multi-dimensional segmentation (Alzua *et al.*, 1998; Hsieh *et al.*, 1997; Lang & O'Leary, 1997; Woodside & Jacobs, 1985) whereby segmentation is based on benefits and other variables namely, travel philosophy (2 studies), activity participation (2 studies), travel product preferences, destination attributes, and experiences realised. Several of the studies further use analysis of variance and discriminant analysis for cross-method validations of the classification results, and to test relationships between or influences of benefit segments and other variables, namely, activities or activity preferences (2 studies), setting attribute preferences, ideal destination planning concerns, constraints, quality evaluation, and expenditure patterns. This demonstrates wide variation in the other variables studied in addition to benefits.

Table 1
Summary of Empirical Studies of Tourist Benefit Research (Non-Cultural Tourism Related)

	Benefits Sought							Benefits Gained	
AUTHOR(S)	(Hsieh <i>et al.</i> , 1997)	(Jang <i>et al.</i> , 2002)	(Lang & O'Leary, 1997)	(Loker & Perdue, 1992)	(McCool & Reilly, 1993)	(Moscardo <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	(Frochot, 2005)	(Shoemaker, 1994)	(Woodside & Jacobs, 1985)
Major Research Objectives	Travel decision pattern multi-stage segmentation based on travel benefit sought, travel philosophy and travel product preferences	Benefit segmentation and identification of optimum target market	Multi-segmentation of benefits sought (motivation); activities; destination attributes and travel philosophy	Vacation benefit segmentation identification of optimum target market	Benefit segmentation and relationship with preferences for setting attributes and expenditure patterns	Benefit segmentation (motivation) & relationship with activities	Benefit segmentation & relationship with activity preferences	Benefit segmentation of image of last destination visited attributes and comparison with ideal destination planning concerns	Multi-dimensional benefit segmentation based on benefits and experiences realised
Tourism Product Analysed	Vacation choice	USA destination	Nature Travellers Outbound vacations	Travel in Nth Carolina USA	3 State parks USA	Out-bound vacations	2 rural areas, Scotland	Domestic vacations	Hawaii
Population Sampled	Japanese leisure	Japanese leisure	Australian travel market	Non-Resident leisure	State Park visitors	Australian travellers	Overnight visitors at local accommodation	US populations	Canadians, Americans, Japanese
No. of Items	25a	42	25	12	18	28	13	39	26b
No. of Dimensions	6	8	7	4	5	8	4	19	Not Applicable
No. of Clusters	6	3	6	6	4	3	4	4	3 national segments

Scale Type	4-point Likert (importance)	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	6-point Likert (importance)	4-point Likert (agreement)	5-point Likert (importance)	10-point Likert (concern)	5-point Likert (agreement)
Statistical Methodology	Cluster analysis; ANOVA & Chi-square	PCA (Varimax); Hierarchical & K-means cluster analyses; ANOVA & Chi-square	PCA (Varimax); Ward’s Min Variance Cluster analysis; DA; ANOVA & Chi-square	PCA; FASTCLUS	PCA (Varimax); ANOVA; K-means cluster; Tukey’s Test	PCA (Varimax); K-means cluster analysis	PCA (Varimax); K-means cluster analysis; Chi-square cross-tabs	PCA; K-means cluster analysis; DA	ANOVA & Chi-square

a: composite scale of reasons for travelling and experiences sought

b: benefits and experiences realised

ANOVA: Analysis of Variance; DA: Discriminant Analysis; PCA: Principle Component Analysis used to explore the underlying dimensions by identifying factors comprising sets of interrelated variables

Table 2
Summary of Empirical Studies of Tourist Benefit Research (Cultural Tourism Related)

	Benefits Sought			
AUTHOR(S)	(Alzua et al., 1998)	(Frochot, 2004)	(Tian et al., 1996)	(Weaver et al., 2002)
Major Research Objectives	Multi-dimensional segmentation using Benefits Sought and Activities to understand Vacation motives	Benefit segmentation (motivation) and influence on quality evaluation	Benefit segmentation and relationship with selected independent variables; potential target markets by cross-tab of benefit and constraint clusters	Benefit segmentation
Tourism Product Analysed	Culture and heritage tourism	3 Historic Houses, UK	Museums Texas, USA	Heritage sites, USA
Population Sampled	UK Outbound	Historic Property Visitors	Museum visitors	US travellers
No. of Items	20	15	17	15a
No. of Dimensions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	5	3
No. of Clusters	5	4	20 cell matrix based on 4 benefit clusters and 5 constraint clusters	2
Scale Type	Not Reported (importance)	5-point Likert (importance)	7-point Likert (agreement)	5-point Likert (importance)
Statistical Methodology	2 Stage Hierarchical & K-means cluster analyses; ANOVA	K-means cluster analysis	PCA (Oblique); K-means cluster analysis; Chi-square cross-tabs	PCA (Varimax); Hierarchical and K-means cluster analyses; DA; Chi-square cross-tabs

