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ABSTRACT

Sense Making and Sense Giving: Using Visitor Narratives to Understand the Impact of Interactions on Destination Image

Catherine M. Guthrie

Destination image is acknowledged as a key factor in destination choice and visitor satisfaction. However, despite thirty years’ research from a variety of perspectives into destination image and image formation, the impact of actual visitation has been largely neglected and understanding of the processes involved in that change is therefore limited. Visitor experience is increasingly recognised as being unique to the individual, leading to calls for research strategies taking into account the visitor’s perspective. This study uses a phenomenological approach to investigate visitor-destination interactions, capturing visitors’ lived experience as expressed in their holiday narratives. Applying a double hermeneutic approach to analysing interview data, this study outlines the elements of destination experience and shows how the meaning encapsulated in the individual’s destination image is mediated by his/her stock of knowledge, the particular combination of predispositions, motivations and characteristics, as well as by their in-destination interactions and encounters with people and place. It develops the ideal typifications of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand to help explain the complex and dynamic interaction between visitor characteristics and behaviour and extends our understanding of the role of other tourists in destination experience by illuminating tourist-tourist interactions and revealing the compromises necessitated by the presence of other tourists. By generating insight into the complex and dynamic interaction between anticipations, motivations and predispositions, and the way in which this interaction affects the visitor’s experience of people and place in a destination, the study has demonstrated the utility of the phenomenological approach in understanding visitor interactions. It has also resulted in a model which explains the processes whereby the visitor makes sense of his/her experience and transmits that experience to others. This can be used by academics and practitioners to further understand the benefits and attractions of existing destinations and to predict the attraction of potential destinations, as well as to promote greater understanding of tourist-host interactions among destination industry providers.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Image has been defined as the “total impression an entity makes on the minds of others” (Dichter, 1985). That total impression may consist of prejudices, beliefs, information and feelings about the entity. In terms of a visitor destination, this might be previous knowledge gained from a variety of sources and previous experience which the visitor brings with them to the destination, coloured by the actual experience of being there, encountering the people and places which make up the destination. This thesis uses interpretive phenomenology to investigate the impact of visitor-destination interactions on perceptions and image: it seeks to reveal and understand the processes and structures whereby visitors make sense of their destination experiences, for themselves and to others, and transmit that destination image through their holiday stories.

Destination image, whether that held by first time or by repeat visitors, is recognised by academics and destination managers/marketers as a key factor in destination choice and visitor satisfaction. It is a complex phenomenon which has been the subject of considerable investigation from a variety of perspectives: sociological, psychological, anthropological, behavioural and marketing. However, it is generally agreed that image is composed of cognitive, affective and conative elements, as set out by Gartner (1993) and that these elements are affected by a variety of factors. These three elements are also interlinked, in that cognitive evaluations combine with affective components to determine or influence the conative, or behavioural, component. In other words, both existing knowledge about a destination’s attractions, facilities and services, and the individual’s motivations and the way they approach destination experience, will affect the way they imagine themselves behaving in the destination. As it is acknowledged that these play a role in pre-visit destination image, this thesis will investigate whether and how actual experience within the destination affects the image which is both carried forward into the visitor’s own set of anticipations for future visits, and transmitted to others through their narratives.

It is important to obtain a better understanding of this process of making sense of the destination, and the role of destination interactions within it, for a number of reasons. Word of mouth, as in recommendations or holiday stories heard from friends, family or
colleagues, is an element of Gartner’s organic induced image (1993) and as such is not something which can be directly controlled by destination marketers or managers. An investigation of both the way it is transmitted and how aspects of actual visitation affect those stories will provide a better understanding of the process and afford opportunities for destination managers to direct change within the destination so that the best possible images are carried away. Each visitor is an individual, and will have their own unique combination of previous experience, knowledge and motivations which form their image of a destination. This thesis will suggest that from an exploration of these elements for individuals it may be possible to discern and conceptualise an underlying process in which these precursors act on, and are acted upon by, the interactions which make up destination experience. In order to do so, it is argued that a research approach is required which captures the richness of individual visitor experience from the visitor’s viewpoint.

On a practical level, tourism destination management and marketing organisations at all levels devote considerable resources to promoting and maintaining the image of their destination among existing and potential target markets. At the national level within the United Kingdom, for example, VisitBritain invested £35 million in 2003-2004 in destination marketing (VisitBritain, 2004) and VisitScotland £25.5 million in 2005-2006 (VisitScotland, 2005). Whilst destination management organisations carry out surveys and benchmarking exercises to evaluate visitor perceptions and the impact of marketing campaigns, these are generally approached from a quantitative perspective and rarely offer the destination manager either the opportunity to gain a deeper insight into visitor destination experience or any understanding of the vitally important transmission of image through visitors’ retelling of their experiences.

1.2 Justification for the Research

Gallarza, Saura and Garcia (2002), reviewing existing literature on tourist destination image, constructed a theoretical model illustrating the complex, multiple, dynamic and relativistic nature of tourist destination image. Their intention was to provide a map to assist future researchers in siting work on tourist destination image, thereby reducing the piecemeal and atheoretical nature of tourist destination image research. Baloglu and McCleary (1999) combined concepts derived from the literature with an empirical investigation to create a model demonstrating that cognitive and affective elements of image are affected by source and type of information, socio-demographic factors and socio-psychological motivations for travel. Their model is designed to consider destination
image in advance of visitation, and so takes no account of destination experience other than obliquely through the influence of friends and family. Given the acknowledged complexity of tourism destination image, it is not surprising, perhaps, that Gallarza et al. (2002, p.57) noted that despite the body of research, there is still no all encompassing model of destination image.

Following Gartner’s model of tourism destination image formation (Gartner, 1993), numerous studies have investigated different facets of image although many of them concentrate on cognitive evaluations. These have included topics such as the measurement and assessment of various destination attributes and the impact of these on image, destination choice, intention to return and willingness to recommend (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Bigné et al., 2001; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Oppermann, 1996), whilst others have considered the influence of different sources of information on image (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Kim and Richardson, 2003). Still others have studied links between satisfaction or service quality and image (Kozak, 2003; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Pritchard, 2003). The main body of work on tourist satisfaction, evaluation of service quality and use of information sources has been more related to those constructs than to image, or has been specific in relation to a particular sector rather than the destination as a whole.

Very little, if any, work has been carried out into the impact of visitation on destination image, other than incidentally as a by product of intention to return or recommend. Although there is a growing body of work relating to visitor experience, particularly from the sociological and anthropological perspectives (Edensor, 2000; McGregor, 2000; Meethan, 1996; Pizam et al., 2000; Uriely, 2005; Wang, 1999), the emphasis is still either on specific sectors, as in experience of heritage sites (Chronis, 2005) or museums (McIntosh, 1999), or on cross cultural issues (McIntosh, 2004; Reisinger and Turner, 1997; Thyne and Zins, 2003).

Not only is there little research into the impact of visitation on tourism destination image, the majority of empirical work on destination image is based upon rating scales and/or lists of attributes which have been predetermined by the researcher. Where unstructured methods have been used, this has been mainly in the early stages of the investigation to elicit information, which has then been incorporated into rating scales or attribute lists, or developed into personal constructs (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993). Whilst such studies are all valid contributions to the understanding of destination image, it could be argued that they are in the main answering “What?” questions: what is attractive or unattractive; what
elements combine to form an image; what affects intention to return or recommend; what is the relationship between various factors? Little of the existing research appears to take the visitor or tourist viewpoint as the starting point for investigating issues relating to “How?” or “Why?”: how does image change with experience of a destination; why are some attributes important and others not in choosing a destination?

Whilst this undoubtedly yields a considerable body of information, it privileges the researcher’s perspective above that of the visitor; the researcher (or indeed destination manager) may believe that the range of attractions or certain rated hotels is a key factor in the visitor’s assessment of the destination, but these may in fact be outweighed by the manner in which the visitor is treated by a resident when asking for directions, or the attitude of shop assistants. Consider the visitor who arrives in a historic town, with foreknowledge of the attractions and sites which lead them to anticipate a pleasurable stay. If that visitor is booked into a hotel by staff in the Tourist Information Centre, and that hotel turns out to be shabby, with staff who display an unfriendly attitude, what is more likely to influence the image carried away and the holiday stories which result from the holiday: the previously acquired information about iconic sites and attractions or the feeling of being unwelcome and uncomfortable in the hotel? If the latter, is this likely to be counterbalanced in the visitor’s mind by the friendly Tourist Information Centre staff, the bus or taxi driver who went out of their way to put him or her down at the right place, the unexpected beauty of a particular building, or the shop assistant who searched high and low for a particular item? Even if these positive aspects outweigh the unpleasant hotel experience in the visitor’s own mind, it may be that if only the negative story of the hotel is told, the image of the destination given to that friend, family member or colleague is one of a down-at-heel, unfriendly destination.

As a destination manager, the researcher spent many years and much energy working to encourage product providers in her destination to focus on customer care skills for all staff, not just the obvious front line staff such as receptionists, so that the visitor would take away an enhanced image of the destination as well as of the individual hotel, guest house, attraction, museum or other facility. The destination took part in the usual destination benchmarking exercises on a regular basis, where a random sample of visitors were asked to rank various pre-determined attributes of the destination such as service, availability and quality of attractions and facilities and ease of getting there. However, this exercise seemed to be at one remove from the visitors’ experience, and did not deliver any understanding of what brought the visitors in the first place or how their experience in the destination had affected the way they thought about the destination and how they
would talk about it to friends and family – that all-important word of mouth publicity. This research will address these issues through interviewing visitors about their experiences as expressed through their holiday anecdotes.

The tourism product is a “collection of experiences” (Gunn, 1972, p.11). The tourism experience is composed of a number of physical, environmental and emotional elements (Murphy et al., 2000; Page, 1997; Pollock, 1999). Visitors’ experienced reality of a destination therefore encompasses interactions not only with frontline staff in tourism facilities but potentially also with all tourism product staff, local residents and other tourists, as well as their encounters with place. That experienced reality is not confined to face to face encounters; the increasing use of new media means that visitor-destination interactions can begin during the planning stage and continue long after the actual visit through destination follow-up and customer relationship management. These experiences may colour the total destination image which visitors carry away with them and refer to when planning future holidays, or when talking about their holidays to friends, family and colleagues. In other words, they can inform the very word of mouth publicity which is considered so valuable by destination managers and yet so difficult to influence. Despite the fact that word of mouth is often cited as a factor in tourist destination choices, Dann and Phillips (2001), in their review of progress in qualitative tourism research, noted there was a lack of research into this type of publicity.

In that same review, Dann and Phillips also noted the lack of studies into the impact of visitor interactions within the destination. Carlzon (1987) coined the phrase “moments of truth” to describe those brief interactions between consumers and a company representative which can affect the way the customer perceives the organisation. A destination is a collection of different elements (attractions, accommodation, retail, catering, environment) rather than a tangible entity such as an airline, but the literature clearly demonstrates that destination image exists, composed of impressions and perceptions. Carlzon’s moments of truth can equally be applied to the interactions between visitors and people and places within a destination, as summarised in Table 1.1. People within a destination include not only frontline staff in tourism facilities, but also all tourism product staff as well as local residents and other visitors, as all of these may have an impact upon the individual visitor experience. Moreover, these interactions may be direct encounters, as set out in the first column of Table 1.1, or indirect, in the sense that the simple presence of hosts, residents or other visitors may affect visitor experience.
Table 1.1: Destination Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Encounters</th>
<th>Impact of Presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visitor/host</td>
<td>Visitor/host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face within destination</td>
<td>Visitor/host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person to person via call centre/enquiry office/telephone call</td>
<td>Visitor/host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person to destination management organisation or host via internet</td>
<td>Visitor/host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor/resident</td>
<td>Visitor/resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to face within destination</td>
<td>Visitor/resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor/visitor</td>
<td>Visitor/visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within travel party</td>
<td>Visitor/visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside travel party</td>
<td>Visitor/visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor/place</td>
<td>Visitor/place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>Visitor/place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>Visitor/place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The suggestion has been made above that destination image is an encapsulation of what a particular destination means to the visitor, and this is the end result of a sense, or meaning, making process. One way in which people make sense of experience is through narrative (Goossens, 2000; Padgett and Allen, 1997; Thompson et al., 1989). It appears to be human nature to share experience in the course of everyday conversations, whether these take place during short interludes such as work breaks, at more formal social gatherings such as dinner parties, or in casual communication with friends and family members. It seems appropriate, therefore, that to understand visitor experience, researchers should listen to the stories visitors tell about their holidays. These narratives reflect the reality of the destination experience for the individual visitor, allowing the researcher to gain a deeper insight into the way that reality is assessed against the anticipations, and how reactions and perceptions are affected by visitor motivations. It is likely, also, that such narratives will uncover the ways in which visitors make sense of their experience, as the retelling of experience is a means for reflecting upon it. This will then provide a basis for conceptualising the sense making process and the role of visitor-destination interactions in that process.

Every individual’s experience of interactions within a destination is unique, related to their motivations and expectations as well as to external factors. As a result, there have been numerous calls for a greater use of interpretivist approaches to tourism research (Botterill, 2001; Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Hollinshead, 2004a, 2004b; McIntosh, 1998; Riley...
and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997). Phenomenology is the investigation of lived experience to arrive at a description and elucidation of a phenomenon (van Manen, 1990). In reflecting upon conscious experience, the researcher can uncover the structures through which meaning is assigned to that experience. A phenomenological approach to visitor destination experience, and particularly the impact of interactions on that experience, provides insights into the way visitors make sense of the destination experience both to themselves and in the retelling of their holiday stories to others. Given the utility of this approach, it is remarkable that there have been very few studies applying a phenomenological approach to tourism, and none to tourism image.

The significance of this study, therefore, is that it uses a phenomenological approach to gain a deeper understanding of visitor destination experience, uncovering the impact of destination interactions on image and shedding light on the way visitors transmit their experiences to others. The study focuses not solely on interactions between visitors and “official” tourist industry representatives, but also on interactions between visitors and residents, other visitors, and place, demonstrating not only that any or all of these interactions can affect the destination experience, but also how, thereby providing an understanding of the process through which visitors make sense of their experience. It attempts to conceptualise this process using an inductively derived model which can be set in the overall context of tourist destination image. For practitioners, this work provides a richer understanding of visitor experience than can normally be obtained from quantitative destination benchmarking studies, and has implications for visitor management, customer care and promotion of a “visitors welcome” attitude among residents. It also provides some insight into how visitor experience is transmuted into and transmitted as word of mouth publicity about a destination.

### 1.3 Research Objectives

This study is concerned with the general area of visitor experience of interactions within and with destinations, and the way these interactions shape and inform visitor perceptions of a destination. This encompasses the motivations and expectations the visitor brings to the destination and to their interactions with and within the destination, the way they assess those interactions and whether and how those interactions affect visitor perceptions of the destination. The overall aim of the study is to investigate and evaluate the impact of destination interactions on visitor perceptions and the destination image visitors carry away and transmit to others.
The main objectives of the research are:

- To investigate visitor/destination interactions by interviewing visitors to explore, through their holiday narratives, both their experience of interactions with people in the destination and whether/how these interactions affect visitor perceptions and hence image
- To develop an inductively derived model of the impact of destination interactions on visitor perceptions and destination image

The specific research questions to be addressed in pursing these objectives are:

- What are the key elements of visitor-destination interactions?
- How do these elements of the visitor-destination interaction relate to visitor characteristics and motivations?
- How are visitor-destination interactions and perceptions of a destination related and how is this manifested in or through visitor stories of destination experience?
- How can we understand these visitor stories and what can we learn from them?

1.4 Methodology

The aim of this thesis is to investigate destination interactions and their impact on visitor perceptions, and hence destination image. It will do so from a phenomenological perspective, analysing visitors’ stories in order to arrive at an understanding of destination interactions as experienced by visitors.

Van Manen (1990) suggests that the qualities of a lived experience are only truly recognised in retrospect, but that the challenge is nevertheless to capture the immediacy of the experience, shorn of preconceptions or reflections on causality. In order to capture visitor experience whilst still fresh, semi structured interviews were conducted with visitors during their stay. The interviews covered three key topic areas intended to elicit anecdotes of visitor experience relating to their expectations, their experiences and the image they would transmit to others as a result of their visit. Interviews took place at three different locations within Edinburgh and within the Greenwich World Heritage site. Both Edinburgh and Greenwich are marketed and recognised as destinations in their own right. Edinburgh attracted 3.6 million staying visitor trips, representing 13.2 million bednights in 2005 (VisitScotland, 2007) and Greenwich attracted 6.8 million visitors in 2003 (Greenwich Council, 2004). Interviewing in multiple locations in two destinations was
considered likely to minimise the likelihood of the eventual key characteristics of the lived experience being either attraction or destination specific. The full rationale for selecting these two destinations will be detailed in Chapter Six, Methodology and Research Design.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim, then imported into QSR NVivo 2.0, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) package designed to assist with the analysis and management of qualitative research. NVivo was used to capture the initial free node coding of interview transcripts, then to develop coding, ask questions of the data and develop the analysis by exploring connections, enabling a constant analytic spiralling from the parts to the whole whilst maintaining closeness to the data (Creswell, 1998). The memo and hyperlinking functions of the software were used to document the emerging analytic structure and provide transparency. In this way, the researcher would fulfil what Patton describes as the “obligation to monitor and report … analytical procedures and processes as fully and truthfully as possible” (2002, p.434).

1.5 Key assumptions

Visitor is defined for the purposes of this thesis as any type of traveller engaged in tourism, which is considered to be:

“the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes” (WTO, 2005).

This researcher believes that whether the holiday is for a period of hours, days or weeks, the experience within the destination is influenced by the same factors and visitors make sense of and transmit that experience through the same processes. In much of the literature, however, the word tourist is used to describe these persons, with the understanding that unless otherwise specified, they are staying visitors on a leisure trip. The term visitor is more commonly used specifically in relation to museums and attractions, rarely in connection with destinations, or with literature concerned with motivation, expectations and satisfaction. In recognition of this, where the literature under consideration uses the term tourist, the discussion will also use this term. Elsewhere, the term visitor will be preferred.

Furthermore, it could be argued that the boundaries between everyday activities and specifically tourism activities are becoming increasingly blurred. For example, shopping is now a major holiday activity, whereas experiences which were once only available
through tourism, such as seeing exotic animals, gazing at tourist sights or engaging with other cultures, are now widely available everyday through the media of television, computers, radio and even exhibitions or simulacra in shopping malls (Uriely et al., 2002; Urry, 2002). Other authors argue that with the advent of working holidays in their various forms, there is no longer a necessary contradiction between tourism and daily activities (Pizam et al., 2000; Ryan, 2002b). Regardless of whether engaged in for a week’s holiday or an afternoon’s escape, it is suggested that the individual may bring to that experience the same bundle of anticipations, predispositions and motivations, make sense of their interactions with the people or place in the same way regardless of whether they are a staying or a day visitor, “tourist” or “visitor”. As an aside, it is interesting to note that destination management organisations, within the UK at least, are increasingly referring to the “visitor economy” (Advantage West Midlands, 2004).

1.6 Summary and outline of the research

This research is original in that it uses a phenomenological approach to investigate the impact of interactions on the destination image held and transmitted by visitors.

Chapter Two gives an account of the ontological and epistemological stance taken in this study in order to establish the phenomenological approach adopted in carrying out the research. The chapter outlines the structure and content of the literature review, and emphasises the role of the literature review as an integral and dynamic element of the research process itself.

Chapters Three, Four and Five comprise the literature review. Chapter Three discusses the nature of destination image, and presents various theories of image formation as a prelude to suggesting that the factors identified as affecting pre-visit information might equally play a role in any changed image which results from the experience of actual visitation. Motivations are identified as major element of the bundle of anticipations which the visitor brings to the destination, and Chapter Four explores the relationship between visitor motivations, expectations and destination image formation. It examines theories of tourist motivation, suggesting that there are overlapping categories and definitions, and focussing on the possibility that different motivations do not necessarily act either separately or sequentially upon the individual, but may be in operation simultaneously. Having established in the preceding chapters that the visitor brings a bundle of preconceptions, including motivations and expectations with them to the destination,
Chapter Five goes on to discuss the linkages between motivation and visitor experience. It examines the impact of those preconceptions, experience and the visitor’s assessment and evaluation of that experience on what might be called a sense making process. In so doing, it suggests that regardless of whether visitor experience is conceptualised as gaze, performance or consumption, it can be extended to encompass not only place and people, but the destination as a whole. The chapter concludes with the proposition that there may be a general process of destination consumption which is experienced by each individual visitor in a way that is unique to them by virtue of their particular anticipations, motivations, predispositions and interactions with people and place.

Chapter Six outlines the methodology and research design, setting out how the interpretive phenomenological approach delineated in Chapter Two will be operationalised. It explains and justifies the phenomenological methods and techniques to be used in collecting and analysing data, and discusses the development, merits and disadvantages of using computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS). The chapter concludes with a section of critical reflection on the methodological approach and research design, followed by a reflection on the overall research journey, likening the PhD process to the travels of the journeyman craftsman.

Chapter Seven reports the analysis of the interview data. It sets out the initial categorisation of the elements of destination experience which emerged from the transcripts before moving on to explore the inter-relationship between those categories to arrive at a description of three ideal types: Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand. A relationship between these consumption styles and selection strategies, or approaches to experiencing the destination, is presented and the impact of these styles on interviewees’ interactions with place and people explored. In this section, the importance of the intra group dynamic is uncovered, leading to identification of the compromises which result from the particular interplay of motivations and predispositions as they relate to travel companions. The final section of the chapter reports on the mechanism of comparison and justification which appear to be the means whereby interviewees make sense of their experience, and the chapter concludes with a model illustrating how anticipations, predispositions, interactions and reporting mechanisms constitute a cyclical and dynamic process of sense making and sense giving.

Chapter Eight discusses the findings from the interview data, setting them in the wider context of existing tourism destination image, motivation and experience research. It returns to the sense making and sense giving model, building it up layer by layer to reveal
the complexities of the interactions between the elements of the process, equating the bundle of anticipations, predispositions and motivations with the phenomenological stock of knowledge and relating them to the cognitive, affective and conative elements of image formation identified in the literature review. The chapter reflects on the merits both of capturing visitor experience through their narratives, and of the value of the phenomenological approach in analysing those narratives.

Chapter Nine summarises the key findings and draws together the conclusions and theoretical and research implications of the study as well as its potential benefits for destination management practice, and sets out some recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER TWO
Theoretical Perspective and Guide to the Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to set out the theoretical perspectives which underpin this research and to introduce the literature review. It is important to understand the epistemological and ontological standpoint of the researcher, because these influence the way the research questions are developed, how those questions are operationalised and the research carried out. This chapter therefore discusses the nature of knowledge and the nature of reality, setting them in the context of the debate on inquiry paradigms in social research and, more particularly, tourism research. It goes on to discuss the phenomenological approach in more detail, before explaining the general approach taken to the literature review and the subject areas considered relevant to this study.

2.2 Inquiry Paradigms: the world view of the researcher

A paradigm is the basic set of beliefs which define a researcher’s worldview (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004), and the inquiry paradigm defines what falls within and outside the bounds of legitimate inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 1998, p.200). Put simply, the inquiry paradigm consists of three interconnected elements: ontology, epistemology and methodology. Ontology is the study of the nature of being, and relates to the assumptions of being, meaning and identity which inform the researcher’s definition of reality: what can be known (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Guba and Lincoln, 1998; Hollinshead, 2004a). In social research, this refers to the assumptions about the nature of social reality which underpin the approaches to social inquiry (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998b). Epistemology is the study or theory of knowledge, and relates to the assumptions made about the nature and construction of knowledge: how it can be known. A researcher’s epistemology is thus what he/she counts as knowledge, and depends on what they want to know about. This then determines how they collect that knowledge (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004). This chapter concentrates on the ontological and epistemological questions, to establish clearly the philosophical stance of the researcher and how this has been carried forward into the review of existing research in tourism destination image and experience. Methodological issues will be considered once the research problematic and specific research questions have been defined through the dynamic process of the literature review.
Guba and Lincoln identified four competing research paradigms: positivism, post positivism, critical theory and constructionism (1998, p.202-203). Positivism refers to the traditional approach derived from the natural sciences. This paradigm assumes that there is a single objective reality which can be measured in absolute terms and is independent of the values of the researcher. Post positivism incorporates some qualitative methods; it accepts that findings are probably rather than definitely true, and objective reality can only be partly, rather than fully known (Guba and Lincoln, 1998). Increasingly, social science researchers have questioned the traditional, scientific approach on a number of counts (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a; Guba and Lincoln, 1998; Lee and Fielding, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1994). The natural scientific enquiry formulates a theory or hypothesis and then tests it. However, the scientific/positivist approach, relying on quantification and generalisation, takes no account of the meanings and purposes attached by human beings to their behaviour, or of the context in which the behaviour takes place. Moreover, the theory proposed by researchers within this paradigm may have little or no meaning for the group or culture being studied. It is also argued that despite being statistically meaningful, generalisations cannot be applied to individuals: for example, just because 85% of visitors to a given attraction say they appreciate the intervention of costumed interpreters, it does not necessarily follow that a particular individual will react favourably to being drawn into conversation with such a guide. Moreover, in many instances the focus is on proving or disproving a priori hypotheses with little value placed on or discussion of the process through which the hypothesis was developed.

Guba and Lincoln (1998) acknowledge that the post positivist approach, which uses qualitative data to give richer insights into the context and meaning of human behaviour in studies, addresses some of these criticisms. However, they note three further criticisms of the positivist and post positivist paradigm (1998, p.199):

- **Facts are not independent of theories.** This undermines objectivity, because facts can only be seen in the context of a particular theoretical framework. Similarly, facts are not independent of values.
- **One set of facts can support several theoretical frameworks.** This means that if a researcher has a theory, they can deduce what facts ought to exist. However, they cannot arrive at one single theory from a given set of facts. The example most commonly given is that the existence of one black swan disproves the hypothesis that all swans are white.
Developments in the physical sciences brought into question the assumption that the researcher has no effect on the phenomena he or she is observing. Social scientists now argue that it is more accurate to recognise that there is inevitably some form of interaction between the researcher and the subject, and that knowledge or findings are created out of this interaction.

Following positivism and post positivism, Guba and Lincoln (1998) suggested that critical theory and constructivism were a distinct move away from the belief in an objective reality to the view that reality is shaped by the macro context of social, political, cultural and gender values (critical theory) and/or the micro context of individual, local or specific values (constructivism). Denzin and Lincoln (1994b, 1998a, 2003b) traced the development of qualitative, or interpretivist, research in sociology and anthropology through five “moments”, as shown in Table 1. They located each moment in a time period of the twentieth century but noted that researchers are still working in each of these moments. This is either because of the legacy of a previous piece of research or because they are following a set of practices in terms of research design, data collection and analysis belonging to one of the moments (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998a, p.22).

### Table 2.1: Moments of Qualitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Period</td>
<td>1900s – 1914. Objective, colonising, depersonalised accounts reflecting positivist paradigm. Researcher as expert, findings presented as fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernist Phase</td>
<td>Post war – 1970s. Move away from positivism, whilst attempting to maintain positivistic rigour in qualitative research. Researchers interested in ways people categorise the world and meaning placed on events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis of Representation</td>
<td>Mid 1980s - 1990s. Research and writing becomes more reflexive. Issues of validity, reliability and objectivity once more problematic. Interpretive theories become more common. Fieldwork and writing blur into one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fifth Moment</td>
<td>The present. End of the grand narrative. Focus on more local, small scale, context specific theories. Researcher as expert rejected, instead becomes one voice among many.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Denzin and Lincoln (1998a) and Phillimore and Goodson (2004)

Some authors prefer the term interpretive for the fourth major paradigm (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004), and there is a sense in which the terms constructivist, constructivism,
interpretivist and interpretivism can seem interchangeable. There is a similar apparent interchangeability between “qualitative” and “interpretive” as umbrella terms. In general, however, qualitative seems to be taken as a generic term to encompass research approaches which do not proceed from the natural scientific perspective, and is commonly used as the opposite of quantitative. The next section discusses this debate in the context of tourism research.

2.3 The Interpretive Paradigm in Tourism Research

Tourism is a complex phenomenon (Przeclawski, 1993), attracting researchers from a variety of academic disciplines: management, marketing, consumer behaviour, psychology, geography, economics, sociology and anthropology. Indeed, the emergence of tourism schools in academia is relatively recent and there is still debate about whether tourism constitutes a discipline in itself (Leiper, 2000) or a multidisciplinary field of study (Tribe, 2000, 2004). It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that there is also an ongoing discussion regarding inquiry paradigms within the field of tourism research. Tribe (2004) notes two divisions of research in tourism. He categorises the first as being concerned with “tourism business studies” because they have clear links with generic schools of business studies, i.e. subjects such as tourism marketing, tourism management and tourism strategy. The second is less easy to define, as it includes any tourism studies which do not fit into the first, and therefore defies a comprehensive definition, but includes subjects such as environmental and social impacts and tourism perceptions (Tribe, 2004, p.49), all of which bring a variety of different methods.

Each individual’s experience of a destination, and interactions within that destination, is unique. It will depend on their motivations, their expectations, how they perceive and react to external factors. In order to understand that experience, tourism researchers need to find a means to see the world through the tourist’s eyes. This has caused numerous authors to argue for improved recognition of the benefits of using interpretivist approaches for the better understanding of various phenomena within tourism (Botterill, 2001; Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Hollinshead, 2004a, 2004b; McIntosh, 1998; Riley and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997). Indeed, Walle considers that tourism needs to develop an entirely new paradigm combining the strengths of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.
McIntosh argued (1998) that tourists are consumers of experiences, which include emotional and evaluative as well as purely physical aspects of the tourist product. Every tourist experience is unique, subtly altered from the generic by the mix of motivations, expectations and knowledge brought to it by each individual. It is, therefore, a highly subjective experience, and one which cannot be captured by the majority of visitor surveys carried out by visitor attractions, destinations and accommodation operators, confined as they are to ratings of the quality and quantity of facilities or attributes pre-ordained by the attraction provider or tourism researcher and to the gathering of sociodemographic profile information (McIntosh, 1998). Nevertheless, Riley and Love (2000) concluded from their review of published qualitative tourism research up to 1996 that positivism is still the dominant paradigm. They suggested that this is partly because journals that concentrate on applied research may feel uncomfortable in drawing bottom line implications and impacts from qualitative research, and therefore lean towards the positivist tradition. Updating the Riley and Love review in 2004, Goodson and Phillimore (2004) considered that qualitative tourism research remained largely situated within Denzin and Lincoln’s (1998b) traditional and modernist moments. However, they noted that tourism researchers were beginning to question whether positivism and quantification were “fully equipped to explore questions of meaning and understanding” (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, p.30). In particular, they suggested there had been “little real attempt to understand individual experiences of tourism” and that little attention had been paid to:

“a more person-focused approach which takes account of the individual’s subjective experiences and perceptions and the roles these play in constructing tourist, or indeed, host experience.”

(Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, p.40)

As will be shown in the remainder of this chapter, phenomenology offers just such an approach. The following section will therefore discuss phenomenology both as a philosophy and research approach to address precisely these issues and provide insight into the individual tourist experience and construction of meaning.

### 2.4 Phenomenology: Understanding Lived Experience and the Life World

It can be argued that all qualitative research is interpretive, in that it involves the researcher watching, listening, asking, recording, examining and then writing or presenting the resultant information. Within this overall approach, however, there are different perspectives depending upon the particular answers to the ontological and epistemological questions noted above (Goulding, 1999; Hollinshead, 2004b; Schwandt, 1998). Schwandt (1998, p.221) suggests that the terms constructivism and interpretivism
“are best regarded as sensitizing concepts” and notes that those who espouse these persuasions share a common goal, that of “understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it.” In order to understand the lived experience of others, the researcher must interpret it, which necessitates clarifying both the process of meaning making and how meanings are embodied in the words and/or actions of social actors.

This concept was developed by German sociologists such as Max Weber (1864-1920) and Alfred Schutz (1899-1959), who argued that the goal of what has become known as human science or human inquiry (as opposed to natural science) is the grasping or understanding (Verstehen) of social phenomena (Schwandt, 1998, p.223). Weber suggested that it is only possible to know nature from the outside, because natural phenomena can only be observed and recorded. By contrast, human science researchers can attempt to suggest motives by interpreting human actions and words to try to reach an explanation of the causes, course and effects of human behaviour (Weber, 1964). There is, however, a tension inherent within the interpretivist approach. On the one hand, they recognise the importance of the individual, subjective experience, yet at the same time seek to develop a degree of scientific objectivity towards their findings. This paradox has been addressed in a number of ways: Weber sought to separate facts, or data and explanations, from the values of the investigator (Coser, 1977); Schutz (1973) discerns different levels in the operation of Verstehen, in developing the structures of the life-world; and yet others counsel that rigorous method can counteract the dangers of the researcher’s own subjectivity impinging upon the analysis (Boulton and Hammersley, 1996).

There is thus a challenge inherent in this approach: how to reach an understanding of the lived experience of the subject through an interpretation which is true to that experience rather than one imposed by the researcher’s conscious or unconscious structures and values. That there is no single answer to this challenge is reflected in the bewildering range of potential answers to the epistemological and methodological questions cited above through which the researcher can establish their world view. However, it was noted above that the epistemological and methodological elements of a paradigm are closely related to the ontological, or the nature of being. Phenomenology approaches the nature of being by seeking to understand phenomena from within, in a manner which is free of all misconstructions and impositions whether religious, cultural or scientific. As summarised by Moran (2000, p.4), it is:
“an attempt to get to the truth of matters, to describe phenomena, in the broadest sense as whatever appears in the manner in which it appears, that is as it manifests itself to consciousness, to the experiencer”

Phenomenology has been variously described as a style of philosophising, a systematic study of social behaviour, and a set of techniques for gathering data (Goulding, 1999, 2005; Moran, 2000; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Schwandt, 2003). The range of different forms of phenomenological inquiry echoes the range of approaches outlined by Schwandt as forms of interpretivism and constructivism. The following sections will review phenomenology as a philosophy and then as a research approach. The discussion will contrast the work of Husserl and Heidegger, as the two main contributors to the development of phenomenology as philosophy, and Schutz, who developed phenomenology as social philosophy, before explaining why hermeneutic phenomenology has been chosen as the framework for the current study.

Husserl (1859-1938) is generally considered the founder of phenomenology (Beyer, 2007; Crotty, 1996; Moran, 2005; Sokolowski, 2000), in that he set out to develop a system for doing philosophy which has at its heart the interconnectedness of human beings with the world. He did this through developing the concept of intentionality, which holds that consciousness cannot exist in isolation. Every thought is a thought of something, every desire, a desire of or for something; every judgement a judgement, comment or criticism of something. Similarly, every action has an object; to reach is to reach something or for something; to hear is to hear something. The world is experienced through these conscious acts. As Moran (2000) notes, for Husserl, the problem was to describe and understand this, but without imposing preconceived notions or hypotheses. He characterised the natural attitude as being the naïve state in which human beings view objects and situations from within the perspective of a variety of taken for granted assumptions arising from history, culture, tradition or education. This natural attitude must be laid aside, or bracketed, in order to examine consciousness as it appears, as a pure phenomenon (West, 1996). Only through this process of reduction is it possible to have an intuition of what consciousness is. In Husserlian terms, such intuition is not a mystical sympathy with the object of knowledge, but the highest stage of knowledge, as hard won as mathematical insights (Moran, 2000). This stepping aside from the natural attitude and concentration on essences has given rise to Husserl’s phenomenology being categorised as transcendental (van Manen, 1990) and therefore tending towards an objectivist view of reality. In fact, Husserl did not suggest that there is only one objective reality; rather that each phenomenon should be approached in as open a manner as possible in order to gain insights of the highest order. As Moran notes, there are two simultaneous but
apparently opposite directions in Husserl’s exposition of phenomenological reduction: towards the self which can transcend the natural attitude and towards the way in which consciousness is always caught up in a world (2000, p.12). Husserl did not deny the scientific world-view in which the world of ordinary experience consists of things which obey laws of nature and physics. He argued, however, that even before human beings rationalise or think about the world, they simply experience it in a pre-given form which he called the life-world. This concept will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter in terms of its development by Schutz in relation to the social world.

Heidegger (1889-1976) was more directly concerned with the ontological problem of existence (Moran, 2000; West, 1996). He rejected the notions of consciousness and intentionality developed by Husserl, believing them to be too allied to Cartesian thought, and preferred to concentrate on the interconnectedness of human beings to the world, which he called “being-in-the-world” or Dasein. At the same time, Dasein is also “being-with-others”. Humans are not detached observers but involved participants. Similarly, things exist in the world both in relationship to humans, as tools or equipment to be used, and in relationship to other things. In Heidegger’s terms, they are “ready-to-hand”, ready to be used, rather than “present-at-hand” or simply there. The individual may not immediately perceive all the aspects of an object, because only some will be revealed at any one time. A tourist bus has both mechanical and functional aspects, for example. Normally, its functionality as a means of transporting tourists from point A to point B is in the foreground, but if there is a breakdown resulting in delays or accident, the mechanical aspects will push functionality into the background. Nevertheless, because things are as they are, whatever the individual perceives at any given moment is reality for that individual. In Heideggerian terms, human beings are to appreciate whatever is revealed, it is their role to be open to what-is, or Dasein. At the same time, just because some aspects of a thing may not be revealed, this does not mean they do not exist. Reisinger and Steiner (2006, p.77) suggest the example of bullfighting in Spain: if bullfights are no longer staged for tourists, it does not mean that bullfights are not a part of Spanish culture and tradition.

Heidegger posited two modes of being, practical and theoretical. Human beings are practical when they are absorbed in the task at hand, directly involved with what-is, accepting things as being ready-at-hand. In tourist terms, the person who takes what they find in a destination in their stride, who engages with the liveliness of a crowded resort or the intervention of the modern world in a historic or traditional site, is being practical. When they express disappointment that the gallery is crowded, or the hotel staff are not
friendly, they are being theoretical, in that they are not engaging directly with the experience but viewing it from the perspective of their preconceived notions of what being in the gallery, or interacting with the hotel staff, would be like. In the theoretical mode, people are only open to the possibilities permitted by their existing knowledge and ideas, which are projected onto the object or experience. Heidegger does not suggest that one or other mode is “right”, only that people in the theoretical mode may be denying themselves the full possibilities of being.

For Heidegger, expression is a key part of the uncovering of *Dasein*, and lies as much in the way human beings relate to things as in the way they talk about them. As Moran notes (2000, p.234), Heidegger linked hermeneutics to phenomenology, considering all human experience to be interpretive, in this sense: although human beings may be open to things, the way they relate to things and reveal them is always related to their pre-judgements which are not necessarily always explicitly articulated. In light of this, all questions must carry assumptions which may distort the possibilities for understanding the phenomenon being investigated. Every question is posed to something, about something, and for a purpose. This requires that the questioner has an initial understanding which will inevitably have an effect on the answer they find because it will affect the way in which they are open to the phenomenon. This leads to concerns that there can be no new knowledge, if phenomena can only be comprehended in terms of what is already understood. According to Moran (2000, p.237), Heidegger’s answer to this is that the hermeneutic circle is not circular reasoning in the sense of a closed circle, but rather a circular movement of to and fro. The questioning throws a certain light on the phenomenon which in turn suggests further questioning, so that understanding can be advanced. The methodological implications of this will be discussed in detail in Chapter Six.

Although Husserl and Heidegger differ in a number of respects, the core of their phenomenological thinking is the attempt to understand phenomena as they present themselves. They acknowledge that at different times, different aspects of phenomena will disclose themselves. This is not to say that other aspects do not exist, just that they are hidden. The degree to which phenomena reveal themselves depends also on the openness with which the individual approaches them, and whether the individual can set aside the pre-judgements of what Husserl called the natural attitude and Heidegger the theoretical attitude. In calling for a return to the things themselves, both phenomenologists were advocating a return to the consideration of the world of lived experience, or *Lebenswelt* (van Manen, 1990, p.182-3). For Husserl, the life-world is the
world of the natural attitude. It has styles, or structures. Heidegger’s modes of Being are also akin to life-worlds. It was Alfred Schutz (1899-1959) who took the idea of such structures, together with other aspects of Husserl’s phenomenology, and applied them to the social world and social sciences (Barber, 2006). For Schutz, the everyday life-world is not a private world, but an intersubjective one: a fundamental reality shared by everyone, taking for granted that they share the same assumptions and understanding. Taken for grantedness is “everything which we experience as unquestionable” (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973, p.4). These assumptions include the bodily existence of others and that those bodies have similar consciousness; that things in the outer world are the same and have the same meaning for everyone; that human beings can relate to each other, can interact, and can be understood; and that human beings share the same frames of reference in the social and cultural world. For Schutz, the life-world is a reality which is both modified by human acts and modifies human actions.

