Cross-cultural issues and research are fundamental to much tourism marketing and especially to developing international tourist markets for cultural events and festivals. With increasing globalization aided by developments in travel and information technology, growing international tourist markets present potentially significant and increasing market opportunities for cultural events throughout the world. In an increasingly competitive marketplace, in order to attract tourist markets, events and festivals need an understanding of these markets and the relevant marketing theories, practices, and strategies. Understanding tourists’ motivation and behavior is essential to identifying attractive tourist market segments in the first instance and then to developing appropriate marketing strategies to attract these segments. Within this environment, the importance of cross-cultural issues and research to tourism marketing and the development of tourist markets are apparent, and yet cross-cultural tourism research to date has been limited. Cross-cultural tourism research in relation to cultural events is even more limited. Cross-cultural tourism marketing research also presents some unique challenges, numerous environmental and methodological problems, and associated costs. These numerous problems, challenges, and costs may in their own right prevent cross-cultural issues and problems from being investigated. Some of these problems can also make the results of some of the existing cross-cultural research suspect. Such problems could well account for the limited amount of cross-cultural tourism marketing research that has been undertaken, even though the potential benefits from such research can be great. This article examines the use and application of cross-cultural tourism research by cultural events. It also outlines some of the unique challenges, issues, and problems that need to be addressed in future cross-cultural tourism marketing research to improve its application, use, and findings, and ensure the benefits outweigh the costs.
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Despite an environment conducive to cultural event tourism by international tourists, little academic research has addressed this phenomenon. Associated with this conducive environment is the apparent importance of and need for cross-cultural research to identify and develop some of these tourist markets and to develop appropriate marketing strategies to attract these tourists to these tourism resources. Relevant studies that
have been conducted to date pertain largely to either cross-cultural research of tourism or cultural tourism in general, or cross-cultural equivalence research of event motivation. Key studies in the existing literature are summarized in Tables 1–4. Cross-cultural studies of event tourism or cultural event tourism in particular have been limited to date.

Furthermore, through a review of the literature and existing data, several gaps have been identified that will drive the discussion in this conceptual article: 1) What cross–cultural event tourism research is needed? 2) When and how should it be undertaken and what environmental and methodological problems need to be considered? 3) What are the implications of these first two questions for undertaking future cross-cultural research in a cultural event tourism context, and what suggestions can be offered that will improve the application, use, and findings of this research.

Objectives and Methodology

An aim of this article is to review the existing literature and data to identify the extent and profile of existing cultural event tourism by international tourists; to also identify the gaps in the data; and to propose suggestions for future research to attract international tourists to cultural events. Much of this research will need to be cross-cultural in nature, and so the major aim of this article is to examine the use and application of cross-cultural tourism research by cultural events and consider some of the issues, challenges, problems, and costs that in their own right may have prevented cross-cultural issues being investigated and cross-cultural research being undertaken. Other problems bring the results of existent cross-cultural tourism research into further question and this is also discussed. Finally, suggestions for future cross-cultural cultural event tourism marketing research are offered to improve its application, use, and findings, and ensure the benefits outweigh the costs.

Background: What Is Cultural Event Tourism?

Cultural event tourism and tourists can take several forms. In this article, cultural event tourists are categorized primarily by type of tourist (i.e., international, national interstate and intrastate, and day visitors) and type of cultural activity attended, with the category of interest being international tourists who attend cultural events (e.g., cultural-historic events or festivals, art events or festivals, including local performing art activities). This typology considers cultural event tourism as a subgroup of cultural tourism based on type of activity attended, and actual tourist behavior. This definition, in turn, is based on an operational/behavioral definition of tourism as the “activities of persons” (Alzua, O’Leary, & Morrison, 1998; United Nations/World Tourism Organization [UN/WTO], 1994; WTO, 1985). Defined this way, the definition is made operational through existing or additional data that can be readily collected, and it relates closely to existing data of relevance to cultural event tourism. In Australia, for example, such literature and data includes the annual International Visitor Survey undertaken by the Bureau of Tourism Research (BTR, 2000) and studies of cultural tourism in Australia by inbound visitors (Foo & Rossetto, 1998).

