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Understanding tourism behavior is fundamental to tourism marketing, and cross-cultural influences are particularly relevant. Therefore, in understanding of tourist motivation toward cultural experiences, this study offers an integrated motivational process model adapted from the leisure literature to extend the theoretical and empirical evidence of relevant constructs and relationships between them. From the tourism literature, a new motivation–benefit model of four psychological dispositions relevant to cultural experiences is proposed and tested: attitudes, motives, benefits sought, and benefits gained. Using four English-speaking tourist market samples from the psychically close Anglo cluster, the research model investigates relationships between the four constructs, applying a structural equation modeling approach. Cross-cultural differences are then tested for the geographic tourist markets as influences on the motivational process model. In the study context, these tourist markets take on an additional significance with one group of domestic tourists and three groups of international tourists. By applying a data set for tourists from the Anglo cluster using a repeat-measurement method, their previously identified psychic closeness is tested as well as further differences that could be expected between the domestic and the international tourists. The model is supported for these tourists, but with significantly weaker attitudes and motives for New Zealand tourists.
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**Introduction**

Cultural influences on consumer behavior have been investigated in numerous studies. In tourism behavior, cross-cultural differences are considered especially relevant for reasons including: growing internationalization, the importance of cultural characteristics to the attractiveness of the product itself, and tourism being a service industry where people from different nationalities meet (Pizam & Fleischer, 2005). Consequently, various aspects of tourism behavior have been examined for cross-cultural similarities and differences in a growing body of literature using a variety of measures. As
specific findings in these studies are also diverse, this suggests understanding of how culture influences tourist behavior, and cross-cultural differences within this, are still open to question. Broad conclusions drawn from these studies show nationality not only influencing tourist behavior such as destination choice and participation in activities, but also determining expectations and perceptions and, in turn, consumer responses to and evaluations of tourism experiences and services (Pizam & Fleischer, 2005). A focus of this study is to test the influence of culture on tourist motivation toward selected experiences in an Australian context. A motivational process model is adapted from the social psychology and leisure literature to empirically test some of the broad conclusions identified above and to measure tourist motivation toward attending cultural experiences. Using a data sample of English-speaking, Western tourists from four geographic markets that correspond to the Anglo cluster, as categorized by Hofstede (2001) and others (e.g., Ronen & Shenkar, 1985), the underlying assumption of cultural value similarity representing consumer attitudinal and behavioral similarity can be tested.

Despite the emerging body of literature suggesting cultural similarity within this Anglo group, recent examples of communication blunders by destination marketers in some of the Anglo cluster nations strongly challenge this assumption. The experience of Tourism Australia’s controversial advertising campaign, “So where the bloody hell are you?” in some of these Anglo markets demonstrates that cultural value similarity and speaking the same language do not guarantee that consumer meaning, attitudes, and behavior in a particular context and toward specific experiences will be the same. In the UK, consumer reactions that the advertisement was offensive saw the regulator ban the advertisement from billboards on motorways, restrict the advertisement’s commercial broadcast on television, and warn Tourism Australia not to use swear words in any future billboards (“Brit Ban,” 2007). Meanwhile, the advertisement that was part of a $100 million plus campaign to lure international tourists to Australia ran in the US and New Zealand (NZ) (Gibson & Braithwaite, 2006) with no adverse reaction. As seen from this example, understanding even subtle differences within this Anglo cluster can have valuable implications for destination marketers.

The present study also aims to contribute to understanding of tourist motivation in relation to tourists’ participation in selected activities, namely, cultural experiences, especially temporal cultural performances, festivals, and events. This understanding is particularly important for those destinations that position and market themselves as “cultural and event capitals” such as Melbourne, Australia, which is a further context of this study. Studies of tourist motivation for participating in specific cultural activities are well represented in the literature, but context-specific studies of tourist motivation toward selected experiences have dominated to date, and only a few consider cross-cultural influences (e.g., Kolb, 2002; Lee, Lee, & Wicks, 2004; Schneider & Backman, 1996). Less is known about the psychological dispositions of the wider tourist market toward attending selected activities, such as cultural experiences, especially the more temporal cultural performances, festivals, and events, yet major tourist markets represent new audience potential for these cultural attractions.