Human beings use what Schutz calls the stock of knowledge to deal with situations in the life-world (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973). The stock of knowledge is the accumulation of previous experiences, whether our own or those transmitted by others. The stock of knowledge is to a degree defined and limited by the individual’s situation and bound up with their subjective experience of the life-world. It also comprises skills, useful knowledge and recipes (patterns based on knowledge and experience) used to deal with situations and/or people. If the existing knowledge is found to be insufficient to deal with a particular situation, that encourages the acquisition of new knowledge which is then incorporated into the stock of knowledge. This allows individuals to compare current situations with those in the stock of knowledge, and therefore act as they have done in similar situations in the past (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973, p.15). This individual stock of knowledge is related to the person’s previous experience and future expectations, whereas the social stock of knowledge is conditioned rather by the historical social world in which the person lives. In other words, some of the experiences, knowledge and skills in this social stock of knowledge are learned from other people’s experiences rather than directly acquired. In tourism terms, the individual stock of knowledge is the visitor’s own accumulation of destination experiences and knowledge, whether directly acquired through brochures or other media or indirectly through travellers’ tales they have heard from friends and family. The cultural expectations and heritage they bring to a destination, on the other hand, are part of the social stock of knowledge.

Schutz (1973) suggests that the everyday life-world has two main spatial categories: the world within actual reach, and that within potential reach. The world within actual reach is
composed of the individual's immediate physical surroundings and the objects they take for granted as being seen, heard or felt. It is essentially in the present. The world within potential reach is either restorable or attainable, depending upon whether it is in the past or in the future. The world within restorable reach is one the individual has only just left and can re-inhabit, either physically or in memory, for example returning to a particular restaurant. The world within attainable reach relates to expectations, and is limited by the individual's position in time and society, and by their biography. Someone in the 15th century would have found it difficult to travel from Britain to India, whereas now it is possible to fly there within a relatively few hours, but at the same time, one person's lifestyle and inclination might make them more likely to go on holiday to India whilst another's would not.

There is a social dimension to the spatial arrangement of the life-world. Although the world in actual reach of any two people will not be identical, there are so many overlaps that it is possible to talk of them inhabiting a common surrounding. However, people have different biographies, so that what is attainable for one is not for another, as suggested above. There are thus gradations of actual, restorable and attainable reach which may overlap, suggesting that although there are many different life-worlds, there is also an everyman's life-world arising out of the intersubjectivity of experience. In the same way, whenever an individual encounters another, he/she brings their stock of knowledge to the encounter. Through checking that each interprets their experience in a similar way, they reach a point where they are on the same wavelength and therefore share a common life-world to some degree. The stock of knowledge of this social world is made up of typifications (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973, p.77), which are modified for each individual encountered. These typifications are more akin to Weber's ideal types than to concrete classifications or typologies, and are ways of understanding how individuals give meaning to their social world. The ideal type encompasses all possible characteristics and behaviours relating to that type, whereas in reality individuals are likely to possess or demonstrate only some of those characteristics, but enough for the typification to resonate as being a valid description.

Schutz, then, develops a sociological form of phenomenological inquiry, demonstrating that the epistemological and ontological considerations of Husserl and Heidegger could be used to make sense of the social world as well as individual existence. The next section will discuss why this approach is particularly suited to the questions addressed by the current research.
This aim of the current study is to investigate the impact of destination interactions on visitor perceptions and destination image, through addressing the research questions:

- What are the key elements of visitor-destination interactions?
- How do these elements of the visitor-destination interaction relate to visitor characteristics and motivations?
- How are visitor-destination interactions and perceptions of a destination related and how is this manifested in or through visitor stories of destination experience?
- How can we understand these visitor stories and what can we learn from them?

In tackling these questions, this project aims not simply to capture the experience of a particular group or type of tourists, but to go beyond that description to an understanding of the processes whereby the visitor makes sense of his/her destination interactions. Van Manen (1990, p.9-10) describes phenomenological research as “the study of lived experience” and “the study of essences”. This study is not just asking “How do tourists interact with a destination?” but rather seeks to discover the nature of these interactions, to understand their impact on visitors and the stories they tell about their visit. In going beyond the experience of particular types of tourists to examine what makes a visitor/destination interaction what it is, this research is “not just a study of subjects” but is studying “in the subjects the object of their experience” (Crotty, 1996, p.36). The phenomenological approach has been used in tourism studies, albeit in only a very few instances. Hayllar and Griffin (2005) applied this approach to studying visitor experience in a historic precinct, analysing interview transcripts to identify the essential characteristics of the precinct experience. Masberg and Silverman (1996) revealed the multidimensional nature of student experience of heritage sites, and Selby (2003) investigated visitor consumption of urban destinations, both arguing that the phenomenological basis of their studies allowed them to understand more fully visitors’ lived experience. The phenomenological approach taken in this study will capture the lived experience of visitors in the destination, interpreting their destination narratives to arrive at an understanding of the sense making process.

2.5 Guide to the Literature Review

A key principle of phenomenological investigation is to be open to the phenomenon under study, to see it as it appears, rather than through the lens of preconceived notions or suppositions (epoché). However, Moustakas (1994) points out that whilst researchers can do their best to be aware of biases, it is not possible to throw off completely ingrained
habits of thought and language. For him, the *epoché* principle suggests rather that the researcher should strive to approach the subject with an open mind. This carries implications for the conduct of the literature review as preparation for the study. In quantitative research, the literature review is generally completed in advance of fieldwork and serves to develop hypotheses or concepts for testing. However, in qualitative studies, particularly phenomenological and grounded theory studies, the approach may be less linear and more cyclical, or reiterative. The researcher uses the literature to become aware of sensitising concepts, of what has previously been written (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). The researcher then tries to set this foreknowledge to one side, allowing the lived experience to speak directly rather than being mediated by external perceptions. Van Manen (1990, p.47) argues, however, that since it is impossible to ignore completely or to forget what is already known, it is better to make this prior knowledge explicit, so that the researcher can be alive to the possibilities that this foreknowledge is colouring understanding of the phenomenon. Patton (2002, p.226) notes that:

> “reviewing the literature can present a quandary in qualitative enquiry because it may bias the researcher’s thinking and reduce openness to whatever emerges in the field. Thus, sometimes a literature review may not take place until after data collection. Alternatively, the literature review may go on simultaneously with fieldwork, permitting a creative interplay among the processes of data collections, literature review, and researcher introspection”.

One purpose of the literature review in this study, then, is to provide a general review and introduction to existing research. More importantly, the literature review is a dynamic phase in the research itself, as it is a tool to aid in exploring and discussing how destination image is constructed, the stock of knowledge which visitors bring to destination experience and the elements which might play a part in making sense of that experience. Lastly, in identifying apparently unexplored areas of destination interaction, the literature review points to the contribution that this study will make to our understanding of this aspect of visitor experience.

Chapter Three sets the context for the current study by discussing the nature of tourism image and theories of image formation. It draws attention to the continuing lack of clarity in destination image as a concept, discusses the main strands of tourist destination image research and notes that few, if any, directly address the impact of visitation upon destination image. One of the acknowledged factors in pre-visit image formation is visitor motivations, and Chapter Four explores in more depth the discussion in the literature regarding the anticipations which the visitor brings with them to the destination, developing and exploring views of the interaction between motivation and expectation. In Chapter Five, these are brought together in an exploration of current thinking on the
nature of tourist experience, particularly experience of place and interactions with hosts, residents and other tourists, and ways in which that experience can be assessed. As the literature review develops, it suggests that visitors are individuals, each with their own baggage of motivations, previous knowledge and cultural/social experience, rather than a homogeneous group. The interplay between motivations, expectations, experience and image may therefore be more complex than can be understood through quantitative approaches, and the phenomenological approach will permit a richer insight into the visitor understanding and retelling of the destination experience.
CHAPTER THREE
Tourist Destination Image

3.1 Introduction

A visitor’s image of a destination has been defined as “the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination” (Crompton, 1979a, p.18). Image is recognised as an important factor in visitor destination choice behaviour (Baloglu, 1998; Dann, 1996; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Gartner, 1993; Govers and Go, 2003; Jenkins, 1999; Klenosky et al., 1999; Lengkeek, 2001; O’Leary and Deegan, 2005; Reilly, 1990; Sirgy and Su, 2000; Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000; Thirkelson, 2003), as well as playing a part in visitor satisfaction and therefore intention to recommend or return (Bigné et al., 2001; Chon, 1991). Studies have thus indicated that destination image plays a significant role in the competitiveness of destinations. O’Leary and Deegan (2005) note that there is an increasing need for destinations to create unique identities to differentiate themselves, as image can be the deciding factor when other visitor choice variables such as price are perceived to be equal. Govers and Go (2003, p.26) suggest that temporary strengthening, or increased exposure, of a destination provided by press coverage of events or other component elements of the destination image can improve competitiveness by affecting visitor choice. Destination image can also assist destination marketers to understand and therefore segment their target markets: a destination such as Lanzarote, offering sunshine and beaches, should direct their marketing to potential visitors seeking “rest, relaxation, stress relief and escape from daily routine” (Beerli and Martin, 2004b, p.634).

Numerous elements of destination image lie outside the control or even sphere of influence of destination managers and marketers so that it can be difficult to effect short term change. Nevertheless, it is important that destination managers understand the existing image of their destination and the impact of visitor experience on that image, so that those factors which can be controlled in and by the destination are managed most effectively (Selby and Morgan, 1996). However, despite its acknowledged importance and a considerable body of research into its various aspects, there is still no overall conceptual framework for tourist destination image (Gallarza et al., 2002) and concern that it has yet to be fully operationalised as a construct (White, 2005).
Destination image is part of the reason for choosing a destination, but also forms some of the visitor’s expectations. However, image is best understood as a dynamic construct and, consequently, image is likely to be altered by an individual’s experience during his or her stay. The visitor’s holiday stories about their experience can demonstrate that altered image, as well as transmitting it to the friends, family and colleagues who may be their audience. Indeed, the very process of narrating provides one mechanism for formulating image. Nonetheless, it is argued, destination image may be seen as the way visitors make sense of the destination in advance of a visit, an encapsulated meaning which may change as a result of their destination experiences. The image, post experience, becomes part of the expectations for subsequent destination choices. This chapter therefore reviews existing literature on tourist destination image as a starting point for developing an understanding of this sense making process. It will consider the nature of tourism destination image and theories of image and tourist image formation, before reviewing existing work on various aspects of tourist destination image, to set the context for the current study and identify any lacunae in this area of the literature. Apart from Baloglu and McCleary (1999), very few if any researchers appear to have investigated image from the visitor’s viewpoint or considered the impact of destination interactions on image. As will be discussed later, such work as exists uses predefined scales to test relationships rather than allowing understanding to emerge from the visitor’s experience. As a first step, however, it will be helpful to examine the nature of tourism image and the components of image formation.

3.2 Tourism Destination Image: Nature and Formation

Destination image is complex, and its influence on human behaviour is of interest to numerous academic disciplines, as noted by Gallarza et al in the introduction to their paper proposing a conceptual model of tourism destination image (2002, p.57). As a result, it has been studied from a variety of perspectives, including anthropology, sociology, geography, semiotics and marketing. For example, introducing a collection of essays on the anthropology of tourism, Selwyn (1996, p.29) is concerned both with the behaviour and attitudes of tourists, those living in tourist destinations and those who observe tourism, as well as with the wider role of tourism in contemporary culture. Dann (1996) investigated the socio-linguistic form and content of images, whilst Sternberg (1997) considered the iconography of destination image in relation to Niagara Falls and others have taken a psychological approach (Sirgy and Su, 2000; Walmsley and Young, 1998). Others, such as Baloglu, have taken a more marketing oriented approach: in a
series of articles developed from a major survey of potential visitors to Turkey and other Mediterranean destinations, he concentrates specifically on recording and understanding particular aspects of tourist behaviour related to destination image and destination choice (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu, 1998; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Baloglu, 2001).

Some twenty years ago, Dichter defined image as a concept which can be applied to a variety of objects:

“The concept of image can be applied to a political candidate, a product, a country. It describes not individual traits but the total impression an entity makes on the minds of others.”

(Dichter, 1985, p.75)

However, Jenkins (1999, p.1) noted that the term image has been used differently in a variety of contexts and disciplines, giving rise to different meanings, from visual representation to a more holistic understanding which includes impressions, knowledge, emotions, beliefs and values, and Gallarza et al. suggested that “there are almost as many definitions of image as scholars devoted to its conceptualization” (2002, p.59). Nevertheless, the definitions in Table 3.1 indicate an underlying consensus tending towards the holistic understanding of image. Indeed, Morgan and Pritchard (1998, p.64) note that a number of common themes have emerged, and agree that Dichter’s definition above is perhaps the most useful to apply to tourism image.

Table 3.1: Definitions of Tourism Image

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawson &amp; Baud-Bovy (1977)</td>
<td>The expression of all objective knowledge, impressions, prejudice, imaginations and emotional thoughts an individual or group might have of a particular place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton (1979a, p.18)</td>
<td>An image may be defined as the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gartner (1986)</td>
<td>Tourism image is a function of brand (political entity) and the tourists’ and sellers’ perception of the attributes of activities or attractions available within a destination area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigné et al. (2001, p.607)</td>
<td>…an individual’s overall perception of a total set of impressions of a place… the subjective interpretation of reality made by the tourist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as definitions of tourism image are drawn from across various disciplines, interest in the process of image formation has been evinced by tourism anthropologists (Selwyn, 1996), semioticians (Sternberg, 1997), sociologists (McGregor, 2000), and marketeers (Bigné et al., 2001). Gunn (1972) was among the first to try to tease out elements of
image formation, approaching tourism from a land use and landscape design perspective. He argued that a better understanding of the way in which travellers formed an image of a destination would enable destination planners to design the layout and landscape of a destination so as to both increase the attractiveness of the destination and live up to expectations created by the image. Gunn suggested that image is personal, and formed on two levels, the organic and the induced. Organic images are acquired over time through personal experience, information from family and friends, newspapers, books and films, whereas induced images are supply side images, distributed through brochures, advertisements and advertorial to promote a product or destination. As will be discussed later, with the increasing convergence of various media, this distinction may be becoming blurred.

Gartner (1993), recognising that image formation and destination selection are closely connected, developed an image formation framework to help destination marketers in planning and implementing promotional programmes. He identifies three components of image, cognitive, affective and conative, arguing that these are interrelated. The cognitive component comprises known attributes of a destination, mental pictures derived from facts; in other words, the sum of beliefs and attitudes which create a picture of the destination’s attributes and comprising both organic and induced elements described by Gunn (1972). Cognitive evaluations combine with affective components to determine or influence the conative or behavioural component.

The affective component relates to the motives for travel. There is a generally held understanding that escape, whether physical or psychological, is the underlying motive for travel. Over the past thirty years, sociologists, behaviourists, psychologists and marketeers have addressed this question of motivation. This has resulted in a number of models of motivation, from Cohen’s typologies (Cohen, 1972, 1979) to Pearce’s blueprint for tourist motivations (Pearce, 1993). Harrill and Potts (2002), reviewing the development of tourist motivation theories, conclude that the answer to what motivates travel depends on both internal and external variables. Whatever these variables, the needs and wants which inform the desire to travel will also decide the benefits sought from the destination. The tourist who seeks simply to get away from a frenetic, nine-to-five existence may prioritise rest and relaxation, whereas one who seeks a degree of self improvement may prioritise cultural attractions. The former may be more attracted by a destination with an image of unhurried tranquillity, the latter by a destination which is seen as a place rich in heritage and culture. In each case, there is a degree of connection
between image and motivation for travel. Tourist motivation is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

Gartner’s third, conative component is essentially the processing of the cognitive and affective components to reach a decision (Gartner, 1993). This has been further explained by Dann (1996) as a description of the processual nature of image formation and its role in destination choice. He argues that the conative component is the interactive element of image, i.e. the way individuals imagine themselves behaving in the destination. To take an example using a ski holiday brochure, a student might look at the pictures of the ski resort’s nightlife and imagine themselves in the bar after a day’s snowboarding, whereas parents planning a family ski holiday might tend to relate to the photographs of families relaxing in a chalet, or collecting children from ski kindergarten, and an adventure seeker might look at the pictures of the peaks and imagine themselves dropping out of a helicopter to ski off-piste.

In refining Gunn’s notions of organic and induced images, Gartner (1993) introduces a distinction between overt induced images, where the involvement of the destination promoters is open and obvious to the consumer, and covert induced images, which appear to be independent of the destination promoter, such as celebrity endorsement or travel articles. He also differentiates between autonomous (independent) agents, solicited and unsolicited organic agents. Baloglu and McCleary (1999) proposed a conceptual model of tourist destination image formation, derived from the literature. They appear to include Gunn’s organic and induced images within the information sources element of their model. These combined with other exogenous, or external stimulus factors (age, education and motivations) directly or indirectly influence the endogenous, or internal, evaluation variables (cognitive perceptions and affective evaluations), which in turn form the destination image. Using path analysis to test their hypotheses, they found that affective components had a greater influence on overall destination image than the cognitive/perceptive ones.

Destination image formation therefore is a process involving a combination of directly promoted images and those absorbed indirectly from a variety of sources. Indeed, Morgan and Pritchard (1998, p.67) argue that the division between organic and official or projected images is increasingly artificial, as tourism promoters draw increasingly on imagery and icons from popular culture. The destination marketer addresses or attempts to influence cognitive image components by providing or disseminating information about facilities, attractions, activities and climate of a destination; at the same time, they will
have an understanding of their target market segments, and will write copy and select photographic images not only to inform but also to create awareness of benefits to be obtained, such as relaxation. Through their promotional material, they will suggest to visitors the type of experience they can expect from the destination, and reinforce cultural associations from other media which may be attractive to the particular target segment, thereby addressing the motivational factors and affective image formation factors. Leisen (2001) assessed non-residents’ images of New Mexico as a vacation destination, grouping responses into four market segments. She concluded that those non-residents who held the most favourable images were most likely to visit and should therefore be targeted in the short term, whilst those holding less favourable images could be the focus of longer term destination marketing campaigns. Harrill and Potts acknowledge that destinations are becoming more proactive in seeking to understand and speak to tourist motivations, citing the “Joy Factor” developed by the San Francisco Convention and Visitor Bureau (2002, p.111).

Gartner considered his paper to be an intermediate step in the development of a holistic understanding of destination image formation (Gartner, 1993, p.209). Subsequently, numerous authors have investigated various aspects of the image formation process. Whilst some have considered affective and/or conative elements (Dann, 1996; McGregor, 2000; Sirgy and Su, 2000; Sternberg, 1997), the majority of research appears to have considered mainly the cognitive elements (Baloglu, 1998, 2001; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Bigné et al., 2001; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Kim and Richardson, 2003; McGregor, 2000; Oppermann, 1996; Selby and Morgan, 1996). Although the lists of destination attributes used in these studies often include items such as “friendly people” or “quality of service”, there appears to have been no attempt to investigate the role of visitor interactions with the destination, whether before, after or during a trip, in the image formation process.

Thus far, the chapter has given a definition of destination image and reviewed the development of thinking on the nature of destination image and the elements involved in the formation of that image. It has suggested the complexity of destination image; acknowledging the variety of work in this area, it has identified a lack of research into whether and how the visitor’s interactions with and within the destination affect the image formation process. The next section will explore this further through a discussion of attempts in the literature to conceptualise destination image.
3.3 Conceptualising Tourism Destination Image

Recognising the quantity and variety of previous work on tourism destination image, Gallarza et al. (2002) argued nevertheless that there was as yet no overarching conceptual framework relating to tourism destination image. They therefore undertook a review of existing literature on tourism image, identifying ten major strands of research and classifying the analytical techniques used to investigate different aspects of tourism destination image. From this, they constructed a theoretical model (Figure 3.1 below) to demonstrate the complex, multiple, relativistic and dynamic nature of tourism destination image. The following discussion of the model will serve as a starting point for considering various ways in which researchers have attempted to conceptualise tourism destination image.

The complexity of destination image has been discussed above, in that it has been defined in a variety of ways, from numerous perspectives, and contains a varying number of components which are considered to interact in different ways by different authors. These are summarised in Figure 3.1. Gallarza et al. further refer to the fact that image can be uni personal, i.e. held by the individual, or collective, i.e. stereotypical (2002, p.69) as evidence of its complexity. The multiple nature of destination image refers to whether it is attribute-based or holistic, and whether its formation is a static or dynamic process. According to Gallarza et al. (2002, p.71):

“a concept is relativistic when it is simultaneously subjective (changes from person to person) and comparative (involves perceptions among various objects)”

Finally, they argue that the dynamic nature of tourist destination image is demonstrated by the influence of two variables, time and space, on image (2002, p.72). Image is considered to change with the passing of time, becoming more complex as a result of increased knowledge and the impact of both follow-up promotion by the destination and reinforcement through recall occasioned by photographs or videos (Ahmed, 1996; Chon, 1991; Dann, 1996; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Gartner, 1986; Selby and Morgan, 1996). The influence of space on image can be regarded as the impact of geographic distance from the destination: the more distant the destination, the more stereotypic the image, whereas that of a destination closer to home is presumed to be more complex as a result of greater knowledge (Ahmed, 1996; Crompton, 1979a; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991).
Each of the four features central to the model represents a “useful dimension of the concept of image for strategic management of destinations” (Gallarza et al., 2002, p.68). However, in their introduction, Gallarza et al. state the model’s purpose as being:

“to contribute to a better understanding of the image concept when applied to tourist destinations and to aid selection of the best research methodologies for measuring the TDI construct.”

(Gallarza et al., 2002, p.57-58)
In other words, the model is intended to provide a map to assist researchers in siting work on destination image in relation to existing strands of investigation and to assist in decisions on appropriate methodologies. Whilst the model is likely to be of interest to practitioners in demonstrating the nature of tourism destination image, it is essentially theoretical, rather than a practical tool for the strategic management of destination image.

Gallarza et al. admit to using subjective criteria in selecting topics and in organising the model, acknowledging that destination image research as a whole includes so many topics that a comprehensive review would be beyond the scope of their paper (2002, p.59). They have therefore excluded topics such as destination attractiveness. Similarly, the taxonomy of research methodologies contains a more detailed examination of quantitative than qualitative approaches, on the basis that categorisation is more difficult in qualitative studies as the attributes derive from the subjects and homogenous labelling is therefore rare. The authors acknowledge that consumer perceptions of destination categories might not be as clear as researchers’ definitions (Gallarza et al., 2002, p.65), which might equally be said of destination attributes, one of the key elements of destination image measurement. Despite this acknowledgement, the authors appear to imply (Gallarza et al., 2002, p.67) that qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups are suitable only for supply side research (Selby and Morgan, 1996) or as a preliminary stage in consumer research (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993).

White (2004, 2005) however pursues a qualitative approach to explore whether destination image is distinguishable from destination perceptions. He argues that the idea of image as a construct is not particularly well developed, suggesting that it is in fact interchangeable with constructs such as perception, attitude and even dreams and hallucinations. He considers that the three elements ascribed to destination image by authors such as Baloglu and Brinberg (1997), Leisen (2001) and Ahmed (1996) and operationalised in their studies are in fact closely aligned to the three component model of attitudes common in psychology literature (White, 2004, p.310). Acknowledging that Echtner and Ritchie (1993) took a more holistic approach, White (2004, p.310) nevertheless queries whether their respondents had an actual picture in mind, or whether in fact they simply had a perception which was different from the elements included in the tangible attribute scale presented to them. He then suggests that there is still confusion as to what constitutes an image, and reviews the work of descriptivist and pictorialist psychologists to gain further insights into image as a construct: descriptivists would argue that image has little relation to logic or meaning, and is therefore of no use in predicting an individual’s intentions towards a destination, whereas pictorialists argue that images are
similar to perceptions but are formed from memory rather than in response to stimuli, and may therefore be generalised or abstract rather than detailed visual perceptions.

According to White, a third conceptualisation of image may offer greater possibilities for destination marketers and managers: Richardson (1969) argues that there is no universal human cognition, as some people record images as experiences whilst others use words, and that images can be classified subjectively according to the degree of conscious control over the image and its vividness. White considers that improved understanding of the relationship between image vividness and intentions to visit, or motivations for travel, could be very helpful for segmentation. However, although he goes on in a later paper (White, 2005) to conduct interviews to ascertain whether there is any difference between responses to requests to state image or perceptions of a destination, he specifically excludes subjects who have already visited the study destination, Sri Lanka, “so that there was no external stimulus in the form of actual visitation experience to influence participant’s responses” (White, 2005, p.193), as he is concerned with image formation in advance of visitation.

Following a review of published qualitative tourism research, Riley and Love (2000) concluded that positivism was still the dominant paradigm, and this would appear to be confirmed by the emphasis on quantitative studies noted above. This dominance may be partly because journals that concentrate on applied research may feel uncomfortable in drawing practical conclusions and impacts from qualitative research, and therefore lean towards the positivist tradition. Furthermore, there is still a greater value placed on quantitative than qualitative research in the academic assessment programmes of higher education funding bodies (Hall, 2004). Walle agrees that there is a bias towards “rigorous, quantitative and scientific methods” (1997, p.524), but argues that despite their power, these techniques are not suitable for every research situation, and particularly not where people’s feelings are under investigation. He notes that precisely because positivist techniques cannot address some phenomena, disciplines such as marketing and consumer behaviour are adding qualitative methods to their research “toolkits”. Addressing the question of applicability of research to the practitioner’s situation, Walle understands that the practitioner increasingly has to deal with the “personal feelings of hosts and the impact of tourism activity on them” (Walle, 1997, p.534) and that a wider variety of techniques other than the purely quantitative is required. This thesis will argue that it is equally important to understand the experiences of visitors and the impact this has on the destination image they carry away as a result of their visit. This in turn will develop an understanding of how word of mouth information about destinations is formed,
and how to improve or enhance aspects of a destination to maximise the positive image transmitted by visitors.

The above discussion has reviewed attempts to conceptualise destination image from both a quantitative and qualitative research perspective. It has argued that the model suggested by Gallarza et al. (2002) is of more use in assisting researchers to situate their own work in relation to destination image than in encapsulating image as a concept. Moreover, the model pays scant regard to any qualitative investigations in the area. Where a qualitative approach has been espoused (White, 2004, 2005), investigations have deliberately excluded the impact of visitation, preferring to concentrate on the image formation process in first time visitors. Lastly, the section considered the calls for increased use of qualitative methods to gain deeper insight into visitor experience by allowing the visitor’s voice to be heard directly. It is becoming clear that there is little, if any, work to date which has considered from either a qualitative or quantitative perspective how the visitor makes sense of his/her experiences and interactions within the destination, and how this sense making affects the image they retain and transmit to others. This is explored further in the following section through a review of empirical research.

### 3.4 Aspects of Tourism Destination Image

Thus far, this chapter has considered the literature relating to formation of destination image and the theoretical frameworks for destination image research. This section now considers the variety and breadth of empirical research into some aspects of tourist destination image which have been identified as elements of those frameworks. This can broadly be classified into measurement of tourist destination image, the impact of image on visitor behaviour in terms of destination choice and intention to return or recommend, and the impacts of time and distance on image. It will be seen that there has been little, if any, empirical research into the impact of visitor experience on destination image.

Gallarza et al. (2002) reviewed the literature on destination image prior to 2000 and noted that studies measuring tourist destination image largely concentrated on measuring or assessing destination attributes (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Chon, 1991; Crompton, 1979a; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Gartner, 1993, 1986; Gunn, 1972; Oppermann, 1996; Reilly, 1990). Most often, these studies used structured instruments incorporating predetermined Likert, comparative or semantic differential
scales and then applied statistical techniques to measure destination attributes. Some authors use bipolar dimensions to consider the relative position of attributes. Echtner and Ritchie (1993) developed a three continuum framework for destination image measurement to accommodate both cognitive and affective elements: attribute/holistic, functional/psychological and common/unique, whereas Walmsley and Young (1998) applied respondents ratings of constructs such as busy, appealing/attractive, trendy, fast pace of life and commercialized to compare destinations on an affective response grid. Both these studies used open ended techniques to refine their list of constructs or questions for the rating scale, and then structured instruments for actual data collection.

Since 2000, studies have tended to focus more on the use of attributes and the other components of image to measure the impact of image on visitor behaviour, whether in terms of destination choice or intention to return or recommend the destination to others, as compared to earlier studies on destination choice which tended to sample potential visitors (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Crompton, 1979a; Gartner, 1986; Kim and Richardson, 2003). Bigné et al (2001, p.614) showed that image is a direct antecedent of perceived quality and satisfaction, as well as intention to return and recommend the destination. Allied to destination choice is destination competitiveness, which has also been assessed using image related studies. For example, visitor perceptions of destination attributes have been measured to identify areas for destination improvement in order to maintain competitiveness (Joppe et al., 2001; O'Leary and Deegan, 2005). Kozak has also carried out a number of studies considering aspects of destination image allied to competitiveness (Kozak, 2003, 2004; Kozak and Rimmington, 1999).

Although Baloglu and McCleary (1999) number friends and family among the information sources incorporated in their model of destination image formation, they do not take into account previous experience of the destination in any other way, being concerned primarily with destination image formed in advance of a visit. Indeed, many existing studies into destination image formation assume that respondents have no prior personal experience of the destination; in other words, their image has been formed from advertising, word of mouth information, brochures and guidebooks, news and other media. Yet as was seen in Section 3.4 above, there is recognition that image is not only formed in advance of a visit but changes over time. Jenkins (1999) notes that stage theory suggests that there will be a difference between the image of a destination held by potential visitors, returned visitors and non visitors and reviews various studies which demonstrate that the image held by people who have visited a destination are more
complex and varied than those of potential or non-visitors, as a result of the acquisition of
greater knowledge during the visit. Similarly, Gali Espelt and Donaire Bonito (2005) distinguish
between a prior, in situ and a posteriori images; respectively, those images brought to the destination in advance, the perceptions gathered whilst in the destination and those relived in memories and photographs following the visit. They note that perception in situ is “a key moment in tourist experience because it contrasts what we have imagined with what we are perceiving” (Gali Espelt and Donaire Benito, 2005, p.778). However, their paper is focussed on the way in which the image of Girona has been portrayed in guidebooks and brochures since 1850, and does not explore actual visitor experience, either of the destination or, indeed, perception of those images.

Where actual visitation is part of previous studies, it is mainly to explore the effects of visitation on visitors’ post visit behaviour, as in whether or not they will recommend the destination to others or return themselves (Baloglu, 2001). Where this likelihood of recommending is related to the extent to which the pre-visit image has been fulfilled, then it could be argued this demonstrates that image has been affected by visitation. However, such studies are more concerned with the relationship between satisfaction and recommendation or intention to return. It can also be argued that they in fact throw more light on intention than actual behaviour, as what is being measured in such studies is the likelihood of recommendation, as in speaking positively about the destination. It would be more interesting, and possibly more useful, to know whether visitors are likely to evangelise about the destination, unprompted, or simply respond positively should the destination arise in the course of conversation, in other words be proactive or reactive in talking about their destination experience.

Some researchers have looked at other elements of the visitor experience, such as customer service. As noted above, Bigné et al. (2001) investigated the relationship between image, perceptions of quality and satisfaction and intention to return or recommend a destination. Vogt and Fesenmaier (1995) also investigated service quality within a destination, comparing visitors’ and retailers’ perceptions and making recommendations for destination management, but not specifically relating their findings to any impact on destination image. Similarly, Hudson and Shephard (1998) assessed visitor perceptions of service quality in ski resorts, identifying areas of strength and weakness. However, as their purpose was to demonstrate that performance/importance analysis could be a useful tool for ski resort managers, they did not draw any conclusions as to the impact of the attributes identified on overall destination image.
Some research has been carried out specifically into the impact of visitation on other aspects of destination image. Dann (1996) compared pre-trip and on-trip response to pictorial images, concluding that the way visitors spoke about their reactions to the photographs indicated changes in their view of the destination and what they either expected to find or had found there. Selby and Morgan (1996) also noted that naïve images of a destination were altered by visitation. Murphy et al. (2000) investigated elements of destination product which influenced tourists’ perceptions of quality and value; whilst this work was not directly investigating image, these could be considered components of image. Comparing tourists with retail consumers, they note that tourists are consumers of atmosphere and experience. These studies have investigated aspects of visitation impact, but there appears to have been little or no work examining visitors’ interactions with the destination and the linkages between good or bad experiences and visitor perceptions of the destination. For example, if a visitor or tourist experiences a particularly good service encounter with a hotel receptionist, how does this affect their perception not only of the particular hotel and its staff, but of the destination – the friendliness of the people, the quality of facilities and so on?

The literature clearly demonstrates that visitation affects destination image, in that increased knowledge is likely to move the image from the stereotypical to the more individual, complex. However, the focus remains largely the change in the perception of attributes and some affective evaluations, i.e. what has changed rather than the process of that change. So for example, the change in ratings of elements such as service quality or friendliness of people is assessed, rather than how this change has been effected. In addition, none of the studies discussed above have investigated the impact of visitor interactions with hosts, residents or other tourists on the image of the destination, or how that image is transmitted to others.
CHAPTER FOUR
The Baggage We Bring: Tourism Motivations And Destination Interactions

4.1 Introduction

The preceding chapter considered the nature of destination image and its formation. It suggested that destination image is one way in which the individual encapsulates the meaning of a destination, whether this is in terms of their knowledge and expectations of the destination in advance of the visit, or their perceptions during and after their stay. The literature suggests that a number of factors play a part in destination image formation. In particular, motivation is recognised as being an integral element of destination image formation (Bogari et al., 2004; Crompton, 1979b; Dann, 1977, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Gnoth, 1997; Goossens, 2000; Harrill and Potts, 2002; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Jamal and Lee, 2003; Moutinho, 1987; Pearce, 1993; Yoon and Uysal, 2005). Baloglu & McCleary (1999) suggested that visitor motivations had an effect upon perceptions of a destination, whilst Bigné et al (2001) noted a relationship between visitor motivations and satisfaction. This thesis suggests that motivation contributes to the expectations that a visitor brings to their interactions with a destination. This in turn is linked to the outcomes of such interactions in terms of visitor satisfaction with the experience and behaviour in terms of recounting the experience to others: these anticipations, or precursors, may shape the meaning of the destination experience encapsulated in destination image.

However, as the following review of the literature on tourist motivation will demonstrate, there is still no one all-embracing theory of tourist motivation, although there are several elements which appear common to the main approaches. It could be argued that the human experience is individual and subjective; it may be, therefore, that a deeper insight into the individual, subjective experience is more important than the creation of an overarching theory of motivation. This experience will differ not only from individual to individual, but for any one individual it will differ depending upon the context. Rather than seeking to impose constructs upon the tourist, therefore, it may be more appropriate to seek to understand their experiences of interacting with a destination and its people. In doing so, it is necessary to be aware that part of what the tourist brings to that interaction is the motivation for being on holiday, so it is appropriate to review the literature on this subject.
4.2 Theories of Tourist Motivation

Researchers have been discussing for some thirty years or more the question of what makes tourists travel. As with many other aspects of tourism research, studies relating to tourist motivation reflect the multidisciplinary nature of tourism as a subject area, encompassing as they do sociology (Dann, 1977; MacCannell, 1976, 1989), psychology (Fodness, 1994; Gnoth, 1997; Ryan and Glendon, 1998; Sirgy and Su, 2000), socio-psychology (Crompton, 1979b; Dann, 1981; Pearce, 1993; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983), consumer behaviour (Goossens, 2000; Padgett and Allen, 1997; Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000; Thyne, 2001), marketing (Bansal and Eiselt, 2004; Kozak, 2002; Yoon and Uysal, 2005), and geography (Shaw et al., 2000) among others.

Dann (1977) noted that whilst work had been carried out to investigate what attracted tourists to different destinations (extrinsic or pull factors), little had been done to understand the deeper motivations which caused tourists to want to travel (intrinsic or push factors). He argued that the desire to travel was rooted in the socio-cultural context of the tourist, who felt ill at ease in the changing world and so sought to resolve this underlying tension. Travel, he suggested, arose from anomie, a deep feeling of dissatisfaction, or from a need for ego-enhancement, and frequently involved a degree of fantasy, in the sense of escaping from cultural norms, or trying out new persona, albeit temporarily.

Since then, numerous researchers have put forward theories of tourist motivation, encompassing a variety of approaches to the subject (Crompton, 1979b; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Gnoth, 1997; Goossens, 2000; Iso-Ahola, 1980; Moutinho, 1987; Pearce, 1993; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983; Pearce and Lee, 2005). As will be discussed below, whether tourist motivation is tackled by sociologists, socio-psychologists or psychologists, there appear to be considerable areas of commonality, where the difference could be argued as being one of terminology rather than substance. Indeed, Dann’s description of tourist motivation (1981, p.212) as arising from deep seated needs to resolve tensions between the individual and society or the individual and perception of self, rather than the commonly given reasons of rest, relaxation, visiting friends or to see specific sights, was prompted by the variety of viewpoints and a desire to offer a description which could admit acceptance of this plurality.

There is general agreement that there are layers of motivation for travel, although this is expressed in different ways according to the particular discipline or approach of the
researcher. Progression through the layers of motivation is similarly expressed as progress along a continuum (Crompton, 1979b), through a hierarchy (Iso-Ahola, 1980), along a ladder (Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983) or through a career pattern (Pearce, 1993). Crompton (1979b) suggested that there were four components involved in the decision to travel which could be set along a continuum from socio-psychological to cultural motivations. State of disequilibrium derives from general motivational theory and is the tension which arises within the individual when a need arises but is as yet unmet; a break from routine may not be a change of lifestyle or activity, but doing those same things in a different social or physical context, i.e. taking a break from the mundane; the alternatives available to satisfy the needs such as staying at home, taking a pleasure vacation or going on a business trip; and finally the particular reasons which provoke the choice of the specific destination. In effect, Crompton differentiates between two layers of motivation. The first layer is the motivation to travel, or impetus motivation; this then sets in motion the directive motivations for the choice of destination (1979b, p.415), which are the second layer. Both layers operate along the continuum from social-psychological to cultural motivations, and the implication is that the individual moves along the continuum from sociological to cultural motivations the nearer they get to actually travelling.

Iso-Ahola (1980, 1982) developed a theory suggesting that at the most fundamental level, the motivation for taking part in leisure activities, including tourism, was the need for optimal arousal and incongruity, in turn determined by biological disposition, early socialisation and social/situational influences. Someone who is interested in art may obtain optimal arousal and incongruity from a variety of vacations: an educational tour with similarly interested individuals; a painting course; or a holiday where they can share their love of art with the family by visiting art galleries and museums from time to time. Their motivation will differ depending on circumstance. Iso-Ahola also suggested that individuals will have hidden and open reasons for participation in leisure: biological disposition and personality reasons will be hidden, whilst perceived freedom and competence, and “leisure needs” are open, or readily expressed (Iso-Ahola, 1980, pp.228-229). The researcher has to find a means to interpret these deeper levels of motivation from visitors' actions and words.

Iso-Ahola discussed Maslow’s hierarchy of needs in relation to leisure motivation, and disagreed with Maslow’s contention that self actualisation behaviour is inner-directed rather than socially motivated. Iso-Ahola (1980) argued that whilst an individual might be motivated by a need to feel competent, they also need criteria against which to assess that competence. If there are no objective criteria, then they may assess their level of
competence against those of others who they think are close to their own level. There is therefore a degree of social motivation as well as inner-direction. As will be seen below, this idea of comparison was further developed by Sirgy and Su (2000) specifically in relation to destination choice and self image.