A problem with the above operational/behavioral definitions of cultural tourism and cultural event tourism is that they do not include attitudinal and motivational dimensions in addition to the behavioral dimensions of cultural tourists and cultural event tourists. Several authors emphasize the importance and advantages of integrating attitudinal and behavioral characteristics and advocate a multidimensional typology and market segmentation approach in relation to identifying market segments and developing appropriate marketing strategies to attract and increase these segments. This approach is advocated in relation to cultural and heritage tourism and international tourists by Alzua et al. (1998). It has also been advocated by other authors (Lang & O’Leary, 1997) in relation to a different type of travel market by activity and interest (i.e., the nature travel market).

A review of relevant literature, especially studies involving both empirical and conceptual research but focusing largely on the allied areas of tourism, leisure, and recreation rather than cultural tourism or cultural event tourism per se, identifies relevant concepts of how to attract tourist markets as an understanding of who is being attracted, together with why and how they are attracted, for this in turn determines their ultimate behavior (e.g., Alzua et al., 1998; Frochot & Morrison, 2000; Lang & O’Leary, 1997; Morrison et al., 1994; Nicholson & Pearce, 2000, 2001; Sung, Morrison, & O’Leary, 2000). If a tourism market can be subdivided by distinguishable characteristics into differentiated groups in accordance with the accepted theoretical principle of market segmentation in general (e.g., Kotler,
1991) and for tourism markets specifically (e.g., Middleton, 1994; Morrison, 2001; Smith, 1989), then this marketing theory advocates developing unique marketing strategies for each of these groups. While the strategic importance of market segmentation among academics and practitioners is widespread, Morrison et al. (1994) acknowledge a lack of consensus on how to divide travel markets into their component segments (i.e., how many and which variables to use to divide the market and which exact procedure to follow in segmentation). Alzua et al. (1998) argue that a shortcoming of market segmentation research in tourism marketing has been to typically derive groups by clustering respondents on the basis of only one dimension (e.g., behaviors or attitudes). The importance and advantages of integrating attitudinal as well as behavioral characteristics in multidimensional segmentation according to Alzua et al. (1998) are that the former may trigger or drive the behavior as exemplified by attitudes such as benefits sought at a destination by travelers, which may influence travelers to choose within a preferred set of alternative activities, or to participate more often or widely. Examples of attitudinal characteristics of relevance to typologies and segmentation of tourists include motivations, values, motives, needs, attitudes, philosophies; benefits pursued; expectations and preferences; and barriers, perceived risks, or fears, which may ultimately prevent any attendance or participation but also play an important role in the decision-making process. In addition to market segmentation, efficient and effective target marketing theory further advocates identifying the market segments that are more or less responsive to marketing efforts directed at them, in order to target those that are most responsive and bring their potential to fruition (e.g., Tian, Crompton, & Witt, 1996).

The acknowledged importance of consumer behavior and marketing to tourism is highlighted above. This, combined with the fact that tourism has become an international phenomenon of global consequence (Dimanche, 1994) with international tourism—the movement across international boundaries—increasing dramatically over the last two decades (jamrozy & Uysal, 1994), suggests that within the tourism literature there should already be a large number of cross-cultural research and international research studies, particularly in consumer behavior and marketing. However, there is a relative scarcity of cross-cultural studies reported in the tourism literature, as noted by Dimanche (1994), and specifically in relation to travel behavior. Plog (1990) noted a little earlier that, “cross-cultural research, particularly related to travel behavior, is quite rare” (p. 43).

The above operational/behavioral definition of cultural event tourists, whereby they are characterized by type of cultural activity attended, requires the development of a typology for cultural event activities and resources that might be available for tourists to have an interest in or to attend. This typology needs to take into account the various cultural event activities included in the cultural tourism research to date as well as identifying other cultural event resources that have not been included to date but that could function as resources for cultural event tourism purposes.