A data set of four Western tourist samples enables the motivational process for cultural experiences to be modeled and tested for potential cross-cultural influences by geographic tourist markets. The four samples are important markets for the study context of Victoria, Australia, and in total comprise six nationalities from the Anglo cluster. One group is domestic tourists from the neighboring states of South Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland, and the other three are international tourists from NZ, UK/Ireland, and North America including the US and Canada (Tourism Victoria, 2010). Within this study, the six nations are grouped into four tourist markets by their geographic relationships relative to the study context of Australia, which is important for marketing purposes. Each of these four regional groupings also aligns with the continents represented within the Anglo cluster nations as discussed later. The cross-cultural tourism marketing challenges highlight the need for those responsible for marketing destinations to understand consumer market groupings in terms of their similarities and differences. Some of these regional market groupings may go across nations and
may also be found within broader cultural groupings such as the Anglo cluster.

This study makes several contributions to understanding of cultural influences and tourist motivational behavior. It specifically considers the motivation of several tourist markets from Western backgrounds toward cultural experiences and the extent of potential cultural differences as a moderating influence on this tourist behavior. It adapts a conceptual model of motivation as a multistage process from the social psychology and leisure literature (Mannell, 1999) to empirically test tourist motivation toward participation in the selected activity of cultural experiences. To achieve the primary aims of this study, three research objectives are pursued: (i) to test the underlying dimensionality of a multiconstruct tourist motivation–benefit process model composed of attitudes, motives, expectations (benefits sought), and benefits gained for cultural group influences between four geographic tourist markets from English-speaking, Western backgrounds; (ii) to model the relationships between the constructs, specifically testing the mediating roles of the preexperience antecedent constructs on each other and on the postexperience behavioral outcome; and (iii) to test cultural group influences between the four groups of tourists as a moderating variable on the resultant model relationships.

A Multidimensional, Multistage Process Approach to Tourist Motivation

To understand tourist motivation for cultural experiences and the potential influences of culture for different geographic tourist markets, an integrated, multidimensional and multistage process model is adapted from social psychology and the leisure literature and tested in this study. Within the context of tourist behavior, motivation is seen as crucial, and since the 1970s—with early foundational studies by Crompton (1979), Dann (1981), and Iso-Ahola (1982)—various theories and models have been developed that guide the empirical study of tourist motivation. Much is known about the motivation and behavior for tourists generally and segments participating in selected activities. Participants at cultural attractions and events are well represented in these studies (Backman, Backman, Uysal, & Sunshine, 1995; Boudier-Pailler, 1999; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Foo & Rossetto, 1998; Formica & Murrmann, 1996; Formica & Uysal, 1996, 1998; Mohr, Backman, Gahan, & Backman, 1993; Richards, 2002). In terms of populations studied, much less is known about the motivation of tourists generally for cultural experiences.

In the understanding of tourist motivation that has been achieved, many diversified approaches toward tourist motivation continue to exist as part of intensified efforts by researchers to develop better models and theories explaining the phenomenon. Harrill and Potts (2002) review the conceptual development of tourist motivation from the early 1970s and assert that “any consideration of the social psychology of tourist motivation should begin with discussion of the social psychology of leisure, within which the concept of motivation is grounded” (p. 106).