a: based on Recreation Experience Preference Scale (Driver et al., 1991)

ANOVA: Analysis of Variance; DA: Discriminant Analysis; PCA: Principle Component Analysis used to explore the underlying dimensions by identifying factors comprising sets of interrelated variables

Benefits and Motivation

While the findings from these 13 studies are diverse and beyond the scope of this paper, further brief comment will be given to the potential interchangeability or relationship between benefits and motivation. Noted earlier in this paper was a widely held belief of some association between tourists' motivations and benefits sought, although the exact link is still to be tested and proven (Frochot & Morrison, 2000), and travellers' motivations, in turn, have always been portrayed as a critical variable in the tourist decision making process (e.g., Crompton, 1979; Lundberg, 1971).

Four of the studies include motivation or motives in their major research objectives (Alzua *et al.*, 1998; Frochot, 2004; Lang & O'Leary, 1997; Moscardo *et al.*, 1996), but all of these use benefits sought as a measure of motivations or motives. Frochot (2004) states, “in order to evaluate the motivational profile of visitors, benefit segmentation was applied” (p.227). Alzua *et al.*, (1998) further claim, “from an international perspective, relatively little is known of cultural and heritage tourists' characteristics, benefits pursued in travel activities or expectations” (p.3) and then define benefits sought as an attitude “which may influence travellers” in their choice of activity participation and frequency (p.6). Different benefit segments attached different degrees of importance to different behavioural activity participation, and the authors claim this supports Silberberg's (1995) assertion that there are different degrees of consumer motivation for cultural tourism. Similarly, Moscardo *et al's.*, (1996) understanding of vacation destination choice through travel motivation and activity preference is achieved by segmenting respondents on travel benefits and describing the resulting dimensions as motives and needs. Lang and O'Leary (1997) utilise the interrelationships between benefit pursued, activity participation and destination preference as a segmentation base which they claim proves their proposed motivation/participation/preference tourist visit type is a theoretically and statistically feasible approach to understand and classify travellers (p.174). The more recent of these studies (Frochot, 2004, 2005) categorise benefit segmentation as being based on psychographic criteria, and a particularly powerful technique for understanding consumer markets in tourism settings, although its performance comparative to other psychographic techniques (such as values) is yet to be demonstrated.

That there is a relationship between benefits and motivation has been raised throughout the tourism benefit research literature, but often with some confusion. Depending on how benefits are defined and categorised they could be considered separate constructs to motives but relevant to the motivational process and also to other behavioural outcomes such as satisfaction or service quality. This paper recommends defining benefits sought as psychological based expectations and benefits gained as a psychological behavioural outcome. So defined they are separate constructs to attitudes, motives, satisfaction, and service quality evaluation but more research is needed to measure and test these constructs and their relationships.

BENEFIT DIMENSIONS CONSENSUS

There has been considerable use of tourist benefit segmentation which allows for the identification of the most commonly found benefit dimensions. In the absence of a validated and agreed benefit scale, identifying the most commonly found dimensions or individual items of relevance to these dimensions can inform future tourist benefit research and guide the development of an appropriate list of items for future cultural tourist benefit research. A summary of the most commonly found benefit dimensions (or individual items of relevance to these dimensions) in the selected empirical studies of tourist benefit research is presented in Table 3.

Fifteen benefit dimensions of importance were most commonly found in these tourism studies. Overall, the most commonly found benefits were identified in 10 studies and these were the benefit dimensions of escape, education/knowledge and social (kinship). These were followed by relaxation (in 9 studies), then nature appreciation (in 7 studies), and social (recognition) (in 6 studies). Three other benefit dimensions were identified in five studies: entertainment, novelty and heritage/culture and two other benefit dimensions in four of the studies: value, and physical sports. Four remaining benefit dimensions were found in three or two studies: risk & daring/adventure, social: meeting new and different people; safety; and self-development/self-esteem. Seven of the fifteen dimensions were identified in both benefits gained and benefits sought studies: education/knowledge; novelty; social (kinship) relaxation; risk & daring/adventure; value and nature appreciation.