In their research on cultural tourism in Australia, Foo and Rossetto (1998) identified six categories of activities, of which two are cultural events: festivals or fairs, and performing arts or concerts. A third category—Aboriginal sites and cultural displays—could include cultural events.

Another cultural tourism research project, the ATLAS project, was established in 1991 to develop a transnational database on cultural tourism, initially focusing on Europe. It began with a technical definition of cultural tourism to facilitate fieldwork research: “All movement of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama outside their place of residence” (Richards, 1996b, p. 24; 2001, p. 37). In the subsequent years of the project, the definition of cultural tourism has been expanded to include a conceptual definition in addition to the technical definition, with the former acknowledging the importance of the motivations of tourists: “The movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs” (Richards, 1996b, p. 24; 2001, p. 37). While this definition recognizes the importance of motivations to cultural tourism, it is difficult to convey the complex nature of such motivations in a definition and has been criticized by various authors accordingly (e.g., see Alzua et al., 1998, p.3; Marciszewska cited in Richards, 2001, p.217; Richards, 2001, p. 37).

A decade since the inception of the ATLAS project, Richards (2001) has developed a framework to accommodate the attractions included in the ATLAS project demand and supply data. Firstly, he overviews different
typologies of cultural tourism and concludes that they are largely based on cultural products rather than considering their organization or their consumption by tourists. Most importantly to this article on cultural event tourism, he notes an increasing tendency to emphasize the role of cultural events (p. 23). His framework focuses on the differences and similarities of cultural attractions in terms of form and function. His starting points are the type of resources that form the cultural basis of the attraction, and the purpose to which these cultural resources are put. The cultural basis of an attraction varies from a presentation of the material products of a culture to the active transmission of elements of the living culture, or culture as a way of life. This definition represents the continuum of definitions of culture, from culture as product to culture as process, with the former tending to be more traditional cultural attractions largely based on heritage and other cultural products of the past, and the latter more contemporary types of attractions based on cultural processes. The second dimension represents the use or purpose to which the cultural resources are put in an attraction ranging from educational uses to entertainment purposes with this dimension, also reflecting the authenticity debate about the presentation of culture ranging from “authentic” to “staged entertainment.” In this framework, cultural event examples are categorized into all four quadrants of these two dimensions. Art exhibitions, for example, are considered to be a more contemporary form, whose purpose is more educational than entertainment. Arts festivals are also a more contemporary form, whose purpose however is more entertainment that educational. Folklore festivals have a mixture of educational and entertainment elements based on historical resources. Historical pageants are also based on historical resources, but are more entertainment focused (Richards, 2001). Richards recommends that any typology of cultural attractions cannot be viewed as a fixed classification but should be understood as a dynamic field within which cultural attractions may position themselves (p. 25). Some attractions may be multiform and multifunctional. Furthermore, Richards notes an increasing shift in the emphasis of cultural production away from the resources of the past, towards more contemporary cultural forms (p. 25). Performing arts events are not included per se in this typology, but are included within the survey instrument as one of seven types of cultural attractions, the others being: museum, monument, art gallery, historic house, festivals, and heritage center.

Alzua et al. (1998, p. 3) acknowledge the importance of defining cultural tourism by incorporating the attitudinal, experiential, and interpretative dimensions of cultural tourism as well as the behavioral approach. In contrast to the ATLAS project’s incorporation of “intentions,” which they claim is a complex concept to measure, they recommend incorporating a scale to differentiate the cultural motivations of the tourist based on Silberberg’s (1995, cited in Alzua et al., 1998, p. 3) conceptualization of cultural tourism. For the purposes of their paper, they define cultural tourism as, “visits by persons from outside the host community motivated wholly or in part by an interest in the historical, artistic, scientific or lifestyle/heritage offerings of a community, region, group or institution.” Richards (2001, p. 37) argues it would be hard to find a tourist who is not interested at least in part in some aspect of the culture of the destination they are visiting. The use of the word “intent,” he further argues, is to differentiate between the “culturally motivated” visitor, who makes a conscious, mindful decision to consume culture on holiday, and the “culturally interested” visitor, who may be almost an accidental cultural tourist (after Bywater, 1993, cited in Richards, 2001, p. 37).