Most early tourist motivation studies focused on motivation per se and not the formation of motivation (Gnoth, 1997). All studies rarely incorporate the subsequent consequences of motivation in the dynamic course of behavior and the relationship between motivation and other behavioral constructs (Hsu, Cai, & Li, 2010). The lack of research considering the antecedents and consequences of motivation is surprising given their inclusion among the five basic components in a general model of motivation from the social psychology of leisure (Mannell, 1999). Furthermore, individuals interact with their environment “causing” motivation (Mannell & Kleiber, 1997, p. 189). This theory led Harrill and Potts (2002) to posit that a true social psychological approach to tourist motivation must include an internal psychological disposition and external environmental situation, yet they found most models had deemphasized or completely excluded one or the other element. Hence, the present study aims to develop and test a model for understanding tourist motivation for cultural experiences based on a process approach that incorporates some antecedents in the formation of motivation as well as some postactivity consequences.
The Conceptual Model for the Cultural Experience Motivational Process

A multidimensional and multistage process approach to understanding tourists’ motivation for the consumption of cultural experiences is adopted in this study. Adapting and empirically testing Mannell’s (1999) conceptual motivation model from the leisure literature is favored. Strengths of this model are its incorporation of motivational components that have a direction and energy, producing states of disequilibrium that are reduced by experiencing activities, and its acknowledgment that people possess multiple psychological dispositions that play a role in the motivational process. In a tourism motivation context, Crompton and McKay (1997) also identify a conceptualization that is process oriented and includes homeostasis. In their definition, “tourism motivation is . . . a dynamic process of internal psychological factors (needs and wants) that generate a state of tension or disequilibrium within individuals” (p. 427). According to Harrill and Potts (2002), tourist motivation models need to address the issue of multicausal motivation, with a focus on the individual while also recognizing that individual experiences cannot be separated from social environments. Hence, they need to consider the behavior of the individual tourist in social contexts and to identify psychological disposition-influencing social behavior.

The motivational process adopted in this study from Mannell’s (1999) model can be seen as having multiple stages: Stages 1 and 3 are the psychological dispositions before and after the activity as depicted in Figure 1. Stage 2 is not shown in Figure 1, but is the actual activity and the consumer’s behavior experiencing this activity. Stage 2 is influenced by the preexperience motivational dispositions of Stage 1 and, in turn, has an influence on the postexperience outcomes of Stage 3. The activity and consumer behavior of interest in this study are tourists’ motivations toward attending cultural experiences while visiting the destination. Whereas some of the psychological dispositions in Stage 1 relate to cultural experiences in general and on holiday, others are context specific to the activity itself, as measured indirectly through pre- and postactivity psychological dispositions (Stages 1 and 3 of the model). The context-specific activity in this study was the Queen Victoria Market, which is a produce market still located in the Melbourne CBD. As well as incorporating heritage listed buildings and various entertainment events, it functions as one of Melbourne’s most popular tourist attractions, as evidenced in the top 15 activities for visitors to Victoria (Tourism Victoria, 2010), where going to markets has ranked highly in recent years.

Proposed Model Dimensions: Motives, Attitudes, Expectations, and Behavior

Mannell’s (1999) conceptual model is further adapted in this study into a new conceptual model (Fig. 1) of four selected constructs of relevance to the motivational process for cultural experiences that have been identified from the literature but have not been tested in an integrated motivation model to date. These four key constructs in the proposed model accord with some of the earlier identified constructs in Mannell’s conceptual model, and they are all firstly based on motivational dispositions that have been described as similar to the idea of personality traits that influence our aroused motive (Mannell, 1999). Three are preactivity motivational dispositions, whereas the fourth is a postactivity motivational disposition. For the preactivity motivational dispositions, attitudes are incorporated and are defined as the affective or feeling responses that consumers have toward an object or a general evaluation of an object (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Motives are another preactivity construct and are summarized as internal factors that arouse, direct, and integrate a person’s behavior (Iso-Ahola, 1980).