In the cultural tourist related studies, 13 of the 15 benefit dimensions were also identified. Of the eleven dimensions found in four or more of these 13 tourist benefit studies, all of these were also found in one or more of the four studies of cultural tourist benefits.

Table 3
Most Commonly Found Benefit Dimensions in the Selected Empirical Tourist Benefit Research by Tourism Context (Cultural Tourism versus other Tourism Contexts)

Most Commonly Found Benefit Dimensions																
AUTHOR(S)	Benefits Sought							Benefits Sought*					Benefits Gained			
	(Frochot, 2004)	(Hsieh et al., 2002)	(Jang et al., 2002)	(Lang & O'Leary, 2002)	(Loker & Perdue, 1992)	(McCool & Peilliv., 1992)	(Moscardo et al., 1996)	SUB TOTAL	(Alzua et al., 2004)	(Frochot, 2004)	(Tian et al., 2002)	(Weaver et al., 2002)	SUB TOTAL	(Shoemaker, 2002)	(Woodside & Woodside, 2002)	SUB TOTAL
Escape	X	X	X	X	X	X	7	X		X	X	3			0	10
Education/ Knowledge	X		X	X	X		5	X	X	X	X	4	X		1	10
Entertainment			X	X			3	X		X		2			0	5
Novelty (1)				X	X		2	X		X		2	X		1	5
Social (Kinship) (2)			X	X	X	X	5	X	X	X	X	4	X		1	10

Social (Recognition) (3)		X	X	X			X	4			X	X	2			0	6
Social: meeting new and different people	X							1	X				1			0	2
Safety							X	1	X				1			0	2
Self-Development/ Self-Esteem							X	1			X		1			0	2
Relaxation	X		X	X	X		X	5	X	X	X		3		X	1	9
Risk & Daring/ Adventure	X	X						2					0		X	1	3
Value			X					1	X				1	X	X	2	4
Nature Appreciation (4)	X			X	X	X		4	X	X			2	X		1	7
Heritage/Culture	X	X	X	X				4		X			1			0	5
Physical Sports	X	X		X			X	4					0			0	4

1. Novelty: Alternative terms used included Exploration/Discovery/Something New/Excitement/Variety/Unique Identify

2. Social (Kinship): Alternative terms used included (socialisation/bonding/affiliation)

3. Social (Recognition): Alternative terms used included Prestige/Show & Tell

4. Nature Appreciation: Alternative terms used included Environment aspects of destination

*Cultural and heritage tourism related research

The four most commonly found benefit dimensions in the cultural related studies were similar to those overall: education/knowledge, social (kinship), then escape and relaxation. The first two of these dimensions were found in all four cultural studies. Only the benefit dimensions of physical sports and risk & daring/adventure were not found in any of the cultural tourist studies. Interestingly, nature appreciation was a benefit dimension in two of the cultural related studies as well as five of the studies overall. For cultural related studies, the inclusion of a nature appreciation dimension would depend on the definition of cultural attractions. Ten of the dimensions were identified in the cultural and heritage tourist study of outbound UK tourists (Alzua, O’Leary and Morrison, 1998) and eight in the study of visitors to museums in Texas (Tian *et al.*, 1996). Six of these benefit dimensions were found in both studies: escape, education/knowledge, entertainment, novelty, social (kinship), and relaxation. Furthermore these six dimensions, include the four most commonly found dimensions in all of the cultural related studies as well as for the 13 studies overall. In addition, social (recognition) was another benefit dimension found in two of the four cultural related studies. These findings strongly suggest that future research of cultural tourist benefits should include items for testing and measuring many of these previously identified dimensions.

One limitation of this study of benefit dimensions that arose in considering some of the conceptual issues and then in identifying benefit dimension consensus, was the familiar methodological problem and dilemma that how something is measured (and statistically analysed) can determine what is found to be measured and, vice versa, what is measured (and how it is defined) can determine how it is measured (and statistically analysed) and this too can determine the findings. Hence the importance of defining and conceptualising constructs and their relationships prior to determining how to measure and test both the constructs and relationships.