The problem with these definitions of cultural tourism motivations is that they do not accommodate the “reluctant cultural tourist.” Research of museum goers (Tian et al., 1996) discovered a large proportion (40% of the potential market) whose decision to attend was constrained by a sense of obligation to spouse or friends, or by pressure to go somewhere or to do something. These obligations and pressures potentially defined their museum visit as a chore rather than as a freely chosen delight.

While some attractions may be multiform and multifunctional, cultural event tourists may have multiple attitudes and motivations influencing and determining their behavior. Cultural differences are especially relevant to tourist behavior, as discussed in the next section.

Background: What Is Cross-Cultural Research?

Culture is a multivariate concept with many definitions and no consensus definition that can be widely accepted (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). There are also many dimensions or elements on which cultures differ (e.g., Hall, 1965) and many different theories or frameworks for these cultural elements and cultural dimen-
Each dominant culture consists of several subcultures based on race, ethnicity, geographic region, and socioeconomic characteristics (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Race refers to a genetic or biological similarity among people (Lustig & Koester, 1993, cited in Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Ethnicity refers to a wide variety of groups of people who share a language, history, and religion and identify themselves with a common national or cultural system (Lustig & Koester, 1993, cited in Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Ethnic variety can be found in all countries (Samovar et al., 1998, cited in Reisinger & Turner, 2003).

Cultural differences are especially relevant to the tourism industry as it is increasingly experiencing globalization and, associated with this, considerable attention to the relevance of cultural diversity: Cultural characteristics represent an attractive element of the tourism product itself, and tourism is a service industry where people from different cultures can meet (Pizam, 1999). Unfortunately, the role of cultural differences in determining tourist behavior has not been paid much attention in tourism research (Pizam, 1999).

There is a need for tourism academic research and literature that analyses cultural differences and determines their impact on tourist behavior. Such research and literature would be cross-cultural by nature. It could be based on differences across nations for the purpose of determining whether similar patterns exist among consumers and decision makers in different countries, as defined by Pizam (1999, p. 407). Other authors have criticized the practice of using nationality as a sole discriminating variable for explaining the differences found in the behavior of tourists (e.g., Dann, 1993). In reviewing cross-cultural tourism marketing research, Dimanche (1994) uses the term “cross-cultural” because it is broader and “reflects more possible differences in consumer behavior than ‘cross-national’” (van Raaij, 1978, p. 693, cited in Dimanche, 1994).

Other purposes of cross-cultural tourism research have been identified, whereby cross-cultural research in a tourism context could have various or multipurposes. Cross-cultural research could help to identify similarities and differences among tourists and local service providers, which in turn could contribute to more effective marketing and management strategies (Reisinger & Turner, 2003). Dimanche (1994) identifies three purposes: one is tourism and culture related, and the other two are tourism, culture, and marketing related. A primary purpose would be to test a touristic phenomenon or construct in various cultural environments, therefore providing different conditions needed to test that phenomenon or construct and gain a better understanding of the construct or phenomenon in question. Another important purpose is to test tourist behavior and marketing theories in international settings, to learn whether the theories can be generalizable or whether they are culture specific. While Dimanche acknowledges that, in tourism contexts, behavior and vacation patterns are often culture specific, better recognition and understanding of differences between cultures through research appears to be important. The third purpose of cross-cultural research is also marketing oriented and aims to explore other cultures, learn about them, and to test cultural differences in tourism marketing contexts (e.g., investigate tourists’ behavioral and attitudinal differences in several international markets to better target and satisfy them). Another body of cross-cultural tourism literature examines the relationship between hosts and guests (e.g., Reisinger & Turner, 2002a, 2002b).