Iso-Ahola notes that Maslow himself recognised the limitation of the hierarchy of needs as a motivational model, namely that it implies a progression upwards from basic levels of physical need to the higher levels of self actualisation, whereas in fact behaviour is motivated by several or all the basic needs at any one time (Iso-Ahola, 1980, p.234). Pearce and colleagues took account of this in developing the travel career theory of motivation (Pearce, 1993; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983; Pearce and Lee, 2005), which postulates five levels of tourist motivation: relaxation, safety/security, relationship, self-esteem and development, and self actualisation/fulfilment. They recognised that individuals might experience several of these needs at any one time, but suggested that one level would tend to dominate. The career element relates to the idea that an individual’s travel experience affects their motivation. The travel career ladder proposed that individuals move up or down the rungs on the ladder as they gather travel experiences. Latterly, the concept of a travel career pattern has replaced the ladder, as it has been recognised that the term “ladder” focussed too much on ascending or descending one rung at a time (Pearce and Lee, 2005). This adjustment takes into account that an individual’s travel motivations may change with accumulated experience, and life stage. Empirically, Pearce and Lee (2005) found that the three motivational factors of novelty, escape/relax and relationship, together with self development, were the main psychological imperatives behind the need or desire to travel, and that the first three did not differ in importance in relation to the amount of travel experience.

These factors echo the three broad themes of escape, ego enhancement and fantasy identified by Dann (1977). The alignment of the travel career elements with Dann’s three themes is summarised in Figure 4.1, together with a similar alignment of Iso-Ahola’s optimal arousal and incongruity with the same three themes. These headings will therefore be used for further reviewing the literature in this area. Following from the discussion of ego enhancement and fantasy, the concept of narrative, or the need to acquire a story to tell about vacation experiences, will be introduced and explored as an outward expression of the process through which the visitor makes sense of their holiday or destination experience.
4.2.1 Escape

Dann (1977) argued that the individual seeks to escape from the stresses and strains of the workaday world which both forces them into unwelcome communication and reduces their capacity for communication with loved ones. Crompton (1979b) identified escape from the mundane as one of seven socio-psychological motives for travel, and Fodness (1994) classed escape as fulfilling the utilitarian function of punishment avoidance. Moutinho (1987, p.17) identified the need to get away from the everyday routine and obligations as well as a need to rest and recover from work and strain. Iso-Ahola (1980) held that one element of leisure motivation, and by extension travel motivation, is the need to avoid boredom; this could also be seen as a form of escape.

Relaxation can be a form of escape. Fodness (1994) identified it as being the positive dimension of the utilitarian function, where individuals reward themselves through relaxation. Crompton (1979b, p.417) described his respondents use of relaxation as ambivalent: there was an apparent contradiction between returning home relaxed, yet in a state of physical exhaustion. He concluded that relaxation was connected to mental state, in that the vacation left people feeling mentally refreshed and therefore relaxed. This is similar to Iso-Ahola’s concept of optimal arousal: if an individual has obtained sufficient stimulation to counteract feelings of boredom, but has not been over stimulated, they will feel an increased degree of freedom and competence (Iso-Ahola, 1980). So, for
example, an individual going on a week’s skiing holiday where they increase their mastery of skiing technique, spend all day on the mountain and are physically exhausted at the end of the week, may nevertheless return home feeling rested and refreshed.

Escaping from the everyday also allows the individual time and space in which to re-establish communications and relations with friends and family. Crompton (1979b) classed this as enhancing kinship relations, Fodness (1994) as demonstrating a social-adjustive function, and Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) as love and belongingness, whilst Moutinho’s category of ethnic and family motivators includes visiting places “your family came from”, visiting family and friends and spending time with the family and children (1987, p.17). This is what Inglis suggests as the civic element of the perfect holiday. At the same time, he acknowledges that for others, escape may be the moments of solitary reflection, of introspection, for which there is no time in the normal daily round. The perfect holiday, therefore, can have both civic and solitary moments (Inglis, 2000, p.11)

It is important to note, however, that this is largely a temporary escape, i.e. a break from routine or a moment of deeper, shared experience which reinforces the underlying bonds with family and friends but from which the individual returns to a more everyday, less intense, interaction on returning from the holiday. Inglis notes that one goes on holiday “for repair work, to put things right, to remember how to be better when one comes back” (Inglis, 2000, p.8). As will be discussed more fully in Chapter Five, there are those who attempt a permanent escape by moving to a destination which has afforded them this temporary break, but this then becomes their everyday world. Inglis also refers to holidays taking place in “bracketed time”, in that they are described as “time off” or “time out” (Inglis, 2000, p.9). As will be discussed in section 4.2.3 below, this also allows some licence to escape into what Dann has called fantasy.

### 4.2.2 Ego-enhancement

The second major impetus for travel identified by Dann (1977) and subsequently discussed in various guises by researchers is ego-enhancement, or the concept that individuals’ travel motives can be associated with self improvement, status enhancement and prestige (Crompton, 1979b; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Goossens, 2000; Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001; Moutinho, 1987; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983; Pearce, 1993; Sirgy and Su, 2000). Crompton (1979b) identified exploration and evaluation of self and prestige as push factors, noting that although respondents were open about motives relating to self discovery and self worth, they were less likely to acknowledge motives
relating to prestige. This supports Dann’s suggestion that tourists are sometimes unwilling or unable to identify their own motivations for travel (1981, p.209-210).

Sirgy and Su (2000) discussed the relationship between travel choice and self image using the concept of self congruity, or the match between the image an individual has of the type of person who visits a particular destination and their own self image. They distinguished four elements of self image which motivate tourists: self consistency (need to act in ways consistent with one’s actual self image); self esteem (need to act in ways which help them to realise their ideal self image); social consistency (need to act in ways which maintain the image others have of them); and social approval (need to act in ways which cause others to think well of them). Moutinho classed these types of motivations as social and competitive, including “because it is fashionable”, “to show that one can afford it” (1987, p.17) in this category, whilst Fodness (1994, p.579) integrated them into the value expression function, encompassing ego enhancement, prestige and social and competitive motivations such as following trends, being first to visit a destination, and so on.

Pearce and Caltabiano (1983) placed these types of motivations towards the top of their career travel ladder, supposing that the desire to satisfy these needs would be more likely to be felt by experienced travellers. However, it can be argued that this is not necessarily the case, as a first time traveller might equally be motivated by the need to have their work colleagues or social circle think well of them. To return to the skiing example cited earlier, an individual might choose a resort perceived by colleagues as trendy, rather than one which offers the physical comfort of pistes suitable for novice skiers. It might also be that the challenge of trying out and mastering a new skill fulfils the individual’s need to bolster their image of themselves as a physically brave and competent person. In fact, Pearce and Lee (2005) subsequently amended the travel career approach in the light of empirical research which indicated that both experienced and inexperienced travellers were motivated by self development. They found that more experienced travellers expressed a desire to experience different cultures and meet local people, whilst less experienced travellers gave more importance to self-actualisation and personal development.

4.2.3 Fantasy

Dann linked fantasy to both the foregoing concepts of escape and ego-enhancement, arguing that travel offers an alternative world to that of daily life, where it is possible to
step outside the normal conventions and accepted norms. For individuals suffering from anomie, seeking to escape, it offers the possibility of more satisfying experiences, whilst for those seeking ego-enhancement, it offers the means of acting out a different personality (1977, p.188). As noted above, this is temporary escape. As going to the theatre or the cinema is an interlude in which the individual is able to suspend disbelief, so going on holiday is an interval in which they can suspend their day-to-day habits and behaviours.

Escape from the cultural and social norms of everyday life can be both positive and negative. Crompton described this group of motivations as regressions, as the instances cited by his respondents tended towards childish or adolescent rather than mature adult styles of behaviour (1979b, p.417) while Moutinho (1987, p.17) identified having a good time, seeking new experiences and having some sort of romantic sexual experience under his category of relaxation, adventure and pleasure motivators. Inglis argues that a holiday must be plentiful and licentious (2000, p.12), by which he means there must be availability of a superabundance of means of indulging in eating and drinking too much, and of satisfying other appetites. The self improvement aspect of escape is also important. Inglis’s seventh maxim is that the vacation “must improve and enhance our minds, spirits and bodies” (2000, p.11). The holiday is an opportunity to try out new roles or activities, safe in the knowledge that these need not be irrevocable changes; a simple example would be the normally clean shaven man who grows a moustache or beard whilst on holiday, or vice versa. The growth in companies offering holidays where individuals can learn new skills in conducive surroundings attests to the importance of this opportunity to try out a new or different element of one’s personality and in so doing, fulfil the need for ego-enhancement.

Fantasy is not solely linked to motivations for going on holiday in the sense of needing to act out a fantasy whilst actually on holiday. Inglis (2000, p.9) refers to “anticipatoriness” as an important element of holidays; and Goossens (2000) argues that feelings about destination attributes, or pull factors, are important, as the emotions they arouse are linked to the fantasising about the destination which plays an important role in destination choice. In other words, experiential processes such as daydreaming, imagining oneself on vacation and enjoying the benefits, are in themselves motivators for taking a holiday. He argues therefore that push and pull factors are in fact two sides of the same coin, linked by the individual’s emotional response, and that enactive imagery, i.e. imagery which allows potential tourists to imagine the experience, will therefore be more effective than promotional material relying solely upon destination attributes. This is broadly
supported by Padgett and Allen’s (1997) contention that services advertising should include a narrative which allows the individual to imagine themselves experiencing the service.

Anticipatory fantasy of this nature could be said to permit the individual to escape in advance of the actual vacation, and reinforces the linkage between expectation and motivation identified by Gnoth (1997). The tourist feels a need to satisfy the urge to escape, and their perceptions of a particular vacation type or destination combine with this motivation to create expectations of the benefits to be obtained from the holiday. The creation of expectations, anticipations of the ways in which the holiday will resolve the underlying tensions which motivate the tourist to travel in the first place, is thus linked to whether or not they will experience satisfaction with their holiday (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Bigné et al., 2001). The tourist may then communicate that satisfaction or dissatisfaction in the way they recommend the vacation or destination to others, either directly or indirectly by recounting their own experiences.

4.3 Narrative: The Stories We Tell

Human beings communicate their experience through narrative, talking about what they have seen and done. Theorists and researchers have argued that narrative is not only a means of communicating to others, it is a way for the individual to make sense of that experience to themselves (Callahan and Elliott, 1996; Gyimothy, 2000; Padgett and Allen, 1997; Polkinghorne, 1988; Wiles et al., 2005; Woodruffe, 1997). Indeed, Polkinghorne (1988) argues that narrative is the primary means by which the meaning of experience is constructed. It is by reflecting on experience after the event, rather than during, that individuals come to understand its meaning, and often, that reflection takes place in the form of talking about the experience to others. As Wiles et al note: “Narratives reflect, communicate and shape the world and our understanding of it” (2005, p.90).

Regardless of the type of vacation, nearly all tourists appear to feel a need to recount their experiences when they return. Goossens (2000, p.308) suggests that individuals can renew feelings, as well as recalling them, by mentally reliving an event or experience which has already happened. It is possible, therefore, that by retelling their holiday experiences the tourist can once again temporarily both escape the mundane and reinforce the self enhancing benefits of a vacation. According to Sirgy and Su (2000), holiday choice is partly determined by the desire to enhance self image, either the tourist’s own, or the image others have of them and recounting incidents from the holiday
experience can contribute to satisfying this need. By telling the stories about the vacation, the returning tourist invites approval or admiration from friends and work colleagues. This could be said to have a bearing, therefore, on the level of satisfaction experienced: if a tourist expects to return from holiday with a fund of stories corroborating a particular aspect of their character or status and, for whatever reason, is unable to do so, then they may well be dissatisfied with their holiday experience.

Equally, during their holiday the tourist might have been enacting a particular facet of their persona which they may be less able to do in the everyday situation. For example, the role of caring parent who ensures that their child is being both entertained and educated through the historical re-enactment; that of cultivated, sophisticated lover of the arts; or that of the uninhibited person who will join in with audience participation. Depending upon their level of satisfaction with the experience, they may then tell that story from the viewpoint of this other persona, trying it out on work colleagues to gauge their reaction to this other facet of their character. From this, it can be appreciated that the particular role a tourist may be consciously or unconsciously playing, and the motivation underlying it, will affect their experience and interactions within and with a destination, which in turn will have an impact upon the stories they then tell on their return.

4.4 Individual and Society: Micro and Macro Levels

All the authors discussed so far agree that some form of disequilibrium, or unresolved need, propels the individual to consider travel as a way of resolving the resulting tensions. In their review of motivation research, however, Jamal and Lee (2003, p.50) argue that only Dann (1977) has sought to relate that disequilibrium directly to the societal and cultural conditions experienced by the potential tourist. Similarly, they suggest that the work of writers such as MacCannell (1976), who comment on the fragmentation of society and the development of holiday taking, is useful in providing a broader social and cultural context, but cannot provide a comprehensive explanation for tourist motivation because it does not incorporate insights into individual desires and motivations (2003, p.52).

Jamal & Lee contend that any overarching theory of tourist motivation must encompass the macro sociological and micro social psychological approaches, as well as concepts from other disciplines with an interest in the tourism subject area, such as political economy, geography, tourism production and consumption behaviour. They therefore propose a model of tourist motivation (Figure 4.2) which incorporates both the global and
local factors and indicates how these impact on the tourist, both stimulating and satisfying the underlying push factors which prompt them to travel (2003, p.53). Although as yet untested empirically, the model does appear to be a good attempt at capturing the complexities of tourist motivation. They suggest that the tourism industry and the destination, being part of the tourism production system, act upon the social structures and change which cause the underlying push factors of anomie, restlessness and disequilibrium. However, it could equally be argued that there is a reciprocal relationship between tourism production and the tourist in that the tourism industry’s promotional activity creates direct pull factors. For example, a person might only realise they want or need a short break in response to an advertisement promoting a special offer. Similarly, it may be only in recounting their holiday experiences on their return that they understand what it was that they enjoyed.

Figure 4.2: Micro-macro framework of tourist motivation

Thus far, this chapter has considered various theories of motivation, suggesting that Dann’s three themes of escape, ego-enhancement and fantasy continue to be useful in grouping together the deeper, push motives for travel. It has noted that these underlying needs are often not expressed directly, but indirectly through the more immediate reasons for taking a specific holiday or choosing a specific destination. It has suggested that narrative, in the form of the stories told about holiday experiences, is a way of making sense of those experiences not only for the audience, but for the tourist as well. Before
drawing implications from this for the current study, it is appropriate to review whether and how these theories have been tested through empirical research.

4.5 Empirical Studies of Tourist Motivation

It has been argued above that the various theories of motivation are simply different ways of describing and explaining a phenomenon which is both common to all tourists and unique to each individual tourist. Researchers agree that when an individual experiences disequilibrium, or deep dissatisfaction, this generates tensions which can be resolved through travel (Crompton, 1979b; Dann, 1981; Fodness, 1994; Jamal and Hollinshead, 2001; Moutinho, 1987; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983). Sociologists would suggest that these tensions arise from the impact of societal change on the individual (Dann, 1977; MacCannell, 1976; Urry, 2002), psychologists that they arise from some imbalance between views of self (Gnoth, 1997; Goossens, 2000; Sirgy and Su, 2000), and socio-psychologists that they are a combination of the impact of social environment and psychological predisposition (Harrill and Potts, 2002; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Pearce, 1993). These conceptual studies are summarised in Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacCannell</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Sociological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dann</td>
<td>1977, 1981</td>
<td>Sociological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton</td>
<td>1979b</td>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iso-Ahola</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce &amp; Caltabiano</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moutinho</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodness</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnoth</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goossens</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sirgy &amp; Su</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrill &amp; Potts</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Socio-psychological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urry</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Sociological</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear, then, that the subject of tourist motivation is very broad and contains overlapping categories and definitions. It is complex at both micro and macro levels; many factors have an impact on social, cultural and economic change, and there can be more than one motive acting at any one time for any individual. This makes it difficult for researchers to attempt to test empirically any theory, as it is a huge challenge to operationalise all the factors. Nevertheless, some studies have been carried out, either specifically to test the conceptual theories discussed above or dealing with particular
aspects of motivation as they relate to destination choice, destination loyalty and visitor satisfaction. These empirical studies are listed in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Empirical Studies in Tourist Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Respondents and Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dann (1977)</td>
<td>To investigate motivation for trip and effect of actual trip on motivations</td>
<td>Correspondence analysis</td>
<td>During trip</td>
<td>Characteristics of anomie and ego-enhancement tourists as polar co-ordinates on a continuum, with both types of motivation having a strong fantasy component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crompton (1979b)</td>
<td>To identify tourist motivations</td>
<td>Unstructured interview</td>
<td>Post trip</td>
<td>Seven socio-psychological motives for travel, unconnected to destination attributes, and two alternate cultural motives partially aroused by destination attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce &amp; Caltabiano (1983)</td>
<td>To assess applicability of hierarchy of needs to tourist motivations</td>
<td>Open question survey</td>
<td>Post trip</td>
<td>Possible to code tourist experiences in Maslow based category scheme of motivations; suggested experienced travellers motivated by higher order needs than less experienced travellers; tourists more concerned with lower order needs in stressful circumstances. Pointed towards travel career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce &amp; Moscardo (1986)</td>
<td>To derive visitor motivations from their experience, and assess applicability of travel career ladder</td>
<td>During visit to historic theme park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors at historic theme parks had different satisfaction levels relating to need for authenticity and depending on place on travel career ladder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fodness (1994)</td>
<td>To assess applicability of functional theory to tourist motivations</td>
<td>Multi dimensional scales; factor analysis</td>
<td>Post trip</td>
<td>Tentative support for functional theory as framework for tourist motivation, but more research required into foundations of tourist motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Respondents and Data Collection</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller &amp; Lea (1998)</td>
<td>To assess importance of authenticity in relation to motivation</td>
<td>Factor analysis, focus group</td>
<td>Previous and non visitors, not related to specific trip</td>
<td>Identified four factors relevant to authentic tourist experience and demonstrated that seeking authentic experience is a motivational factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloglu &amp; McCleary (1999)</td>
<td>To assess role of motivation in destination image formation</td>
<td>Factor and path analysis</td>
<td>Previous and non visitors</td>
<td>In addition to influence on affect, socio-psychological motivations directly influence perceptual/cognitive evaluations and therefore both affective and cognitive aspects of image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd (1999)</td>
<td>To assess comparability of different methods of assessing tourist motivation</td>
<td>Content analysis of tourist's descriptions; reasons to travel and destination attributes scales</td>
<td>Not specific trip related</td>
<td>Lack of correlation between motivation findings from different studies using different instruments suggests need for caution, and need for theoretically sound instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapachai &amp; Waryszak (2000)</td>
<td>To assess beneficial image, based on consumption values, and effect on decision making</td>
<td>Open question survey</td>
<td>Non visitors</td>
<td>Implies motivation plays a part in destination choice as beneficial image is based on consumption values which link to motivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thynne (2001)</td>
<td>To assess values underlying museum visits</td>
<td>Means end laddering technique</td>
<td>During museum visit</td>
<td>Confirms that people consume the same product/service for different reasons based on different underlying values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd (2001)</td>
<td>To test applicability of self-theory to tourist behaviour</td>
<td>Factor analysis</td>
<td>Not specific trip related</td>
<td>Suggests dynamic between tourist situation and tourist self concept which impacts on future motivation and holiday choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters &amp; Ali-Knight (2002)</td>
<td>To investigate motivations of wine tourists</td>
<td>Likert scale</td>
<td>During visit to wineries</td>
<td>Resultant model relates intention/purpose to wine specific motivation and other motivations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Respondents and Data Collection</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kozak (2002)</td>
<td>To investigate whether motivations differ depending upon destination and visitor's nationality</td>
<td>Factor analysis</td>
<td>Immediately post trip</td>
<td>Four types of motivations: culture, pleasure seeking/fantasy, relaxation, physical. Motivations appear to vary with destination and nationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bansal &amp; Eiselt (2004)</td>
<td>To investigate relationship between motivation and destination choice</td>
<td>Open question survey</td>
<td>Immediately pre trip</td>
<td>Framework for explaining planning process pre trip indicates motivators such as climate, relaxation, adventure, personal or educational reasons determine main destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beerli &amp; Martin (2004b)</td>
<td>To assess relationship between perceived image, motivations, experience and socio-demographic characteristics</td>
<td>Factor analysis, Likert scales</td>
<td>During trip</td>
<td>Motivations influence affective components of image. Congruence between tourist motivation and nature of the destination has positive influence on affective image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McIntosh (2004)</td>
<td>To assess importance of Maori culture as motivation for visiting New Zealand</td>
<td>Semi structured interviews with standardised open ended questions</td>
<td>Start and end of trip</td>
<td>Maori culture secondary or incidental factor suggests tourists motivated more by need for difference, escape and/or romanticising other culture than genuine desire for understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce &amp; Lee (2005)</td>
<td>To relate travel motivation patterns to travel experience</td>
<td>Semi structured interviews, Likert scale and principal component analysis</td>
<td>Not specific trip related</td>
<td>Travel motivation can be pattern and combination of motives influenced by previous travel experience and age. Contradicts original travel career ladder theory as higher motivation levels expressed by less experienced respondents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Cont’d: Empirical Studies in Tourist Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Respondents and Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yoon &amp; Uysal (2005)</td>
<td>To investigate the impact of motivation on satisfaction and destination loyalty</td>
<td>Structural equation modelling</td>
<td>During trip</td>
<td>Need for further studies because tourists can be differently motivated and therefore react differently to destination product and experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang et al (2006)</td>
<td>To compare differences in behaviour and motivation among novelty seeking tourists</td>
<td>Likert scales</td>
<td>During trip</td>
<td>Differences in behaviour and characteristics despite all seeking novelty of experience, suggesting impact of other motivations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolau &amp; Mas (2006)</td>
<td>To investigate whether and how motivation affects influence of distance and price on destination choice</td>
<td>Regression modelling (multinomial logit model)</td>
<td>Not specific trip related</td>
<td>Motivations are moderating factors affecting the relative importance of price and/or distance in choosing a specific destination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dann (1981) noted that one of the issues facing researchers was that tourists might be unable or unwilling to state their underlying motivations for travel, and that researchers therefore would have to infer these from tourists’ expressed reasons for travel. Perhaps because of this, the majority of researchers use classifications derived from general motivational theory to group travel motivations expressed by tourists into categories to characterise the underlying push factors. For example, Fodness used categories derived from the functional approach to attitude, which suggests that individuals hold certain attitudes because those attitudes serve psychological needs (1994, p.558) whilst Crompton (1979b) developed nine motives, Moutinho (1987) lists five classes of travel motivators and, as seen above, Pearce and colleagues (Pearce, 1993; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983; Pearce and Lee, 2005) base their categories on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.

Those authors who have suggested various theories of motivation have, on the whole, attempted empirical testing to assess the applicability or otherwise of their concepts. Thus Dann (1977), from his survey of winter visitors to Barbados, was able to identify
underlying motivations for travel using scales to indicate levels of anomie and ego-
enhancement, and to suggest that these motivations remain unchanged as a result of the
actual vacation experience. Similarly, Crompton (1979b), Pearce & Caltabiano (1983)
and Fodness (1994) were all able to demonstrate the applicability of their respective
theories of motivation.

The majority of remaining authors listed in Table 4.2 have investigated motivation in
relation to other factors linked to destination choice and image (Baloglu and McCleary,
1999; Bansal and Eiselt, 2004; Beerli and Martin, 2004b; Kozak, 2002; Nicolau and Mas,
the application of self concept, which is akin to Sirgy and Su’s concept of self-congruity
(2000), as a means of understanding tourist experience. Others have tested specific
motivational factors such as the desire for authentic experience (Pearce and Moscardo,
1986; Waller and Lea, 1998), values underlying visits to museums (Thyne, 2001) or
interest in destination attributes such as indigenous culture (McIntosh, 2004) or specific
industries (Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002), and Chang et al. (2006) investigated motivation
as one factor to differentiate between types of novelty seeking tourists.

However, Todd (1999) notes that tourist motivation researchers have had difficulties
choosing appropriate methods to investigate motivation, as have consumer behaviourists
in general. She identifies three streams of investigation: indirect assessment, replicating
Pearce & Caltabiano’s (1983) approach; respondents rating the importance of different
reasons for travel; and finally respondents rating the importance of different destination
attributes. Comparing the three methods to assess whether they are interchangeable,
she concludes that the indirect, qualitative method of asking respondents to write about
their holiday experiences does not provide sufficient data for comparison with the two
quantitative methods. She also concludes that results obtained via the other two methods
cannot be compared directly either, as they did not appear to be testing the same
constructs. This is perhaps not surprising, as it could be argued they are assessing
different motivational factors, rather than motivations per se. Reasons for travel can be a
mix of push and pull motivations, whereas destination attributes are pull factors. Although
motivations were inferred from the importance rating of destination attributes, this was
presumably researcher driven, and therefore perhaps a less accurate reflection of the
respondents’ motivations. The current study will examine motivations as expressed
through visitor narratives and so may provide a more accurate reflection of those
motivations.
It is not surprising, therefore, that various authors maintain that there is still as yet no comprehensive theory of tourist motivation (Harrill and Potts, 2002; Jamal and Lee, 2003; Todd, 1999). This review has demonstrated the complexity of the subject, reflected in the variety of approaches and the fact that not only is motivation the driving force impelling individuals to take holidays, but it is also a factor in so many other aspects of tourist behaviour: destination choice, the type of vacation, the anticipation and expectations brought to the holiday, and the level of satisfaction experienced.

4.6 Conclusion

The foregoing review clearly demonstrates that tourist motivation is a complex subject, encompassing a spectrum from deep seated tensions within the individual to the perceived attractiveness of destination attributes such as the availability of different types of facility, climate and so on. Motivation research has spanned this range, with theories and investigations encompassing attempts to classify the underlying drivers, explain different types of motivation in psychological, behaviourist, or sociological terms, and assess the relationship of these factors to destination image, visitor satisfaction and choice behaviour. Commentators have noted the difficulties of developing an all embracing theory of motivation when existing research covers both the macro and micro levels, and it is recognised that motivation is a dynamic concept to the extent that it differs from individual to individual, and from situation to situation. However, previous research has approached this complexity by identifying and separating out the various factors. Whilst this has lead to considerable insight and understanding, it has necessarily understated, or even ignored, the fact that individuals may not experience these factors as discrete motivations.

This thesis argues that motivation does not just vary from individual to individual and situation to situation, but that there is also a dynamic at work between the numerous motivational factors operating on any one individual within any given destination context. Thus the surface motivation for choosing a destination might be to have a short break with the family, but contained within that may also be a desire to return to nature by walking in wilderness country as well as a desire for luxury which may be satisfied by choosing a four star hotel which has spa facilities. In addition, the parents may also seek to provide educational opportunities for their children by choosing a walking route which will offer the chance to see and learn more about the local wildlife or geography, and entertainment or excitement by tackling difficult terrain. Whether any or all of these different surface
motivations are satisfied is likely to affect whether the underlying motivations of escape and ego-enhancement are fulfilled. For example, if the weather is too bad to allow getting out into the wilderness, even if other means of fulfilling the education and entertainment factors are found, it is possible that one or other parent’s image of his/herself as passing on love and knowledge of countryside to their children may not be satisfied.

This dynamic may also play a part in the visitor’s interactions with people, facilities and landscape within the destination. If the visitor goes on holiday to escape the humdrum, the stresses and strains of a busy and rushed daily life, and then meets those same stressful attitudes in the resort staff, sales staff in the souvenir shops, or people in the street, then they are perhaps less likely to feel satisfied with their holiday experience. On the other hand, if they have been able to slough off those same stress factors simply by getting away from their normal environment, they may at the same time be able to rise above such attitudes when encountered in others by virtue of being able to play a different role, such as the dispassionate observer, or the more “chilled out” person, perhaps.

It has been seen that there is a wide spectrum of motivations, and that there is as yet no overarching theory of tourist motivation, despite the many investigations of sets of factors. This suggests the need for a different approach, which attempts to capture and understand the process whereby motivations contribute to the visitor’s narratives about their holiday experiences. In so doing, it is hoped to understand the dynamic interactions between various motivational factors, expectations and perceptions of a destination. It has already been noted above that visitors may not be able or willing to talk about their more deep seated motivations. The proposed phenomenological approach, by encouraging them to talk about their destination experiences whilst they are still fresh, capturing their “lived experience” (van Manen, 1990), may help the researcher to obtain a greater insight into these motivational factors and their contribution to the sense making process.

This chapter has considered the different levels of motivation, the way motivation can inform expectations, and therefore impact upon the stories visitors recount about the destination. The following chapter will explore further the links between motivation and visitor experience.
CHAPTER FIVE
Visitor Experience

5.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters discussed tourist destination image and tourist motivations, and showed how these precursors shape visitor expectations relating to their holiday or visit. The visitor acquires an amount of cognitive information through brochures, guidebooks, the internet, and word of mouth, and brings with them affective factors closely allied to motivations, such as the atmosphere they expect, the way they may expect to feel whilst on holiday. In addition to the immediate reasons for travel, such as visiting a particular destination, taking a specific type of holiday, visiting friends and relatives or filling in time on a business trip, there are the underlying motivations related to the fulfilment of need and or benefits sought: the need for a break from routine, for time spent renewing bonds with family and friends, or for the chance to escape in some way, whether through trying out a new skill or persona, or simply by being somewhere else.

The visitor thus arrives in a destination with a preconceived bundle of ideas and aspirations relating to their visit: the things they will do, what they will find, the experiences they will have and the benefits they will acquire. In the previous chapter, it was noted that motivations and expectations vary from person to person; similarly, visitor experience varies from one individual to another (Lengkeek, 2001, p.368; McIntosh, 1998, 1999). Accepting that all experience is broadly individual, it is nevertheless possible that there may be a general model which can describe the way that individual experience is processed, i.e. how the visitor makes sense of the experience. This chapter will therefore look in greater detail at the elements which constitute and shape what might be called a sense making process: the impact of the bundle of preconceptions, the visitor experience, and the visitor’s assessment and evaluation of that experience.

5.2 Processing Experience

Cohen (1979) noted that tourism had been seen as being either a frivolous, spurious activity, or as a reaction to and flight from the intolerable everyday modern world. He argued that neither view was universally valid, and suggested that tourists could be said to exhibit different modes of tourist experience along a continuum which depended upon their degree of alienation from the everyday world, or social and/or spiritual centre. In
other words, experience is intimately connected to motivation, and this in turn affects the type and degree of experience sought, and thus the level of satisfaction with the interaction, destination or holiday.

Cohen (1979) suggested five modes of experience, ranging from the recreational mode, where the tourist simply seeks to re-create him/herself, recharging their batteries with entertainment, through modes related various levels of disconnection or alienation from the centre of their own society, to the existential mode, where the tourist has become committed to a centre in another society than his/her own, sometimes to the extent of leaving their original society or culture and migrating to the new. The most common example of Cohen’s existential tourist is perhaps the person who returns to the same retreat or kibbutz for a period, taking time out to reconnect to their spiritual home. However, he also suggests that the person who goes on holiday to reconnect with the past centre of their culture may also be an existential tourist: the African American returning to Africa, or the New Zealander coming to Europe to trace their pre-emigrant family tree. Lengkeek (2001), revisiting Cohen’s modes, argued that rather than an alternative “centre out there”, it is more helpful to refer to the concept of “out-there-ness”, as the tourist temporarily exchanges their everyday reality for another which they cannot fully know or anticipate. This allows a greater role for the imagination, as the individual can project hidden hopes, fears and desires onto an activity, story, or cultural and spatial surroundings. Lengkeek suggested therefore that Cohen’s modes can also be seen as a progression from play, through exalted or sublime fantasy, to either a descent to a new everyday mundane reality or a deep commitment to the new which has gone beyond play (Lengkeek, 2001, p.180).

Cohen (1979) acknowledged that tourists are not fixed in these modes; how and when they relate to them depends upon personal characteristics, and tourists may experience any number of the modes within a single trip. He also recognised that there are people who take a broader view, regarding nearly everything as a part of “their” culture, and can therefore travel in different modes without leaving their own spiritual centre. Whether the tourist feels satisfaction with their holiday depends on the degree to which the experience lives up to their expectations and fulfils their underlying motivations. The more a tourist tends towards the existential end of the experience spectrum, the harder Cohen suggested it would be for them to realise their experience, and the more important authenticity becomes. Authenticity as a concept for understanding visitor experience will be discussed later in this chapter, but first it is appropriate to consider various elements of visitor experience.
5.2.1 Gaze, Performance or Consumption?

What makes a tourist experience? It would seem to be composed of a number of elements: the physical attributes and qualities of the destination; the activities the tourist engages in; interactions with people and places. The economists Pine and Gilmore (1998) suggested experience as an economic concept differs from service in that whereas services are intangible, experiences are memorable. In their view, services are delivered, whilst experiences are staged:

"An experience occurs when a company intentionally uses services as the stage, and goods as props, to engage individual customers in a way that creates a memorable event"


Destination managers are not in full control of staging the destination experience because they do not directly control the various service and product offerings, including host community behaviour and landscape, or travel group composition, but nevertheless many destinations are marketed as offering a holistic experience which will create lasting memories. VisitScotland’s “Live it. Visit Scotland” TV and media campaign uses imagery relating to all five senses to convey the impression that Scotland can deliver a memorable and unique experience based on its history, people and scenery (VisitScotland, 2006). As the national tourism organisation, however, it can only encourage, not compel, tourism product and service providers to implement the quality assurance and customer care programmes which can ensure the promise is delivered. Moreover, as will be argued below, the visitor is not simply a passive consumer of experience, and so even where these supply side elements are delivered, there is no guarantee that the visitor will have the type of experience promised by the advertising.

Pine and Gilmore considered that experience can be divided into four categories (entertainment, educational, escapist, esthetic - sic), depending upon where they lie on the spectra of two dimensions, absorption/immersion and passive/active participation (Pine and Gilmore, 1998, p.102). These are illustrated in Figure 5.1 below. Entertainment for a tourist might be attending a concert, or a son et lumière presentation, where they are absorbed in the music or the spectacle, but are not actively participating. Taking a skiing lesson whilst on holiday involves more active participation, but the tourist is still more outside the event, as they watch the teacher demonstrate and try to apply the skill, than actively participating. Once the tourist sets off to ski the Mer de Glace glacier at Chamonix or the Circuit des Portes de Soleil in the Savoy Alps, they have moved to Pine and Gilmore’s escapist category, because they are both actively participating and immersed in the experience. However, if their viewing of the Mer de Glace consists only
of riding the Montenvers funicular railway, enjoying the view from the restaurant terrace and then going back down by rail, their experience has become an esthetic one, as they are immersed in the environment but have little or no effect on it.

**Figure 5.1: Dimensions of Experience**

![Diagram of Dimensions of Experience](image)

Adapted from Pine and Gilmore (1998)

This suggests that there is more to tourist experience than Urry's tourist gaze (Urry, 2002). Urry developed Foucauld’s analysis of the medical gaze to suggest that the historical development of tourism demonstrates there was no single gaze. The tourist gaze differed depending on the frame of reference of the group or individual doing the gazing, but encapsulated everything the tourist sought to see and do whilst escaping from the world of work. Urry went on to suggest that the tourist gaze changes constantly with the efforts of destination managers and marketers to produce new objects for people to gaze on. This leads to a new post-tourist who is either constantly searching for that which differentiates his or her experience from the staged events which supposedly render tourist sites and sights inauthentic or fake, or who accepts, even delights in, that very inauthenticity. For Urry, then, the gaze as a form of consumption is an experience in itself. However, Perkins and Thorn (2001) noted that the gaze metaphor has been criticised for being over concerned with questions of authenticity, for its passive orientation which appears to deny the tourist any form of engagement with the toured culture, for not taking into consideration the physical activity which is part of tourism, and finally, for being rooted in the history and development of tourism in Britain and Europe and thus not taking account of the way tourism is constructed in other societies and cultures.
They argued therefore that the gaze is too passive, and preferred the metaphor of performance, since this encompasses bodily involvement, physical, intellectual and cognitive activity as well as simply gazing (Perkins and Thorns, 2001). The fortnight’s holiday in Blackpool was about more than simply escaping the routine of the remaining 50 weeks of the year; it was about the feel of the sea breezes, the licence to play, to strengthen family and friendship bonds. Brought up to date, it can be argued that an equivalent is the package tour to Bali, or any other sun seeker’s paradise, where the emphasis is not so much on observing the local culture as on sun, sea, sand and sex (Perkins and Thorns, 2001, p.100). The desire to master a new skill or environment involves the tourist using cognitive, intellectual and physical abilities, as in white water rafting, going on a painting holiday or pony trekking. Performance implies the whole body being involved in tourism, therefore, and supports Pine and Gilmore’s recommendation that stagers of experience should seek to engage all five senses (Pine and Gilmore, 1998, p.104).

Wearing and Wearing (2001, p.153) took a person centred approach to tourism experience and argued that each individual tourist constructs and reconstructs him or herself:

“...in the light of the actual experiences of interaction with significant others, significant reference groups and the generalized other of cultural values, symbols and language in the tourist space.”

They considered that to objectify the destination by shifting the focus to destination as site or sight, was too simplified to explore the complexity of tourist experience, involving as it does interactions between tourist, site and host community. They therefore preferred to concentrate on “the people involved in tourism interactions and the meanings they construct” (Wearing and Wearing, 2001, p.152). Tourism experience is thus a process by which the individual fashions and refashions a sense of self.

Yet others argue that tourism is a form of consumption, in that tourists consume sights and experiences. Inglis introduces his book, “The Delicious History of the Holiday” as the first of a tripartite work on the rise of consumerism, viewing holidays as “one of the local triumphs of consumer capitalism” (Inglis, 2000, p.ix). Writers on heritage tourism have focussed on the notion of consumption, arguing that tourists/visitors do not merely gaze on the heritage spectacle or site, but actively consume through participating in or engaging with the reconstruction or interpretation of history on offer (Beeho and Prentice, 1997; Chronis, 2005; Crang, 1996; Masberg and Silverman, 1996; McIntosh, 1999;
McIntosh and Prentice, 1999; Meethan, 1996; Shaw et al., 2000). Indeed Voase (2002) went so far as to propose that the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ should be re-evaluated, suggesting that the level and type of engagement is key: ‘active’ can refer to being mentally active, not just physically active, and physical activity does not always denote mental engagement. He questioned whether the increasing availability of interactive museums, sites and attractions, and of displays within them, militated against the consumer having a wider engagement by restricting the imagination or limiting the nature of the interaction. A parallel is the often cited comparison between television and radio: the pictures are better on the radio (Hoskins, 2005).

It could be argued, then, that visitor experience is part of a process of consumption. Interactions with place and people are the destination experience consumed by the visitor. Experiences of people range from engaging in direct interactions with people encountered in the destination, such as hosts, residents, other tourists or people within the tourist’s own travel group, to indirect interactions where the tourist notices or is affected by the presence of others without actively engaging with them. This latter could be considered in terms of gazing upon others, whereas the former falls into what Goffman calls the “interaction order”, an encounter which takes place in a social situation, “in which two or more individuals are physically in one another’s response presence” (Goffman, 1983, p.2). Experience of place encompasses the physical encounter with the space, buildings and facilities, and mental encounter or engagement with the atmosphere, artefacts and/or anecdotes connected with the place. The following sections consider in more detail visitor interactions with these elements of place and people which contribute to destination experience. The question which then arises is how tourists/visitors digest this experience and make sense of it, and whether this is then incorporated into the image retained of the current destination and into the precursors for future holidays.

### 5.2.2 Experience of Place

Environmental psychologists consider that the relationship between an individual and their environment is complex, as the influence of the environment is subtle and often based on affective qualities such as how peaceful or depressing or uplifting a place may be (Russell and Snodgrass, 1987, p.245). Certainly, a destination as place is a complex entity, being a physical place, as well as a composite of the various tourism product offerings of accommodation, retail, catering, transport and attractions. The visitor interacts with the space as much as they interact with the people, in that they have to move through the town or countryside, they are aware of the atmosphere of a place and in terms of visitor
attractions such as museums, theme parks, heritage attractions, they relate and react to the interpretive materials and displays as well as to any guides or animateurs.