Expectations in the form of benefits sought are the third preactivity construct and are included because expectations have been conceptualized as a motivational force underlying leisure behavior (Manfredo, Driver, & Brown, 1983). Benefits sought are one type of expectation that has been widely researched in the tourism context, often for market segmentation purposes (Frochot & Morrison, 2000). The one postactivity psychological disposition is benefits gained (alternatively called benefits realized). They have also been widely researched in a tourism context (Woodside & Jacobs, 1985) and, in this study, represent a postactivity disposition that is closely linked to the preactivity expectation of benefits.
investigate the relationship between some of these constructs, and the results to date vary regarding which constructs should be included and how they should be sequenced.

In terms of different approaches to motivation construct sequencing to date, previsit dimensions investigated have included motives, expectations, and attitudes, whereas postvisit dimensions have also included attitudes, especially toward satisfaction of expected motivational items. Attitudes sometimes precede motives, citing theory in social psychology that “attitudes can serve as sources of motivation for the way in which people interact with their environment” (Lindgren, 1969, cited in Ragheb & Tate, 1993, pp. 62–63). At other times, attitudes follow other previsit motivation (Hsu et al., 2010) or are a postactivity measure of motivation-satisfaction (Gnoth, 1999).

Model Construct Sequencing and Relationships

The previous literature on motivation research within tourism or related leisure contexts reveals that many different constructs and their role in motivation have been considered as well as relationships between the constructs. Only a few studies investigate the relationship between some of these constructs, and the results to date vary regarding which constructs should be included and how they should be sequenced.

In social psychology approaches to tourist motivation–satisfaction, postvisit responses to items are usually compared with responses to previsit items using the repeat-measurement method.

sought. Whereas the literature on tourist motivation is vast and beyond review in this article, support for incorporating benefits constructs in a process model for understanding visitor motivation can be seen in Hsu et al.’s (2010) summary of 35 studies, six of which are benefit segmentation related, including one in a cultural-historical event context (Formica & Uysal, 1998). In another study of the effects of motivation on attendance at the same cultural-historical event (Formica & Murrmann, 1996), the researchers called for further research to use other components of travel behavior as well as motivation discriminators, and benefits sought was one of the suggestions.

Model Construct Sequencing and Relationships

The previous literature on motivation research within tourism or related leisure contexts reveals that many different constructs and their role in motivation have been considered as well as relationships between the constructs. Only a few studies
Research of sightseeing tour motives (Dunn Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991) asked subjects 20 motivational items adapted from earlier leisure motivation studies at the beginning of the tour. Then, at the conclusion, subjects indicated their satisfaction with various aspects of the tour corresponding to the motivational items. The researchers found considerable similarity between motivation and satisfaction dimensions “as expected” (p. 234). Gnoth’s (1999) own empirical research of campervan tourists could be categorized as a motivation–satisfaction model as it included two motivational dimensions in a multistage approach using a repeat-measurement method. Tourists were asked their reasons for choosing a campervan before they took possession of the vehicle (a previsit measure as expectancy values) and then after they returned it (a postactivity measure as attitudes of satisfaction).

A repeat-measurement approach is proposed in the present study for the two benefits constructs in the model. Building on previous work (Dunn Ross & Iso-Ahola, 1991; Gnoth, 1999; Mannell, 1999), this study explores tourist motivation by adopting a process approach that is multistage as well as multidimensional. The incorporation of attitudes, motives, and benefits sought and gained in this new conceptual model for tourist motivation can thus be considered a justifiable variant of the two-stage motivation–satisfaction approach identified as the dominant approach in the earlier discussion of social psychological theories of tourist motivation by Harrill and Potts (2002). This methodology contrasts with many previous studies that examine motivation as a single behavioral construct, either previsit or postvisit, with the majority of studies requiring respondents to recall underlying reasons for their visit from which bias can be expected (Hsu et al., 2010).

Other sequences for some of the constructs exist. Hsu et al. (2010) holistically model three constructs in a tourism context, with new proposed sequential directions between the constructs that the researchers claim depart from Gnoth’s (1997) earlier conceptual work that linked motivation, expectation, and attitude in tourism research. Focusing on the previsit stage of tourists, the researchers posit and empirically test tourist behavior as an expectation–motivation–attitude (EMA) model with a data sample of Chinese outbound travelers.