Conducting cross-cultural research is prone to many environmental and methodological problems that can impede it being undertaken or limit its use, according to Dimanche (1994). Cultural and language differences and their effects are obvious problems. Other environmental factors include a misunderstanding of the value and benefits of cross-cultural research; ethnocentrism of researchers; and lack of the associated needed resources such as money, multilingual researchers, or cross-cultural cooperation with research colleagues. Methodological issues when undertaking cross-cultural research are many and include language translations and cultural equivalence, experiential and cultural equivalence, and measurement equivalence. Further problems noted by Dimanche (1994) are the relative scarcity of cross-cultural studies reported in the tourism literature, and, of the published studies, most of those using translated instruments tend to lack sufficient information concerning the validity and reliability of the question items in the various cultures, therefore making the results suspect. As well as these methodological issues relating to how the research is undertaken, another frequently encountered problem especially relevant to cross-cultural tourism research of international markets is access to research population samples, in terms of sufficient numbers, and where and when the population samples are accessed (i.e., at home, at the destination, on-site at cultural attractions/
events or at noncultural attractions/events, at the destination departure point, before and after the cultural event experience, etc.

Four main types of literature relevant to cross-cultural tourism research of international markets for cultural events have been identified:

1. Cross-cultural research of tourism in general, cultural tourism in general, and of events (summarized in Table 1).

2. Research (non-cross-cultural) of event/festival (cultural and noncultural) attendees’ (tourists and/or others) motivation, preferences, characteristics, and behavior (summarized in Table 2).

3. Research (non-cross-cultural) of cultural tourists (summarized in Table 3).

4. Research (non-cross-cultural) of specific types of cultural events and attendees’ (nontourists) motivation, preferences, and barriers to attendance (e.g., performing arts attendees) (summarized in Table 4).

Significance of Cultural Event Tourism for International Tourists and Gaps in the Data

In Australia, for example, details of international visitor attendance at cultural events and their characteristics and motivations are only available for the country as a whole and are part of a broader study of cultural tourism in Australia undertaken in 1995 (Foo & Rossetto, 1998). For cultural tourism overall in Australia, approximately 62% (or 2.1 million) of all international visitors to Australia in 1995 (3.427 million) participated in at least one cultural activity. The market source of these cultural tourists—Asia (45%), Europe including the UK (28%), New Zealand (15%), and North America (10%)—was found to be rather consistent with the distribution of all inbound visitors for the period except for a higher proportion of visitors from Europe and North America being likely to visit cultural attractions in Australia than other groups of visitors. By type of cultural activity, of the six cultural activity categories included in the research, cultural events ranked third and sixth, respectively, for visits to performing arts or concerts (15% of visits) and visits to festivals or fairs (4% of visits). The respective rankings of the other cultural activity categories were visiting museums or art galleries (31%), historic or heritage buildings, sites, monuments (27%), Aboriginal sites and cultural displays (15%), and visiting art or craft workshops or studios (9%). The Aboriginal sites and cultural displays could also include attendance at cultural events. Foo and Rossetto (1998) concluded that these attendances suggest the untapped potential that inbound tourists present to cultural events and in particular to organizers of festivals and fairs.