**Table 5.1: Effects of the Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperceptible</td>
<td>Factors undetectable by the individual</td>
<td>Effects of smell/odour, gases, chemicals, infrasound, different types of electromagnetic radiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory Experiences</td>
<td>Impact of temperature, light, colours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collative Properties</td>
<td>Novelty, complexity, incongruity, dissonance, surprisingness, unpredictability of any combination of sensory features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Categorization</td>
<td>Basic level: chair, truck, apple Superordinate level: furniture, vehicle, fruit Subordinate level: living room chair, postal delivery truck, Jonathan apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>A single specific object: a specific chair, truck or apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Association with historical events, traditional rituals, meaningful actions Associations with identifiable group, culture, family, organisation Symbol for values, ideas, beliefs, ideologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons and Space</td>
<td>Physical presence of others leading to increased arousal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocking or Facilitating the Plan</td>
<td>Environment’s ability to fulfil the goal</td>
<td>Effects of crowding, impact of physical events such as fire, flood, earthquake,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Russell and Snodgrass (1987)*

Russell and Snodgrass (1987) argued that almost any aspect of the environment can affect an individual, from the purely physical to a place’s symbolic meaning. Their classification of these effects is summarised in Table 5.1 above. Related to destination experience, this suggests that visitors will be affected by sensory factors such as warmth,
light, stimulus factors such as novelty, familiarity and complexity, and the meanings they attach to places, such as association with historical events, traditional rituals or meaningful events, a specific group, culture or organisation, or symbolic values and beliefs. Poria, Butler and Airey (2004) considered these meanings in relation to heritage sites in Israel and concluded that all three were in evidence as reasons for visiting. Visitors had come either because they wanted to make links to their own heritage, to observe and learn about the specific heritage attached to the site, or to have a recreational experience, a day out at a site which was considered world famous (Poria et al., 2004, pp.25-26).

Much of the literature relating to experience of place considers it in relation to motivations and/or authenticity, particularly in the field of heritage tourism. Prentice, Witt and Hamer (1998) suggesting that beneficial experiences are the core product of tourism, investigated the benefits gained by visitors to heritage parks and found that these ranged from feeling that they had learned something of importance, had gained insights into the past, into the heritage of the area, to having had valuable time with friends/family. Chronis (2005) investigated visitor experience at Gettysburg and showed that as tourists moved around the different elements of the site, they and the guides, or other attraction staff, co-operated to create, or perform, the story of the site. This interpretation was aided by the tourists' knowledge, memories or experience of other sites. Chronis suggested, in fact, that the tourist’s interpretation and/or interaction with the narratives on offer was partly contingent upon their previous knowledge and personal histories. Goulding (2000a, 2000b), considering museum and historic site visitors, noted differing motivations for each of three categories of visitor (existential, aesthetic and social). She suggested that the individual visitor constructed his/her own meanings from their interaction with the site, which were not “necessarily those of the museum professional or academic critic” (Goulding, 2000a, p.849). Drawing a parallel between delivering a service and selling an experience, she notes that both are mediated by a variety of factors, the importance of which will differ from individual to individual (Goulding, 2000b).

Hayllar and Griffin (2005) investigated visitor experience of historic precincts such as The Rocks, a historic area of Sydney, Australia. Using phenomenological methods, they discovered three central themes of atmosphere, physical place and history and drew from these a general sense of place which related both to the contribution of The Rocks precinct to the image and experience of Sydney and to the intrinsic experience of the precinct itself (Hayllar and Griffin, 2005, p.525). However, it is important to note that this was experienced and expressed in different ways by the interviewees: the authors found
three different categories of visitor, whom they described as Browsers, Samplers and Explorers depending on the way they seemed to have approached the experience of The Rocks. More recently, McKercher, Wong and Lau (2006) investigated the relationship between movement patterns and destination consumption, suggesting that consumption style relates to whether the destination is the primary focus or merely a stopover as part of a holiday. Interviewing visitors to Hong Kong, they identified Wanderers, Tour-takers and Pre-planners among tourists visiting Hong Kong as their main destination, and Explorers, Uncommitted Tourists and Intimidated Tourists among their sample of visitors for whom Hong Kong was a stopover en route to their main destination. As with the Hayllar and Griffin study, these categories are related to the way in which the interviewees approached the destination.

Other authors have considered different facets of the visitor experience of place, such as reinforcing identity or cultural roots through experience of place (Palmer, 2005), and the degree of active or passive engagement with place (Fairweather and Swaffield, 2003). Palmer investigated the mechanisms by which visitors were able to reinforce or discover a feeling of Englishness through visiting three heritage sites with particular connections to the history of England. In exploring the nature of identity and the way it can be reinforced by such visits, Palmer notes that experience of heritage places involves both symbolic content of the site and individual evocation of memories and links to family and social history (2005, p.12). She further notes that not everybody will read or interpret the sites in the same way, as their connection to the sites comes from their individual imagination and past experience. Fairweather and Swaffield (2003) investigated tourist experiences of landscape in New Zealand. Their discovery of similar landscape appreciation factors across three locations suggested some common, even fundamental, experiences of tourist settings, again structured by individual characteristics as well as social and cultural characteristics. Once again, this underscores the idea that while there are commonalities in tourist experience of place, each individual makes sense of that experience in the light of their previous experience, personality and motivations. Moreover, whilst these studies have been in relation to specific forms of place, such as heritage attractions or landscape, the current study argues that experience of place can also be considered in relation to the destination as a whole: individuals will each experience a destination in ways that are unique, shaped by their particular anticipations and motivations.
5.2.3 Interactions with People

“No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main.” (Donne, 1624). Donne was meditating upon the bell tolling for the death of an unknown person, but it is also true that no tourist is entirely separate from either the people they are travelling with, or the other people they encounter in a destination. Moreover there is, inevitably, overlap between experience of people and of place. Referring to the Hayllar and Griffin study discussed above, Trauer and Ryan (2005) argue that the experience of place engendered by precincts such as The Rocks involves a relationship which includes respect for people and place, based on interactions with people in that specific place. The two elements are thus intimately connected in the destination experience, whether the interactions with people are with hosts, residents or other tourists.

Tourists are often in couples, are family groups or groups of friends, whether travelling independently or as part of a more organised tour; even if travelling alone they cannot completely ignore those around them; the other tourists, their hosts or the destination’s residents. Thus these interactions, whether within their travel party or strangers, are part of the destination experience, and may colour not only their own image of the destination, but also the image they reflect to others when speaking about their holiday. Indeed, Trauer and Ryan (2005, p.481) noted that understandings of place are governed by a number of factors such as the attribution of meaning by tourists, reaction of hosts, promise made by the commercial sector, the nature of the place itself and the nature of the company the tourist enjoys there. They further suggested that place can have meanings through being the context for personal relationships, and that although these relationships are often the source of holiday memories, this area has been understated in destination image literature. It is therefore important for destination managers and marketers to understand the impact of other people on an individual’s destination experience in order to improve visitor management and targeted marketing messages.

Despite this significance, Dann and Phillips (2001) noted there was very little contemporary research which investigated the impact on tourists of their interactions with the destination, whether those interactions are with tourism industry personnel, the resident or host community, or other tourists (Dann and Phillips, 2001, pp. 256-257). Although they acknowledged the investigation of the impact of tourists on the host community, they suggested there was, to date, little which had “systematically examined the socio-cultural consequences of tourists mixing with each other” (Dann and Phillips,
This section considers the existing literature relating to tourist interactions and suggests that material published since 2001 continues to focus on tourist/host and tourist/resident interactions. It addresses the question of tourist/tourist interactions by reporting on the findings emerging from an investigation of the impacts of tourist interactions on destination image and draws implications from these for both visitor management and destination marketing.

Tourists interact with each other and with the host community, either directly in face to face encounters or indirectly by taking part in the same activity or being in the same space. These interactions form part of the overall destination experience, and are likely to influence both the tourist’s perceptions of the destination and the destination image carried way and transmitted to others. However, a review of the existing literature on tourist interactions shows that little attention has been paid to these aspects of tourist interaction, as the focus has largely been on tourist/host interactions, and where tourist/tourist interactions have been considered, these are secondary elements in research into leisure or heritage experience.

### 5.2.3.1 Tourist/host interactions

Much existing literature on tourist/host interactions concentrates on the cultural perceptions or on the impacts of tourists on residents. Work on cultural perceptions focuses either on the tourist’s perceptions of the host culture (McIntosh, 2004), or on cross cultural differences (Pizam and Jeong, 1996; Pizam and Sussmann, 1995; Pizam et al., 2000; Reisinger and Turner, 1997, 1998), whilst research into the impact of tourists on host communities focuses on social distance (Thyne and Zins, 2003) or on the impact of tourists on residents’ attitudes towards tourism (Williams and Lawson, 2001). McIntosh argued that previous studies into tourist perspectives on indigenous tourism products and services gave a piecemeal understanding of demand, as they had been carried out in support of a variety of different agendas (2004, p.2). Moreover, they concentrated on tourists’ views at or in relation to specific sites or attractions, and so gave no indication of the type of experience the tourist actually sought rather than consuming because it was available. Although many tourists’ expectations and prior knowledge are formed by material in guidebooks or tourist brochures, and may thus be somewhat stereotypical, McIntosh suggested that tourists’ motivations and expectations play a role in their appreciation and experience of the host culture, and indeed might also determine whether they seek a spectacle, a learning experience or a deeper engagement (2004, p.3). Similarly, it can be argued that motivation and expectations may also be an important element in the way tourists interact with each other. If a tourist wants to have a deeper,
more spiritual experience in, say, a wilderness location, what is the likely impact of either a group member or other, non associated tourist talking incessantly? So for some visitors, at least, the interaction with others may play a key role in their experience.

Travel supposedly broadens the mind, leading to greater insights into other societies and cultures. These can be obtained not only from tourists’ interactions with the host community, but also through encountering tourists from other cultures whilst on vacation. However, referring to previous research suggesting that tourist experience of indigenous culture contributes to a greater understanding of that culture, and therefore changes perceptions, McIntosh cautioned against viewing tourists as “amateur anthropologists” (2004, p.13). Her findings indicated that despite expressed desire for a sincere encounter with the culture, the level of actual learning was shallow, indicating that tourists seek interactions with host cultures rather as a form of exotic encounter. This tendency towards stereotypical assumptions about other, different cultures is noted in the studies undertaken by Pizam and colleagues into tour guides’ perceptions of tour groups from different countries (Pizam and Sussmann, 1995; Pizam and Jeong, 1996). Accepting Dann’s arguments in relation to the problems inherent in using nationality as a marketing segmentation variable (1993), Pizam and colleagues nevertheless found that nationality should be considered alongside the other variables of personality, lifestyle, social class, culture and tourist-role, as their research indicated that tour guides perceived differences between different nationalities of groups in relation to social interaction (Pizam and Sussmann, 1995, p.285; Pizam and Jeong, 1996, p.915). Furthermore, Pizam and Sussman (1995, p.916) noted that others in the destination, such as residents and other tourism employees also tended to use nationality as a basis for distinguishing between tourists.

Reisinger and Turner (1997, 1998) suggested that greater awareness of cultural differences and their impacts could be used to improve both service delivery and training provision, as well as to target promotional messages more effectively at these markets. They argued that the host country and its tourism providers should understand the culture of the tourists they receive, in order to minimise unintentional misunderstandings as well as to enhance service provision by better anticipating and meeting overseas tourists’ requirements. It could also be argued that if such stereotypical perceptions of different nationalities are used by host communities and tourism providers to distinguish between tourists, then they may also be used by tourists to distinguish other tourists. Such perceptions of other tourists encountered during a holiday may have an effect on the overall impression carried away and transmitted to others, as may the presence of large
numbers of other tourists, depending upon the motivations and expectations of the individual visitor.

Other researchers have considered the impact of tourist host interactions in terms of residents’ perceptions of tourists and tourism. Thyne & Zins (2003) measured the social distance, or the degree of sympathy and understanding, between tourists and the host community, and suggested that host community attitudes to tourists and tourist development may vary with the tourists’ nationality. Where the host community is more socially distant from the tourists it receives, the more negative their attitude to the impacts of tourism. Williams and Lawson (2001) investigated New Zealand residents’ perceptions of the impact of tourism on their community, with the aim of identifying opinion groups and describing their opinions on tourists and tourism. They found that attitudes to community related issues were more important than opinions of tourists as such. In other words, in areas where there were many tourists, one resident might welcome them, perceiving little or no disruption to local services, whereas another might consider them an unwelcome intrusion, causing them to feel like strangers in their own home or creating too much noise, litter and pollution (2001, pp.283-284). These differences may impact on tourists, in that they may in turn be made to feel unwelcome, or that their money is welcome but not their presence. However, it is also possible that the same concerns in relation to crowds, noise, spoiling of the experience may also be felt by one tourist in the presence of others, depending upon motivations and expectations, and this may in turn affect their image of the destination.

5.2.3.2 Tourist/tourist interactions
Since Dann and Philips (2001) identified tourist interactions as an area requiring investigation, there have been a few studies which have considered tourist/tourist interactions. Mykletun, Crotts and Mykletun (2001) included travel party composition among the independent variables in a study to identify the most valuable visitor segments to the Baltics. They looked specifically at the impact of visitor role in predicting whether visitors would value Bornholm as a destination and hold a positive attitude towards it. However, visitor role was defined as travel party type and trip purpose, with no discussion or investigation of the impact of that role on others in the party, and purpose of trip appeared to be the major indicator, in that one of the conclusions was that respondents travelling to Bornholm for holidays and visiting friends and relatives placed the highest value on the destination. Moreover, they did not indicate whether the presence of other tourists outside the travel party was a factor in visitors’ evaluation. Fairweather and
Swaffield (2001) investigated tourists’ appreciation of different landscape experiences available in Kaikoura, New Zealand. They categorised their respondents into one of five different experience-seekers, of which two appeared to comment on the impact of other tourists on their experience. Several of those identified as maritime recreational tourists appeared to be seeking escape from the pressures of everyday life; this group overall expressed dislike of commercial tourism activities which encouraged or indicated growing numbers of tourists. The second group, family coastal holiday tourists, chose images showing other recreational tourists, highlighting activities such as sharing experience of mammals and enjoying the facilities of the town, which suggests a more positive approach to the presence of other tourists and indeed, a preference for activities which could be enjoyed by all the family.

There has also been some research into the impact of inter-group interactions, although this has been largely in the area of vacation choice behaviour. Gilbert & Hudson (2000) investigated constraints on participation in skiing holidays and found that interpersonal factors were significant not only in whether or not a skiing holiday was chosen, but also in the amount of skiing undertaken. These interpersonal factors included items such as other potential party members lacked the money or time to go, too many family commitments, fear of embarrassing oneself in front of friends or family members, partner not interested in skiing. They acknowledged that their research was limited to constraints on skiing participation, but suggested that similar research could be conducted into participation in other tourist activities (Gilbert and Hudson, 2000, p. 922). The findings reported in this paper suggest that some of these interpersonal constraints or considerations can apply during the course of a holiday as well as in the decision making process beforehand, depending upon the motivations of the individual tourist in relation to others in their party. Masberg and Silverman (1996) in their study of heritage site experience found that travel companions figured largely in the student visitors’ recollections of experience, and touched briefly on the importance of significant companions in relation to the heritage visit experience, without exploring this aspect in any depth.

Although there has been some research touching on tourist interactions, therefore, these have been in relation to tourist/host interactions and the impact of these on host community attitudes to tourists and tourism. Findings relating to tourist/tourist interactions have been incidental to the main focus of studies of leisure participation and heritage experience. There has apparently been no work investigating either the impact of tourist/tourist interactions on destination experience or how this affects the destination
image which they portray in their holiday stories (Guthrie and Anderson, 2006). Recommendations from family and friends are frequently cited as an important source of reference material in choosing a holiday (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Bansal and Eiselt, 2004; Bigné et al., 2001; Gartner, 1993; Gunn, 1972; Guthrie et al., 2004). Destination managers and marketers, therefore, need to understand how such tourist/tourist interactions may shape this word of mouth publicity material in order to ensure their destination is offering the most appropriate experiences and possibilities to their target market. Understanding how visitors convey their experiences to others in this way (sense giving) will also shed light on how they make sense of and incorporate those experiences into the anticipations, expectations and motivations carried into future holidays and destinations.

5.3 Assessing and Evaluating Experience

So far, this chapter has argued not only that visitors bring their individual anticipations and motivations to a destination, but that as a result, they each experience differently the constituent elements of the destination. It has been suggested that the destination experience is a process of consuming, whether through gaze or performance, and that visitor interactions with place and people are major constituents of that process. Moreover, the fact that each visitor has a unique experience of the destination suggests that the anticipations and motivations they bring with them are precursors which shape the consumption process. In other words, that they are factors which shape the way in which visitors make sense of, or evaluate, their destination experience. In one sense, this evaluation and assessment could be considered as being bound up with the degree of authenticity felt; in another, it could be related to visitor satisfaction. This section will therefore consider the literature in each of these areas, starting with the ongoing debate as to the relevance of the different types of authenticity, and then moving to a consideration of visitor satisfaction studies.

5.3.1 What is Authentic?

The Collins Paperback Dictionary (Hanks, 1990) defines authentic as being: “1) of undisputed origin or authorship; genuine. 2) trustworthy, reliable.” This would lead one to suppose that a tourist might evaluate his/her experience as authentic if it appeared to be genuine, as in not a fake, or if they felt they could trust the experience, i.e. that they were not being misled or let down by it. However, the concept of authenticity has generated
increasing debate in the literature (Jamal and Hill, 2004; Reisinger and Steiner, 2006; Wang, 1999). Wang (1999) notes that since it was introduced into the tourism field by MacCannell (1976) the ambiguity and limitations of authenticity as a concept have been increasingly exposed, and its validity and usefulness questioned because so many tourist experiences (for example, visiting friends and relatives, pursuing hobbies such as sailing, shopping, fishing, beach holidays) are not explicable in terms of the conventional, sociological definition of authenticity (Urry, 2002). Wang therefore suggests that as the object-related notions of objective and constructive or symbolic authenticity between them “can only explain a limited range of tourist experiences” (1999, p.350), a third form of activity oriented, existential authenticity is useful for a wider range of tourist situations, and can further be classified into intra-personal and inter-personal authenticity.

Both the modernists and constructivists concerned themselves with what Wang defines as object-related authenticity, although with differing perspectives. The modernist view, exemplified by Boorstin (1964) and MacCannell (1976) rests on the idea that there is an objective reality and that it is therefore possible to prove the factual, historical or traditional provenance of artefacts. This is a museum based authenticity, where experts judge the genuineness of objects and culture, and seems to lead to a negative view of tourists as being unable to differentiate between the real, the staged and the inauthentic. A somewhat elitist view, this approach suggests that the majority of tourists simply accept the product and experience offered to them without the exercise of any critical faculties, and in so doing takes no account of tourists’ differing motivations.

The constructivists argue that knowledge and truth are not absolutes; rather they are constructed or created in the mind of the individual, and are context dependent (Schwandt, 2003). Whether or not a tradition, culture or artefact is genuine is therefore related to the social context in which it was created, and also depends upon the judgement of the observer. The context in which tourists choose to accept attractions, objects or host cultures as authentic is as much their own motivations as their understanding of the social and cultural background of the toured object. They may be prepared to accept and engage with MacCannell’s staged inauthenticity if, for example, by doing so they are contributing to the protection or conservation of the original it represents. Tourists will therefore engage with the reproduction site at Lascaux because in doing so, the original caves and paintings can be preserved. Similarly, they will accept that some of the buildings in Colonial Williamsburg are reproductions, either because the original has been destroyed and then rebuilt, or because parts of the buildings have had to be restored, on the understanding that the intention is to convey a sense of the original.
Moreover, the tourist may arrive with a number of preconceptions of the colonial ambience and setting, and the buildings and costumed guides and interpreters allow the visitor to maintain these preconceptions and engage with the actual experience on offer. The staging is acknowledged, and therefore does not detract from the experience. Wang refers to this as symbolic authenticity (1999, p.355-6) and Chronis demonstrated them empirically in his research with visitors and guides at Gettysburg (Chronis, 2005).

However, these interpretations of authenticity largely relate to the toured object and the tourist’s cognitive perceptions of genuine-ness. The deception or dislocation the tourist is supposed to feel when faced with the inauthentic is based on the perception of the thing, whether that is the culture of the host society or the context of the observed attraction or artefact. As discussed previously, there are many other motivations for going on holiday, such as being with friends and family, trying out a new experience or learning a new skill. Evaluation of these is based on the quest for the authentic self, rather than authentic objects (Cohen, 1979; Reisinger and Steiner, 2006; Wang, 1999), and is the reason Wang identifies a third, existential, form of authenticity. This is evaluated in terms of the degree to which the tourist feels they are being true to themselves, engaging in an activity which allows them to exist in the moment, experiencing the flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975). Wang suggests this has both an intra and inter personal dimension, or as Inglis puts it, both civic and solitary (Inglis, 2000, p.12). Intra personal authenticity, the solitary dimension, relates to bodily or physical pleasure and spontaneity, and/or to self making through adventure, escape into the extra-ordinary, fulfilling the fantasy motivations for tourism. Inter personal authenticity is a civic dimension and relates rather to strengthening or deepening family or friendship ties through shared experience, and to taking part in community activities outside of normal life, escaping from the normal social hierarchy and status. In the skiing examples from the previous chapter, the skier who enjoys a week of off-piste adventure may feel sheer physical pleasure in being in the mountains as well as fulfilment through having sufficient mastery of skiing technique to tackle challenging descents is likely to experience intra personal authenticity. The disparate group of skiing clients in a chalet-hotel who are largely ignorant of each other’s social status and develop their own community based on their daily ski experiences, demonstrate the inter personal dimension of existential authenticity.

A common thread running through the above discussion is that of the tourist’s comfort, in the sense of physical and/or psychological wellbeing, which affects the level to which they feel able to engage with the destination experience. It could be argued that the degree to which tourist’s expectations, arising from the motivations underlying their trip and their
search for authenticity, are met will result in a varying level of wellbeing. The level of wellbeing may then relate to the satisfaction felt and the judgement made of the overall experience. Prentice (2004) argues for the concept of familiarity as a tool for experience marketing, suggesting that it goes beyond the preference for the comfort of the tourist bubble. He argues that authenticity and sincerity are judged in terms of tourist imaginings or expectations, as demonstrated by the fact that first time visitors tend to have more stereotypical impressions of a destination and that these linger despite repeat visits.

Table 5.2: Typology of Familiarity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>The extent of sources and information about the destination used prior to visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>The extent of past experience, i.e. whether 1st timer or repeat visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximate</td>
<td>Familiarity related to visitor’s own culture, ethnicity or nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Described</td>
<td>Extent of family or personal links with place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Extent of personal educational involvement, whether formal as in through structured courses, or informal, through books, novels, plays, TV, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


However, the various forms of familiarity suggested (Table 5.2) could all be said to contribute to the tourist’s comfort or wellbeing in the destination – the greater the level of knowledge, whether acquired through information sources, literary or cultural sources, or prior experience, the less anxiety, conscious or unconscious, the tourist will feel in placing themselves in the new situations and surroundings. Conversely, it could also be argued that those who seek the exotic or unusual when on holiday may deliberately be pushing themselves outside their “comfort zone” with a view to enhancing their eventual wellbeing through the sense of mastering the new situation.

Perkins and Thorns (2001) consider that the concern of most tourism operators is to give clients/tourists an experience which they believe will authenticate the images promulgated in promotional material, rather than an authentic experience of the destination, believing that this will deliver satisfaction for their clients. This can equally apply to destination marketers/managers, and both disregards what the tourist may consider to be authentic, as well as the degree to which they may or may not be familiar with the place. As discussed above and in the previous chapter, expectations are linked to motivations, and this influences the type of authenticity sought. The cultural tourist is likely to be in search of objective authenticity, wanting to experience some form of connection to another culture, whether their own distant past or a different, present culture. They may value
confirmation that the guides/animateurs acting out the lifestyle of the Tudor manor base their interpretations on the best available historical knowledge (Crang, 1996). The group of friends on a beach holiday, by contrast, may be more interested in physical pleasures and relaxation; for them, evaluation of and satisfaction with the holiday or destination is much more likely to involve aspects of Wang’s inter personal existential authenticity (Wang, 1999), such as whether they feel their bonds of friendship are strengthened through sharing the experience.

There are, then, many interpretations of authenticity in the literature. Jamal and Hill (2004) recognised that the concept is both puzzling and not clearly defined and suggest that rather than striving to settle on one definition, it is more rewarding to consider three dimensions of authenticity: objective (real), constructed (socio-political) and personal (phenomenological). They also suggested that scholarly characterisations of tourism experience as authentic may be implicit rather than through direct application of the term, and may reveal undisclosed bias and philosophical assumptions (Jamal and Hill, 2004, p.356). Developing a framework to encompass the wide variety of elements which should be considered when compiling practical indicators of authenticity in relation to heritage and cultural spaces, they suggested that these areas are brought into being “through the meaning-making activities of people interacting with objects, events and activities” and that this “includes residents and visitors engaging with the place and each other” (Jamal and Hill, 2004, p.368). Furthermore, that experiential moment can be in the past and the present simultaneously. Although the tournament of the Field of the Cloth of Gold took place in the early 16th century, the visitor standing in front of the suit of armour presented to Henry VIII by Francis I of France at that time, reading the Royal Armouries information about the event, will still feel it as a real experience because they are seeing both the genuine artefact in the present and connecting to the event itself through their imagination. Similarly, the visitor watching a craftsman create a tourist souvenir can be connected to the past through the impression of centuries of tradition coming to life in the skill of the modern woodcarver or glassblower. Studying tourist/host interactions in a Turkish village, Tucker (2001) noted several different interpretations of authenticity, from the social authenticity of tourists feeling they had genuinely interacted with the villagers without the mediation of tourist guides, to those who were aware of the dichotomy between a local guesthouse which could provide the comfort they expected yet set in a village where they could explore MacCannell’s (1976) front and back rooms, i.e. the space specifically open and intended for tourists and the back room space where the “real” life of the village takes place but into which the tourists can still gain access. Tucker notes that:
“regardless of whether the presentations and performances of the village and the locals are perceived as authentically traditional by the tourists, the encounters in themselves satisfy the quest for the “authentically social” precisely because the experience is not blatantly staged”
(Tucker, 2001, p.886-887)

It is perhaps for these reasons that Reisinger and Steiner (2006) have recently argued that objective authenticity as defined in the literature should be abandoned as a concept. Reviewing the literature and building on Wang’s (1999) survey, they suggested that the numerous, contradictory and irreconcilable concepts, values and perspectives on the authenticity of objects made the term and concept of authenticity unusable for research discussing whether objects and activities were genuine or real. In place of these myriad perspectives, they propose as an alternative the way people see themselves in relation to the tourism object. This stems from the Heideggerian viewpoint that whatever is given to or appears to the tourist is genuine and real, whether or not it is incomplete. To the phenomenologist, just because an aspect of a situation or object does not immediately present itself, or is hidden by some other aspect, that does not make the situation or object any less real to the person experiencing it, nor does it mean that the other aspect ceases to exist. It simply means that one aspect has come to the foreground. In McGregor’s (2000) study of use of guidebooks in relation to the death rituals in Tana Toraya, just because the tourists only attended the specific buffalo slaying part of the ritual did not mean that the other elements ceased to exist. In the same way, because each human being has a unique perspective, no two visitors will ever experience the same place or interaction in an identical way, but that experience will be no less real to each person. This suggests that tourists understand, or make sense of, their experience in their own terms, out of their own individual sets of preconceptions and predispositions. Reisinger and Steiner therefore conclude that it may be more valuable to direct research attention to the “diverse and personal nature” (2006, p.81) of tourist experiences.

5.3.2 Measuring Experience through Satisfaction

Tourist experience is recognised as encompassing all aspects of the holiday, from planning and anticipation, through actual visit, to evaluation of the experience and future destination or holiday choice behaviour (Ryan, 2002c). The discussion above concentrated on the affective elements of experience, linking motivation and authenticity. Another aspect of tourist experience which has received considerable attention from researchers is that of tourist satisfaction. Research interest in this area developed from the general services marketing and service quality literature, and has concentrated on gap
analysis, critical incidents and importance/performance appraisal. Such studies have tended to focus on specific mechanical aspects of tourist experience such as hotel check-in (Mattila, 2000), service quality and service experience (Otto and Richie, 1996), and retail (Yuksel, 2004). Where studies have concentrated on satisfaction with destinations as a whole, the emphasis has been on the importance of various destination elements in relation to overall satisfaction, likelihood of repeat visitation and/or intention to recommend (Bigné et al., 2001; Kozak, 2003; Kozak and Rimmington, 2000; Pritchard, 2003; Yoon and Uysal, 2005) rather than understanding the role of satisfaction, or evaluation, in the process whereby the visitor makes sense of their overall destination experience.

Otto and Ritchie (1996) acknowledged that applying services marketing measurement instruments, such as the SERVQUAL model, had been found to be effective in assessing the functional and technical aspects of service quality and delivery in tourism. However, they noted that this type of model did not capture key dimensions relating to the affective and holistic factors which also contribute to consumer satisfaction (p.167). Other researchers have also acknowledged that tourist satisfaction is more complicated than simply assessing the performance of services (Bigné et al., 2001; Ekinci and Riley, 2001), whilst Ekinci and Sirakaya (2004, p.190) noted the apparent confusion between customer satisfaction and service quality in tourism research. These latter went on to examine the relationship between customer satisfaction, service quality and overall attitude, concluding that service quality is an antecedent of customer satisfaction, i.e. that the customer becomes aware of satisfaction or dissatisfaction by evaluating service quality.

Much of this research has been conducted in specific sectors, as noted above. Kozak and Rimmington (2000) investigated tourist satisfaction with Mallorca as an out of season holiday destination, looking at the impact of a number of different destination elements on overall destination satisfaction as evidenced by intention to return and/or recommend the destination. However, they acknowledged that their research did not take into account motivations, which might have a role to play in satisfaction. This recognition of the potential importance of antecedent factors such attitude and self congruence was developed in the final part of the Ekinci and Sirakaya study mentioned above (Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004). In other words, tourists’ attitude to the way service is delivered, where it is delivered and how it fits with their self-concept affect their evaluation and hence their satisfaction with that service. As discussed in Chapter Four above, it can be argued that these form part of the anticipations which precede the destination experience. Moreover, if they are part of the evaluation process for the service experience, it is possible that they
are also part of the process whereby the visitor not only evaluates but makes sense of the overall destination experience.

Ryan (2002c) discussed the role of adaptive behaviour in relation to achieving satisfaction from a holiday experience. For example, if expectation does not match up to the experienced reality, the tourist may adjust their expectations to minimise the psychological discomfort which would arise from dissatisfaction. A common example of this might be where the tourist rationalises poor hotel accommodation as being unimportant because he/she will not be spending much time there, therefore it is of no consequence to his or her overall satisfaction. On the other hand, if the purpose of the holiday is a luxurious, relaxing break in excellent surroundings, then even the smallest thing wrong with the room might assume greater importance. This indicates that expectations and motivations not only precede the visit, but in some way affect or mediate the evaluation of the experience, whether this is in terms of overall satisfaction or expressions of satisfaction such as intention to return or to recommend.

Perhaps because tourist satisfaction research has mainly derived from general services marketing and customer satisfaction research, studies have tended to proceed from the viewpoint of testing particular hypotheses, usually involving predetermined scales and techniques such as factor analysis or structural equation modelling. As discussed above, such studies have demonstrated the existence of relationships between the various factors involved in tourist satisfaction as a measure of tourist experience. However, in concentrating largely on elements of experience which can be measured using quantitative techniques, this research has focused on what is happening rather than investigating how or why anticipations such as motivation, expectations or attitudes affect the process of destination consumption, and the sense-making and sense-giving which results. Moreover, as noted above, many of the studies have focussed on one particular aspect of the destination experience, rather than the destination as a whole, and have been carried out some months after the experience itself. As noted by Otto and Ritchie (1996, p.173), it is preferable that research into service experience should be as recent and real as possible, i.e. carried out as soon after the experience as possible. This is to ensure that the “evaluation remains fresh in consumers’ minds” (Otto and Richie, 1996, p.173). Whilst Otto and Ritchie were concerned that functional benefits should not replace experiential benefits in the recollection, this also reflects the phenomenological concern to capture lived experience (van Manen, 1990) and the importance of the researcher being the first audience for visitor’s stories, before there has been any chance for conscious or unconscious manipulation of the experience.
It could be argued that there is a degree of overlap between the experience, authenticity and satisfaction literature discussed in this chapter and elements of consumer behaviour, as they relate to the way in which visitors consume the attraction, service or facility. The discussion thus far suggests that the visitor is engaged in consuming the destination, and indeed some of the authors drawn upon in this study could be described as belonging at least in part to the consumer behaviour literature (Bickart and Schwarz, 2001; Bogari et al., 2004; Callahan and Elliott, 1996; Ekinci and Sirakaya, 2004; Gyimothy, 2000; Klenosky et al., 1999; Moutinho, 1987; Thompson et al., 1989). However, beyond the material relating to the use and value of narrative as a means of understanding experience discussed in Chapters Four and Seven (Callahan and Elliott, 1996; Padgett andAllen, 1997), a search of the wider consumer behaviour literature did not reveal additional material which would directly add to this study of tourist experience with its particular focus on tourist destination experience.

### 5.4 Conclusion

This chapter began by suggesting that although each tourist experience is individual, there may nonetheless be common elements to the way that experience is processed. It discussed the various ways in which tourist experience has been conceptualised, from Cohen’s modes of experience (Cohen, 1979), to Urry’s gaze (Urry, 2002), experience as performance and experience as consumption. It suggested that in fact individual tourist experiences are part of a process of destination consumption, with interactions with people and place as major elements of that consumption. Whilst much of the literature on experience of place has concerned specific types of place, this chapter has argued that experience as a process may be extended to the destination as a whole and in its entirety. As individuals experience specific places differently depending upon their motivations and expectations, the same can be argued for their experience of destinations. Reviewing the literature on tourist interactions, it was shown that this has largely concentrated on the impact of tourist/host interactions on the host communities rather than the impact of interactions on tourist or visitor experience and hence image of the destination. The question raised, therefore, is how that experience is digested and comprehended, and whether it subsequently forms part of the precursors for future holidays.

Visitors bring their individual combination of motivations, expectations and image to a destination, and experience people and place differently. How visitors assess their
experience can be considered in a variety of ways: the degree to which the experience is considered authentic, expectations are met, or motivations fulfilled. In a broad sense, these all relate to kinds of satisfaction. The last section of the chapter has therefore considered satisfaction as a means of assessing experience. Reviewing the literature on authenticity, it concurs with Reisinger and Steiner (2006) that more is to be gained from studying the nature of tourist experience than attempting to define authenticity. Turning to satisfaction studies, it has shown that these mainly concern the nature of the relationship between service delivery, service quality and satisfaction, from researcher defined categories, rather than providing insight into the process whereby visitors evaluate, or make sense of, their destination experience. The call for satisfaction research to be “as real and as recent as possible” (Otto and Richie, 1996, p.173) suggests that the phenomenological approach of capturing lived experience, and interviewing visitors whilst their destination experience is very fresh, will deliver greater insights into the sense making process.

Figure 5.2: Suggested Process of Destination Consumption

In conclusion, it has been argued that visitors bring a number of elements with them, as noted in Chapter Four, as precursors to the destination experience. That destination experience is a process of consumption which encompasses a variety of different elements. Each individual may approach that menu of experiences or interactions with people and place differently, depending on their particular combination of motivations, expectations and a priori image, with the result that they may use different means of
making sense of their experience as revealed in their memories and holiday stories, which may then have an impact on their future destination experiences. Nevertheless, it may be possible to discern a general process of destination consumption even if each individual visitor experiences that consumption in a unique fashion. This is suggested in Figure 5.2 above, and Chapter Six will set out a methodology and research design to investigate this phenomenon.
CHAPTER SIX
Methodology and Research Design

6.1 Introduction

Chapter Two set out the ontological and epistemological perspectives underpinning this research, which is firmly based in the phenomenological openness to the subject under investigation and the desire to understand the phenomenon. The research strategy adopted in this study is therefore an interpretive one, drawing largely from hermeneutic phenomenology. This chapter addresses the third of the paradigm questions posed in Chapter Two, namely that of methodology, by which is meant the general and specific research strategy to be used to find out what the researcher believes can be known (Guba and Lincoln, 1998).

The literature review presented in Chapters Three, Four and Five demonstrated that there are still lacunae in the understanding of visitors’ destination experience: there is little research which has attempted to capture visitors’ lived experience; although there is some recognition that the precursors to visitor destination experience are complex, there is little empirical work which has tacked this potential complexity; and there has been little work which has focused on the impact of visitation on visitors’ perceptions of a destination. This study investigates this research problem by posing the following research questions:

- What are the key elements of visitor-destination interactions?
- How do these elements of the visitor-destination interaction relate to visitor characteristics and motivations?
- How are visitor/destination interactions and perceptions of a destination related and how is this manifested in or through visitor stories of destination experience?
- How can we understand these visitor stories and what can we learn from them?

The aim of this research, then, is to explore and understand the way that interactions and encounters within a destination affect how visitors perceive the destination and how they will talk about it and their experience of it. The research strategy will be an interpretivist one, drawing upon qualitative methods to elicit visitors’ stories about their destination experience as a means to arrive at an understanding both of the experience and how it shapes their image of the destination.
6.2 Qualitative research in tourism

As noted in Chapter Two, there has been increasing recognition of the need for tourism researchers to find research strategies which enable them to gain a better understanding of various phenomena within tourism, and of the benefits of adopting interpretivist approaches (Botterill, 2001; Goodson and Phillimore, 2004; Hollinshead, 2004a, 2004b; McIntosh, 1998; Prentice et al., 1998; Riley and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997). Post positivists have incorporated qualitative methods as a preliminary stage to derive respondent generated lists of attributes or factors (Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Reilly, 1990). Others have moved further towards interpretivist approaches, with calls for genuinely mixed methods (McIntosh, 1998) and recognition that the tourism researcher as much as any other is a bricoleur with a need for a range of different methods and tools to suit the range of research problems facing them (Walle, 1997).

Nevertheless, Riley and Love (2000) concluded from their review of published qualitative tourism research up to 1996 that positivism was still the dominant paradigm. They suggested that this was partly because journals that concentrate on applied research might feel uncomfortable in drawing bottom line implications and impacts from qualitative research, and therefore lean towards the positivist tradition. Walle agreed that tourism scholarship “reflects this bias in favor of rigorous, quantitative and scientific methods” (1997, p.524), but argued that although these are powerful techniques, they are not suitable for every research situation, and particularly not where people’s feelings are under investigation. He noted that disciplines such as marketing and consumer behaviour were adding qualitative methods to their research “toolkits” precisely because they recognised that rigorous, positivist techniques cannot address some phenomena. For example, Thompson, Locander and Pollio (1989) argued nearly twenty years ago for the reinstatement of consumer experience into consumer research, and specifically for a holistic research strategy which results in thematic description of, and identifies recurrent patterns in, consumer experience, both of which emerge from the context of that experience. Addressing the question of applicability of research to the practitioner’s situation, Walle understood that the practitioner increasingly had to deal with the “personal feelings of hosts and the impact of tourism activity on them” (1997, p.534) and that a wider variety of techniques other than the purely quantitative was required. Ryan argued that research methods are needed which both convey an understanding of “messy” tourist experience and allow the emergence of consensual reality to inform policy making (Ryan, 2000, p.129), whilst Connell and Lowe (1997) considered that inductive techniques such as grounded theory were appropriate for tourism management research.
Goodson and Phillimore (2004), updating Riley and Love’s 2000 review of tourism research, considered that positivism continued to be the dominant paradigm, but that qualitative approaches were gaining ground. They concluded that “selectivity and eclecticism are the order of the day” as researchers “experiment with new techniques and seek new ways of writing their research” (Goodson and Phillimore, 2004, p.41). This is not to say that “anything goes” is the correct antithesis to positivist methods, however. Proponents of qualitative approaches have expended much effort in discussing and elaborating ways of ensuring that qualitative research is as rigorous in its own fashion as quantitative research is perceived to be. There is general agreement that the enquiry methods and techniques should be appropriate to the subject matter, and that deliberation on ontological and epistemological issues should precede such methodological decisions (Hollinshead, 2004b; Seale, 1999; Silverman, 2001). Bowen (2001, p.33) documented his own journey from positivist to qualitative approach in relation to a study of satisfaction and dissatisfaction on long haul tours, noting that “each methodology has its strengths and weaknesses”, and Silverman (2001, p.4) argued that “methodologies cannot be true or false, only more or less useful”. Goulding (2005) suggested that it is permissible to incorporate techniques and methods from different methodologies, always provided that the objective is clear and their use is well documented. Dann and Phillips (2001) argued that qualitative methods are particularly suited to those areas of tourism research which are concerned with understanding tourism behaviour and experience, as they allow theory to emerge rather than being imposed on a topic, and in allowing the participants to speak in their own voice, provide a greater richness and depth of data.