Previously tested relationships between multidimensional motivation and related behavioral constructs include motivation with: satisfaction and destination loyalty (Yoon & Uysal, 2005); overall perceptions of the destination (Correia, Oom do Valle, & Moco, 2007); satisfaction, revisit intentions, and recommendation intentions for Chinese tourists visiting the US (Xu, Li, & Weaver, 2010); and in a behavioral model of leisure participation with leisure attitudes and satisfaction (Ragheb & Tate, 1993). Positive and significant influences were largely proposed in the tests of the relationships among the latent constructs in these models, but were not always found. External pull motives were found to negatively influence tourist satisfaction (Yoon & Uysal, 2005). Internal push motives negatively influenced overall destination perceptions (Correia et al., 2007). Some paths in the relationships between dimensions were not significant (Ragheb & Tate, 1993; Xu et al., 2010).

The previous discussion suggests some directional links between some of the constructs in the present study’s proposed motivational model. Positive associations are proposed between the three preactivity constructs of attitudes, motives, and benefits sought and also between each of these and the postactivity construct of benefits gained.

Accordingly, in the motivational process toward cultural experiences, the following specific hypotheses are proposed:

**H1:** Stronger attitudes will positively influence stronger motives.

**H2:** Stronger motives will positively influence higher expectations of benefits sought.

**H3:** Stronger attitudes will positively influence higher expectations of benefits sought.

**H4:** Stronger motives will positively influence greater benefits gained.

**H5:** Stronger attitudes will positively influence greater benefits gained.

**H6:** Higher expectations of benefits sought will positively influence greater benefits gained.

In this study, the mediating role of some of the pre-experience antecedent constructs of attitudes, motives, and benefits sought on the postexperience outcome of
benefits gained is also explored, as proposed within the relationships between H1 and H4, H1 and H3, H2 and H6, H3 and H6, and H4 and H6 in the conceptual model (Fig. 1). These paths are based on the basic causal chain involved in mediation, as outlined by Baron and Kenny (1986), which in turn draws on the most generic formulation of a mediation hypothesis whereby an active organism intervenes between stimulus and response, as recognized by Woodworth (1928, as cited in Baron & Kenny, 1986).

The Influence of Geographic Tourist Market Culture on Cultural Experience Motivation

A further focus of the conceptual model tested in this research (Fig. 1) is the effect of culture for the four geographic tourist markets on the motivational process for attending cultural experiences while on holiday. This model suggests a culture effect for each of the four motivational process constructs and, at the same time, that culture will moderate the relationship between these four constructs. Culture is primarily measured in this study by two proxies of regional affiliation, which is a culture assessment approach commonly used in the business literature (Lenartowicz & Roth, 1999). English language spoken at home was one measure of culture for the sample. The other measure was regional grouping of the six nationality groups, further categorized as the Anglo cluster in the business literature (Hofstede, 1980, 2001; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985), into four geographic tourist markets (Australia, NZ, US/Canada, and UK/Ireland). This approach was adopted because of the Anglo cluster’s geographical grouping notably covering at least four continents (Ronen & Shenkar, 1985) and the compatibility of these four market groupings by continents as major tourist markets for Australia with associated implications for marketing campaigns as noted in the introduction.

Hofstede’s (1980, 2001) work measuring 53 national cultural differences and similarities based on five cultural indices is widely used as measures of national culture values. Early cross-cultural patterns in his work were identified by Hofstede (2001) who clustered the 53 countries and regions studied, in his own words “somewhat arbitrarily,” into 12 groups (p. 62). In the Anglo cluster, six nationalities formed one group “representing clear historical and/or linguistic culture areas” (p. 63). Other authors’ work (Ronen & Shenkar, 1985), synthesizing clusters of countries from various studies, including Hofstede (1980), also found support for an Anglo cluster of countries that were characterized as former British colonies. All six countries within the data set of this study were included in the Anglo clusters identified in this earlier work. Recent retesting of Hofstede’s (2001) national culture values for eight national cultures in a tourism context in and around Melbourne, Australia, by Reisinger and Crotts (2010) included three nations (Australia, UK, and US) from the Anglo cluster. The data results for these tourist samples were very similar to Hofstede’s (2001) findings for those countries. The analysis also identified support for international regions that cluster closely together and warrant separate marketing campaigns including a Western grouping. The researchers concluded this demonstrates “that national cultural differences do not end at national borders” (p. 153).