This research includes motivations of international visitors to cultural sites overall by country of residence and also by type of cultural site but it does not include analysis at each of the six types of cultural sites by country of residence. Hence, it highlights similarities and differences in motivation for attending any type of cultural site by country of residence with the main motivation for UK, European, and North American tourists being “to experience something Australian” (39%, 47%, and 30%, respectively) followed by “specifically wanted to attend or visit” (32%, 32%, and 29%). For Asian markets—which are only categorized by Japan and Other Asia—the main motivation was “part of a package tour” (57% and 32%, respectively) followed by “to experience something Australian” (23% and 24%). In comparison, the main motivation for New Zealand tourists was “specifically wanted to visit” (41%) followed by “interested and wanted to spend time with friends/relatives” (16%). Visitors to cultural events, such as performing arts or concerts and festivals or fairs, were all motivated by the social aspect of the experience, but visitors to performing arts also had to be interested in the performance while visitors to festivals or fairs sought an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse. Visits to Aboriginal sites and cultural displays were also sought after by cultural visitors rather than used to fill in time with the majority of visitors seeking an Australian experience and often did so on impulse.
### Table 1
A Summary of Key Cross-Cultural Studies of Relevance to Cultural Event Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Major Issue of Relevance Addressed</th>
<th>Research Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cultural research of tourism in general</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dann (1993)</td>
<td>Limitations in the use of “nationality” and “country of residence” variables in tourism research</td>
<td>Conceptual/Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimanche (1994)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural tourism marketing research</td>
<td>Conceptual/Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klemm (2002)</td>
<td>Attitudes of Asians of Pakistani origin British citizens to tourism travel preferences in light of the ethnicity hypothesis</td>
<td>Exploratory/Empirical/Primary/At country of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozak (2002)</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations based on British and German tourists visiting Mallorca and Turkey</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/Primary/Destination departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizam &amp; Sussmann (1995)</td>
<td>Influences of nationality on Japanese, French, Italian, and American tourists’ behavior based on UK tour guide perceptions</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson &amp; Crompton (1988a, 1988b, 1988c)</td>
<td>Vacation travel preferences of French and English Canadians and cultural influences on their perceptions of the vacation attributes of the USA and Canada</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisinger &amp; Turner (2002a, 2002b)</td>
<td>Cultural differences between Asian tourist markets and Australian hosts</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside &amp; Jacobs (1985)</td>
<td>Benefits derived from traveling to the same destination by three different national samples: Canadians, Americans, and Japanese</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At destination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan &amp; McDonald (1990)</td>
<td>Attitudes towards, preferences for and motivational determinants of selected vacation travel attributes of international tourists from four countries: Japan, France, West Germany, and UK</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cultural studies of cultural tourism in general</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reisinger (1992)</td>
<td>Tourist–host contact as part of cultural tourism</td>
<td>Conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards (1996a, 1996b, 2001)</td>
<td>Findings on production and consumption of European cultural tourism based on transnational database on cultural tourism established by ATLAS</td>
<td>Empirical/Conceptual/Destination attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-cultural research of events</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton &amp; McKay (1997)</td>
<td>Motives of visitors including international visitors attending cultural and sporting festival events at San Antonio Festival, USA</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formica &amp; Uysal (1996)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural research of behavioral, motivational, and demographic characteristics of festival visitors (Umbrian Italian and out-of-region others) to the Umbria Jazz Festival</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formica &amp; Uysal (1998)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural research of behavioral, motivational, and demographic characteristics of festival visitors (Italian and others) to an international cultural-historical event in Italy, Spoleto Festival</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider &amp; Backman (1996)</td>
<td>Cross-cultural equivalence of research of festival motivation among attendees of an Arabic cultural festival in Jordan</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sive sources of information (i.e., information that comes to them including word-of-mouth and advertising), and visitors to Aboriginal sites using travel-related sources.

Limitations of this research are that the analysis of the extent of cultural tourism by country-of-residence categories is very broad, especially for Australia’s emerging international tourist markets from Asia such as China, Taiwan, Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, which are reported and analyzed into two categories only: Japan and Other Asia. It does not give a breakdown of the extent of cultural tourism in each state/territory by type of cultural activity. Motivation at the different cultural sites reveals differences by type of site, but this analysis is not available for the different types of international visitors by country of residence. Nor is there published analysis of sources of information used by inbound cultural visitor by type of cultural activity cross-tabulated with demographic characteristics such as country of residence, age, gender, occupation, main purpose of visit, duration of stay, or preferred language.