As discussed in Chapter Two, this project aims to go beyond capturing the experience of a particular group or type of tourists to identify and understand the processes through which the visitor comprehends his/her destination interactions and experience. This study focusses on discovering the nature of those interactions, understanding their impact on the visitors, and on the stories they relate about their visit. Govers and Go (2003) suggested that as tourism, in common with most services, is an experiential product, consumers will try to organise the disparate elements of events and their reactions into a meaningful whole. This in turn suggests that they will relate their interpretations of that experience to other people through story telling, or narrative (Govers and Go, 2003, p.27), making sense of their own experience in the process: Thompson et al. (1989, p.137) cited a respondent who realised whilst describing her shopping experiences that she was happier with products bought on impulse than those bought for practical reasons. Cary (2004, p.62) suggested that “narrativity marks, organizes and clarifies experience”. The challenges for the researcher in capturing these narratives will be discussed further in the
section below explaining the specific techniques used in this study. Such narratives, retailed to friends, family and colleagues, are the word of mouth publicity which has been recognised as contributing to destination image formation. Moreover, the image a visitor holds of a destination, whether in advance of or as a result of a visit, is a form of shorthand for their understanding of that destination, an encapsulated meaning which may inform both their choice of destination and their expectations. It is appropriate, therefore, to give a brief account of research approaches taken by tourism image researchers before detailing the research design for the current study.

6.2.1 Approaches to tourism image research

The quantitative bias contained within the conceptual model of tourism destination image developed by Gallarza et al. (2002) has been discussed above (Chapter Three). Other models, such as that developed by Baloglu and McCleary (1999) use techniques such as factor analysis to investigate cognitive variables and bipolar scales to assess affective variables, with the researchers generating the items for evaluation. The use of structured methods such as these has benefits in making it easier to collect data from a large number of respondents, and more acceptable to generalise the results (Robson, 2002), but two comments should be borne in mind, relating to sample population and data collection.

Such studies are often based on convenience samples, such as students in a captive situation; Kim and Richardson (2003) took a sample of students, whilst Baloglu and colleagues sampled people who had already expressed interest in a particular destination (Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu, 1998; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Baloglu, 2001). In the first case, the students are unlikely to be representative of the population as a whole, by virtue of their age and level of education; in the second, requesting information about a destination implies a degree of awareness of the destination which may be greater than the awareness of the population as a whole. If it is assumed that destination image can be a collective construct, then it could be argued that data should be collected from a random sample of the population as a whole, not simply certain groups within it. This concern was addressed by Walmsley and Young (1998), who used a random sample of households to assess images both of local and international tourist destinations and concluded that direct experience of local destinations caused them to be evaluated on a different basis than international destinations. This would seem to support the view that experience or awareness of a destination affects the way it is evaluated, and therefore the image held.
Secondly, the techniques employed in data gathering rarely allow scope for understanding the specifics of any one experience. In the majority of cases, the cognitive or perceptual aspects of destination image are measured through asking respondents to rate a variety of attributes using Likert or other rating scales. The responses are then analysed statistically using techniques such as factor analysis (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Beerli and Martin, 2004a; Bigné et al., 2001; Crompton, 1979a; Hudson and Shephard, 1998; Joppe et al., 2001; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Kozak and Rimmington, 1999; O’Leary and Deegan, 2005; Tapachai and Waryszak, 2000). The destination attributes are usually generated in advance by the researcher and may thus be more a reflection of the researcher’s views than the attributes the subject considers important. In addition, the requirement to keep the survey instrument manageable means that some aspects of the destination may be omitted or not even considered for inclusion, restricting the opportunities the subject has to record their actual views.

This has led some researchers to consider alternative means of measuring cognitive perceptions of destinations. Reilly (1990), assessing the advantages and disadvantages of multidimensional scaling and semantic differential scaling, proposed free elicitation of adjectives as a method for measuring image. He argued that this allows respondents to “describe the target stimulus in terms that are salient to the respondents, rather than responding to researchers’ predetermined image dimensions” (1990, p.22). Echtner and Ritchie (1993) argued that to capture both the functional and psychological characteristics of attribute based and holistic components of image, a mixture of structured and unstructured methods should be used. They therefore included a set of open ended questions as the first part of their research instrument, to allow respondents to express themselves freely in describing their overall impressions of the destination. Jenkins (1999) also argued that the use of structured methods, such as Likert and semantic differential scales, can be unreliable because they use a priori compiled lists of attributes. This may lead either to important attributes being missed from the study, or results concentrating on outcomes and attributes which are unimportant to the tourism consumer. She therefore supported the use of various elicitation techniques as a first stage in a mixed methods approach to the measurement of destination image.

Where qualitative methods have been used in tourism research, then, they have been largely incorporated into the research design at an early stage to elicit information from respondents which can then be investigated using quantitative techniques. This allows the researcher to help reduce bias in the design of the research instrument and then test a priori hypotheses, describe the relationship between factors predetermined from a review
of previous research, or evaluate the applicability of techniques such as personal construct theory. Walle (1997), discussing the merits of quantitative and qualitative research in tourism, noted that whilst the scientific route is powerful, it takes time and excludes topics it is unable to deal with. The qualitative, or humanistic, approach is insightful and can be used to tackle most topics although it generates fewer numbers and perhaps requires a greater degree of training on the part of the researcher. He concluded that in reality the majority of tourism research lies on the continuum between science and art.

Numerous studies have contributed to the understanding of destination image (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Bigné et al., 2001; Chon, 1991; Crompton, 1979a; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Kim and Richardson, 2003; Kozak, 2003; Oppermann, 1996; Reilly, 1990; Selby and Morgan, 1996; Walmsley and Young, 1998). However, it could be argued that in taking a quantitative approach, they are largely answering “What?” questions: what is attractive/unattractive; what combines to form an image; what affects the intention to visit/return/recommend; what is the relationship between various factors? Moreover, as noted above, the relationships or factors under investigation are predetermined. Few researchers appear to start from the visitor/tourist viewpoint when setting out to address issues relating to “How?” and “Why?”: how does image change with visitation, or with more information; why are some attributes important and others not in choosing a destination; how do motivations and cultural expectations affect the way a visitor experiences the destination? This thesis argues that a phenomenological approach is particularly suited to the collection and analysis of data to answer these “How?” and “Why?” questions.

6.3 Research Design Considerations

The aim of this study is to gain an understanding of the visitor’s interactions with a destination, whether with the place itself or the people within it (residents, frontline tourism staff, other tourists), and the impact these interactions have on the way in which they talk about the destination after their visit. In attempting to understand the visitors’ experience, a phenomenological approach was taken, to try to capture visitors’ lived experience.

Tourism researchers have commented that “Phenomenology does not contain a tradition of techniques” (Masberg and Silverman, 1996, p.21), suggesting that the precise method should meet the requirements and goals of the particular study. Goulding (2005)
suggests that it is permissible to incorporate techniques and methods from different methodologies, provided that the objective is clear and their use is well documented. In the present instance, the aim is to understand visitors’ experience of interactions within a destination. Padgett and Allen suggest that we make sense of our experience through narrative, as people have a natural propensity to organise information in a story format, and that narrative can be viewed as “the primary form through which people communicate and comprehend experience” (1997, p.56). Goossens (2000) also considers that mentally reliving experience is an important part of making sense of it. Conversation as a means to capture the tourist’s frame of reference and experience has been advocated by Ryan (1995) and more recently by Selby (2003). Van Manen (1990, p.227-228) recommends the phenomenological researcher to “gather and reflect upon stories, anecdotes and recollections of live experience”. Patton agrees that phenomenological enquiry requires “carefully and thoroughly capturing and describing how people experience some phenomenon” (2002, p.104). Such experience is understood in retrospect; at the time, we simply live it (van Manen, 1990, p.35-36). Listening to the stories visitors relate in a relatively unstructured interview would therefore seem to offer the best possibilities for understanding their experience.

However, Sirgy and Su (2000) suggest that tourists choose destinations to conform to their self image, whether that is their own ideal self image or the social self image, i.e. the way they hope to appear to others. It could also be argued that in making sense of experience, people might consciously or unconsciously amend their narrative to reflect that same self-image. For example, a person who likes to consider and portray themselves as well travelled might play down an incident in a café or restaurant where a misunderstanding arose over whether service was included in the bill, because this might not accord with their view of themselves. On the other hand, if that person wanted to demonstrate their familiarity with the language and culture, they might tell the same story in a different way, emphasising the conversation rather than the cause of the discussion. Moreover, Jenkins (1999) notes that post visit images, although more complex, may suffer from fading due to time elapsed since the visit. Despite the convenience of interviewing a sample of Aberdeen residents about their previous holiday experiences, therefore, it was decided that to capture the immediacy of experience, without the accretions of memory and unconscious adaptation, it would be preferable to interview visitors whilst on holiday in a destination. In this way, it was hoped that the researcher would be in many instances the first audience for the narratives arising from visitor experience of that destination.
6.3.1 Data Collection

Discussing the trade-off between depth and breadth involved in research design decisions, Patton (2002) contrasts the depth of detail, nuance and context afforded by qualitative research with the breadth of response available using quantitative instruments, but then notes that there is a similar trade-off to consider within qualitative research (2002, p.227-228). Maxwell (1998) agrees that one of the most important issues is the extent to which the researcher structures the study in advance. Unstructured approaches trade generalisability and comparability for internal validity and contextual understanding, and are thus particularly useful, in Maxwell’s view, for understanding processes. It is possible to investigate either a small number of experiences for a large number of people, or a greater range of experiences for a smaller number of people, even down to a single person who might be studied intensively over a period of time. Patton (2002) concludes that the decision as to the range of focus of a particular study will be influenced by a number of factors, such as resources available, as well as the research questions and objectives. This section explains the research design decisions taken in this study.

The focus of this research is the impact of visitor interactions on their perceptions of the destination as a whole. It has been noted earlier that there has been little work to date on the holistic experience of the destination, rather than experience of component parts of a destination such as accommodation, heritage attractions, retail, and so on. It was therefore considered important to interview visitors in a place which is a destination in its own right, rather than one which might be visited as an adjunct to a visit to friends and relatives, or a business trip. Whilst it would have been feasible to concentrate on only one destination, the intention was to give a UK context to the research, and to try to discover whether common themes would arise across more than one destination. Edinburgh and London were originally chosen as representing UK destinations recognised nationally and internationally. However, for the reasons of access noted below, it was decided to focus on Greenwich World Heritage site as a destination within the larger destination of London, in the way that Edinburgh is a destination within the larger destination of Scotland. Edinburgh attracted 3.6 million staying visitor trips in 2005, representing 13.2 million bed nights, of which 7.1 million were overseas visitors and 6.1 domestic visitors (VisitScotland, 2007). Greenwich attracted 6.8 million visitors in 2003, of which 92% were domestic (Greenwich Council, 2004). Both places are “must see” destinations for overseas visitors to the UK.
Interviews were carried out in Edinburgh during the autumn half term holiday week in October 2004. The researcher obtained permission to interview visitors in three different attractions: Edinburgh Castle, the Scotch Whisky Heritage Centre and the Royal Yacht Britannia. It had been envisaged that interviewing visitors at three different locations would make it easier to maintain a destination rather than attraction specific focus. In the event, interviewees were quite willing to focus on the destination as a whole. When seeking access to interview sites in London, the opportunity was offered to interview visitors to the World Heritage Site at Greenwich, which attracted some 6.8 million visitors in 2003 (Greenwich Council, 2004). As this is a large site, with a variety of attractions contained within it, drawing both national and international visitors, and on the basis of the experience at Edinburgh, it was decided to accept this invitation and for the researcher to be based solely at Greenwich for this set of interviews. These latter interviews were undertaken in May 2005 in three different locations around the World Heritage Site: the Visitor Centre, the Painted Hall, and the National Maritime Museum.

Whilst it could be argued that in a phenomenological study, the emphasis is on describing and elucidating the essential visitor experience, and therefore stories told by any and all visitors would be valuable, understanding those stories is of primary importance. Nuance and implied meaning can be a vital element of that understanding. In many social science studies, the researcher has the opportunity to return to the interviewee in follow up interviews to clarify transcripts and probe further to gain a deeper understanding of the interviewee’s sense-making. However, the intention of this study was to capture the freshness of visitors’ experiences whilst on holiday. At the outset, contact details were requested from interviewees in case of need to clarify transcripts. However, several interviewees, although willing to take part in the interview, were not willing to provide contact details, and indeed some were clearly uncomfortable with the idea of any follow up contact. As it would not have been feasible to undertake follow-up interviews with them, partly because of time and travel considerations, and partly because of the issues of memory and narrative amendment referred to earlier, they were not pressed to give contact information and in fact the request was dropped for the Greenwich interviews. Even then, one interviewee was only prepared to participate on condition that none of his details, including first name, were recorded.

In order to minimise as far as possible questions of language and culture, it was decided initially to concentrate on interviewing first time domestic visitors. As interviewing in Edinburgh progressed, however, it was decided to include native English speaking visitors, i.e. from Canada, the United States of America, New Zealand and Australia.
addition, the interviews include one with a Finnish lady who had been resident in England for several years, one with a German couple who have lived in Australia for decades, and one with a Dutchman. In all three cases, the transcripts show that the interviewees are comfortable expressing themselves in English, and it was considered appropriate, therefore, to include them in the data set. Patton notes that this type of opportunistic, emergent sampling can be a strength of qualitative research, as it allows the researcher to take advantage of unfolding opportunities (2002, p.240). It was not always possible to identify whether a potential interviewee was British before approaching them, and the overseas visitors engaged in conversation expressed interest and willingness to talk about their experiences. It was acknowledged that there might be some cultural differences which would impinge on expectations and perceptions, and these are discussed in the analysis where relevant, but it was considered that nevertheless, these visitors’ stories might throw additional light on the essential characteristics of visitor-destination interactions.

6.3.1.1 Sample Size

Much consideration has been given to the question of sample size and number of interviews. In a quantitative study, the aim is normally to test a hypothesis on a sample which is large enough to permit use of appropriate statistical techniques, and can be considered representative of the population to which it is intended to generalise the results. Various techniques for sampling can be used, depending upon circumstances and purpose of the study. Patton contends that:

“validity, meaningfulness and insights generated from qualitative inquiry have more to do with the information richness of the cases selected and the observational/analytical capabilities of the researcher than with sample size.”
(Patton, 2002, p.245)

In a qualitative study where there is no intention to generalise results to a particular population, data collection and analysis generally continue until the same themes and issues recur continually, when data saturation is said to have been reached (Gibbs, 2002; Strauss and Corbin, 1998), or the researcher feels confident that their description fits the phenomenon and “resonates with our sense of lived life” (van Manen, 1990, p.27).

As this study aims to describe and elucidate the phenomenon of visitor/destination interaction, it was considered inappropriate to set a target sample size, but rather to collect as many interviews as possible within the limits of the time available and willingness of visitors to participate. Robson (2002, p.198) comments on the difficulty of pre-specifying numbers of interviews in what he calls flexible design studies, but notes
earlier that typically in grounded theory studies, for example, some twenty to thirty interviews will be carried out to achieve saturation (p.165). Patton (2002, pp 227-8) also recognises that there is a trade-off between breadth and depth, i.e. a larger number of shorter, less in-depth interviews may be required to reach saturation, whereas the same richness of data and saturation point may be reached in a smaller number of more in-depth interviews. Nevertheless, it is data saturation which is important, rather than sheer numerical size of the “sample”. Indeed, earlier in the same work, Patton argues that sampling “is aimed at insight about the phenomenon, not empirical generalisation from a sample to a population” (Patton, 2002, p.40)

6.3.1.2 Interviewing Visitors
In all, 57 interviews were recorded across the two destinations. However, one interview at the Royal Yacht, Edinburgh, was discarded because at the end of the conversation it became apparent that the couple, although visiting on this occasion, had been long time residents before moving away for work purposes. It was considered that their responses were not truly those of visitors and it was therefore not appropriate to include them in the sample. A summary of the interviewees showing interview locations, origin and age range of respondents is given in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Summary of Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Greenwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total interviews</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Locations</td>
<td>Edinburgh Castle (6)</td>
<td>Visitor Centre (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotch Whisky Centre (4)</td>
<td>Painted Hall (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Yacht Britannia (11)</td>
<td>National Maritime Museum (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Overseas (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>&lt;24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the interview locations chosen offered some space where the researcher and interviewees could be seated for the interview. The Edinburgh interviews were carried out at the Redcoats Café at Edinburgh Castle, the café of the Scotch Whisky Heritage Centre at the top of the Royal Mile, and in a seating area of close to the Royal Yacht Britannia.
The Greenwich locations were the Visitor Centre, the Painted Hall and the main entrance of the National Maritime Museum. In addition to seating, three of the venues offered refreshments. These areas were chosen because seating would make for a more relaxed setting, and if the interviewees were already considering refreshments, it was a reasonable assumption that they might be less pressed for time, and more willing to engage in conversation, than whilst actively looking around the site or attraction (Ryan and Higgins, 2006). This proved to be the case, with the slight exception of the National Maritime Museum, where a combination of the more crowded setting and the fact that several of the interviewees were killing time waiting for the next showing at the Planetarium tended to truncate the interviews. In one further instance, in the Painted Hall, an interview was cut short by the gun salute given by HMS Illustrious as she passed Greenwich on her way to mooring further up the River Thames.

It was considered that interviewing in multiple locations across the two destinations would minimise the likelihood of the key characteristics of the lived experience derived from the data being either attraction or destination specific. In the event, as will be shown in the analysis, interviewees not only talked about their immediate experiences in the particular destination, but also referred to previous destination experiences. The interviews ranged between ten and fifty minutes in length, with the majority lasting approximately ten to twenty minutes. Whilst it is acknowledged that in many phenomenological studies, interviews tend to be somewhat longer, the purpose of this study is to understand how visitors make sense of their experience through the stories they tell to others about their destination experience. It is suggested that such stories tend to be transmitted during ad hoc social interactions, such as the ten minute coffee break, or in the course of a family phone call, or a dinner party, and are rarely the subject of extended social discourse. The conversational style of the interviews in this study can therefore be considered an accurate reflection of the reality of visitor narratives. Indeed, it might be argued that the limited time available forces this to be the case. Recent qualitative studies carried out in visitor attractions in New Zealand (Ryan and Cave, 2005; Ryan and Higgins, 2006) have found that the combination of recording the interview conversation, taking keyword written notes and transcribing the interviews as soon as possible, produced rich data sets from conversations lasting similar lengths of time and in similar situations.

Potential interviewees were approached by the researcher with the request for an interview. If willing, they were invited to sit down, give basic contact details as shown on the interview record sheet at Appendix 1, and take part in the interview. The interviewees were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, which was achieved by giving each
interviewee an alias. The interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder and only a very few notes were taken during the interview itself. Using the recorder meant that the researcher could pay close attention to the interviewee and be alert to facial expression and body language as well as tone of voice. Riley (1996, p.30) considers that audio taping is the preferred way to record conversations, noting that the fact of taping gives weight to the interviewee’s views and taping also reduces the distractions of note taking for both interviewer and interviewee. For the interviewer, it is difficult to take notes and listen actively to the narrative, whilst the interviewee may pick up signs that something they’ve said is of particular interest and concentrate on that as a way of giving the believed required response. However, immediately after each interview, the researcher took time to make short notes in her field log to record any immediate observations. In addition, before starting the interviews in each location, she made notes about the general setting to aid recall when transcribing. The researcher transcribed the interviews verbatim as soon as possible on her return from each destination.

6.3.1.3 Style of Interview
Patton (2002, p.349) sets out the range of interview styles and techniques, from the completely structured and formal interview which is questionnaire based to the totally open ended, unstructured interview more commonly used in hermeneutic, grounded theory, ethnographic and other qualitative forms of enquiry (see Table 6.2). He recognises that each has its strengths and weaknesses, making it more or less appropriate for different research questions and situations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Interview</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal conversational interview</td>
<td>Questions emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of conversation; no predetermination of topics or wording</td>
<td>Increases salience and relevance of questions; interviews are built on and emerge from observations; interview can be matched to individuals and circumstances</td>
<td>Different information collected from different people with different questions; Less systematic and comprehensive if certain questions do not arise naturally. Data organisation and analysis can be quite difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview guide approach</td>
<td>Topics and issues to be covered are specified in advance in outline; interviewer decides sequence and wording in course of interview</td>
<td>The outline increases the comprehensiveness of data; data collection is more systematic for each respondent. Logical gaps in data can be anticipated and closed. Interviews remain fairly conversational and situational.</td>
<td>Important and salient topics may be inadvertently omitted. Interviewer flexibility in sequencing and wording questions can result in substantially different responses from different perspectives, leading to reduced comparability of responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized open-ended interview</td>
<td>Exact wording and sequence of questions determined in advance. All interviewees asked same basic questions in same order. Questions worded in completely open-ended format.</td>
<td>Respondents answer the same questions, increasing comparability of responses; data are complete for each person on topics addressed in the interview. Reduces interviewer effects and bias where several interviewers used. Permits evaluation users to see and review the instrumentation used in evaluation. Facilitates organisation and analysis of data.</td>
<td>Little flexibility in relating interview to particular individuals and circumstances; standardised wording of questions may constrain/limit naturalness and relevance of questions and answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed, fixed response interview</td>
<td>Questions and response categories determined in advance. Responses fixed; respondent chooses from among these fixed responses</td>
<td>Data analysis simple; responses can be directly compared and easily aggregated; many questions can be asked in short time.</td>
<td>Respondents must fit their experiences and feelings into the researcher’s categories; may be perceived as impersonal, irrelevant and mechanistic. Can distort what respondents really mean or experienced by limiting response choices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from Patton (2002)*
In this study, with little likelihood of being able to return for further in depth interview or conversation with the interviewees, it was considered important to cover the same general areas with each interviewee, whilst allowing them flexibility and freedom to tell their stories about their experiences. It was therefore decided to take an approach part way between the interview guide and a completely informal conversation. The interviews were allowed to develop as conversations, with the aim of covering four key topic areas. Each conversation was initiated and developed using three open questions, one relating to each of the research objectives, and the researcher kept in mind a list of potential probes and prompts which could be adapted to the flow of each individual interview (Ryan and Cave, 2005; Ryan and Higgins, 2006). In this way, the key areas of interest were covered, ensuring comparability of data, but at the same time the researcher was also able to follow the natural course of the conversation and elicit visitors’ narratives about their expectations, their experiences and the image they would transmit to others as a result of their visit.

Table 6.3 below shows the three interview questions and the areas of understanding they were intended to uncover. The initial question addressed the broad area of interviewees’ expectations about the destination. Asking about things that stood out led them into talking about their experiences, and was intended to encourage and elicit anecdotes about experiences which might become the basis of the stories they would tell to families, friends and/or acquaintances after their return home. The final question not only addressed this in a different way, but also offered the researcher an opportunity to discover how/if their image of the destination had changed. This happened both through the visitor explicitly making a comparison between expectations and their experience during the course of the interview, and through the researcher comparing the two sections of the transcript.

Table 6.3: Interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview question</th>
<th>Understanding sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What made you choose destination? What did you expect to find?</td>
<td>What image, understanding, expectations of the destination they had before they came. Probe questions elicted source of these expectations, eg. Friends, family, internet, guidebooks, news media etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell me about your visit, the high points, low points, memories you will take away?</td>
<td>Stories, narratives about their visit, encounters they have had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone at home/work were to ask you about destination, what would you tell them about it?</td>
<td>Whether initial expectations have been met, disappointed, exceeded. How and why perceptions/image of destination has changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A tenet of qualitative research is that the researcher does not have an objective, completely uninvolved attitude to the subject under investigation. The research is usually grounded in the researcher’s experience or field of interest, and the issue is not that this does not exist, but that the researcher can be honest and open about their orientation to the research question. Gubrium and Holstein (1998) note that narratives are rarely if ever completely free, unmediated retellings of experience. They are shaped by the storyteller not only for reasons, conscious or unconscious, of self image, but also to suit the particular audience. A researcher thus needs to be aware of their impact on interviewees; hence Riley’s comment that:

“topic focus should be provided by the interviewer but the direction of conversation and subject matter must remain the domain of respondents”
(Riley, 1996, p.27)

The researcher is therefore a collaborator in the narrative, and also an influence upon it, in that the interviewee may seek to satisfy perceived needs on the part of the researcher (Robson, 2002); this was demonstrated by one or two interviewees in the current study who actively asked whether they were giving the “right” information, to which the researcher made clear there were no right or wrong answers, as she was interested in their experiences in their words. In order to minimise direct impacts, the researcher was careful to avoid leading and dichotomous questions, and wherever possible when asking for further information, asked explicitly for examples or reflected back what had just been said to elicit confirmation or further details. Although she did not have a written list of additional questions and prompts visible whilst carrying out the interviews, the researcher had considered a range of potential prompts and probes in advance, and discussed them with her supervisors to minimise any potential bias or direction.

6.4 Analytical Approach

The tests of good research are generally taken to be validity, reliability and reproducibility. To this end, in positivist research designs, much use is made of statistical tests of internal validity and reliability, and weight given to the relevance/representativeness of samples in order to be able to generalise results to the population under study. In contrast, concerns have been expressed about the consistency and transparency of analysis of qualitative research (Boulton and Hammersley, 1996; Robson, 2002); specifically, that any qualitative research cannot be replicated because of the subjective nature of the responses. However, most qualitative research does not proceed on the basis that there is one reality out there waiting to be discovered, or that the researcher is objective, divorced from “out there” and thus able to discover that one reality. The concept of reproducibility of
response data is inappropriate in relation to qualitative research. Rather, the method and analytical approach should be clearly recorded and reported so that others can follow the analytical process (Ryan, 2005). Seale (1999) argues that issue of criteria for judging quality of qualitative research is problematical. Researchers should not be hidebound or straight jacketed by a particular method and he considers the idea that research must be carried out “under the burden of fulfilling some philosophical or methodological scheme” (Seale, 1999, pp.471-472) to be a threat to quality. Instead, qualitative researchers should be skilled craft workers, understanding and choosing the most appropriate tools for the work in hand.

Other authors frame this debate in terms of criteria for establishing the trustworthiness of qualitative research. Those most often mentioned were set out by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and are summarised in Table 6.4 below. Decrop (2004, p.160) suggests a number of research techniques to meet these criteria. Credibility may be enhanced by prolonged engagement with the subject or informants, as well as through the experience, training, status and presentation of the researcher.

Table 6.4: Criteria for Trustworthiness of Qualitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Quantitative Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Suggested meanings are relevant to informants and theoretical propositions conform with interview and/or observation data</td>
<td>Internal validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability</td>
<td>The extent to which findings are applicable to another setting or group</td>
<td>External validity/generalisability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Correspondence between data recorded by the researcher and what actually occurred in the setting</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>Data analysis process is made objective through transparency and openness to a variety of explanations</td>
<td>Objectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Lincoln and Guba(1985) and Decrop (2004)

The study has addressed transferability, i.e. the extent to which findings may be applicable to another setting or group, through the use of theoretical sampling. Moreover, whilst this study is necessarily context bound, at the more abstract level, the interaction model developed should be useful for understanding the sense making and sense giving processes of different sets of visitors in varying circumstances and contexts. Dependability has been addressed through creating an audit trail, as will be discussed later and in the Technical Glossary. In addition, the audit trail of theoretical memos,
project diary and field notes, and the constant checking of findings to ensure openness to disconfirmatory evidence are steps which have been taken to address the confirmability of the study. These issues will be addressed further in the discussion of computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS). However, Janesick (1994, p.216) sums up the argument thus:

“Validity in qualitative research has to do with description and explanation, and whether or not a given explanation fits a given description. In other words, is the explanation credible?”

In phenomenological terms, the criterion is whether the explanation resonates for the reader with a sense of lived experience. Van Manen (1990, p.227-8) sets out key techniques for carrying out this type of phenomenological investigation, summarised in Table 6.5.

**Table 6.5: Research practices for phenomenological research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turning toward lived experience</th>
<th>Reflect upon experience whilst at the same time putting to one side pre-existing suppositions, assumptions and causality in relation to that experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigating experience as lived</td>
<td>Gather and reflect upon stories, anecdotes, recollections of lived experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting on essential themes</td>
<td>Use themes emerging from the lived experience to describe and explain the structures which make up the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing and rewriting</td>
<td>Use textual description to clarify themes and meaning, to combine parts and the whole to allow the description of the essence to emerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a strong and oriented relation</td>
<td>Remain strongly oriented to the phenomenon to avoid being sidetracked, falling back on taxonomic concepts or preconceived notions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering parts and whole</td>
<td>Keep a balance between the overall design of the study and the importance of the individual parts, i.e. from time to time step back and look at the whole rather than get so absorbed in the writing that the overall sense of direction is lost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from van Manen (1990)

These cover both data collection and analysis, although the main emphasis is on the interpretation of the stories and anecdotes collected. Moustakas (1994) gives two versions of these steps, and Goulding (2005) refers to Colaizzi’s Seven Steps. The approach can best be described as listening to and then reading attentively the stories of
lived experience, putting aside pre-existing assumptions and being open to the phenomenon as it is being described; identifying significant or meaningful statements in individual accounts and then discovering themes or patterns arising across several accounts; from these, developing a rich description of the phenomenon and then considering the core structure which offers an explanation of the behaviour or processes at work.

After reading the interview transcript in its entirety more than once to obtain a sense of the whole, it is read in detail and significant statements are coded descriptively. Then the researcher looks at the descriptive codes or categories across all the interviews to see how they group, or cluster together, and to identify ideas which do not seem to fit. With the insights gained, the researcher returns to detailed examination, and then steps back again to review the whole and move from descriptive to analytic categories. In the final stages, the analytic categories can themselves be grouped to provide the key categories which explicate the phenomenon. Thus the process of reading and re-reading allows different aspects of the phenomenon to reveal themselves. Through this and the developing thought and insight through writing, which is itself a form of discovering (van Manen, 1990), the researcher engages in a reiterative process which Creswell (1998) calls the analytic spiral, where he/she circles from the parts to the whole to the parts and back again, each time gaining a deeper understanding, until the parts are integrated with and comprehended as the whole. At the same time, this allows the researcher to check and recheck the data and their interpretation, to make sure that they are exploring ideas or themes which do not fit, or which contradict emerging explanations.

There are some similarities in this approach with grounded theory studies: Goulding (2005, p.298) notes that there is now recognition of the validity of using some grounded theory techniques alongside other approaches provided the objectives are clear and authors such as Connell and Lowe (1997) and Riley (1995, 1996) have argued for greater use of this form of inductive qualitative research in tourism marketing and management research. Certainly, the principles of starting from the data, of constant comparison and moving from descriptive to analytical categories are similar. However, the grounded theory approach seeks a core concept which will explain the whole, whereas the phenomenological approach seeks to synthesise the parts and the whole to obtain a description and understanding of the whole (Goulding, 2005) and this thesis argues it is thus better suited to developing understanding of the processes whereby visitors make sense of experience. The ways in which these techniques have been used in the current study will be discussed further later in this chapter and the next. First of all, since the
transcripts were imported into QSR NVivo 2.0, a computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) package, to assist with data management and analysis, the next section will discuss the advantages and disadvantages of using computers in qualitative data analysis.

6.5 Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS)

Qualitative data consist of field notes, interview transcripts, observations and memos. Before the advent of computers, these were laboriously copied, sorted into files and indexing systems, and cut and pasted as links and connections were made between cases and themes. Over the past fifteen years, the tools available to qualitative researchers for dealing with these mountains of data have been augmented by computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) packages. The first CAQDAS programs were developed in the 1980s and required the researcher to have a high level of understanding of computer programming to go beyond the basic search and retrieval of text to creating databases which could be interrogated to discover similarities, patterns and dissimilarities in data. Since then, CAQDAS programs have developed from exploratory use of basic, readily available software such as word processing and database packages into much more user friendly, dedicated packages for qualitative data analysis incorporating ever more sophisticated features, such as the ability to hyperlink between texts, analytical memos and external documents and data sources (Kelle, 1995; Lee and Esterhuizen, 2000). It is now possible to encompass a whole project within one software program, freeing the researcher from some of the time consuming clerical and data management tasks to focus more on the task of analysis itself (Guthrie and Thyne, 2006).

Those in favour of CAQDAS argue that in making data analysis more transparent, systematic and therefore trustworthy, it enhances rigour (Kelle, 1995). Kelle and Laurie (1995) consider that computers, and appropriate software, can be used as tools to identify and deal with sources of error in both sampling issues and consistent, reliable application of coding schemes. They concede that using computers may make it easier to handle larger volumes of data from larger numbers of data sources (interviews, focus groups, field notes and so on), but that there is no guarantee this will reduce the amount of time required as the data will need to be prepared and entered. It is however generally agreed that CAQDAS greatly facilitates the organisation, storage, retrieval and interrogation of data once entered (Anderson and Shaw, 1999; Dey, 1993; Gibbs, 2002; Huberman and
The advantages and disadvantages of CAQDAS are summarised in Table 6.6 below. However, despite the tremendous technological developments which have taken place, the issues raised in connection with the use of CAQDAS still seem to centre on its perceived advantages and disadvantages, classified by Lee and Esterhuizen (2000) as closeness to data, unintended consequences and software use, with little debate until very recently as to how CAQDAS might be enabling researchers to approach their data differently (Richards, 2002a).

Table 6.6: Advantages and disadvantages of computer assisted qualitative data analysis software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient, consistent data management</td>
<td>Can distance researcher from data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of searching for words and phrases</td>
<td>Danger of forgetting to ground theory in data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of sorting and organising data</td>
<td>Some programmes too influenced by grounded theory approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates code and retrieval of data</td>
<td>Potential over emphasis on code and retrieve approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates model and theory building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates checking for negatives, unusual cases</td>
<td>Unmindful manipulation of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


6.5.1 Closeness to data

A recurrent concern among qualitative researchers is that using computers distances the researcher from the data. Computers make it easy to code and retrieve segments of data, but once retrieved, there is a danger that those segments are separated from their original context, resulting in meanings being attributed and conceptual links created which are not grounded in the whole of the data (Coffey et al., 1996). However, numerous programs now include the ability to create hyperlinks between retrieved segments and the source document, as well as between coded text and memos, other documents and even figures, illustrations and audio or video files, enabling the researcher to circle back and forth between coded text and context (Dey, 1993; Lee and Esterhuizen, 2000). Creswell refers to this as the data analysis spiral, suggesting that analysis is not simply circling back and forth, but the movement between data and context leads upwards through the different
levels of analysis from data to pattern to concept (Creswell, 1998, 2003). This suggests that such programs should facilitate the phenomenological approach which moves from the part to the whole.

Gilbert (2002) suggests that qualitative researchers should continuously move to and fro between the data coded at nodes and the original texts. This helps avoid the coding trap, where they either become bogged down in coding, or do coding mechanically, losing sight of the larger picture and an understanding of why a piece of text is being coded to a particular node. It is also possible to continue coding as a way of putting off looking for the higher level connections in the data. She does note, however, that as researchers become more familiar and comfortable with CAQDAS, they also develop “metacognitive skills”, whereby they are aware of the coding trap and begin to consider creatively how best to use the functionality of their software to capture the meaning of their data and enhance their analysis (Gilbert, 2002). She further suggests that a metacognitive shift is required, in that the researcher needs to reflect not only upon the data, but also upon their use of CAQDAS such as NVivo. For example, in using a particular operation in the software to ask a question of the data, the researcher should then also ask whether the result does in fact answer the question posed, or whether they may have made an error which has resulted in a nonsensical, or false, answer. The analogy would be using a pocket calculator to carry out an arithmetical calculation, hitting a wrong button by mistake and being unaware that the answer to the calculation is out by, for example, a factor of ten (Gilbert, 2002). For these reasons, the researcher in the current study devoted considerable time not only to learning how to operate the software, but also to understanding how to use it to interrogate the data effectively and guard against “garbage in, garbage out”.

### 6.5.2 Unintended consequences

Lee and Esterhuizen (2000, pp.236-237) summarise two potential unintended consequences of CAQDAS: trading of resolution for increased scope, and implicit adoption of grounded theory as the methodology of choice. The first refers to the fear that computers’ ability to handle large volumes of data efficiently would lead to an increase in sample size at the expense of depth and context, although Fielding and Lee found no evidence to support the idea that sample sizes were increasing. The second concern is that as most CAQDAS applications incorporate code and retrieve functions, the software implicitly drives researchers to adopt grounded theory over and above other, potentially more appropriate, methodologies (Coffey et al., 1996, para 1.4). However, it can equally
be argued that most forms of qualitative research involve coding or categorising in some form; it is the type of coding and how it is developed from the descriptive to the analytic levels which may vary according to methodological perspective (Gibbs, 2002; Lee and Fielding, 1996; Richards, 2002a). As noted above, and will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter, the approach in this study has been to read the transcripts, develop descriptive coding as a first stage, then develop analytic categories which have been synthesised to describe and explain the visitor’s destination interactions and the way in which they make sense of them.

### 6.5.3 Software use

One of the greatest advantages of computer use is the ability to manage large amounts of data effectively, freeing the researcher to concentrate on the analysis. It does not necessarily reduce the amount of time required overall, as data preparation and entry are still needed, but it does facilitate the organisation, storage, retrieval and interrogation of data thereafter (Anderson and Shaw, 1999; Dey, 1993; Gibbs, 2002; Gilbert, 2002; Mehmetoglu and Dann, 2003; Patton, 2002). Lee and Esterhuizen (2000, p.235) found this aspect of software gave researchers the ability to be more rigorous in their analysis, as it made careful checking easier. The ease of searching and retrieving data frees researchers up to ask more questions, and verify more analysis. Moreover, the ability to link between source documents, analytical and theoretical memos and some form of project journal, and capture this either on CD-ROM, through sharing files, or using screen shots to illustrate different stages in a project, provides an audit trail which enhances project transparency (Bringer et al., 2004).

On the other hand, whilst CAQDAS frees researchers from the time spent in cutting and pasting and searching through piles of index cards (Marshall, 1993:152, cited by Marshall, 2002, p.57), there is still a time commitment in learning to use the software so that researchers understand what it can and cannot do, and how best to use its functionalities to answer their particular research question. This includes learning how a program supports differing methodological perspectives; although many CAQDAS applications offer similar functions, they are not one size fits all solutions. A program which has been developed from a content analysis background may not offer the best support for an ethnographic study, for example. However, there is a growing community of qualitative researchers using CAQDAS, with online discussion lists such as QUALRS and QUALSOFT providing considerable support. The software developers also provide user
forums, and resources such as the University of Surrey CAQDAS Networking Project offer the novice a helping hand.

Gibbs (2002, p.11) comments that CAQDAS programs are tools which assist the researcher to develop theoretical ideas, but although they ease the task, they cannot substitute for the researcher constantly reading and re-reading the material and reflecting upon it. From the foregoing summary, it can be seen that the advantages and disadvantages of CAQDAS are in several instances two sides of the same coin. This goes to the heart of the CAQDAS debate – does the tool (i.e. the computer and software) rule the researcher, or vice versa. There is a sense in which the debate on methods and methodology is so entwined with the debate on whether or not to use CAQDAS, that it is clear that Hollinshead’s notion of the researcher as bricoleur can be applied to technology as well as to methodology (Hollinshead, 1996).