A CONCEPTUAL TYPOLOGY OF THE MOST COMMONLY FOUND BENEFIT DIMENSIONS

To identify the underlying conceptual basis for the most commonly found benefit dimensions identified in this study, each dimension is categorised in relation to benefit typologies and conceptual trends identified from the literature and presented earlier in this paper in the section on what to measure issues. The following conceptual typology and benefit dimension categorisations are proposed: *psychological*: education/knowledge; *psycho-physiological*: novelty; escape; entertainment; relaxation; heritage/culture, and nature appreciation; *socio-psychological*: social (recognition); *sociological*: social (kinship); and *economic*: value.

This proposed categorisation emphasizes the importance of psychological-based or part psychological based dimensions in tourism benefit research, especially the psycho-physiological based dimensions many of which are hedonic pleasure-oriented or fantasy related, and thereby supports two earlier identified research trends. It endorses the conceptual shift within the operationalisation of benefits identified by Tian, Crompton, and Witt (1996) away from activities and amenities toward experiential and psychological outcomes. It also suggests agreement that hedonic benefits are considered more relevant to cultural and experiential products than utilitarian benefits as claimed by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the findings of this study’s overview of tourism benefit research and the discussion of recent relevant research findings, there is strong support from an extensive body of existing research that benefits make a significant contribution to understanding and prediction of tourists’ motivation and behaviour which is fundamental for marketing purposes. Both benefits sought and gained by tourists make a contribution to this understanding. A better understanding of tourists’ motivation and behaviour is essential to maintain and increase tourist engagement with cultural attractions and events and therefore the following propositions are recommended for future uses of benefit variables in research of tourist’s cultural experiences.

Proposition 1: More research of tourists’ benefits from cultural experiences is needed to gain a better understanding and prediction of their behaviour.

Proposition 2: What is being measured needs to be defined and it is recommended that benefits sought be categorised as a psychological expectation and benefits gained as a psycho-physiological behavioural outcome.

Proposition 3: Particular types of dimensions should be included for testing and based on the findings from this review of most commonly found dimensions, for cultural tourists these are: education/knowledge; social (kinship); relaxation; escape, entertainment, novelty, and social (recognition).

Proposition 4: Conceptually, benefits should be considered as separate constructs to motives, but more research is needed to gain a better understanding of the relationship between these constructs.

Proposition 5: Benefits could be a useful dimension in a multi-dimensional segmentation of cultural experience tourist markets, if differences can be found.

Proposition 6: Conceptually, benefits are key dimensions of relevance to another consumer behavioural outcome, that is, satisfaction which is also of relevance to consumer's future motivation and participation. A new use of both benefits sought and benefits gained measures in future tourist research is proposed as a research method of benefit. Benefits could be used as a measure of satisfaction for experiential products such as cultural experiences, using the difference between benefits sought and benefits gained as a variation on the expectancy disconfirmation theory (Oliver, 1980) thereby identifying any negative gaps which reduce satisfaction for all service encounters as conceptually identified in the gap analysis model (Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor Michael Jay Polonsky for contributing to the initial idea of a paper on this topic and his encouragement and support to the author to write this paper but the final ideas expressed are those of the author.

REFERENCES

- Alzua, A., O'Leary, J. T., & Morrison, A. M. (1998). Cultural and heritage tourism: Identifying niches for international travelers. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 9(2), 2-13.
- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Dolnicar, S. (2002a). Activity-based market sub-segmentation of cultural tourists. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(2), 94-105.
- Dolnicar, S. (2002b). A review of data-driven market segmentation in tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(1), 1-22.
- Dolnicar, S. (2002c). A review of unquestioned standards in using cluster analysis for data-driven market segmentation, *Proceedings of ANZMAC 2002*.
- Dolnicar, S., & Leish, F. (2003). Winter tourist segments in Austria: Identifying stable vacation styles using bagged clustering techniques. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41, 281-292.
- Driver, B. L., Brown, P., J., & Peterson, G. L. (Eds.). (1991). *Benefits of leisure*. Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing, Inc.