Cultural Event Tourism Research: Needs and Issues

An overview of the existing research and literature of relevance to cultural event tourism, and to developing international tourist markets in particular to these events, reveals a lack of research, information, and knowledge in this area. It also reveals two main areas of related need: firstly a need to consider what the focus of such research should be and then issues relating to how such research should be undertaken.

What to Research?

Primary questions of relevance to attracting international tourist markets to cultural events are: Who goes, and to which cultural event resources? Why do they go?

Table 2
Research (Non-Cross-Cultural) of Event/Festival (Cultural and Noncultural) Attendees’ Motivation, Preferences, Characteristics, and Behavior: A Summary of Studies of Relevance to Cultural Event Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Major Issue of Relevance Addressed</th>
<th>Research Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backman et al. (1995)</td>
<td>Motivations and activities of US event tourism pleasure travel market</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formica &amp; Murmann (1998)</td>
<td>Motivation and group membership (families, friends, couples) effects on attendance at Spoleto Festival in Italy</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Festival visitor motivation from organizers’ point of view</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohr et al. (1993)</td>
<td>Festival motivations, event satisfaction and visitor demographics by visitor type in North America</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholson &amp; Pearce (2000, 2001)</td>
<td>Profile characteristics and motivations of event attendees by visitor type including overnight tourists and others (locals and day-trippers) at four events in New Zealand</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott (1996)</td>
<td>Effects of festival type and past visitation on visitors’ festival motivations at three festivals in North America</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site &amp; at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uysal et al. (1993)</td>
<td>Event motivations to a community-based festival in North America</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site exit surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Research (Non-Cross-Cultural) of Cultural Tourists’ Motivation, Preferences, Characteristics, and Behavior: A Summary of Key Studies of Relevance to Cultural Event Tourism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Major Issue of Relevance Addressed</th>
<th>Research Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alzua et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Cultural heritage and tourism markets by benefits sought, behavior (activities undertaken), and demographic characteristics for UK international tourists</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/At home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light (1996)</td>
<td>Profile characteristics, motivations and benefits of event attendees at a heritage site in South Wales</td>
<td>Empirical/Primary/On-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do they go? When do they make the decision and what influences them? As seen in the published research of relevance to cultural event tourism (Tables 1–4), the majority has focused on North American events and why attendees go to such events (i.e., what motivates them and what are the audience profile characteristics in terms of attitudes, behavior, and demographics). Only a small number of these studies include tourist attendees and even less include international tourist attendees. There is also a need to find out more about nonattendees. Who does not go and why? What are the barriers, constraints, or fears that prevent them from attending at all? Even for the attendees, barriers, constraints, or fears, as well as personal motivations for attending and perceived benefits of attending, influence their decision making in terms of the type of cultural events attended and frequency of attendance, and can reduce their level of attendance at different types of cultural events.

There is a need for research of cultural event attendance in a tourism context in the following areas:

- International tourist attendance at cultural events. Tourist visitors are only included in a few of the event/festival or cultural tourism studies to date and then usually only comprise a small portion of the population studied. Furthermore, in these studies, international tourist visitors are rarely included or comprise even smaller portions of the population studied.
- What motivates international tourists to attend? What attitudinal, behavioral, and demographic characteristics motivate them to attend? Which attitudinal characteristics can and should be researched: motives, needs, drives, values, benefits sought, expectations, preferences, and philosophies?
- What are the influences on international tourists’ cultural event decision-making processes? When do they plan? What role do marketing strategies and information sources play in these tourists’ decision-making process?
- Cross-cultural research of cultural event tourism by international tourist markets.
- Research of international tourists who are nonattendees at cultural events to ascertain the barriers, constraints, or fears that prevent them from attending.
- Identification of the cultural event resources available to international tourists and what features attract international tourist markets, and how access to these cultural events can be increased for international tourists.
- Market segmentation analysis of international tourists who attend and do not attend local cultural events at the destination to see whether discrete segments can be identified for marketing purposes, especially in relation to understanding consumer market segments’ attitudes, behavior, and decision making, in order to develop appropriate marketing strategies for identified segments, especially regarding promotion, publicity, positioning and image, product development, distribution, and pricing.