6.6 Use of CAQDAS in tourism related research

Perhaps because of the concerns discussed above, or the predominance of the positivist paradigm noted in various reviews of qualitative research in tourism (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Riley and Love, 2000; Walle, 1997), there appears to be little published work which either explains how CAQDAS programmes have been used in tourism research, or indeed mentions their use at all. Notable exceptions include Ryan’s exposition of the use of CATPAC software in phenomenographic analysis (Ryan, 2000), Mehmetoglu and Dann’s evaluation of Atlas-ti for semiotic content analysis (Mehmetoglu and Dann, 2003), and Andersen and Shaw’s comparison of manual methods, word processing and a CAQDAS package, NUD*IST 4.0, in their study examining the motivation of volunteer workers at a major visitor attraction (Anderson and Shaw, 1999). To date, there appears to have been little published mention of NVivo in connection with tourism research. A search of several databases threw up only two papers; both mention NVivo being used to assist the analysis but do not elaborate on how it was used (Gustafson, 2002; Xiao and Smith, 2004). This project is concerned with destination image, so the search was extended to the broader field of marketing, where there are also relatively few instances of CAQDAS use being reported or evaluated (Dembrowski and Hanmer-Lloyd, 1995; Dolan and Ayland, 2001; Maclaran and Catterall, 2002; Schmidt and Pioch, 2005; Sinkovics et al., 2005). Gummesson (2005, p.313) acknowledges that software facilitates the life of the researcher:
“...assists but does not take over the human researcher’s role as analyst/interpreter and the need continuously to fine-tune analytical/interpretive skills”.

The consensus appears to be that CAQDAS packages have considerable advantages provided they are used appropriately.

6.7 Using QSR NVivo 2.0

The NVivo 2.0 package was selected for this project because it is a code based theory building program which is flexible enough to support a variety of interpretive approaches. It allows the researcher to code in a variety of ways, to interrogate the data through text searching using key word, Boolean and proximity searches across user specified sets of documents or nodes (containers for coded segments), and to think graphically about the data using an incorporated modelling tool. This would provide a good fit with the intended analytic process of reading and re-reading each individual interview to identify significant meaning units, moving from these parts to look across the whole to link the meaning units into themes, relating these themes back to the interviews, revision and rethinking, and eventually, to reveal the underlying structures and processes involved in the impact of visitors interactions on their image of the destination and the stories they tell to others. NVivo’s facility for creating hyperlinks between transcripts, memos and nodes, and the ability to code and search the results of earlier searches, or system closure (Richards, 2002b) was seen as being particularly helpful. From a practical point of view, the researcher was already familiar with QSR’s sister qualitative data analysis application, NUD*IST, and therefore it was anticipated that the learning curve could be somewhat shortened, as there are similarities between the two programs. Of the two, NVivo was preferred because its rich text facilities allowed greater use of different typefaces and headings to distinguish sections of text, and because it incorporates a modelling tool. The following sections illustrate how using NVivo 2.0 has assisted not only in the analysis and management of the data but also in enhancing the rigour and transparency of the research process.

Verbatim transcriptions were saved as rich text files and imported into QSR NVivo 2.0 as soon as possible after the interviews took place. Table 6.7 sets out the key interview questions together with the nodes used to give an initial broad coding.
### Table 6.7: Broad nodes to reflect interview questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Interview question</th>
<th>Understanding sought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>What made you choose \textit{destination}? What did you expect to find?</td>
<td>What image, understanding, expectations of the destination they had before they came. Probe questions elicited source of these expectations, eg. Friends, family, internet, guidebooks, news media etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Tell me about your visit/ the high points,/low points/ memories you will take away?</td>
<td>Stories, narratives about their visit, encounters they have had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>If someone at home/work were to ask you about \textit{destination}, what would you tell them about it?</td>
<td>Whether initial expectations have been met, disappointed, exceeded. How and why perceptions/image of destination has changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereafter, each transcript was read in detail, and phrases or sections which seemed significant were coded using NVivo’s free node facility. Nodes are essentially containers for text relating to or illustrating categories within the data, akin to Wolcott’s expanding drop file (Wolcott, 1990). Despite the concerns expressed by Coffey et al. (1996), however, nodes are not merely names or labels; they represent concepts or ideas within the data and are thus a key focus of the analytical thinking in qualitative research (Gibbs, 2002, p.58). In this instance, each node was given a definition as it was created, with a brief description of the definition being stored in the node properties, and where necessary a longer reflection on why the node was created, possible implications and potential relationships to other nodes recorded either in the Project Journal or a node memo. Later changes to the node definition as a result of reading other interviews or searching to inspect relationships were also recorded in the node properties and associated analytical memo (Richards, 2002b). This initial coding of the Edinburgh interviews produced a range of free, i.e. unassociated nodes (Figure 6.1).
NVivo offers three types of nodes: free, tree and case. A full explanation of the differences between the node types is given in the Technical Glossary at Appendix 1. Free nodes are unassociated, whereas tree nodes are used to group related ideas in the data. In this project, the Edinburgh interviews were coded without any pre-existing tree structure, whereas when it came to the initial coding of the Greenwich interviews, a tree structure had been developed from the previous Edinburgh interviews. This made for easier and faster coding of the Greenwich interviews, but at the same time the researcher was on the lookout for any new or unexpected themes. These were either incorporated into the tree structure, or created as free nodes until further reflection prompted either their placement in the existing structure, or a revision to accommodate new discoveries. Figure 6.2 shows an excerpt from the node tree following coding of the Greenwich interviews, as well as the free nodes at that point of the project. NVivo is able to accommodate revisions to the node tree throughout the project, and the ability to record through memos the thinking behind the shaping and reshaping of the node tree enables the development process to be transparent.
NVivo’s case nodes are a way of keeping all documents or text relating to an individual together. In the current study, some interviews were with couples or small groups rather than individuals. A case node was created for each individual, an attribute table holding basic descriptive data (age group, country of origin, location of interview) was created in Excel and then imported into NVivo so that it would be possible at a later stage to interrogate the data using these attributes, for example to see what Australian visitors to Greenwich said about their experience and compare it with the experience of Australian visitors to Edinburgh.
One of the advantages of CAQDAS packages cited above is the ability to manage project data. NVivo 2.0 offers a number of ways in which to organise the storage of project data. Each document can be given a description and attributes, and can be included in one or more sets of documents. Different icons, which can be colour coded, can be used to distinguish documents and memos. Interview transcripts were assigned a number of attributes, such as interview location and number of people in the party (Figure 6.3). The transcripts were also placed in sets, to facilitate searching all interviews which had taken place in Edinburgh, or all those which had taken place in Greenwich. It was also decided to use NVivo to store notes on journal articles, books, book chapters and so on which would form part of the literature review, to facilitate hyper linking between relevant literature, the interview transcripts and memos. Such notes were stored in proxy documents. These were colour coded, assigned attributes and grouped into sets reflecting the subject area covered, e.g. methodology or destination image. Sets and attributes can be used to define the scope of searches (Gibbs, 2002), for example to differentiate between comments made by overseas visitors and domestic visitors, or between overseas visitors from different countries.

One of the advantages of CAQDAS packages cited above is the ability to manage project data. NVivo 2.0 offers a number of ways in which to organise the storage of project data. Each document can be given a description and attributes, and can be included in one or more sets of documents. Different icons, which can be colour coded, can be used to distinguish documents and memos. Interview transcripts were assigned a number of attributes, such as interview location and number of people in the party (Figure 6.3). The transcripts were also placed in sets, to facilitate searching all interviews which had taken place in Edinburgh, or all those which had taken place in Greenwich. It was also decided to use NVivo to store notes on journal articles, books, book chapters and so on which would form part of the literature review, to facilitate hyper linking between relevant literature, the interview transcripts and memos. Such notes were stored in proxy documents. These were colour coded, assigned attributes and grouped into sets reflecting the subject area covered, e.g. methodology or destination image. Sets and attributes can be used to define the scope of searches (Gibbs, 2002), for example to differentiate between comments made by overseas visitors and domestic visitors, or between overseas visitors from different countries.
6.7.1 Enhancing Rigour and Transparency

As discussed earlier, one of the advantages of CAQDAS is the ease with which an audit trail, or project record, can be created showing the development of the analysis throughout the project, thereby enabling the rigour with which the project has been carried out to be assessed (Marshall, 1999). Various functions in NVivo have been used to maintain an audit trail for this study. From the start of the project, the researcher has kept a project journal to record progress, reflect on her thinking about the data and note the different stages of the project. Whilst this is no different from any researcher’s diary or journal, using NVivo it is possible to create hyperlinks to the interview transcript, literature review notes or analytic memo from the journal, allowing the researcher and others to move more easily from the comment to the document that inspired it.

Thinking about specific aspects of the analysis has also been recorded in memos, either relating directly to individual interviews or to analytic themes as they have arisen. NVivo provides the facility to time and date stamp entries, so it is possible to trace development chronologically. The data and time have been used as headings, which makes it easy to jump to a specific stage in each document. This is illustrated in Figure 6.4, which shows the document explorer and the headings in the Node Memo relating to Holiday Attitude. It is a feature of NVivo that these memos form part of the data set, in that they can also be
coded for later interrogation. For example, in tracing the development of thinking about Holiday Attitude, a search could be made for all text coded to Holiday Attitude in a set of documents which would include all node memos and all documents in the grouping “My thoughts”. This would return all instances of text relating to the researcher’s thinking on this topic, as opposed to all interview data coded to this topic. This is particularly useful once a node tree has been developed, when the original node may have been turned into a placeholder node, with all the text originally coded in it coded on into child nodes. The Node Memo can then be divided into headings relating to the child nodes and still encapsulate reflections on the node as a whole.

6.7.2 Reflections on using NVivo 2.0

NVivo does not claim to “do” qualitative data analysis; it is a software tool which assists the researcher to organise, interrogate and analyse qualitative data. As with any tool, effective use relies upon a good understanding of how it operates, gained either through training or simply spending time becoming familiar with its capabilities. NVivo comes with a manual, and is also supported by a number of books and workshop series, as well as a forum on the QSR web site, www.qsrinternational.com. The researcher has had recourse to all of these and found them informative, clear and helpful. The real difficulties encountered during this project are, almost certainly, as much symptomatic of any qualitative research project as of the software per se: Feeling overwhelmed by the amount of material, worrying about consistent coding, trying to move from initial coding to conceptual development too soon, finding lots of interesting lines to follow and, at times, not being able to see whether any of them join up!

As mentioned above, this project involved 57 interviews, and it was also decided to bring the literature review notes into NVivo. In this instance, therefore, data management has been a particular concern, and the ability to create hyperlinks between project documents has been particularly useful. However, the strengths and weaknesses summarised in Table 6.8 would apply to a greater or lesser extent regardless of the scale of a research project. Moreover, smaller scale projects in terms of numbers of interviewees might nevertheless involve a series of interviews with each interviewee over time, and result in similar or larger amounts of data.
Table 6.8: Strengths and Weaknesses of QSR NVivo 2.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Management:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Management:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Choice of ways to organise data storage</td>
<td>· Reciprocal linking between specific passages in different documents is cumbersome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· All project data can be stored within the program</td>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Transparent project audit trail can be created using hyperlinks, date/time stamping and node properties</td>
<td>· Modelling tool can be time consuming to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Easy to find way around data through use of date/time stamping, different headings, icons</td>
<td>· Does not export direct to a mapping package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Flexibility of approach due to tree, case and free nodes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Flexibility to rearrange coding structure as analysis develops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Development of node definitions traceable through node properties and/or memos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Supports forms of analysis beyond grounded theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Search facility includes Boolean, text and proximity searches to interrogate data in variety of ways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Spread finds retains contextuality of search results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Integral modelling tool helps to visualise development of analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weaknesses noted in Table 6.8 are a result of some elements of the package not being as fully developed as they might be. The modelling tool is quite useful, but time consuming to use and the researcher has found it easier to use alternative mindmapping packages to develop the diagrams in this thesis. The other unsatisfactory feature is the difficulty of making reciprocal links between specific passages in different documents, in that the links between documents are only at document to document level. Overall, however, the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. NVivo’s date stamp facility, combined with the ability to link between documents, recording how the researcher has circled from data to analytical comment, back to the data and back again to the larger picture, means that using NVivo 2.0 has provided additional means to enhance transparency and demonstrate the rigour of her research process.

6.8 Reflections on the Methodological Approach

This research project was partly born from the researcher’s experience as a destination manager and partly from her own holiday experiences which developed into an intellectual
curiosity about destination interactions and experiences. Her recollection of one historic city will be forever coloured by the one night spent in a shabby commercial travellers hotel, which was like an establishment from a J.B. Priestley novel, where staff were dilatory, the food mediocre and the atmosphere down at heel, so that she and her partner decamped next day. Rationally, she knows that this particular town has a number of interesting historic buildings, a fascinating museum, and a rejuvenated waterfront, but yet her first image is always of that hotel. The question in her mind, therefore, was what is it that most colours the destination image a visitor retains: the iconic sights and attractions of a destination, the friendly person who went that extra mile to help, whether they were a hotel receptionist, waiter or bus driver, the grumpy landlord, the churlish shop assistant, or the Tourist Information Centre assistant who took the stress and strain out of booking accommodation and travel?

As a destination manager, the researcher spent many years and much energy working to encourage product providers in her destination to focus on customer care skills for all staff, not just the obvious front line staff such as receptions, so that the visitor would take away an enhanced image of the destination as well as of the individual hotel, guest house, attractions, museum or other facility. The destination took part in the usual destination benchmarking exercises on a regular basis, where a random sample of visitors were asked to rank various predetermined attributes of the destination such as service, availability and quality of attractions and facilities, and ease of getting there. However, this seemed to be at one remove, and did not deliver any understanding of what had brought the visitors in the first place or how their experience in the destination had affected the way they thought about it and how they would talk about their experience to friends and family – that all-important word of mouth publicity.

Whilst the researcher is a fairly outgoing person, the process of interviewing was somewhat daunting. Not so much obtaining access to interview locations, as her contacts in destination management greatly facilitated this, but in approaching total strangers and then maintaining a high level of concentration through the interviews, balancing the desire to keep conversation flowing with the need to ensure she did not lead or influence the interviewee. It is interesting to note that one or two interviewees openly expressed concern as to whether they were providing useful or “the right” information, and several more expressed the hope at the end of the interview that they had been able to help. This emphasises the fact that the interview is a social interaction, where the majority of people are inclined to be helpful, and so feel a need to know whether their contribution has been acceptable. This does pose the question as to whether what they say is
motivated by a feeling of what may be regarded as socially acceptable; in this instance, there were sufficient cases where the researcher felt a greater or lesser degree of personal discomfort as a result of some of the opinions expressed for this to be discounted as a factor in the analysis and interpretation.

As discussed in Guthrie (2007), the chosen approach has sometimes left the researcher feeling overwhelmed by the complexity of the processes emerging both from the literature and the data, the volume of data, and the constant concern as to whether she was maintaining consistency and/or carrying out the analysis in a rigorous and truthful manner. However, being able to trace her thinking through the memos, coding and searches recorded in NVivo has proved very helpful. Ultimately it has been a rewarding process in that the visitor stories were as rich as anticipated and, in contrast to the benchmarking surveys, the researcher feels she has achieved a more in depth understanding of the way visitors approach and make sense of their interactions with and within a destination.

6.9 Reflections on the PhD Journey

Having reflected above on the methodology and research approach taken in this study, it is appropriate to give space to consideration and reflection on the overall research journey, before moving on to the detailed analysis and discussion of the interview data and findings presented in the following chapters.

The PhD research student can be compared to a journeyman craftsman working on the masterpiece which will decide whether or not he/she will be accepted into the guild (Guthrie, 2007). As noted earlier in this thesis, Hollinshead (1996) argues that the tourism researcher should be a bricoleur, using a variety of different methods and techniques to create a research design suited to the research question in hand. This interpretation of bricoleur goes beyond the literal translation from the French meaning of handyman to imply the creative aesthetic of the craftsman. These closing reflections explore the analogy between the postgraduate research journey and the artisan transition from apprentice to journeyman to member of the academic guild.

The notion of researcher as craftsman, or artisan, is not new. Hermann Hesse recognised the scholar and craftsman as two sides of the same coin and possibly of his own personality, in his novel *Narziss and Goldmund*:
“... a thinker strives to find out the essence of the world by means of logic, and so to define it. He knows that our understanding, and logic, its instrument, are imperfect tools with which to work-just as any skilled craftsman knows very well that no brush or chisel ever made, could give the perfect, shining form of a saint or angel. Yet both these, the thinkers and craftsmen, strive to do it, each in his own way.”

(Hesse, 1971, pp.267-268)

Artisans pursue the creative marriage of form and function, design, materials, tools and techniques to enable them to realise the vision which inspired them. That vision might not be fully fashioned at the start of the enterprise, only revealing itself fully as the work is completed. The academic researcher starts with a question, which can only be satisfactorily resolved by marrying appropriate research methods and techniques. That question may not be a fully formed research aim with objectives and questions at the start of the journey, but will become clarified as the project develops, and the researcher learns more about how subject and material respond to the techniques being used. Whether a complete original or a new view of a familiar subject, the finished work of artisan and researcher should resonate with their intended audience as capturing and explaining some aspect of their subject; although the finished research product must be rigorously informed, the unique fusion of method, data and researcher means that it is, in many ways, as much art as science.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994a, 2003a) describe the qualitative researcher as a bricoleur who puts together different views or voices to create a new vision. Their bricoleur researcher selects from different methods and techniques, within and between competing or overlapping research paradigms and sees research as an interactive process shaped by a myriad of factors including history, personal history, social setting, gender and so on. The qualitative researcher’s philosophical standpoint determines the choice of methodology and research design just as the artisan’s approach to their craft is influenced by their fundamental beliefs: in the Bauhaus ethos, form follows function, or in the cubist school multiple perspectives are depicted simultaneously in the one object.

In the medieval craft guilds, apprentices lived and worked in the workshops of their masters, learning the simple tools and tasks of the trade, following the masters’ procedures and patterns (Wolek, 1999). The academic apprenticeship for most researchers begins in the undergraduate years: they are introduced to academic writing, literature searches, use of references, learning the accepted models, standard approaches to completing assignments. At postgraduate level there is an advanced apprenticeship where the basic academic skills are refreshed and sometimes added to
trade specific skills acquired from practitioner experience. There may also be new skills and tools to acquire, such as referencing and analysis software packages. The postgraduate dissertation represents the first steps along the road to crafting new, rather than reformulating existing, knowledge.

Apprenticeship complete, the research student sets off on their journeyman travels. Medieval journeymen would travel around Europe, spending time in the workshops of different masters to learn about all aspects of their chosen craft: not simply the technical tricks of the trade, but also the commercial and other skills necessary for them to set up and run their own workshops. The PhD student may not travel about in quite the same way, but they still sit at the feet of acknowledged masters, whether in the specific discipline or in the craft of research itself. The literature review and methodology chapters of doctoral theses are a distillation of these different sojourns and the way they have shaped not only the research project, but the student’s development as a researcher.

The qualitative research journey resembles that of a medieval journeyman mason: wandering from one cathedral to another and back again, as the researcher seeks to understand not only the body of work in the subject, but where he/she is situated in relation to tourism knowledge and knowledge in general. Convinced that the limitations of using structured instruments meant that visitors’ real thoughts would not be captured (Walle, 1997), this researcher knew from the outset that she wanted to investigate the impact of destination interactions on visitor perceptions and destination image by interviewing visitors while they were in the destination, to hear their stories. Consequently she spent many hours in the cathedral of qualitative methodology, puzzling over the different forms and styles, trying to decide which branch of the methodological craft would be best suited to the research question and her standpoint. The breakthrough came when a fellow research student in a completely different discipline suggested investigating phenomenology. Reading Van Manen’s account of capturing lived experience produced the sensation of coming home (van Manen, 1990). Here was a methodology which chimed with the desire to capture visitor experience before it became overlaid with the accretions of memory, to allow that experience to emerge from the data, and identify themes which would lead to an understanding of how destination interactions affect visitor perceptions and image. The researcher had not finished the journey, but the route had become much clearer.

Irrespective of actual methodology, with qualitative analysis the emphasis is on the reiterative nature of the process. The journeyman researcher has to learn to move from
detailed inspection and interrogation of the data to stepping back to see the larger, conceptual issues, and back again in much the same way that an artist or sculptor might concentrate on a particular detail before stepping back to consider the whole composition, or the mason from the detail of a gargoyle to totality of the cathedral it serves. Creswell (1998) refers to this as the analytic spiral. The experience of this study has been that the journeyman researcher not only circles to and fro between data and analysis, but between all the elements of the research project. At times, it seems as if each journal article or book chapter read leads to revisiting not only that particular area of the literature review or methodology, but to looking with fresh eyes at what has been uncovered in the data. Similarly, new questions or insights from the interview data send one questing through the literature again, as hearing about new techniques might send an enthusiastic journeyman to yet another craft master. The journey is therefore anything but linear; more often it meanders from place to place, craft hall to craft hall, but always with the underlying purpose of acquiring more knowledge, more skill and more experience. After each foray, the researcher returns to the magnum opus, looks at it in a new light, adds something here, chips away at something there, remoulds it or polishes it – always challenging the work with what has been learned.

6.10 Conclusion

This chapter has set out the methodological approach to this research which flowed from the ontological and epistemological concerns discussed in Chapter Two, and the research problems identified through the literature review in Chapters Three, Four and Five. It has revisited the debate surrounding the use of qualitative methods for tourism research. In giving a brief account of the largely quantitative approaches used in tourism image research, it has pointed to two issues relating to sample populations used and the inability of positivist data collection techniques to capture the “How” and “Why” questions in relation to destination image and experience. Following from the exposition of phenomenology in Chapter Two, it has explained the phenomenological methods and techniques to be used in collecting and analysing the data, and detailed the specific choices of location, sample size and interview style, summarised in Table 6.9. The latter part of the chapter has discussed the overall approach taken to analysing the interview data, discussed the merits of using computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) and the steps taken to minimise the disadvantage, and explained how the particular NVivo 2.0, the particular package chosen, has been used. Finally, the
The researcher has reflected on the methodological approach and research design, and on the overall PhD journey.

### Table 6.9: Summary of Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Approach</th>
<th>Interpretive phenomenology</th>
<th>To understand nature and process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Locations</strong></td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3 sites in each</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>56 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interview Style</strong></td>
<td>Informal, conversational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recorded and transcribed verbatim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key and field notes taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analytical Approach</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interview transcripts imported into QSR NVivo 2.0</strong></td>
<td>For ease of data management and interrogation, and creation of audit trail for confirmability and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reiterative reading and re-reading, from parts to whole and back again – the analytic spiral</strong></td>
<td>To allow categories and themes to emerge, and to integrate parts with the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Constant checking</strong></td>
<td>To ensure openness to disconfirmatory findings and anomalies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SEVEN
Analysis

7.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters have discussed the literature on tourism destination image, motivation and experience, developing and setting out the research questions, and proposing a phenomenological approach as a means of understanding the processes whereby the visitor makes sense of their destination experience. The previous chapter considered in detail the specific research design and approach to data collection. This chapter sets out the analysis of the interview data, explaining the development of various descriptive and analytical categories and demonstrating how they assist in furthering an understanding of the various factors which mediate the sense-making process. Given the interpretive approach taken to the analysis, these sections contain some comment on and interpretation of the findings. However, the full discussion of the findings in the wider context of the existing literature, and further discussion of the sense making and sense giving model, is presented in Chapter Eight.

This chapter addresses each of the four research questions, set out in Chapters One and Six. The reiterative nature of the analytical approach, discussed in Chapter Six, is such that there is a degree of overlap between the sections as the analysis builds from the initial descriptive categories to the presentation of the complex nature of the sense giving and sense making process. The analysis begins with a set of descriptive categories, derived from the data, which address the first research question and illustrate the elements of the destination experience. This is followed by a further exploration of the inter-relationship between these categories to address the second research question. This suggests that visitors can be categorised into one of three ideal types, based on the relationship between consumption styles and selections styles, or approaches to experiencing the destination: Gourmets, Grazers or Gourmands. To address the third research question, these ideal types are used as a means to examine the impact of interactions with people and place both on visitors’ destination experience and the way they appear to make sense of that experience. Finally, the fourth research question is answered by arguing that predispositions, anticipations, experience and sense making interact to form a continuous, dynamic cycle of visitor experience. Each element of the cycle will differ from holiday to holiday and visitor to visitor, but the process remains, mediated by the individual’s particular mix of anticipations, predispositions, interactions and experience.
7.1.1 Stories, Anecdotes and Narratives

As discussed in the previous chapter, the aim of the interviews was to encourage interviewees to talk about their destination experiences in such a way as to enable the researcher to capture their lived experience. As the study focussed on specific research questions relating to the elements of destination interaction, visitor perceptions and characteristics, it was considered helpful to have three key interview questions to act as conversation starting points and elicit interviewees’ stories, anecdotes or narratives about their destination experiences.

In this study, a distinction is made between a story, which is usually conceived as having a defined shape (beginning, middle, end) and internal logic, and narrative, which is broader, encompassing all forms of retelling of experience, regardless of degree of detail, defined shape as in story, or purpose. It is argued that all the interviews are narratives about the interviewee’s experience. For example, the response to “What would you say about...?” tended to be a narrative, being a process of describing what and how they would talk about the destination to people back home. Similarly, the response to “Why did you choose...?” also invited a narrative, in that the interviewees were then recounting their expectations and motivations - rarely a story, but definitely a description of the process whereby they came to visit the particular destination. In contrast, when talking about the memories they might carry away, half the interviewees recounted anecdotes about specific incidents or encounters.

These key questions were also used as part of the first broad coding of the interview transcripts. Each Edinburgh interview transcript was read to identify text which broadly referred to Expectations, Experience or Perceptions. Within these broad categories, free nodes were used to capture ideas or topics. Subsequently, as associations and connections began to suggest themselves, the nodes were formed into a tree structure to reflect these groupings. This tree structure was then used alongside the three broad questions for the initial coding of the Greenwich interviews, but was not rigid in the sense that as new data suggested either new nodes or possibilities, the node tree could be amended to incorporate the changes. A fuller explanation of the different types of nodes in NVivo 2.0, together with the various ways in which the data can be interrogated through different types of search (matrix, union, intersection), is given in the Technical Glossary at Appendix 1. With the exception of initial categories of Expectations, Experience and Perceptions noted above, all the categories discussed in this analysis emerged from
within the data as opposed to being imposed by the researcher. However, it should be noted that not all nodes were “in vivo”, i.e. named from a phrase or word which recurs in the transcripts.

This chapter, then, provides the analysis of the interviews following that initial broad reading and coding of the transcripts. The early sections of the chapter consider the categories/nodes which capture the elements of the destination experience, followed by a discussion of the ways in which the various elements combine to form part of the sense-making and sense-giving processes, i.e. how they become the stories that visitors tell about their destination interactions and experience.

7.2 Elements of the Destination Experience

This section addresses the first research question “What are the key elements of visitor-destination interactions?” by setting out the categories which emerged from the interviews: Anticipations, Holiday Attitude, Interactive Mode, Motivations, Place, People, and Reactions, together with any sub categories where these emerged. It also begins to address the second research question, “How do these elements of the visitor-destination interaction relate to visitor characteristics and motivations?” in that it starts to uncover the ways in which these categories are linked to visitor characteristics and motivations. In this section, and throughout the analysis, interviewees are referred to in the text by name followed by interview transcript reference. In the tables, only the interview transcript reference is cited, except where the extract is taken from an interview with more than one person and includes comments from both interviewees, when the names are used to distinguish between them.

7.2.1 Anticipations

Visitors have a variety of sources through which they acquire information and ideas about a destination, as has been well documented (Chapter Three), and which create anticipations or expectations about what they will find or experience. The interview question “What made you choose Edinburgh/Greenwich? What did you expect to find?” drew out a range of responses relating to tangible destination attributes which determined the visitor’s anticipations, such as attractions and facilities, stereotypical images or impressions, and information gathered from formal and informal sources. Figure 7.1 shows an excerpt from the NVivo 2.0 node tree showing the nodes categorising these
responses: Destination Attributes, Stereotypes, Previous Experience and the three main types of External Reference. The following sections give a short account of the development and characteristics of these categories.

![Anticipations](image.png)

7.2.1.1 Destination Attributes
The examples given in Table 7.1 show that interviewees tended to talk in general terms about the choice of things to see and do in the destination, with little specific detail relating to particular places. Unsurprisingly for two destinations marketed over the years for their historic associations and visitor attractions, there was frequent mention of history and other cultural attributes. In Edinburgh, numerous interviewees mentioned the Castle, the Royal Mile and museums and galleries, whilst in Greenwich interviewees talked about the connections with time, the meridian and maritime history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>Contains comments about buildings, weather, facilities in the destination known about in advance of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice of things to see and do:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01</td>
<td>“the shopping and lots of facilities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-02</td>
<td>“there’s a lot of places to visit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03</td>
<td>“there’s loads of things to see”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-05</td>
<td>“it’s a place with lots of culture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-01</td>
<td>“it’s more about things to do than people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-07</td>
<td>“Really old, pretty cities, having lots of lovely old buildings”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-03</td>
<td>“Well it’s the capital I suppose. You know, people say how nice it is, with the buildings and so on”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-06</td>
<td>“Just that there are lots of things to do, like museums, and it’s very naval, isn’t it?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1 Cont: Destination Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>Contains comments about buildings, weather, facilities in the destination known about in advance of visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical/cultural attributes: Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-02</td>
<td>“there’s vast amounts of history, you’ve got a lot of tourist sights… the Castle, the heritage centres and so on…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-06</td>
<td>“…so many galleries in a small area, also we’ve been drawing in the Castle and drawing in the Botanical Gardens…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02</td>
<td>“Oh I expected a lot of history, the Castle, kind of stuff like that. Potted history.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-04</td>
<td>“Well I expected something older, and older is certainly what I got.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/cultural attributes: Greenwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-11</td>
<td>“Essentially, the maritime college and its remarkable baroque architecture. Also, I suppose, the long naval traditions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-19</td>
<td>“…things to do with the sea, you know, the maritime industry…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-24</td>
<td>“the museum, the Observatory, Cutty Sark and the navy and buildings.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-30</td>
<td>“the usual historical things, Greenwich Mean Time, the meridian, the time ball station.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1.2 Stereotypes

Just under one third of interviewees appeared to have some stereotypical images of aspects of the destination, giving rise to this node, which is illustrated in Table 7.2. Some of these, mainly from overseas visitors, were in relation to expectations of poor weather. Others were more cultural, with interviewees talking about a romantic view of Scotland, for example, or other cultural icons such as the British bobby. It is interesting to note that despite efforts over recent years to balance the image of Edinburgh as a historic city with an emphasis on its more contemporary attractions, interviewees in Edinburgh did have the impression before their visit that there was much to see and do, including shopping, eating and drinking, but were mainly concentrating on the historical attractions, the “must see” places like the Castle, the Old Town and the Royal Yacht Britannia. This may have been a factor of the interview locations, which were mainly in heritage attractions, and of the time of year (October). It is possible, for example, that had interviews been carried out during the International Festival and the Fringe, there might have been a greater number of younger visitors who would have been more interested in and aware of the cosmopolitan attractions in the city.
Table 7.2: Stereotypical Anticipations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>References to a stereotypical image or behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weather and climate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-06</td>
<td>“Colder than the south”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02</td>
<td>“probably miserable weather.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-09</td>
<td>“I think what always put me off was the rain, and the weather, the bad weather”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-04</td>
<td>“I think we still had a picture of it as kind of a foggy, rainy, dismal place, and we did come in March last time so I would guess it was colder, but it wasn’t so rainy, but not foggy, and not… I guess that kind of Victorian image still carries through sometimes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03</td>
<td>“But you know I kind of wanted to go, once you come to Scotland, what you think in your mind is the Monarch of the Glen, I love that series. So that’s kind of where I wanted to go, I wanted to stay in a hotel which is an old castle, or whatever, next to the loch. You know, you look for the mountains, and you can walk, and you can smell the fresh air”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-02</td>
<td>“I guess, too, you get all the legends of Scotland, that intrigues me as well. It’s the Rob Roy stuff, the Loch Ness monster, and if you go there, you can say “Oh yeah, I’ve been to Loch Ness”. It’s all that stuff as well. Yeah, the stuff of legends.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-08</td>
<td>“I thought the English, the bobbies particularly, had a reputation for helpfulness.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1.3 Previous Experience

The node Previous Experience developed from a free node “Been before”. Initially it was a tightly focused category, containing only references to having been in the specific destination before, but as some interviewees cited experience of similar places, the definition was broadened to encompass this aspect. A third of interviewees were making repeat visits either to the specific destination (Edinburgh, Greenwich) or to the surrounding destinations of Scotland or London. Half the Edinburgh interviewees were making a repeat visit, mainly to Edinburgh rather than Scotland, whereas only nine of the 36 Greenwich interviewees had been either to London or Greenwich before, and the majority of those had been to London. In most instances, either the person or couple had enjoyed their previous visit and wanted to see the things they had not been able to fit in on the previous visit, or one partner had visited or stayed before and was sharing their enjoyment with the other partner. Illustrative quotations are given in Table 7.3.
Table 7.3: Previous Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>References indicating previous experience, either of the specific destination/attraction or similar ones, as influencing interviewee expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeat visit</td>
<td>“We came to Edinburgh last year it was about May, wasn’t it (to Jean who confirms) for about three or four days… And we enjoyed it, so we thought…” “Well, we’ve been a couple of times before in the summer when the Festival is on.” “We’ve been here before and, um, twice before, and when we got back home… Well, the first time we came because we hadn’t been to Scotland and we kept saying, “We must come”. We did, and we liked it so much, this is our third time” “…having been here before, I mean, I think my expectations were pretty much to be able to see a lot of historical sites, and I remembered that it was very easy to get around, and, um, not such wonderful food” “Well, the atmosphere in London in general is very nice. I came a long time ago, twenty five years ago, and I had forgotten the atmosphere, and it was very pleasant to come back into it.” “So my wife wanted to come here, so we can finish off what we didn’t see last year.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>“We found that that street, we went there last night, that you found when you came a few months ago, where all those bars and that were”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.1.4 External Reference Sources
This node and its subcategories are illustrated in Table 7.4. From their answers to the question “What made you choose Edinburgh/Greenwich? What did you expect to find“, interviewees’ anticipations appeared to have been coloured in part by information or impressions of the destination derived formally or informally from three main sources: word of mouth recommendations or stories from friends, family and colleagues; standard information sources such as guidebooks, information centres or the internet; and images or information provided through the media, i.e. films, television or the newspapers. Twenty two interviewees had used some form of guidebook or the internet. Guidebooks and the internet seemed to be used for factual information, or ideas for what to do and where to stay, but in some instances, word of mouth and media images seemed to have had more influence on what the interviewee anticipated finding in the destination, or at least to have prompted the interviewee to talk more about this aspect. Word of mouth falls into specific referral, where the interviewee had been told about a particular site, attraction or destination by a friend or relative, and a more general form of having “heard about” it. There were also a few instances of media influenced expectations. In Edinburgh, interviewees referred to specific films or television programmes such as
Trainspotting and Monarch of the Glen, whereas Greenwich interviewees referred more to general documentaries or films on history or London.

Table 7.4: External Reference Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Visit Information (39% of interviewees)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-04</td>
<td>“I looked at a couple of web sites, the VisitScotland one and I think there’s another Edinburgh web site, the Edinburgh and Lothians”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-05</td>
<td>“had a look at quite a few web sites just trying to find out things to go see when we were here”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-01</td>
<td>“We bought a Scotland guide, the AA Scotland guide, we have a look on maps and things like that”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-01</td>
<td>“we’ve done a lot of research on the Internet and travel books”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-02</td>
<td>“by getting things from the British Tourist Authority, to read up about maybe places and probably maps”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-27</td>
<td>“We’ve got the Lonely Planet guide”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word of mouth (62.5% of interviewees)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01</td>
<td>“So I said, ‘Yeah, let’s go to Edinburgh, ’cos I’ve never heard anybody that I know that’s been here say a bad word about it. They’ve always said it’s a fantastic place, nice people, plenty to do and fantastic, great shops”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03</td>
<td>“Everybody told me that Edinburgh is a beautiful town and they are absolutely right, the town is beautiful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-05</td>
<td>“And a lot of people, a lot of Kiwis, who we know from back home always rave about it and say its such a lovely place… and you know, most people I’ve spoken to have tons of good things to say about it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02</td>
<td>“My girlfriend came in May and really had a good time in May.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-04</td>
<td>“one of the internet mechanisms that was helpful for us in choosing a place to stay in Edinburgh was tripecon.com, where people do submit their personal reviews.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-03</td>
<td>“I found out about Greenwich because my husband was born in England, and he’s been here before. It was a childhood day out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-09</td>
<td>“We were told by people who live in London, two different sets of people, “Oh, do go to Greenwich”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-17</td>
<td>“we knew that there was a maritime museum here and we’d heard it was very nice here”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-21</td>
<td>“Our daughter suggested we come”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-34</td>
<td>“a friend back home said “Oh don’t forget to go to” and that probably twigged the memory”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Influence (21% of interviewees)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01</td>
<td>“we’d seen programmes about the Royal Mile”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03</td>
<td>“I think the way I think of Scotland is because of the Monarch of the Glen. I just love that series. The scenery is so gorgeous, it is so brilliant, so if I think about Scotland, that’s what I think about.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-08</td>
<td>“I visualised Trainspotting, I think… Because I suppose it’s the preconception I’ve got of the fact that, you know, drugs and alcohol, and you know, and I know it’s probably not that bad, but it’s this preconception, that you imagine that, you know, you’re going turn every corner and there’ll either be somebody drunk or, you know, drugs, or something.” “I suppose things I’ve read in the press as well, the fact that, you know, I’ve read things about the fact that Scotland has high incidences of alcoholism and drug addiction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-01</td>
<td>“we stopped at Oxford Street, went to Margaret Street to see All Saints Church because Andrew Lloyd Webber had done a docco (documentary) on it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-27</td>
<td>“I knew about … sort of… the longitude zero, and some of the naval history. Certainly I’d seen quite a few images of the place in various documentaries over the years” “it’s things we’ve seen on TV”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.2 Holiday Attitude

This placeholder node consists of four nodes containing text which indicates the way interviewees seemed to approach their holiday experience: Free and Easy, Planning and Prioritising, Seeks Reassurance and Welcomes the Exotic. These nodes and their definitions are presented in Table 7.5, together with representative quotations from a number of interviews.

Table 7.5: Holiday Attitude

| Planning and Prioritising | Interviewees talking about how and why they plan their visit - the wish list of things to do, the constraints which contribute to their priorities: “we have our Edinburgh guide book with us and that’s what we’ve chosen things from, because we’re only here until Friday, so we’ve only really got two days…” (E-RYB-03, Para. 102) "I think you’ve got to have a shopping list, yeah, what you want to do, where you want to go.” (G-02, Para. 138) |
| Free and Easy | Interviewee comments indicating a flexible attitude to what they see and do on holiday, for example not necessarily planning out every day, reacting to circumstance, being able and willing to play it by ear, so to speak: “…we just tend to get an idea and think let’s go. Let’s do it.” (E-Castle-01, Para. 65) “we were just flying it day by day, .. so no research at all” (E-RYB-07, Para. 27) “You can’t be too rigid; sometimes, you’re better off being a bit flexible. Wake up in the morning, see what the weather’s like and then decide what you want to do.” (G-02, Para. 131) |
| Welcomes the Exotic | References to finding, seeking and delighting in the exotic or unusual: “It’s fascinating still to see how other people live, their culture, their way of life.” (E-Castle-01, Para. 131) “And we’re delighted to speak to locals. Sometimes we do, it just happens, and that’s fascinating, that’s part of the experience, and it just makes you feel the different cultures, I love that.” (G-9, Para. 48) |
| Seeks Reassurance | Indicates interviewee looking for guidance/reassurance either from tour guides, hosts, or other sources of information such as web sites, guide books, interpretation materials: “you never feel lost. You’ve always got a landmark, a major landmark, something you can see and say, “Oh yes, I know where I want to be, I want to go up there.” (E-Castle-06, Para. 121) “Because I’m a vegan, I’m particularly interested in the restaurants and wherever we go, we have to kind of design our day so that we can be near restaurants at the end of the day we can feel good about. You know, London’s got loads of good restaurants, and I actually sent away for the vegetarian book on London,” (G-10, Para. 78) |

Some interviewees were relaxed and easygoing, whereas others are more organised, planning and prioritising the things they want to see and do whilst in the destination. It became apparent that these are not mutually exclusive, in that some interviews contained examples of more than one attitude. For example, Toni (G-31) uses guide books and the
Internet to plan what she wants to see and do, has a list of places in London to see, but once in Greenwich:

“I’m on my way there now, to see the Observatory, now I’ve wandered around the little market, you know, and took a look at the Cutty Sark and now, I’m going to the Observatory.”