All of the previous work from the literature suggests that the differences between the six Anglo-based nationalities further categorized in this study as four geographic tourist markets and two tourist groups (domestic and international) will be minimal. Therefore, when the proposed model is further tested for the influence of culture (Fig. 1), the following hypotheses are proposed for the four geographic tourist markets:

H7a: Attitudes toward cultural experiences are similar.
H7b: Motives to partake in cultural experiences are similar.
H7c: Benefits sought from cultural experiences are similar.
H7d: Benefits gained from cultural experiences are similar.
H7e: The motivation–benefit process for cultural experiences is similar.

Method

Participants and Measures

Data were obtained from 720 English-speaking Western tourists to Melbourne (44% Australians, 19% New Zealanders, 17% North Americans, and 20% tourists from UK/Ireland). Half of the responses were from females, but there was a significant
scales were developed and tested, drawing on the literature. The scales in this study draw upon early foundation research of scale-based motivation incorporating both push and pull items (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1981), Iso-Ahola’s (1989) seeking/avoiding tourist motivation theory, Haley’s (1968) utilitarian-based benefit segmentation dimensions, and hedonic related items because of their relevance to aesthetic products (Hirschman & Holbrook, 1982), which are the context of this study. Attribute-based dimensions as well as some experiential and psychological dimensions were included within each construct to test shifts in cultural experiences noted in the literature (Addis, 2005; Geissler, Rucks, & Edison, 2006; Swanson & Davis, 2006; Tian, Crompton, & Witt, 1996).

To develop measurement models for each of the four constructs comprising the cultural experience motivational process, the data set described above was randomly split in a two-stage cross-validation procedure allowing exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses to be performed on separate samples (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988). The resultant measurement models comprised four dimensions for

### Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Measurement Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Example Item*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, history, and culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Cultural performances in historical settings (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive word of mouth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Cultural experiences because local people attend (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional performing arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Theatrical performances (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>See famous performers (0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social consumption</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>To tell my friends and relatives about it (0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>To forget about the demands of daily life (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn local culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>To learn about local history (0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>To relax mentally (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits sought</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edutainment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>From my visit I expect...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage and facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>To gain knowledge (0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>Signs to be clear and helpful (0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>A range of food and drinks available (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits gained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged eduhedonism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>From my visit...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>I interacted with staff (0.74)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example items are those with the highest loading for each construct dimension given in parentheses.
each of the attitudes, motives, and benefits sought constructs, whereas only two dimensions were required for benefits gained (see Table 1). Each dimension, in turn, comprised multiple items, totaling 40 items overall, all measured on a 1–6 agreement scale: 9 for motives, 13 for attitudes, 12 for benefits sought, and 6 for benefits gained (see Table 1, Column 5, for the sample item with the highest loading for each construct dimension).

The CFA measurement models for each construct were checked for validity and discrimination. In all cases, the goodness-of-fit measures met the criteria recommended by Byrne (2001): normed chi-square values below 3; CFI, GFI, and TLI values above 0.90; RMSEA values below 0.06; and SRMR values below 0.05. Summated scales were created for the 14 underlying dimensions, and the correlations between these subscales (see Table 2) were used to justify the creation of aggregated scales for each of the four constructs using a total of 40 items for the 324 people with complete data.