When undertaking research of cultural event attendance in a tourism context, there is evidence to suggest that the following should be considered in deciding what to research:
• Cultural tourism participation is affected by arts knowledge and cultural capital (Richards, 2001, p. 44).
• Arts cultural festival event attendance is influenced by visitor type and composition of traveling party (Formica & Murrmann, 1998).
• First-time and repeat visitors attending festivals (in country of origin) have different motivations (Scott, 1996).
• Marketing information has also been identified as an influence on the decision-making process to participate in cultural tourism activities with different sources being used to different degrees for different types of cultural tourism activities (Foo & Rossetto, 1998).
• Prior knowledge, either personal or obtained from other sources, can change visitor’s search activity (Ryan, 1995).
• Market segmentation of cultural event tourists needs to include attitudinal as well as behavioral and demographic characteristics (e.g., Alzua et al., 1998; Backman, Backman, Uysal, & Sunshine, 1995; Formica & Uysal, 1996, 1998).

How Should Cross-Cultural Event Tourism Research be Undertaken?

Cross-cultural tourism research in general presents many environmental and methodological issues and challenges as mentioned previously and discussed by various authors (e.g., Dimanche, 1994; Reisinger & Turner, 2003). In a cultural event tourism context, in particular, what basis should be used to identify different cultures, what type of cross-cultural research method should be used, where and when should the research be undertaken?:

• What basis of culture should be used: nationality, ethnicity, country of origin, race, and/or language?
• Direct research of participants and/or nonparticipants; indirect research such as cross-cultural tourist behavior based on tour guide perceptions (e.g., Pizam & Jeong, 1996) or the festival organizer’s perceptions (Kim, Uysal, & Chen, 2002); cross-cultural equivalence studies that transfer survey research undertaken in one language and geographic context into another setting such as festival motivational research designed in English for the North American events and transferred into Arabic and administered in Arabic by native Jordanians to attendees of an Arabic cultural festival in Jerash, Jordan (Schneider & Backman, 1996). Results from descriptive and factor analyses suggest a commonly employed motivation scale produces similar results in the Arabic culture.
• Where and when should the research of cultural event tourists and nonparticipants be undertaken: for example, at home in their country of origin; at the destination; before and after attendance at the event; on-site at one cultural event or across several cultural events?

Future Research Directions and Managerial Implications

Geographically, the majority of published research of relevance to cultural event tourism by international markets has been within research of cultural tourism in general and associated markets, in Australia (e.g., Foo & Rossetto, 1998), Europe (Richards, 1996a, 1996b, 2001), and UK international tourists (Alzua et al., 1998). Other relevant research of festival motivation in general has focused on North American events. More recently, there have been several published studies on events in other geographic areas such as Italy (e.g., Umbria Jazz festival, Spoleto Festival) (Formica & Murrman, 1998; Formica & Uysal, 1996, 1998); four festivals in South Island, New Zealand (Nicholson & Pearce, 2000, 2001); and an Arabic cultural festival in Jordan, Middle East (Schneider & Backman, 1996). Furthermore, the majority of research has focused on English-speaking language tourists and seldom includes international tourists.

Considering the need for locally based cultural events to expand their audiences and attract new markets and the opportunities for developing international tourist markets for cultural events, cross-cultural research in this area is urgently needed. While it presents many challenges and issues as outlined in this article, the benefits of such research in terms of increased understanding of different consumer markets for cultural event tourism, and thereby developing more effective and improved marketing to attract such consumers, should outweigh the costs. Not only would such research be of relevance to attracting the international tourist markets, but it could also be of relevance to locally based cultural events increasing their local audiences from different ethnic groups or attracting new local markets of various ethnic backgrounds.
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