(G-31, Para. 6)

It is possible that these nodes may be the opposite ends of two continuums, one between Free and Easy and Planning and Prioritising, the other between Seeks Reassurance and Welcomes the Exotic, and that individuals may exhibit attitudes at different points on the continuum depending upon the interplay of other factors such as motivations, travel party composition, constraints and even the particular type of holiday or destination. This will be developed and explored further in Section 7.3.3 in the context of strategies used to experience the destination.

7.2.3 Interactive Mode

This node was originally labelled Holiday Behaviour, as the initial reading of the Edinburgh transcripts indicated that interviewees had preferences for how they wanted to behave whilst in the destination, whether they wanted to learn, were content to watch or observe or wanted to engage more actively. On reflection, it appeared that these were in fact different ways in which the interviewees preferred to interact with the destination experience. The node was therefore renamed Interactive Mode, with four child nodes Engaging, Spectating, Learning, and Observing. These and their summary definitions are shown in Table 7.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>References which indicate that the interviewee wants to share in, take part in, the experience on offer in the destination - not watch from the outside</td>
<td>30 (12 domestic, 18 overseas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>References to interviewees wanting to learn from their interactions with the destination - learn about history, about the “other”.</td>
<td>15 (8 domestic, 7 overseas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>References to interviewees noticing what’s around in the destination or situation and commenting on it, rather than simply gazing at or on.</td>
<td>11 (2 domestic, 9 overseas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectating</td>
<td>References which seem to indicate that the interviewee prefers to watch rather than take part in the experiences in the destination</td>
<td>7 (3 domestic, 4 overseas)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that these nodes are not mutually exclusive. Rather, in a similar fashion to the
nodes discussed above under Holiday Attitude, they can be taken as stages along a
continuum, and interviewees may demonstrate different interactive modes in relation to
different destination experiences or interactions. For example, a matrix intersection
search showed that 18 interviews contained text coded both to Engaging and to one of the
three aspects of Place experience (Sense of History, Making Connections, Atmosphere)
presented in section 7.2.5, whilst a similar search showed that 16 interviews contained
text coded both to Engaging and to aspects of People experience (Welcome, Crowds,
Language) presented in section 7.2.6. Of those, 9 interviewees were talking about the
way direct encounters with destination residents or hosts made them feel welcome. By
contrast, comments relating to crowds were largely about the presence of crowds
interfering with the interviewee's ability to engage with the experience. This will be
explored further in the discussion of tourist/tourist interactions in section 7.4.1. Similarly,
Learning is related to the motivation of Self Enhancement, and will be discussed below.

7.2.4 Motivations

This node was originally a free node, created to hold references to the reasons
interviewees gave for coming to the destination, and the benefits they seemed to want
from this particular holiday or visit. As the categorisation progressed, Motivations became
a placeholder node, containing seven sorts of motivations which had emerged from the
interviewees' conversation about their destination experiences (Figure 7.2). The following
sections briefly describe and illustrate each of these categories. However, it is noticeable
that the interviewees rarely expressed only one motivational factor, but rather appeared to
have a mixture of motivations.

Figure 7.2: Motivations

- Getting closer
- Self enhancement
- Something different
- Comfort
- Seeking Value
- always wanted to go
- Escape
7.2.4.1 Getting Closer

It was evident from the initial reading of the interview transcripts that the desire to get closer to the past, through seeing buildings and artefacts, was an important factor for many interviewees. This was more evident among overseas visitors: 24 interviews with overseas visitors contained references to this, compared with 12 interviews with domestic visitors. The other strand in this node was the interest expressed by some interviewees in getting closer to their own family heritage, or to artefacts and buildings which had meaning in their own lives and backgrounds. Table 7.7 gives a flavour of the extracts coded to this node. Getting Closer is the most frequent motivation among these interviewees, with 36 interviews of the 56 containing extracts coded to this node. As will be demonstrated later, in Section 7.4, deeper analysis shows this motivation to be closely related to aspects of experience such as Making Connections, a Sense of History and the impact of other people.

Table 7.7: Getting Closer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node definition</th>
<th>References to getting closer either to history and culture, or to roots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting closer to the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01, Para. 91</td>
<td>“Just seeing, well as much as you can nowadays, how it once was, how people once lived in the underground dwellings, that sort of thing, yeah, enjoyed that.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-06, Para. 65</td>
<td>“I like going round houses where you’ve got everyday artefacts and you can see the servants’ lives and things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-08, Para. 60</td>
<td>“You get a concept of what it’s like living in one of those tall buildings…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-11, Para. 38</td>
<td>“I read a bit about the history, naval history, of the eighteenth century and so you feel “Those people were here”, the ones history is all about and you see their names.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-19, Para. 58</td>
<td>“ seeing the coat, the coat Nelson wore, and the actual bullet hole”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Getting closer to own heritage or background | |
| E-Castle-05, Paras. 77-82 | “Carol: Well in New Zealand really we have no kind of history like this. I mean, we’re… Barbara: We’re only, what, 200 years old? Carol: Well, the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1870 and before that, like, we had oral history from the Maori people but nothing was recorded like it is here, so its quite fascinating for us to be able to trace into that, where our people came from…” |
| G-29, Para. 6 | “I was a flight attendant for a long time and we always used GMT, so I just sort of wanted to see where it came from.” |
| G-31, Para.14 | “Yeah, there’s a company in the United States that makes miniatures, ok, and they do all sorts like different things and one of them is the Observatory. So the little Observatory is in my house, so I wanted to see it here.” |
| G-32, Para. 35 | “Science, the whole Greenwich Mean Time, that sort of thing. I’ve been dealing with that all my working life, just about, and to see the source of it and also the naval college.” |
7.2.4.2 Self Enhancement

The concepts of ego enhancement and self image as motivations for travel and tourism were discussed in Chapter 4. Twenty three interviewees appeared to be partly motivated by a desire to take part in activities or visit attractions which could be described as contributing in some way to self improvement or learning, either in their own eyes or those of other people. This was expressed in a number of ways, illustrated in Table 7.8, and was also related to the Interactive Mode Learning, as mentioned above.

Table 7.8: Self Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node definition</th>
<th>Comments indicating interviewee wants to improve self, either by learning or doing something they or others would see as self enhancing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting historical/cultural attractions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01, Para. 37</td>
<td>“And the architecture, we love architecture, museums and all such things. We don’t just lie on beaches, we don’t do beach holidays, I’ve done that years ago”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-04, Para. 119</td>
<td>“I think, things to do, as well. Somewhere that’s got a bit of culture and a bit of history, or somewhere where you can go out and walk in the countryside. We went to the Lakes, didn’t we? “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to learn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-04, Para. 43</td>
<td>“Just for the perspective, I think, that it gives on your own particular place in history, and how we got here, all of us, and where we might be going from here, in that nothing is ever really new again, its all just the same patterns going over again.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-20, Para. 10</td>
<td>“We were thinking when we get home, we must look that up… because we’ve lost our sequence of time, because if Trafalgar was 2005, that means… when Napoleon was defeated that was that year, how come he was in Russia in 1812? Not 2005, you know, 1805. And so we’re thinking “We must go home and check some of our dates, because we’ve got a bit of a mishmash there that doesn’t compute” So it’s giving us food for thought for other things.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-02, Para. 63</td>
<td>“It’s just nice to broaden your horizons, to be able to say “I’ve been here, and I’ve done that” and it just gives you more of a scope when you’re talking to people. You can say, “Oh yeah, I’ve been there and I know about this and I know about that.””</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-07, Para. 71</td>
<td>“Yes, um, I think anything where I learn something new is worthwhile, so anytime I go through a building and see something I haven’t seen before, or I go to an exhibit and there’s something I did not know about before, then that falls into the category of worthwhile. It’s interesting and part of what has created a pleasant day for me.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desire to learn also seemed to be a desire to broaden one’s horizons, whether in terms of breadth of experience or depth of knowledge. Wendy (G-20) had a positive thirst for knowledge and was racking up a list of facts to check when she got home, whereas for
others, the broadening of horizons seemed to be more connected with self esteem, a feeling that it is important to be well travelled and/or knowledgeable and that this distinguishes the interviewee in some way. For example, Paula (G-01) saved her money to be able to travel from Australia to the UK, but was aware that this set her apart from others in her family:

“there are very few of the family who would say, “Oh, we’ll go with Aunty Jemima on the trip”. They’re quite happy to just tour their own country, they have no interest in coming over here…”

(G-01, Para. 15)

7.2.4.3 Something Different
It became apparent that a number of interviewees saw going on holiday as a chance to do or experience something different with twenty two interviews containing references coded to this node. As the extracts in Table 7.9 illustrate, some interviewees had chosen a different type of holiday or destination, whereas others appeared to be more in search of, or expecting to find difference, whether in language or culture. This was in the main a positive motivation, as opposed to Escape (see section 7.2.4.7) which seemed to be more negative.

Table 7.9: Something Different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node definition</th>
<th>References to going on holiday to do/find something different to the ordinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different holiday/destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-02, Para. 134</td>
<td>“…from now on we’re on our own and we’ll book as we go, and being off season we figure that we shouldn’t have too much trouble, and d’you know, we’ve never done that in Australia? Never, have we? We’ve always had where we’re going, and its always been all paid for and we can just relax. But we’re going to relax. It’s just something totally different for us.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-27, Para. 44</td>
<td>“Well, our other big holidays have been to Hawaii. Totally different.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para. 50</td>
<td>“When you’re a school teacher and you’ve always been trapped into July and August, at least that’s the Canadian holidays. This [being newly retired] allows us to travel at a time when we know its going to be a little less busy,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different culture/experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01, Para. 127</td>
<td>“You go to different places to learn about different cultures; if they’re the same as you, why bother going, that’s what I always say.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-08, Para. 78</td>
<td>“when you go to Aberdeen, you feel you’re in Scotland sort of more than most, … you do feel you are in another country with a different culture and a sort of different … whereas in Edinburgh you don’t feel as removed from where you’ve come from, if you know what I mean”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4.4 Comfort
Physical or psychological aspects of comfort seemed to be important motivations for some 21 interviewees, either as a factor in choosing a destination or activities, or in talking
about their reactions to elements of the destination experience. From the quotations in Table 7.10, it can be seen that physical comfort includes aspects of the destination such as food and drink, the quality of accommodation, the weather. Psychological comfort seems to relate to some aspects of familiarity with the destination, culture or customs, and seems to be linked to a degree with feelings of safety as part of the destination experience of Place, as well as to previous knowledge or experience. As will be discussed later, concern for the physical and/or psychological comfort, either of the interviewee or their travelling companion(s) is also a factor in tourist interactions.

Table 7.10: Comfort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>Comments indicating either physical or psychological comfort/security are a factor in reasons for going on holiday or choice of destination.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-02, Para. 83, E-RYB-08, Para. 146</td>
<td>“We like a bit of luxury, don’t we?” “It’s built around good food, good wine, and a relaxing time, and the surroundings, really.”  “also this time of year to have a city break than a countryside one, as it had rained on our countryside break in August, so we thought we’d do a city one and then if it rained you could sit in somewhere…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-08, Para. 35, E-SW-02, Para. 136</td>
<td>“I think because I felt more comfortable. When we came last year, I did actually feel, a couple of times we were out late, you know, I was a bit wary, whereas now I’m more comfortable. Although, there are instances when I hear, like people shouting and that, I’m a bit on edge. Because I suppose it’s the preconception I’ve got of the fact that, you know, drugs and alcohol, and you know, and I know it’s probably not that bad, but it’s this preconception, that you imagine that, you know, you’re going turn every corner and there’ll either be somebody drunk or, you know, drugs, or something.” “We’re just a bit apprehensive here as we’ve not driven on the roads and they’re a little bit narrow and how far we’re going get in a day, is there going to be a place for us they can put us..”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4.5 Seeking Value
This node developed from an initial free node labelled Value for Money which arose during the first readings of the Edinburgh interviews. Some interviewees made specific reference to attractions or facilities being or offering good value. As the Greenwich interviews were transcribed and coded, and the totality of the interviews considered, it became clear that whilst there was a cognitive perception of certain aspects of the interviewee’s experience which was expressed as value for money, captured in the Perceptions node, Value for Money, there were also indications that some interviewees
were concerned with value in a wider sense. As this in turn is linked to the ways in which interviewees approached the destination experience and interactions, it will be discussed more fully in later sections of this chapter.

7.2.4.6 Always wanted to go
This node is an *in vivo* node, arising from a phrase which was used by several Edinburgh interviewees, who said they had just always wanted to go. Initially, this was taken as an indication that the destination was a “must see” one, but further inspection seemed to indicate that in fact this was more a case of an underlying, vague wish to visit the particular place but it was a specific trigger which pushed them to actually plan the visit. For example, Roger and Joy (E-RYB-03) had “always wanted to come to Scotland” but it was someone else giving them a short break as a present which had actually pushed them into making the visit:

> “And now, the connection with our son’s girlfriend... she keeps talking about Scotland and we wanted to discover it more, anyway, and we've always said we'd like to come to Scotland when we had the opportunity and... we've come.”
> (E-RYB-03, Para.41)

7.2.4.7 Escape
As mentioned above, Escape can be a similar motivation to Something Different, in that visitors can be looking for a contrast to their everyday existence. Something Different is defined in this study as a positive motivation, where the interviewee is trying a new experience, new destination or new activity. Escape, on the other hand, is defined as much more of a break from the pressures or stresses of interviewees' normal life, whether it is looking for a contrast as a break from routine or a break as a reward after a period of stress (Table 7.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.11: Escape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Node Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break from routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-23, Para. 35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward after stressful time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-04, Para. 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, it is clear that there is rarely any single motivation underlying interviewees' choice of holiday, destination or activities while in the destination, but rather they seem to
have a number of different motivations. The interconnections between these and the other elements of destination experience and interactions will be explored in the discussions in sections 7.4 and 7.5 relating to tourist interactions and to strategies for making sense of the destination experience.

Having set out above the categories which emerged from the initial question, “What did you expect…”, the following section will explain the nodes Place, People, Reactions and Interactions which categorise interviewees’ stories, anecdotes and comments about their experience in the destination which arose in response to the question, “Tell me about your visit, the high points, low points, memories you will take away?”

7.2.5 Place

Forty three interviews contain comments relating to the interviewees’ experience of place. From these, three aspects of place emerged: Making Connections, Atmosphere and Sense of History.

7.2.5.1 Making Connections

For just over half of the interviewees (30), part of their destination experience was the way in which a place allowed or enabled the individual to make connections to their own heritage, their family or to other linkages between their experience and the place they were visiting. This might be triggered by place names, by objects on display, or just by being in the place. The examples in Table 7.12 show interviewees commenting on how being in a place conjures up memories of friends, linking London and Greenwich street names with place names back home in Australia, and going to a place because it featured in their own life, albeit as something they taught for many years.

As mentioned above in Section 7.2.4.1, there is a degree of overlap between this node and the motivation Getting Closer, in that the one is sometimes bound up with the other. Although related, the two categories do not appear to be one and the same. A matrix intersection of Experience of Place and Motivations indicated 16 documents where passages were coded to both Getting Closer and Making Connections. However, a union search showed that 43 documents contained coding for one or other of these codes. There is therefore a distinction between the two. Text coded to “Getting Closer” indicates that this is something the person looks for, whereas text coded to “Making Connections” refers to the person actively making connections to their family, heritage or things they’ve seen elsewhere as part of the experience of being in a particular place. For example,
Matthew (E-Castle-04) said that part of the reason he was visiting Edinburgh was because:

“my Dad’s from Scotland, from Kirkcaldy, and I’ve never been to Scotland so I wanted to come and look at Scotland, maybe a little bit into the family history as well while I’m here and sort of find out about the clan, look at things like that.”
(E-Castle-04, Para.10)

Later in the interview, talking about their visit to the Castle, it is clear that in addition to wanting to get closer to his Scottish roots, part of Matthew’s experience has been about making a direct connection with his family history:

“I think the, is it the war memorial?... I think that’s very powerful. It’s almost like the chapel’s set in France, is that. I sat in there for a few minutes and that was quite... I was looking in the books and our surname appears quite a number of times... cos I don’t know an awful lot about my family.. so that has been quite interesting”.
(E-Castle-04, Para. 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.12: Making Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Node Definition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02, Para. 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-01, Para. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para. 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.5.2 Atmosphere

In 22 interviews, interviewees talked about place in terms of how buildings, people or weather affected the feeling or atmosphere they sensed there. Once again, however, these comments were rarely about the atmosphere in isolation, but about how the atmosphere contributed to the interviewee being able to get closer to the history of a place, make connections or simply be the way they seemed to prefer to be on holiday. For example, Sara says of Edinburgh:
“It’s just quite pleasant, wandering around the streets, people watching, looking in the windows and enjoying the atmosphere. It’s always got a lovely feel, this place.” (E-Castle-06, Para. 117)

In many instances, particularly in the Greenwich interviews, comments on the atmosphere were made by comparing it with the rest of London, the wider destination. Several people commented on how tranquil or peaceful Greenwich seemed in comparison, which seemed to be connected with the “spaciousness, really, around the buildings themselves” (G-24, Para. 22). Another commented that Greenwich was “...very peaceful. It’s amazing the amount of open space you’ve got here, relative to London itself” (G-36, Para. 66). Comparison with previous experience, or other destinations, will be discussed further in the context of making sense of experience and interactions in Section 7.5.2.

Table 7.13: Atmosphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>Comments about the atmosphere of a place - tranquil, busy, peaceful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03, Para. 61</td>
<td>“It was quite dark, I went in on my own and I jumped a couple of time because I heard the voices and there was no-one there, then I realised. It was very good, absolutely brilliant. I thought that it was exactly what I wanted more of in the Castle, it was so brilliant that that was what the customer hears.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para. 54</td>
<td>“I think that the crowds in London and the tourists give it a sense of busyness that’s kind of fun”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-06, Para. 21</td>
<td>“we looked up at this [the Castle] in the rain, in the grey, and it’s this forbidding sort of thing, and I thought, “Oh..” It looked very dour, and the Scott memorial as well is always black, I always remember it being black, yet, having seen it in the summer, in the sun its something... it’s the contrast, depending on the weather.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-22, Para.27</td>
<td>“It has an older feel to it, at least today, being such a beautiful day, it’s kind of rich and warm,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.5.3 Sense of History

Given that the interviews took place in two World Heritage sites, it is perhaps not surprising that a number of interviewees felt a sense of history, indeed almost of touching history. As illustrated in Table 7.14, this was particularly marked among visitors from Australasia and North America, who appeared to be overwhelmed, even awed, by the length and depth of history they perceived in Greenwich and Edinburgh as compared to what they considered the relatively young heritage of their own country. Where domestic
visitors expressed a sense of history in connection with place, this was more in terms of making connections with their family history, or simply getting closer to the past in some way.

Table 7.14: Sense of history – overseas visitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Definition</th>
<th>Comments about the atmosphere of a place - tranquil, busy, peaceful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison with home country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-05, Para. 21</td>
<td>“It’s amazing for us to be able to touch a building that … our oldest building is about 1800s so it’s just really amazing to see something and realise how many years it’s been standing here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-04, Para. 93</td>
<td>“I mean, in the States, everything is relatively .. new. We’ve got a bit of history in the older, in Virginia and what not, but not like this history.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-01, Para. 9</td>
<td>“with Australia being such a young country, coming to England and here to see what, you know, the buildings are so old you can’t imagine, coming from Australia where we think a hundred years is something…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-04, Para. 21</td>
<td>“It is unbelievable, the history that actually you can feel it. In South Africa, we are a much younger country, and the history… there’s not that type of history that goes back beyond 1800, so this to me is really wonderful, it’s really good”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.6 People

Interviewees’ anecdotes about direct encounters or interactions with people in the destination were coded separately under Interactions, and will be discussed in Section 7.4. However, interviewees also commented on the impact of the presence of other people, whether or not they were made to feel welcome by the behaviour or attitude of people they encountered, and in a few instances, where language was either perceived as being a barrier to, or part of, the destination experience. As most instances of these comments are closely linked to particular encounters or interactions with people they will be discussed in more detail in the section on Interactions. Only seven interviewees made no comment about either the welcome they received or felt, or the numbers of other people in the destination.

7.2.7 Reactions

Various of the nodes in the category Reactions were originally free nodes. It became clear, however, that they were all types of reaction, or response, to the experience of being in the destination, so they were collected under Reactions. The children nodes and
brief descriptions are set out in Table 7.15, together with the short notes made in NVivo 2.0 indicating how the definitions altered over the course of the analysis.

Table 7.15: Child nodes of Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>References to feeling safe or unsafe in the destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>Created this to hold instances where interviewees note that they are served in destination by people of other nationalities i.e. Australians in Scotland, non French person in Paris, etc. Mismatch, because there is a mismatch between the expectation of nationals being involved in tourism. 080305: Broadening this node to include all examples I find where reality does not appear to match expectation. 220605: Realise I have been including here both positive and negative instances of mismatch, i.e. where reality either does not live up to, or exceeds expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>Created to capture positive and pleased feelings about experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surprises</td>
<td>References to anything which surprised, was unexpected, “finds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put Off By</td>
<td>Created as the opposite to pleasure, i.e, to capture interviewees negative reactions to experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awe</td>
<td>Created to capture that sense of awe, amazement, almost being overwhelmed by a facet of the interaction experience, whether its people or place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.7.1 Pleasure
The majority of interviewees (43) expressed pleasure at their experience in the destination. A Matrix Intersection search (see Technical Glossary) retrieving all sections of text which were coded to Pleasure and any of the other Concept Nodes showed that whilst pleasure was expressed to some degree in connection with all the positive categories, it coincided most often with text coded to the following concepts: Getting Closer, Welcome, Atmosphere, Surprises; tourist/host, tourist/resident and tourist/attraction interactions; Engaging; and Comparisons and Reporting. As Pleasure is an outcome of or reaction to those different elements of the experience, it is discussed in the sections relating to each of these categories. Similarly, the material which has been categorised under Put Off By, an opposite of Pleasure, will be discussed in detail in Section 7.4 in relation to other categories such as tourist/tourist or tourist/host interactions, and in Section 7.5 in relation to ways in which the interviewees’ make sense of their experience, such as Forgiven Not Forgotten.

7.2.7.2 Safety
Nine interviewees talked about elements of their experience which were connected with whether they felt safe, or had worries about security in some form. Safety or security did
not seem to be a major concern, these were more reflections of the interviewees' experience in the context either of anticipations they had brought with them, whether word of mouth or media generated, or in the context of experience of interactions with people. Examples of the former include the impact of the film/novel Trainspotting discussed above under Comfort, whilst two other interviewees referred to specific news media reports of violence. Kirsty referred to recent reports of violence in Glasgow:

“...there were four murders that night. There was that triple murder in one flat, and they arrested somebody, and there was a knife murder somewhere else”

(E-RYB-02, Para.63)

Another couple, Mike and Sheila (E-RYB-11), mentioned a documentary about knife culture among children. In both these cases, however, there was a refusal to let this put them off their visit.

Anthony (E-RYB-05), admitting that his concerns about safety “just comes from me being frightened I’m going to get murdered” (Para.92), i.e. a nervousness which is part of his character, as “when I go abroad, I’m always nervous about going out” (Para.88). This is less a reaction to the destination experience, then, than a facet of his character which impinges on his experience. He and his partner talk about a specific incident when they witnessed pickpocketing in Valparaiso, but they seem to feel safe because:

“strangely enough, you could see it wasn’t a tourist. He was picking off his own because they looked local people”

(E-RYB-05, Para.80).

Safety did not seem always to be a negative aspect. Some of the people interviewed in Greenwich had positive things to say about how safe they felt, or how they had been nervous about taking the London Underground at night. For example, Laura and Jared (G-08) were reassured by the highly visible presence of police on the Underground, in comparison with their previous destination, Cairo. Pauline, from South Africa, compared the concerns she and fellow South Africans had about being in London with the tremendous feeling of safety she actually experienced:

“And that is part of the holiday. It’s wonderful to do that, because at home we’re watching over our shoulder every second. We live like animals, its instinctive now, we don’t know we’re doing it. And here, yes, I hang on to it, but I’m not... everyone does it, pickpockets are everywhere, but with the Tube you don’t have to worry about, you know, violent crime. That’s what I’m talking about. And walking around at night, we’re all terrified when we get here, “Can we go to the theatre? Use the Tubes?”

(G-09, Para.80)

In these and other instances, the feeling of safety, the contrast with expectations or their home situation, added to their pleasure in the destination experience.
7.2.7.3 Mismatch

Pauline, cited above, illustrates precisely the sort of mismatch between the anticipations the visitor brings with them, and what they find, which gave rise to this code. The types of mismatch are summarised in Table 7.16, with brief illustrations.

Table 7.16: Mismatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More to see and do than anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-SWC-04, Para.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-8, Para.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-11, Para. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-13, Para.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-15, Para.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-20, Para.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than the historic sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02, Para.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-20, Para.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-21, Para.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison with elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-25, Para.33, G-30, Para.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-08, Para.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SWC-04, Para.156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pauline’s case, it is the lack of crime which brings an unexpected feeling of security which adds to her pleasure in the holiday, whereas in the example cited earlier, where Gareth and Frances talk about the lack of Scots voices, demonstrates a mismatch.
between their expectation of finding a cultural difference mainly encountering English or Australasian voices while in Edinburgh. The latter anecdote also illustrates how previous experience forms part of the anticipations through which visitors view a destination – Gareth compares Edinburgh and Dublin to explain his experience of Edinburgh. This will be discussed in more detail below.

7.2.7.4 Surprises
It could be argued that in some sense, Surprise and Mismatch are not very far apart, in that both are aspects of the unexpected. Mismatch codes instances where expectations are either not met, or are exceeded, whereas Surprises codes incidents or experiences which are completely unexpected or constitute a special and surprising find or discovery. So for example, Jean and Martin (E-Castle-01) encounter a Celtic band on the Royal Mile, dressed in costumes reminiscent of the film Braveheart:

“One of the high spots was that group we saw last year, the Saor Patrol, playing the Celtic music, I don't know if you've ever seen it, they play in the old Celtic clothes and they were very good, and we saw them live. We were just passing by, it was at the bottom of the Old Town, and it was a beautiful day, and we heard this noise and it wasn't like the normal bagpipes, and we saw them.”

(E-Castle-01, Para.71)

Similarly, two young New Zealanders came across a parade by the Scottish Indian Association completely unexpectedly:

Barbara: It was quite cool, you know, bagpipes. And when you see them coming along and they've got their big head dress..
Carol: I thought it was hilarious, there were all these Scottish people wearing like Indian costumes and playing the bagpipes, it was so funny (Laughter).

(E-RYB-05, Para.46-48)

An example of discovery from Greenwich is Edgar’s reaction to finding the Chapel:

“I think actually, the thing that I shall remember most, is the Chapel which was a bit of a contrast to the Painted Hall, which I found a bit overblown, but the Chapel was so much more restrained. I found it um… I didn't know anything about the Chapel, so that was a total surprise and pleasure.”

(G-11, Para.18)

7.2.7.5 Awe
The reaction of Awe appeared mainly to be occasioned in overseas visitors overwhelmed by the sense of history compared to their own country, as discussed under Experience above. However, it also includes interviewees’ comments on the sheer numbers of people in some places, particularly in connection with London’s transport system:

“we got on at Victoria, the train station, and I mean, you just sort of go with everybody or you get left behind. I mean that's nothing like at home; we have a lot of people catching trains but nothing like here.”

(G-02, Para.101)
“Quite amazed at the number of people that came off the Brighton train, though, at about, what time was it, about nine o’clock, half past nine. The train had come in from Brighton and, er, swarms… (Laughter) You know, we were amazed at how many people came off the train.”
(G-02, Para.107)

“We knew there would be a lot… we came yesterday and we landed in Liverpool Street Station and went to the place where we are staying and then we went for a walk. It was just overwhelming, the people, and I thought, “My God,” and we were sure there must be something going on. But I think it’s everyday the same.”
(G-16, Para.22)

7.2.8. Perceptions

This node was initially a container for answers in response to the third interview question, “If someone back home were to ask you about Greenwich/Edinburgh, what would you tell them about it?” It was anticipated that comparison of these answers with those given to the first question about expectations would give an indication of how/whether interviewees’ perceptions of the destination differed following their visit. Once the answers had been collected, further close reading suggested a number of sub categories, or child nodes: Things to see and do, Ease of access, Climate and Value for Money. These are illustrated in Table 7.17, and relate to tangible, cognitive aspects of the destination, in much the same way as the categories outlined under Anticipations – Destination Attributes. By contrast, the various categories grouped under Reactions (Safety, Mismatch, Pleasure, Surprises, Put Off By, and Awe) are more closely connected to perceptions of affective, intangible qualities of the destination.
### Table 7.17: Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Things to see and do</th>
<th>E-Castle-06, Para. 59</th>
<th>“The galleries are very, very good... The extremes, the old town, the contrast between that and the magnificent Georgian part”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-RYB-11, Para. 97</td>
<td>“there’s certainly enough to keep you occupied for three, four, five days...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G-05, Para. 50</td>
<td>“It’s lots of interest, it’s on the river, it’s good views, there’s the museum, there’s the Palace here, and the Observatory...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ease of Access       | G-29, Para. 30        | “It feels very separate from the rest of London, to me, which is I think is the reason we’ve never come. I always thought it was further away. I guess I always thought it was more of a day trip than a place you could get to easily. It seems very compact, easy to get around.” |
|                      | G-11, Para. 30        | “Well first of all, a delightful way to get here is on the river. We did that, and we’re now going back on the Docklands Railway to see another bit of it, so its very accessible, for a start.” |
|                      | E-Castle-04, Para. 115| “Its actually not that long a distance, I think even for a long weekend from the Midlands it would be possible. I mean, I think it would be about five and a half hours’ journey time on a normal run. We’re obviously quite lucky now that Easyjet fly from East Midlands to Edinburgh as well, so that would be another option.” |
|                      | E-Castle-06, Para. 121| “…so as long as you’re in that central area, you never feel lost. You’ve always got a landmark, a major landmark, something you can see and say, ‘Oh yes, I know where I want to be, I want to go up there.’” |

| Climate              | E-RYB-02, Para. 24    | “The funny thing is, is the weather, even though its raining today, even yesterday when it rained, the weather isn’t really that bad here. I find that the weather is a little over exaggerated...because maybe they don’t want people to think it’s a beach holiday...” |
|                      | E-RYB-05, Para. 45    | “I don’t think it [bad weather] detracts from the city itself, you know. I mean, in the sense of the buildings and that, you can still go and see buildings” |
|                      | G-26, Para. 10        | “We were delayed getting here because of the rain, we had to shelter for quite some time, yes. But it is lovely, it really is nice.” |
|                      | G-30, Para. 34        | “The weather’s not the greatest, but it’s not bad, you know. You wrap up, but there’s sunshine and everything’s bright and, like I say, colourful” |

| Value for Money: Positive | E-Castle-01, Para. 107 | “I think it was value for money, really, you toured yourself round with one of these (mimes audio guide) and it was not a short, quick, you could wander round and take as long as you want” |
|                          | E-Castle-02, Para. 49 | “Its not a guided tour here, we’re under our own direction, but basically, I think that for what you pay to get in, there is a lot to see.” |

| Value for Money: Negative Perception | E-RYB-05, Para. 21 | “…if we came up again, I would never, I would never do that again. I would go to one of the main hotels, you know, the Sheraton or the Hotel Caledonia, or something. Its worth paying the extra money, because as far as I’m concerned, for bed and breakfast it wasn’t cheap, it was £58 a night. It was dreadful.” |
|                                   | G-10, Para. 78       | “Boy, though, hotels are expensive here.” |
This section has outlined the development of the base level categories relating to the various elements of visitor/destination interactions. These categories are summarised in Table 7.18.

### Table 7.18: Elements of Destination Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipations</th>
<th>Holiday Attitude</th>
<th>Interactive Mode</th>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination Attributes</td>
<td>Planning and Prioritising</td>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Getting Closer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype</td>
<td>Free and Easy</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Self Enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td>Welcomes the Exotic</td>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>Something Different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reference</td>
<td>Seeks Reassurance</td>
<td>Spectating</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Visit Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always Wanted to Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reactions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perceptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Connections</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Mismatch</td>
<td>Things to see/do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of History</td>
<td>Crowds</td>
<td>Surprises</td>
<td>Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Put Off By</td>
<td>Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awe</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial analysis has also revealed that these categories are interconnected, as illustrated in Figure 7.3. Visitors bring with them a number of Anticipations, based on both external information and references and previous experience. These Anticipations both feed into and arise from their Motivations for visiting the destination as well as being allied to the way they seem to prefer to interact with the destination experience (Interactive Mode). Interactive Mode seems also to be linked to the way they approach their holiday, which will be explored and discussed further in the next section. These two factors are also linked to Motivations. Once in the destination, visitors encounter people and places and experience a range of reactions and acquire new or changed perceptions. These have been briefly described above and will also be discussed further in the next section.
7.3 Structuring Destination Experience

The first readings of the interview transcripts had revealed a number of descriptive categories which seemed to constitute the elements of the destination experience. The previous section explained how these arose within the data, and how there appeared to be interconnections between the categories. In this section, the interactions between Holiday Attitude, Interactive Mode and Motivation will be explored in more depth in order to achieve an understanding of the ways in which these visitor characteristics might affect visitor experience.

7.3.1 Destination Consumption Styles and Selection Strategies

In the early stages of reading through and categorising the Edinburgh transcripts, there were numerous comments which suggested a possible distinction between respondents who were content to engage with the experiences on offer as they presented themselves
and those respondents who might have a list of “must see/have” attractions or experiences, however derived. This led in the first instance to the development of the Holiday Attitude and Interaction Mode categories explained above. The Greenwich interviews also revealed comments on the numbers of things to see and do in the destination: interviewees either acknowledged they were unable to see or experience everything, or that there was more on offer than they had been aware of before the visit. Text searches on phrases such as “more to see” and “come back” revealed that twenty four interviewees talked either about there being too much to see and do on one visit, and/or about returning to “finish off what we didn’t see last year” (G-33, Para 14).

7.3.2 Gourmets, Grazers and Gourmands: Three Styles of Destination Consumption

There seemed to be two extreme reactions when confronting the number of things to see and do: either to prefer choosing only one or two sights/experiences, or to want to see as much as possible. Some also referred to the possibility of doing, or having done, too much. These contrasting approaches, together with the sense of some interviewees experiencing a form of cultural indigestion due to a surfeit of attractions/activities, suggested both that the destination was a place of consumption and that it might be possible to categorise visitors according to their consumption patterns. This might then provide a means to relate the process of consumption to predisposition factors identified above, such as motivations, holiday attitudes and interaction modes.

In order to develop consumption as a style, a categorisation was developed to explore whether interviewees could be characterised as tending towards a Gourmet or Gourmand style of consumption. A Gourmet is generally regarded as one who is a connoisseur in eating and drinking, whereas a Gourmand is defined as being gluttonous, being fond of eating and drinking, often to excess (Hanks, 1990, Roget's New Millennium Thesaurus, 2006). The quotations in Table 7.19 illustrate the difference between the two: Christine and Henry (G-16) are Gourmets who prefer to see a few things in depth, whereas Jeannette (G-21) and Wendy (G-20) are Gourmands and want to see as much as they can within any limitations of time or physical ability. Seven interviews showed very definite Gourmet traits, whilst ten showed definite Gourmand traits. As these typifications are two extremes, these numbers are not surprising. Categorisation of the remaining interviews will be discussed later in this section.
As mentioned above, there were instances where interviewees commented either on feeling as they had had enough and needed a change, or were concerned about the possibility of doing too much. This was mentioned by both Gourmets and Gourmands, but whereas the Gourmets are concerned about exhaustion spoiling their ability to learn from or assimilate specific experiences, the Gourmands appear more concerned about their overall comfort and destination/holiday experience. Examples illustrating this are set out in Table 7.20. Gourmet Karen (E-Castle-03) has come to know her limitations and the point at which she cannot absorb more from a particular visit. Alison (G-35) had already taken in numerous churches and museums on her tour of Europe, and felt she had had enough history for the time being, whilst John (G-27) had a long list of places he wanted to see but was aware this might actually spoil his overall destination experience.
Table 7.20: Cultural Indigestion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03 Para 100</td>
<td>“I have learned that I don’t want to take in too much at one time, because you get so exhausted and it becomes like a burden”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gourmand</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-27 Para 44</td>
<td>“… we feel that we can’t really justify putting our feet up and doing nothing for a day, because we’ll leave and say, well, ‘I wish I’d gone to see that.’ I know this is a trap; I’ve heard people say that you just do too much”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-35 Para 32</td>
<td>“We just got back from Portugal and Spain, and we’ll have to say that it’s probably enough history for us. It’s a silly thing to say, but you can… like we did the Rome and Italy, and all that stuff, because there’s only so many churches you can really see, you know what I mean? … My comment is after a while it doesn’t “wow” you any more, and I’m still looking for the “wow”. We went to the Alhambra, and you know, somebody just said, “Wow” but after a while it’s hard to work up a “Wow”. Which is too bad, because you don’t get it all, then you get too much of it.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in Chapters Four and Five, individual motivations for taking a break or a holiday vary. Figure 7.4 below encapsulates the different manifestations of these motivation factors depending upon the individual’s consumption style. The Gourmand motivated by self image or reputation, captured in this study under the category Self Enhancement, might be concerned about being "caught out" on their return if they miss seeing or experiencing any part of the destination. Gareth and Frances (E-RYB-08) demonstrate this with their concern about lack of tourist information provision jeopardising their experience, discussed later in this section. The Gourmet, on the other hand, might be less concerned about others’ opinion but prefer to think of themselves as being more discerning, or more well travelled. This characteristic is illustrated by the anecdote told by Charles and Sara (E-Castle-06) about their experience in a fish and chip shop, (see Section 7.4.2.2. below).
This categorisation into ideal types seems to work well in distinguishing different ways of behaving. For instance, a similar difference can be found in considering economic factors in motivation, and what the individual considers to be good value in a destination experience. It was clear in several interviews, particularly with overseas visitors, that the visit represented a considerable investment of either leave allowance and/or money. However, there was a difference in how they appeared to assess the need to get value for this investment. Gourmands talked about needing to see as much as possible to get value for their investment, whereas the Gourmets prefer to get a depth of experience. Both these economic and reputation factors are illustrated in Table 7.21 which provides examples of the ways in which interviewees belonging to these two typifications construe specific elements of their destination consumption. Social factors are more closely related to interactions with people, particularly the impact of other people in the travel party on the consideration list of places to see and things to do, and will be discussed in more detail in the later sections.
Table 7.21: Gourmets and Gourmands – Motivation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th>Gourmand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Image/ Reputation</strong></td>
<td>“I tend to be interested in things that most people don’t have time for. Most New Zealanders when they come here, they don’t come here strictly speaking to revel in the history, or revel in the cultural aspects and the links that we have, or anything that went before. It’s more just because it’s the easiest destination where they speak the same language as we do” G-30 Para 169</td>
<td>“it’s just nice to broaden your horizons, to be able to say “I’ve been here, and I’ve done that” and it just gives you more of a scope when you’re talking to people. You can say, ‘Oh yeah, I’ve been there and I know about this and I know about that.’” E-Castle-02 Para 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>“We’re not the sort who rush through and find that we have been twenty five places but we haven’t seen them because we’ve been rushing through…” G-16 Para 78</td>
<td>“Because it’s a long way to come and a lot of money to come, we need to be able to soak up as much as we can. I mean, I know that’s a selfish reason but…” SW-02 Para 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, returning to the transcripts to explore these ideas further, it became clear that not all interviewees fell neatly into one or other grouping, but many sat in the middle ground somewhere between the two extremes. The categories of Gourmet and Gourmand are polar extremes, ideal typifications after the manner of Weber’s ideal types (Weber, 1964). In reality, individuals classified in this way may not ever possess all the characteristics or behaviour patterns; nevertheless, the categories serve as indicators by which to gauge the characteristics and behaviours of others. Comparing the seven Gourmet and ten Gourmand interviews with the remaining thirty-nine, these latter appeared to exhibit neither the quality criteria of the Gourmet nor the do-it-all, see-it-all purpose of the Gourmand. As will be shown below, many of them were not completely neutral but had certain Gourmet or Gourmand tendencies related to the consumption strategy chosen. These in-between interviews did however seem to be characterised by a certain lightness of touch, in that the respondents did not appear to seek the depth of quality sought by the Gourmets and lacked the appetite which drove Gourmands to want to see and do everything. They were therefore characterised as Grazers, nibbling at the surface across a broad swathe of the destination. The transcripts were then assigned document attributes to identify them as being Gourmet, Grazer or Gourmand to facilitate further searching to investigate how consumption style related to individual visitors’ predispositions, experience and the way they might talk about the destination. Only five transcripts gave no indication of the consumption style of the interviewee, largely because those interviews were taken up with narratives about specific incidents rather than about
the way the interviewees were experiencing the destination. These five interviews were classed as Consumption Unknown, and effectively ceased to form part of the analysis from this point onwards.