Descriptive statistics for the four aggregate scales and 14 subscales (Tables 1 and 3) show Cronbach’s alpha values of above 0.7 and 0.6, respectively, which suggests reasonable measurement reliability according to Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006). The sample includes high levels of repeat visitors to both Melbourne and the Queen Victoria Market (QVM) for all four geographic tourist markets, with almost one third or more having visited Melbourne previously and a quarter or more having visited QVM previously. However, a very significant relationship \( \chi^2(3) = 76.0, p < 0.001 \) was found between geographic tourist market and previous visits to Melbourne, with 87% of Australians, 57% of the New Zealanders, but only 37% of people from the UK/Ireland and 30% of North Americans being repeat visitors. For previous visits to the QVM, a very significant relationship \( \chi^2(3) = 43.1, p < 0.001 \) with geographic tourist market was also found, with 70% of Australians, 58% of the New Zealanders, but only 32% of people from the UK/Ireland and 26% of North Americans having visited QVM previously. This shows that each of the four geographic markets do not bring to the experience an equivalent set of preexperience demographics, and this will be further discussed in the interpretation of the study’s findings.

Table 2: Correlations Between Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.001.
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tested using a structural model based on Figure 1 and constructed using single indicator latent models (Munck, 1979) for each of the four constructs. In this model, the constructs were represented by their aggregated scales, using estimated Cronbach’s alpha values to allow for the measurement error in these scales. Hypothesis H7e was tested by determining whether the fit of the structural model deteriorated significantly when the same weights were used for all four geographical tourist markets (i.e., a test of invariance or moderation for the

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Final Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Benefits Sought</th>
<th>Benefits Gained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of items</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s α</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motives</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits sought</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits gained</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.001.

**Data Analysis**

Structural equation modeling (SEM) is used to evaluate the simultaneous relationships between latent constructs. A full structural model, incorporating measurement models for the four constructs, could not be considered due to the relatively small sample size, and aggregated scales were used instead. However, as noted by Bollen (1989), the potential for drawing incorrect conclusions may be large if measurement error is ignored in such a structural model. The first six hypotheses were therefore

![Figure 2. Estimated structural model.](image-url)
However, as shown in Table 4, although all the total standardized effects were positive for each of the six hypothesized links (H1–H6), there were two significant negative direct effects. Attitudes have a direct negative relationship with benefits sought (H3), whereas motives have a direct negative relationship with benefits gained (H4). However, these negative effects are more than offset by the indirect effects associated with those relationships.

Comparison by Geographic Region

A MANOVA suggests a significant but small difference between the mean scale values for tourists in at least one of the four geographical tourist markets ($F(12, 839) = 2.15, p = 0.012$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.020$). As shown in Table 5, follow-up univariate tests with SNK post hoc tests show significant differences in mean values only in regard to attitudes and motives, with New Zealanders scoring particularly low on these two scales. This suggests that hypotheses H7a and H7b must be rejected, whereas H7c and H7d are supported with similar levels for

Table 5
Comparison of Geographic Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Motives</th>
<th>Benefits Sought</th>
<th>Benefits Gained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia ($n = 137$)</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand ($n = 72$)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America ($n = 53$)</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK and Ireland ($n = 62$)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 320)$</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$ value</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001$</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial $\eta^2$</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
benefits sought and gained for tourists from all four geographic tourist markets.

An invariance test across geographical origin using the single indicator latent model found no significant difference between the weights required for the four geographical tourist markets [$\chi^2(18) = 18.37, p = 0.431$]. This confirms that the relationships between attitudes, motives, and benefits sought and gained are similar for Western tourists, thus supporting H7e.

Discussion and Conclusion

In the present study, a new motivation–benefit model for understanding tourist motivation toward cultural experiences is proposed and tested. It uses an integrated, multidimensional, and multistage social psychological process approach that provides new understanding of tourist motivation in the understudied context of cultural experiences. A motivation–benefit process model composed of attitudes, motives, benefits sought, and benefits gained from cultural experiences is presented, and the underlying dimensionality for each of these constructs was further supported for four geographic tourist markets within the Anglo cluster with no significant moderating effect of culture. This suggests that in general Western tourists are keen potential audiences for cultural attractions and experiences when at home or on holiday.