- Driver, B. L., & Bruns, D. H. (1999). Concepts and uses of the benefits approach to leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 349-369). Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing.
- Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (1998). Market segmentation of an international cultural-historical event in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(4), 16-24.
- Frochot, I. (2004). An investigation into the influence of the benefits sought by visitors on their quality evaluation of historic houses' service provision. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 10(3), 223-237.
- Frochot, I. (2005). A benefit segmentation of tourists in rural areas: A Scottish perspective. *Tourism Management*, 26(3), 335-346.
- Frochot, I., & Morrison, A. M. (2000). Benefit segmentation: A review of its applications to travel and tourism research. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 9(4), 21-45.
- Haley, R. I. (1968). Benefit segmentation: A decision orientated research tool. *Journal of Marketing*, 32(July), 30-35.
- Haley, R. I. (1971). Benefit segmentation: A decision oriented research tool. In J. F. Engel, H. F. Fiorillo & M. A. Cayley (Eds.), *Market segmentation: Concepts and applications* (pp. 196-205). New York: Reinehart & Winston.
- Hirschman, E. C., & Holbrook, M. B. (1982). Hedonic consumption: Emerging concepts, methods and propositions. *Journal of Marketing*, 46(Summer), 92-101.
- Hoek, J., Gendall, P., & Esslemont, D. (1993). Market segmentation: A search for the holy grail? *Asia-Australia Marketing Journal*, 1(1), 41-46.
- Holbrook, M. B., & Hirschman, E. C. (1982). The experiential aspects of consumption: Consumer fantasies, feelings, and fun. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(September), 132-140.
- Hsieh, S., O'Leary, J. T., Morrison, A. M., & Chiang, D. (1997). Travel decision pattern segmentation of pleasure travel. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 3(4), 289-302.
- Jang, S. C., Morrison, A. M., & O'Leary, J. T. (2002). Benefit segmentation of Japanese pleasure travelers to the USA and Canada: Selecting target markets based on the profitability and risk of individual market segments. *Tourism Management*, 23(4), 367-378.
- Kotler, P., Bowen, J. T., & Makens, J. C. (2006). *Marketing for hospitality and tourism* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Lang, C.-T., & O'Leary, J. T. (1997). Motivation, participation, and preference: A multi-segmentation approach of the Australian nature travel market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 6(3/4), 159-180.
- Lewis, R. C. (1981). Marketing for full service restaurant - an analysis of demographic and benefit segmentation. In J. H. Donnelly & W. R. George (Eds.), *Marketing of services* (pp. 43-46). Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Loker, L. E., & Perdue, R. R. (1992). A benefit-based segmentation of a nonresident summer travel market. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(1), 30-35.
- Lundberg, D. E. (1971). Why tourists travel. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 26(February), 75-81.
- McCool, S. F., & Reilly, M. (1993). Benefit segmentation analysis of state park visitor setting preference and behavior. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*, 11(4), 1-14.
- McKercher, B. (2002). Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4, 29-38.
- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2003). Testing a cultural tourism typology. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5, 45-58.
- McKercher, B., Ho, P. S. Y., du Cros, H., & So-Ming, B. C. (2002). Activities-based segmentation of the cultural tourism market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(1), 23-46.

- Moscardo, G. M., Morrison, A. M., Pearce, P. L., Lang, C.-T., & O'Leary, J. T. (1996). Understanding vacation destination choice through travel motivation and activities. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 2(2), 109-122.
- Oh, H., Kim, B.-Y., & Shin, J.-H. (2004). Hospitality and tourism marketing: Recent developments in research and future directions. *Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 425-447.
- Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(November), 460-469.
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing*, 49(Fall), 41-50.
- Shoemaker, S. (1994). Segmenting the U.S. Travel market according to benefits realized. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(2), 8-21.
- Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 16(5), 361-365.
- Spangenberg, E. R., Voss, K. E., & Crowley, A. E. (1997). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of attitude: A generally applicable scale. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 24, 235-241.
- Tian, S., Crompton, J. L., & Witt, P. A. (1996). Integrating constraints and benefits to identify responsive target markets for museum attractions. *Journal of Travel Research*, 35(2), 34-45.
- Voss, K. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Grohmann, B. (2003). Measuring the hedonic and utilitarian dimensions of consumer attitude. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 40(3), 310-320.
- Weaver, P., Kaufman, T. J., & Yoon, Y. (2002). A market segmentation study based on benefits sought by visitors at heritage sites. *Tourism Analysis*, 6(3/4), 213-222.
- Woodside, A. G., & Jacobs, L. W. (1985). Step two in benefit segmentation: Learning the benefits realized by major travel markets. *Journal of Travel Research*, 24(1), 7-13.