Acknowledged in tourism literature, cultural properties play an important role in influencing tourists’ visit intention (Calver & Page, 2013) and reflect indigenous attributes of local provinces as historical culture resources (Kemperman, Borgers, & Timmermans, 2009). To investigate factors that attract tourists, we applied value theories in cultural property and consumption to explain tourists’ visit intention of cultural properties. This study used six constructs to test our theoretical model, including three value dimensions of cultural properties (aestheticism, education and history: Calver & Page, 2013; de la Torre, 2013; MacKay & Fesenmaier, 2000), two value dimensions of consumption (utilitarianism and hedonism: Babin, Darden, & Griffin, 1994; Wertenbroch & Dhar, 2000), and tourists’ visit intention (Park & Yoon, 2009).

**Design/methodology/approach**

Based on theoretical relationships in the literature, this study postulated four causal relationships between cultural property values, consumption values, and visit intention. Participants were Korean domestic travelers who visited Korean cultural property sites in two years. In all, four-hundred sixty-three completed questionnaires were used for testing value theories to explain tourists’ visit intention of cultural property sites. Measured items in the constructs (21 items) used five-point Likert-type scales (1: strongly disagree – 5: strongly agree). To ensure construct reliability and validity, we assessed Cronbach’s alpha, composite construct reliability (CCR), averaged variance extracted (AVE), and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Correlation analyses were applied to investigate the overall relationship among constructs, and then, hypotheses were tested using structural equation modeling (SEM). This allowed for an examination of all paths of latent variables in the theoretical model. The examined hypothetical relationships include:
H1: Aesthetic value is positively related to hedonic values (a), utilitarian value (b), and visit intention (c), but the relationship with hedonic value is larger than utilitarian value (d).

H2: Educative value is positively related to hedonic values (a), utilitarian value (b), and visit intention (c), but the relationship with utilitarian value is larger than hedonic value (d).

H3: Historic value is positively related to hedonic values (a), utilitarian value (b), and visit intention (c), but the relationship with utilitarian value is larger than hedonic value (d).

H4: Both dimensions of consumption values – hedonic values (a) and utilitarian value (b) – are positively related to visit intention, but the hedonic value has a stronger relationship with visit intention than utilitarian value has (c).

Findings

Results indicated that all measured variables were satisfactory with the criterion and thus, the measured items achieved construct reliability and validity (CCR and AVE). Cronbach’s Alpha exceeded .8 for all items. The factor loadings (λ) of the observed variables ranged between .586 and .833. The CFA result indicated a sound model fit with the high parsimony of model index and all coefficients are significant at p<.01: Normed Chi-Square=2.066, $\chi^2$(df=174)=359.443 (p<.01); TLI=.939; CFI=.95; PCFI=.787; and RMSEA=.048 (ranged .041 – .055). As a result, constructs had a satisfactory level of criteria to measure the hypotheses. The procedure of SEM, was conducted in a manner consistent with the computed CFA. The result depicted the model fit satisfied all criteria along with a high parsimony of the model (Normed Chi-Square=2.515, $\chi^2$(df=175)=440.095 [p<.01]; TLI=.914; CFI=.928; PCFI=.773; and RMSEA=.057 [ranged between .051 and .064]). Overall, the results of the theoretical model suggested that the model supported 10 out of fifteen hypotheses and was generally consistent with expectations, while the hypotheses of H1c, H2c, H3a, b and d were not supported. The main reasons for failing support of these hypotheses are insignificant paths between constructs (H1c, H2c, and H3b), an unexpected relationship between constructs (H3a), and opposite direction of relational strength between constructs (H3d). The results revealed that eight paths out of eleven paths were significant at p<.05 while three paths were not significant. The insignificant paths were aesthetic value to visit intention, educative value to visit intention, and historic value to utilitarian value. The overall result showed that the three values of the cultural property are antecedents to determine the two consumption values and visit intention and that those values in cultural property had significant correlations. Among cultural property values, the historic value only had a significant direct effect on tourist visit intention while having a negative relationship. Other two values in cultural property positively affected hedonic value in the consumption value while there was no significant direct effects on tourist visit intention. Both dimensions of consumption value significantly affected tourist visit intention; nonetheless, the hedonic value was a more critical consumption value than the utilitarian value to increase tourist visit intention.
References:


Relevance to Marketing Educators, Researchers and/or Practitioners:

For tourism marketing researchers, this study showed that value theories anticipate the tourists’ visit intention of cultural properties. Overall, the results suggest that the cultural property values are important antecedents to determine tourists’ consumption values and visit intention. Also, the two dimensions of consumption values directly determined tourists’ visit intention. These results suggest cultural property managers provide visitor-oriented cultural education and aesthetic experience linked to the original historic value of the cultural site. The cultural properties had a stronger relationship with hedonic consumption value than utilitarian value, which is consistent with previous literature (Calver & Page, 2013). This result indicates that cultural property marketers may increase tourist revisits to the same site by offering fun and enjoyable linked experiences. The combined results suggest that by developing linked experiences through entertainment and/or events it may further satisfy tourist’s emotions with on-site programs (e.g., folk plays and educative programs) and deepen their overall emotional connection to the cultural property site, resulting in increasing tourist revisit intention. Interestingly, the historic value had an inverse relationship with hedonic consumption value yet a positive relationship with visit intention. It implies an increase of awareness regarding the excellence of historic value by advertising emotionally attached local history associated with the other two dimensions of cultural properties (aesthetic and educative values) as an essential consideration to offer fun and contributive experiences in the tourists' visit. In other words, cultural property managers need to develop differentiable promotion programs by implementing the locally domain-specific experiential programs to provide joyfulness and novelty to tourists (e.g., field-based experiential activities), which easily equates to visitors’ temporal and monetary values (i.e., expected values) that are capable of estimating tourist desires to visit.
Originality/Value:
To examine the motivational factors of tourists’ visit intention, we applied an interdisciplinary approach by interweaving two value theories in archeology and tourism (cultural property value), and marketing (consumption value). The result of the empirical test suggests this theoretical integration meshes well with tourists’ visit intention of cultural properties.
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