As this was a new motivation–benefit process model for tourist motivation toward cultural experiences, positive associations between all four constructs were hypothesized (H1–H6) and largely supported. Two hypothesized links between the constructs were not fully supported because a direct negative link was found in both cases: (i) A direct positive link between attitudes and benefits sought (H3) was not supported when motives are included, and (ii) a direct positive link between motives and benefits gained (H4) was not supported when benefits sought are included. The former suggests that the positive but weak relation between attitudes on benefits sought, seen in Table 4 ($r = 0.34$), is transmitted through higher motives to partake in cultural events. The latter reveals a complex association between the precultural experience dispositions of motives and expectations about benefits sought with the postconsumption benefits gained. As these negative effects are more than offset by the indirect effects associated with those relationships, this warrants further research.

The saturated model fitted in Figure 2 means that all the constructs are linked directly to each other, indicating that no relationships are fully mediated. This affirms this study’s model incorporating some antecedents of tourist motivation with some behavioral outcomes. This model explains 48% of the variation in motives, 57% of the variation in expectations, and 47% of the variation in benefits gained. This suggests that other variables may be required to explain the full motivational process for cultural experiences, which again leads to a call for further research.

The MANOVA and follow-up univariate tests suggested that culture was a significant variable accounting for differences between the four geographic groups in the case of attitudes and motives. Although the NZ tourists are less enthusiastic about attending cultural experiences than the other Anglo cultural groups in terms of attitudes and motives, when they do attend, their expected benefits sought and gained from the experience are not significantly different. The high repeat visitation in the NZ population sample compared to the other international tourist groups could possibly underlie this significant finding; however, the Australian domestic population sample had an even higher repeat visitation rate with no significant difference in any of the four motivational process constructs compared to the other international tourist groups. Hence, further research is warranted to understand these differences in relation to attitudes and motives toward attending cultural experiences between the geographically/psychically close Australians and New Zealanders. In the meantime, this finding suggests that destination marketers and managers should heed these differences.

Culture measured by regional groupings for Western tourists, identified in the literature as a psychically close Anglo group (Hofstede, 1980, 2001), was tested as a moderating variable on the cultural experience motivation–benefit process. This invariance test, using an aggregated scale model allowing for measurement error, confirmed that the relationships are similar for the four groups of tourists. This result supports hypothesis 7e and affirms Western tourists as a psychically close Anglo...
group, as identified in the literature. This study’s focus on cross-cultural similarities and differences between Western samples of local and international tourists for the model for cultural experiences permits a comparison with selected Eastern cultures in future research where a significant moderating effect of culture would be expected. The literature on cultural differences by nationality (e.g., Hofstede, 2001) and in a tourism context (e.g., Reisinger & Crotts, 2010) strongly suggests cultural differences, especially between Asian and Western nationalities.

Within the tourism and leisure motivation research, it has been astutely observed that managers do not manage experiences per se but must provide conditions amenable for meaningful or satisfactory experiences (Harrill & Potts, 2002; Mannell, 1999). From this comes the need to identify what is required for meaningful or satisfactory experiences. Mannell (1999) claims “research on the subjective nature of leisure tells us that there is a need to look for and be sensitive to the links between the objective environment and the way it is perceived by the individual participant” (p. 247). Harrill and Potts (2002) emphasize that on-site experiences often include a social dimension, hence, the attractiveness of a social psychology process approach to tourist motivation that captures both an internal psychological disposition and an external environmental situation. The motivation–benefit model for understanding tourist motivation toward cultural experiences and the cross-cultural influences found in this study suggest that even English-speaking, Western tourists within the Anglo cluster do not always speak the same language.
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