7.3.3 Sampling, Browsing and Working through Lists: Strategies for Consuming the Destination

The Gourmet, Gourmand and later the Grazer categorisations refer to the interviewees' style of consumption, i.e. how they consume the different elements of the destination. However, the respondents seemed also to be using different strategies to simplify or filter the choices of the things to see and do on offer in the destination. The way in which these relate to consumption styles will be discussed once the selection strategies have been explored in detail.

Table 7.22: Consumption Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Choosing only a few things to see and do, in the knowledge can't do everything</td>
<td>19: 6 domestic 13 overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing</td>
<td>Wandering around a destination, leisurely and possibly unplanned way of experiencing what's on offer</td>
<td>7: 3 domestic 4 overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working through a List</td>
<td>Having a pre-planned list of places/activities to work through</td>
<td>18: 5 domestic 13 overseas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews were therefore reviewed to ascertain how respondents spoke about the way they approached the decisions about what to see and do. Twelve of the transcripts did not give any real indication, in some cases because the interviewee was mainly concerned to recount instances of encounters with or observations of people in the destination, in others because the interviewee talked only about their experience in the specific location of the interview and not about their destination wide experience. However, the remaining 44 interviews did provide evidence to suggest that the interviewees used one of three types of strategy for selecting among the plethora of things to see and do in the light of the individual constraints on their time or ability to see and do everything in the destination: sampling (19), browsing (7), or working through a list (18). Definitions are given in Table 7.22. This categorisation was at first shown by creating free nodes in which to capture the relevant text from the interviews. As these nodes were
mutually exclusive, i.e. no interview had text coded to more than one of the three, it was decided to use document attributes to identify the three different categories as well as those interviews where the selection strategy could not be identified, categorised as Unknown. This would facilitate further searching to examine how these characteristics might relate to or be affected by individual visitors’ predispositions and consumption styles and whether this had an impact on their experience and the way they might talk about the destination.

The initial categorisation of the interviews had identified four different attitudes relating to how the interviewees seemed to approach their holiday: Free and Easy, Planning and Prioritising, Welcoming the Exotic and Seeking Reassurance (see 7.2.2 above). A matrix search comparing consumption strategies with the four different holiday attitudes revealed that those interviewees who appeared to be working through a list of attractions or activities also talked about planning their time or prioritising some aspects of the destination over others, whereas those who were sampling or browsing tended to have a free and easy attitude. The following sections will look in more detail at these strategies, before relating them to the three consumption styles.

7.3.3.1 Sampling

Table 7.23: Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appetizer</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-03, Para 47</td>
<td>“… there’s loads of things to see and a day is not enough, so I’ve decided to come again”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-SW-02 Para. 48</td>
<td>“I think last time we just walked around, really, we didn’t actually do many of the sights or anything like that, so I think this time we’ve come back to do more sights…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-29 Para.10</td>
<td>“… we kind of got an overview of the whole area and we stopped at the craft market and you know, here we’re going to the Chapel and I’m trying to talk him into walking up to the Observatory.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-32 Para.53</td>
<td>“… we’ve done the hop on, hop off bus tours in every city… we do that first to get our bearings and then picked out where we wanted to go in the time we had.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See fewer things in depth

| E-RYB-05 Para.33 | “… there is lots of architecture. But unfortunately, we haven’t got the time to be looking at it. I particularly wanted to come to look at Britannia today.” |
| G-16 Para.84 | “We’d rather see a little bit less, but see the things properly and not rush through” |
Interviewees who were sampling the destination talked of being aware that they could not see or do everything in the destination in the time they had available, as illustrated in Table 7.23 above. Several interviewees categorised as Sampling specifically mentioned either that they had been to the destination before and were returning to see more, or that they were getting an overview on the current visit, by boat trip, bus tour or guided tour, with a view to coming back at a later date. Whilst this was categorised as planning and prioritising behaviour, and might imply that they have a list to work through, their purpose was not to try to get through a comprehensive list of all the possibilities on offer. Rather, they had either returned to sample the attractions or experience which interested them, or were treating this first visit as an appetizer, intending to return to sample specific elements of the destination at a later date. Planning and prioritising behaviour was also demonstrated by those with a desire to experience a few attractions or activities thoroughly. Others in the Sampling category (10 interviewees) demonstrated a Free and Easy attitude, in the sense that although they realised they would be unable to see everything they had not done much research beforehand, and were making choices on a day to day or even spur of the moment basis:

“... rather than plan our trip out day by day, we decided when we'll get to London we'll just take it day by day, and today we woke up and we thought, in this book is Greenwich, and Greenwich is accessible by the Tube, so that's what we did”

(G-10, Para. 14)

7.3.3.2 Browsing

Browsing is defined in this study as taking a leisurely, more unplanned way of experiencing the destination. Interviewees in this category talked of wandering around, or of happening upon things (Table 7.24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.24: Browsing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Castle-01, Para. 99</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I just like wandering around”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Castle-06, Para. 116</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It's just quite pleasant, wandering around the streets, people watching, looking in the windows and enjoying the atmosphere.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-SW-04, Para. 95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We just happened into the Museum on the mound, off Princes Street, and we took in the Titian exhibition at the Academy of Art.... You know, it’s just a great city to walk about, and really comfortable sites to rest and have a cup of coffee, have a beer...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G-05, Para. 30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Well, no, I’ve been wandering the back streets prior to coming here, to get a bit of lunch, and if I have time, I’ll give a swift visit to the museum, then I’ll wend my way home.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G-12, Para. 23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I’ve just been kind of wandering around.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They also fell largely into the Free and Easy category, as might be expected. However, compared with the Samplers who were Free and Easy, those in the Browsing category who were Free and Easy seemed to have no overall plan, no intention to pick and choose in advance, but were content to experience whatever presented itself. Martin and Jean (E-Castle-01) talked about their reaction to finding a group of Celtic musicians playing on the Royal Mile, for example:

“They were brilliant and we sat there for about half an hour and we bought some of their CDs.”
(E-Castle-01, Para. 71)

Max found that “to just get on one of those buses and ride around all day, it’s kind of pleasant, rather than trying to see everything” (G-13, Para. 87). This is a different attitude than that of the Samplers, who seemed to use the tours more as a means of obtaining an overview and pointers to key elements of the destination, and indicates that although these two categories use the same mechanism for taking in elements of the destination, the process by which they make their selection differs.

### 7.3.3.3 Working through a List

#### Table 7.25: Working Through a List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value for Time</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-04 Paras. 94-99</td>
<td>“Katie: And we’re hoping to come back one other day to go to the Scott monument, that’s quite nice to climb up and have a good look, and the gardens and … Matthew: In Edinburgh. We’re planning to go to Kirkcaldie tomorrow, that’s where Dad comes from, to go and see the place. We’ve only just got today and Wednesday, so I think we’re … time-wise.. Katie: We’re partly going to see how much we’ve got done today, and then plan for the next day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-01 Para. 7</td>
<td>“Well we’ve done a lot of research on the Internet and travel books, and my previous experience, Jemima’s sister Christine’s previous experience. We, you know, time is valuable and money is very, you know, we’ve economised for several years to come”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Enhancement</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-03 Para. 105</td>
<td>“But if people have been here and they’ve discovered something and we’ve only got three days, then we fit the important bits in…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting Closer</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-27 Para. 26</td>
<td>“Not so much things that I didn’t know about, but things that I probably won’t be able to do. I’d like to… I want to see Westminster and St. Paul’s. I’d like to wander around the legal district too, stroll around and see some of the significant sites there.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always Wanted to Go</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-02 Para. 139</td>
<td>“I think you’ve got to have a shopping list, yeah, what you want to do, where you want to go. Even if you don’t always get there, but. mainly. See, we’d always wanted to go to Brighton and I enjoyed it. It was totally different to what we expected.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The matrix search comparing the strategies with Holiday Attitude revealed that Planning and Prioritising seemed to be a characteristic behaviour of those respondents who appeared to be Working Through a List of attractions or activities, with 14 of 18 interviews demonstrating this attitude. These interviewees talked about planning their time, or prioritising some aspects of the destination over others, but from a variety of motives as briefly illustrated in Table 7.25.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that there is a degree of overlap between the different selection strategies and holiday attitudes. As mentioned above, and as might be expected, the majority of interviews (34) lay somewhere between the ideal types of Gourmet (7) and Gourmand (10) in terms of consumption style. A matrix search was carried out to compare strategies and styles, which revealed that there appears to be some relationship between the two. This is summarised in Figure 7.5.

**Figure 7.5: Consumption Styles and Strategies**

Comparing the groupings Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand with the three consumption strategies, there is a clear distinction between the Gourmet and Gourmand extremes, in that those in the Gourmet category use Sampling or Browsing, whereas the Gourmands are definitely Working Through A List. Grazers tend towards one or the other, depending upon whether they use Sampling or Working Through A List to select attractions and
activities. As explained above, the two types of holiday attitude, Free and Easy and Planning and Prioritising, are found in each of the three consumption strategy categories but manifest themselves differently. Matrix searches comparing consumption strategy and holiday attitude within each of the three consumption styles reinforced these differences.

As Table 7.26 shows, the Gourmet style encompasses both Sampling and Browsing, with a Free and Easy attitude. Planning and Prioritising is very much focussed on ensuring that the interviewee chooses the one or two attractions to experience in depth. Whilst few interviewees could be classed as entirely Gourmet, the same balance between Free and Easy and Planning and Prioritising is seen in the Grazers who used Sampling or Browsing. As referred to earlier, they are using tours to pinpoint places or things to come back to at a later date. Moving towards the Gourmand style, the predominant consumption strategy is Working Through A List, and Planning and Prioritising assumes a greater importance. Here interviewees plan their way through the destination experience first and foremost, and where they are Free and Easy, it is in the context of accepting external influences and opportunities, choosing an indoor option from their list if the weather is bad, for example, or in their tolerant attitude to other people.

Table 7.26 : Consumptions Styles, Strategies and Holiday Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th>Grazer</th>
<th>Gourmand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Sampling (5)</td>
<td>Browsing (12)</td>
<td>Working through List (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browsing</td>
<td>Browsing (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working through List (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (3)</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (7)</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (2)</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (5)</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising (1)</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising (3)</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising (1)</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free & Easy and Planning & Prioritising were introduced in section 7.2.2 above as one dimension of two categorised as Holiday Attitude, the other dimension being the degree to which interviewees seemed to Welcome the Exotic or Seek Reassurance. There were fewer comments which fell along this dimension, with only four interviews containing material coded to Welcomes the Exotic and thirteen with material coded to Seeks Reassurance. Interviewees in the Gourmand category who appeared to seek...
reassurance were concerned to ensure that they were not missing any information which might help them get the maximum from their stay. This gave rise to comments about the quality of information on web sites or the amount and quality of interpretation material in the destination. For example, Gareth and Frances (E-RYB-08) felt that they only found a particular bar because the taxi driver mentioned it, and that their stay would be improved if there were more information available:

“it was just like a few extra restaurants and things like that that just seemed a bit more.. with bars and things like that. So... but I wouldn't have known that and we only went down there because a taxi driver had taken us there when we came. So we wouldn't have known anything about it.”
(E-RYB-08, Para.120)

“it'd be great if you had a little map that had little border saying you've got these little bars and, you know, like you get ... When I've been to the States and that, you know, they do it, but here you kind of have to, like, make your own discoveries, really. And yeah, that's great, but when you've only got a short space of time, then ... We went on a, well a walking mystery tour thing last night and we came out and thought we needed to get something to eat. It was about - what, nine thirty, quarter to ten? and we thought, “Well, where do we go?” and we were just kind of standing there thinking, “Well, now where do we go?” and places were starting to shut, and it was dark, and we just kind of found somewhere in the end, didn't we? But, you know, we probably walked past some fantastic places but because you didn't know, then you just walked on by.”
(E-RYB-08, Para.135)

Like Paula and Jemima (G-01) cited earlier (Table 7.24), they want to go away having experienced as much as possible of the sorts of things that interest them, in this case good bars and restaurants. Gourmets are more likely to seek reassurance as to the quality of the experience; for example, James and Carolyn (E-SW-04, Para.172-177) talk about balancing recommendations on the internet with recommendations from friends and family when looking for destination and accommodation information.

Of the four interviews containing material coded to Welcomes the Exotic, three were in the Grazer category and one in Gourmand. The references were either to coming upon and enjoying unexpected events, such as Jean and Martin’s encounter with the Saor Patrol, a Celtic folk rock band in costume on the Royal Mile (E-CASTLE-01 Paras.70-83), or positively engaging with other cultures which they might come across on holiday, like Pauline (G-09):

“It's part of my experience. And the more different cultures, people, the better. That's in where we've been. Sort of central, Westminster, London. And we're delighted to speak to locals. Sometimes we do, it just happens, and that's fascinating, that's part of the experience, and it just makes you feel the different cultures, I love that.”
(G-09, Para.48)
None of the interviews with Gourmets in the current study contained material coded to Welcomes the Exotic. This does not mean that the Gourmet style of consumption does not encompass a taste for experiencing something different or unusual: one can imagine that a Gourmet tourist might seek out a "real local's pub" in the depth of the English countryside rather than stop at the first pub by the side of the main tourist route, for example. From the above, it would appear that whilst no one Holiday Attitude is specific to a particular Consumption Style, there are discernible trends in the way Holiday Attitude is manifested depending upon whether an individual is a Gourmet or Gourmand.

7.3.4 Consumption Style and Interactive Mode

The four Interactive Modes (Engaging, Learning, Observing, Spectating) were briefly described in section 7.2.3 above. As suggested, these modes are not mutually exclusive. Investigation also showed that, as with motivations, the particular mode manifests itself differently in interviewees categorised as Gourmets as compared to those categorised as Gourmands. When Gourmets engaged with people or places, it seemed to be on an intellectual or imaginative level. Edgar (G-11) recounts an anecdote about a particular guide from a previous holiday who had, he felt, set a benchmark in terms of a guide’s level of knowledge, ability to communicate with their audience and relate to the differing levels of understanding in the audience:

“My wife accuses me that I’ve fallen in love with one when we were in Greece years ago, on a Swan Hellenic cruise. We had a superb Athenian lady as guide for part of our time and she was absolutely superb. She was extremely well informed and educated, and she was enthusiastic about what she was talking about and could explain it well. And flattered people who asked questions, saying what good questions they were, and so on, and you remember that, that stays with you for the rest of your life, really. Because also, she told you, in a way that… the parrot like repetition you get from other guides has no impact at all on you…”

(G-11, Para.58)

Edgar’s engagement with and appreciation of Greenwich is similarly intellectual. He talks about the layout of the buildings, how well they relate to each other and their setting, their place in history:

“CMG: And what is it about the buildings and the architecture that particularly interests you? Is it, I don’t know, getting closer to the period, or is it an appreciation of the architecture for its own sake, or…

Edgar: Well, it’s both. It’s delightful… architecture. But also, it is very representative of its time and the whole place is redolent with the art history of the period, you know. I read a bit about the history, naval history, of the eighteenth century and so you feel “Those people were here”, the ones history is all about and you see their names. We’ve just been looking at the memorial for Hardy in the
Chapel, or in the Chapel Anteroom and there we are, Nelson’s great friend, you know, it’s… it’s quite real, really.”
(G-11, Paras.37-38)

Like other Gourmets, he engages with the experience as someone who is already knowledgeable, a connoisseur who wants to learn to improve his understanding. Contrast this with Gourmards Gareth and Frances (E-RYB-08), who are equally keen for information, specifically wanting more interpretation, more guidance, because they feel they might not be getting the whole experience, they might be missing something if they are left to their own devices:

“But I find it weird, I think, I find it’s not very, I dunno, really “popular”, if you know what I mean, whereas, if you go, again, if you, I don’t, I don’t know, I think you have to make a conscious decision to find it. I don’t think it’s very much in your face, if you know what I mean.”
(E-RYB-08, Para.48)

“I think you have to get away from the mainstream stuff. And do it. I’ll give you an example of that. We went round Mary King’s Close, didn’t we? And that was very funny. You know you go down, there’s not a lot there, but its interesting, when you’re in one of the rooms and the original wallpaper is still there and the original, you know, that to me was interesting but really, there’s a sort of a sign there, and we just came across that,”
(E-RYB-08, Para.110)

There appears to be a distinction between a cerebral, and a sympathetic, even empathic engagement, in that Gourmets seem to engage with their brain and rational faculties, whereas the Gourmands tend more to engage with their hearts, so to speak. This same distinction emerges from a comparison of Grazers, who use sampling as a strategy and tend towards the Gourmet, with Grazers who are working through a list and tend to the Gourmand. It also appears to be linked to the Getting Closer motivation, at least where interviewees talked about experience of place rather than people. For example, sampling Grazers referred to being in such and such a place as helping them to “understand” or “comprehend” the history, or set what they had learned previously in context, and appreciated the information they were gathering about the exhibits or the place. Grazers in the Working Through A List category tended to talk more about soaking up, or sopping up, a place and even, in one case, compared Greenwich favourably with Buckingham Palace and Westminster Abbey because:

“...it’s a more enjoyable experience rather than just being a historical experience because you have that chance to just meander or wander and take in the sights.
Jared: And the markets. We haven’t been to the markets, we haven’t had time.
Laura: You’ve got the mix of everything, too, between the history of the seamen, and the maritime museum and the boat itself, the Cutty Sark.”
(G-08, Paras.114-119) (Researcher’s emphasis)
Clear differences between the characteristics of Gourmets, Grazers and Gourmands are beginning to emerge from the categorisation of tourists based upon their consumption style and strategy. At one end, Gourmets appear to be more cerebral and interested in quality rather than quantity of experience. At the other, the Gourmands appear more concerned with sensations, and with experiencing as much as possible in the time available. Grazers may have tendencies towards one or the other, but seem to be less purposeful than those at either extreme of the spectrum; the next section will investigate this further with a view to identifying sub categories of Grazers, based upon selection strategy and interactions.

The preceding discussion has identified a relationship between the styles and strategies of consumption discussed above and the predisposition factors identified in the earlier analysis, such as Motivation and Holiday Attitude. Visitors can have a variety of motivations, regardless of consumption style or strategy, but the latter will affect how those motivations are manifested, and the same is true with holiday attitude: a Gourmet will engage with the destination experience in a different way to a Gourmand. In the next sections, the various forms of visitor interaction recounted by the interviewees will be examined in the light of this interplay between consumption style, strategy and predisposition factors.

### 7.4 Interactions

Tourists interact with each other and with the host community, either directly in face to face encounters or indirectly by taking part in the same activity or being in the same space. These interactions form part of the overall destination experience, and are likely to influence both the tourist’s perceptions of the destination and the destination image carried way and transmitted to others. Having identified the consumption styles and strategies discussed above, a matrix search was carried out to compare the type of interaction (tourist/resident, tourist/host, tourist/tourist) with the three styles of consumption. Table 7.27 shows the results of this search in terms of numbers of documents coded.
Table 7.27: Tourist Interactions and Consumption Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Category</th>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th>Grazer</th>
<th>Gourmand</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/tourist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/host</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/resident</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/attraction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tourist/attraction interactions category was designed to capture references to the experience of going around attractions, including comments on interpretation and artefacts. Much of the material coded here has already been alluded to above under Experience of Place, Motivations and Interactive Mode. For example, Matthew’s comments about the war memorial cited above (E-Castle-04, Para.79) both convey his sense of making a connection to his own family history and the atmosphere of the chapel itself, as well as being an instance of a tourist/attraction interaction.

Reading through the extracts in the other interaction categories, there were both anecdotes and reflections on direct encounters with, and comments or observations on the presence, impact or characteristics of, hosts, residents or other tourists. There appeared to be a difference between tourist/tourist and tourist/host and tourist/resident interactions. As will be explored later, tourist/tourist interactions could be classified into the impact of travel companions and that of other tourists, whereas the distinction within the other two categories was between direct encounters with, and comments or observations on, the presence or behaviour of other tourists. As has already been discussed above, the category Grazer encompasses interviewees whose selection strategy, Sampling, indicated they tended more towards the Gourmet as well as those who were Working through Lists and therefore tending more towards the Gourmand. Further searches were carried out to analyse Grazer interactions in terms of selection strategy, to see whether there was any discernible difference between Grazers using Sampling and those who were Working Through a List and then if there were any similarities between these and Gourmets and Gourmands respectively. The numbers of documents containing material in each category are shown in Table 7.28.
Table 7.28: Grazers – Interactions and Selection Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sampling (12)</th>
<th>Browsing (5)</th>
<th>Working through List (11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/tourist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/host</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist/resident</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Closer inspection of the extracts revealed that the Sampling Grazers in this study do seem to share some tendencies here with the Gourmets, whereas the Grazers Working through a List have more in common with the Gourmands. These similarities will be explored more fully below. For convenience, these two sub categories will be referred to as Grazer/Gourmets and Grazer/Gourmands respectively. Grazer will be used to identify those Grazers who either browse or whose selection strategy is unknown.

7.4.1 Tourist/tourist interactions
As noted above, these can be divided into the impact of the simple presence of other tourists, and the impact of travelling companions.

7.4.1.1 Travelling Companions
Both the physical and emotional wellbeing of travelling companions can influence a tourist's enjoyment of a destination, whilst the fact of being in a couple or a group can necessitate the conscious or unconscious accommodation of the interests, likes and dislikes of the other members of the travel party. Both factors may also play a role in the choice of attraction visited or activity undertaken. In the present study, the majority of people interviewed (44 of 56) were travelling with other people, and the following examples illustrate ways in which this appears to have affected their destination experience.

Several interviewees chose itineraries or attractions taking into account the physical limitations of their travelling companion. Jemima, travelling with her mother, Paula, said:

"we're looking up all the key places to visit. Mum … she's only got one lung … we walk a lot of places cos that's the way to do it, but we have to be a bit selective. Like we can't just go three or four kilometres because she can't physically get there. So a lot of our trip is around making it easy for her."
(G-01, Para.110)

Others interviewed in Greenwich appreciated the little train which runs between the Observatory and the rest of the site, because it made it easier for their travel companion:
“My husband hasn’t been well so we’ve really enjoyed also having that vehicle to take us... That was really worthwhile for someone who shouldn’t be... overdoing things.”
(G-21, Para.46-50)

There were numerous instances of interviewees placing a priority on doing things that would be enjoyed by their travel companions, even when this was not what they would necessarily have chosen. Melanie, travelling with five friends:

“really didn’t want to go on the (London) Eye because I’m absolutely terrified of heights, but it was brilliant, absolutely brilliant”
(G-26, Para.44).

Similarly Chris, an American fitting in some sightseeing on a business trip, had come to the National Maritime Museum “because one of us wanted to see the Harrison clocks” (G-22, Para. 10) and although these are actually in the Observatory, he had nevertheless both enjoyed the Museum and discovering Greenwich. Talking to others, he would describe it as “kind of rich and warm, and... cloaked in mystery... definitely scenic” (G-22, Para.27) and direct anyone with an interest in history to visit it, as it “has a lot to offer in that respect” (G-22, Para.31). Chris and Melanie had each made discoveries and had an enhanced experience through falling in with the plans of others in their group.

Others seemed to find enhanced pleasure from the enjoyment of their travelling companions. Shirley had come to Greenwich because her husband was interested in maritime attractions, and normally on a family trip to London, they would do the type of things she and her daughter enjoyed. However, this time she had specifically chosen to do something her husband would prefer because he recently had a difficult time, with his father dying six months previously, and being himself newly retired:

“...we usually do what I want to do, or what my daughters want to do, which is trundle round the shops, and this time, I knew my husband was very interested in ships”
(G-06, Para.51)

She found it “nice to be relaxing for a change. Being on our own.” (G-06, Para.63). Another interviewee, Wendy, also seemed to derive added enjoyment from the fact that Greenwich offered her the opportunity to indulge her love of history whilst at the same time allowing her husband to satisfy his mechanical curiosity:

“My husband’s like the mechanical, and all that sort of thing. I love the history part of it, so we’ve both had a glorious day because you’ve managed to put them both together very nicely... Made the mechanical things come to life, as well as me being able to say, ‘Oh yes, I remember reading about...‘”
(G-20, Para.14)
Similarly, Max came to Greenwich to see the Cutty Sark and the various museums primarily because his father had wanted to see them, having “been to London and around here in World War II, so he'd been back and forth across the Atlantic a bunch of times during the War” (G-13, Para.30) although Max was also interested in naval things, having been in the US Coastguard like his father. That shared interest seems to have enhanced his experience and appreciation of Greenwich.

All the examples cited above are from interviewees who fall either into the Gourmand or the Grazer/Gourmand categories. Their concern for physical or psychological comfort seems to be in some sense an inclusive one, in that the emphasis is on doing as much as possible to enhance enjoyment despite any limitations.

On the other hand Malcolm, in the Gourmet category, seemed both restricted by his partner, and to be trying to find something to suggest that will tempt her:

“my nearest and dearest … she's half English, you see, and she's been to London so many times, and so I say, “Oh, let's go and see Buck House” and she'll say, “Oh, really, come on, that's boring, you don't want to do that, let's go to …” So I didn't see Buck House, and that's fine, you know, I don't mind. But, so, I was racking my brains trying to find something she hadn't done in London”
(G-30, Para.88)

Having persuaded her to take a boat trip to Greenwich earlier in the week, Malcolm had returned on his own for what he describes as “selfish motives” to look for traces of his ancestors, an activity he did not believe she would find interesting or enjoyable. For other Gourmets, there is a sense that to try to see too much, to take in too much, would be uncomfortable, hence they pick and choose:

“Christine, my wife, wanted to see more and more and more and I said this morning, “We can't see it all in five days”. So what we're doing now, we're having a really good look at three or four places and then come back and see the rest.”
(G-16, Para.78)
The above examples illustrate that tourist interactions with others in their immediate travel party are affected by a complex interplay of motivation factors such as concern for the physical or psychological well being of companions, consumption styles and forms of compromise. This may take the form of acquiescing in the group preference, or agreeing to do jointly agreeable things one day and independent ones on another. These intra group interactions in turn affect the individual’s overall destination experience as well as the choice of attractions and activities during the visit. Figure 7.6 above illustrates the positive and negative impacts of others in the travel group and the outcomes of the compromises which are sometimes made. It also illustrates the impacts of other tourists who are not part of the travel party, and suggests that the negative impacts in particular may result in some compromises. The impact of other tourists is discussed further below.

7.4.1.2 Other tourists
As well as their travel companions, tourists are also affected by both the presence of and encounters with other, unknown or stranger, tourists. The presence of large numbers of other tourists can be perceived as a positive: Pauline, visiting London from South Africa, expects and welcomes the liveliness of a city destination, almost exulting in the hustle and bustle:
“The crowds and the people and the excitement and where you are in London West End, is half of the excitement of the show... just walking around. Being in the taxi cabs, the movement of the people and all the different kinds of people” (G-09, Para.60)

Similarly, John and Jancis, an Australian couple on a touring holiday in Britain, regard the numbers of other people as "part of the adventure" (G-27, Para.139).

More commonly, other tourists were seen as something to be accepted, even commented upon, but avoided where possible, for a variety of reasons. Sara and Charles comment on the difference between Edinburgh at Festival time and in October. They accept the presence of other tourists because of the attractions of the Fringe and the International Festival, which is also their reason for being in the city, but employ avoidance tactics, such as escaping to the Castle, because as Sara says, “not many people come up to the Castle and round through the Park, so you can get away from them” (E-Castle-06, Para.90). Her overriding feeling is that at Festival time it is “difficult to move around, there’s so many people...It’s a bit claustrophobic at times” (E-Castle-06, Para.83 and 90). Charles enjoys the people watching element of visiting cities, but seems to feel overfaced: “when it’s the Fringe, you’re almost sated with the number of people to watch” (E-Castle-06, Para.81).

Gourmands and Grazer/Gourmands also find other tourists a nuisance, but seem positively determined not to let this interfere with their experience. Recalling walking holidays in the Yorkshire Dales in the years when the James Herriot TV series was boosting tourism to that area, Mike and Sheila found the extra tourists a nuisance in the evenings but weren’t put off going to the area “because you could still get away from them, just walking” (E-RYB-11, Para.142). John and Jancis, commenting on their previous day spent in Cambridge, felt the number of people in the main streets was “crazy” but this did not detract from their enjoyment because “once we got away around the Backs, it was terrific” (G-27, Para.135).

Escape, as illustrated above, is one avoidance tactic. Several interviewees, fearing the presence of too many other tourists would prevent them getting the most from their visit, would use a different tactic for minimising the impact of other tourists: planning to visit outside the main tourist season. Edward and Martha, Gourmands from Tasmania, deliberately chose to come to Scotland in the low season (October) because it is an expensive trip, and they want to “be able to soak up as much as we can. I mean, I know that’s a selfish reason...” (E-SW-02, Para.71). Carla and Mark were Grazer/Gourmands; the timing of their trip to Greenwich was mainly due to a gap in work commitments, but
they too “try and go when its not high season... it’s not as crowded, which makes it easier to get in places and do things, we’re less restricted.” (G-4, Para.93). Gourmets like Edgar (G-11) and Dutch (G-18), and Grazer/Samplers like Pauline (G-09), also tried to avoid crowds, but this was more because crowds impinged on their aesthetic appreciation of the experience on offer, by being noisy, for example.

Moreover there were specific instances where the press of other tourists had spoiled Gourmet interviewees’ experience, by stopping them from being able to experience attractions or places at their own pace and in their own way. Karen gave a vivid description of how her experience is partly spoiled by the presence of other tourists, and not just in the castle. Like others quoted above, she was pleased to have come to Edinburgh slightly out of season, because busy tourist areas mean queues:

“Like in here, you come and you have to queue a long time for the café, find a place, queue for the toilets, have to queue to see everything, in fact.”
(E-Castle-03, Para.100)

Queuing has a detrimental effect on Karen’s experience: “When there are loads of people and you’re walking behind someone, you feel that you can’t stop.” She prefers it when “I can take my time”. When there are lots of people, she gets “frustrated and irritated” because:

“...if there are loads of people stopped to look, it stops the whole queue and you can’t go anywhere. You can’t walk, you have to wait … and you can’t see properly because people are standing in front of you”
(E-Castle-03, Para.104)

She does not seem to be alone in feeling this irritation; she notes that it affects other tourists as well, which in turn increases the generally negative effect:

“people tend to be tired when they queue for something, or they become very arrogant and frustrated and irritated and that kind of reflects those feelings when you start to feel irritated and tired and its just, you know, constant like, “Excuse me”.
(E-Castle-03, Para.104)

Anthony showed a similar awareness of the potential discomfort of being forced into a closer encounter with other tourists when he talked about the breakfast room at the hotel he had been staying in:

“We were on a table on our own, but other guests came in, didn’t they? And I know it should happen, because people get talking, then, but it is a bar to some people, you know what I mean? One of the worst times is breakfast, isn’t it, where you’ve just woken up and you don’t really want to be sociable, but you have to be unless the dining room has enough space inside”
(E-RYB-05, Para.8 and Para.12)
Only interviewees in the Gourmand or Grazer/Gourmand categories commented on the characteristics of other tourists, and their observations coloured by other aspects of the destination experience, such as a free and easy attitude, or reactions such as mismatch or feeling welcome. Edward and Martha regarded the differences as part of the experience, commenting “they just have a different philosophy of life, I guess, from what we do” (E-SW-02, Para.148) Jancis appeared to feel a mismatch between her expectations and experience, in that the large number of French tourists in London and Greenwich meant that she sometimes didn’t “realise that I actually am in England, the number of French accents” (G-27, Para.103), while Matthew was really commenting on the skills and attitude of their Edinburgh Castle guide:

“The amazing thing was when we started the tour, he asked everybody where they were from, he literally asked everybody, and it was amazing. We’d got people from all round the world in our little group … Poland, America, Canada, Australia… It was nice that he did that, though, it’s nice to have an idea of who you’re alongside” (E-Castle-04, Para.145)

While there were comments which would support the notion that tourists hold stereotypical perceptions of other cultures or nationalities, these were not made in relation to other tourists, but in relation to the differences between residents of the tourist’s own country and those of the one they were visiting.

All the above instances indicate the impact of the simple presence of other, unknown or stranger, tourists. There were few instances of actual encounters between interviewees and stranger tourists and these were usually cases of attractions or places being recommended. Kirsty, for example, has obviously chatted with the other guests in her B&B, and came to the Royal Yacht Britannia “because the people next to me at breakfast this morning said ‘It’s fabulous’” (E-RYB-02, Para.91). It would seem that unless obliged to by the fact of being in a tour group, most interviewees were aware of other tourists more by observation than by engaging with them. Indeed, one interviewee, having commented on the variety of other nationalities holidaying in England, said: “But do we mingle? No.” (G-27, Para.121). There seems to be a preference for maintaining a certain distance from other tourists whilst extracting the most from the destination in terms of engaging with the atmosphere and attractions, preferably also unimpeded by the numbers of other tourists. At the same time, it is important that all members of the travel party enjoy their experience. A partner or travel companion’s discomfort or lack of enjoyment can colour the tourist’s experience and shape their holiday stories; similarly, the experience can be enhanced if both partners’ different interests or motivations can be
satisfied in the same destination, as their individual positive experience is multiplied by seeing the other person enjoy themselves as well.

7.4.2 Tourist/host and tourist/resident interactions

In the initial coding, separate nodes were created for interactions between the interviewees and hosts, i.e. frontline tourism or destination representatives, and between interviewees and local residents, as it was considered there might be different elements to the two interactions. More might be expected of frontline staff, for example, or visitors might perceive differences in the attitudes of residents as opposed to tourism staff. On further review, it became clear that narratives about tourist/host and tourist/resident interactions could be broadly divided into anecdotes or recollections of direct encounters with tourism or other frontline staff (hosts) and the local population and comments upon various aspects of either hosts or residents. Table 7.29 shows the numbers of each in terms of references or stories rather than interviews.

Table 7.29: Direct Encounters and Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tourist/host</th>
<th>Tourist/resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourmet</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazer/Gourmet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazer/Gourmand</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourmand</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of interviews contain more than one anecdote or comment about hosts or residents, and there are several instances of overlap, where either an anecdote about an incident or encounter has led the interviewee to comment in more general terms on either residents or hosts, or vice versa. It is noticeable that there are many fewer references to direct encounters with residents, which is perhaps unsurprising in that unless staying with friends or relatives, most visitors are likely to meet and interact primarily with tour guides, accommodation operators, attraction and tourist information staff, or shop assistants, taxi and bus drivers etc.
7.4.2.1 Tourist/Host Encounters

Interviewees seemed to have had both positive and negative experiences of interactions or encounters with tourism frontline staff or services. In a number of instances, whether the incident was seen as positive or negative was related to whether the individual exceeded or failed to meet expectations. Dean and Ann recounted an incident where a waiter had searched high and low for some tomato sauce when asked for it, eventually producing some. As Dean put it:

“Now most places would say, ‘No, we haven’t got any’, and that’d be the end of it, so it made your day, didn’t it, really, that. It’s just little things like that, people going out of their way to help you.”

(E-Castle-02, Para. 41)

On the other hand Anthony, himself a guest house owner, felt the girl who showed him and his partner their bedroom was failing short of the standards he expected, because she did not give a full guide to the facilities in the room:

“All as she said to us was, ‘Breakfast in the morning is between 8 and 9.30’. Not, as we always tell our guests, ‘Tea and coffee’s there, if you need it’.”

(E-RYB-05, Para. 20)

In both instances, there is a mismatch between expectation and the experience which results in the interviewee recounting the particular interaction. Similarly, interviewees talked about disparity between the accommodation they had booked and what they found on arrival. James and Carolyn had specifically requested a room with a bath en suite at the time of booking over the internet, but when they arrived at the hotel they found the only en suite rooms had showers not baths. James commented, “it was just, I felt, unfortunate that they hadn’t said that in their reply” (E-SW-04, Para. 164). He seemed philosophical about it, but nevertheless disappointed enough to recount the tale.

As can be seen from Table 7.28 above, interviewees across all the consumption styles recounted incidents relating to direct encounters with hosts. However, there appear to be some distinctions between the consumption styles in terms of the impact of the encounters. Karen spoke of two different encounters. In the first, she and her friend were looking for a light evening snack and were given helpful recommendations by the staff of a more expensive, upmarket restaurant. This is then contrasted with the less than helpful attitude of the bus driver when Karen was unaware of the system for payment on Edinburgh’s bus services.

“We found one place, it was terrifically expensive. It would be nice if you go out for a meal once a month, but not like this, when we wanted something to eat just before we go to bed. We asked them, if they know any other place, because we don’t actually want this kind of meal now. They were very friendly, saying “Yes, you can go there, there, or there.” They weren’t offended or anything, not saying
“They don’t want to eat our food”, or “We’re too expensive for you”, so that was professional, polite. Actually it was what you should expect people to do, but they were friendly and kindly showed us the way to another place. The bus driver this morning wasn’t particularly as friendly, but anyway, it was fine…”  
(E-Castle-03, Paras.28-29)

“I wasn’t sure where to put the money, where to get the ticket. I just said, “Are you going to town?” and he said “Yes” and then I put the money in the totally wrong place, and what he did, he just looked at me as though to say “No, it goes there” and I just thought, “Sorry”. And he didn’t look bad, or anything, but a little bit like, “Don’t you realise the money should go there?” and I thought, “Well, thank you very much.” But I didn’t mind that. But that was the only thing. He wasn’t impolite or anything, but he didn’t say anything either, he just had no time. I heard him giving instructions to other people, so I don’t think he meant anything bad, and I didn’t take it that way, but I thought, “Well you could just say, well actually, you put the money there”."
(E-Castle-03, Para.33)

Karen, a Gourmet, seemed to be assessing these encounters not just in terms of how they made her feel at the time, but also against a particular standard of behaviour. Other Gourmets James and Carolyn, recalling an incident from a holiday in Paris, similarly talked about their shocked reaction at the time and seemed to be assessing the shop assistant in terms of standards of behaviour:

Carolyn: No, I, I think you walk away. I do a fair amount of travelling and I think you walk away with a sense of, uh, people’s receptivity to you, kindness, um…
James: It’s a question of blatant hostility, I suppose, as far as this obviously sophisticated woman to pretend to be so ignorant as to how to properly offer a sample of perfume.
(E-SW-04, Paras.152-155)

Dean and Ann (E-Castle-02) are classed as Gourmands, and in recounting the tomato ketchup incident quoted above, put more emphasis on how they felt about the waiter going that extra mile. Alison (G-35) had a disappointing experience with a motel in Portugal and contrasted the attitude of the motel staff with that of a tour guide on the same holiday:

“I did not get any place that I felt they cared, and people say Portugal is friendlier than Spain? I can’t say that… except for the people who were giving the tour, the little city tour, and they couldn’t have been nicer, and again, we tipped them. And they were friendly and funny, you know, and I thought… because you like to sort of walk into a motel and feel warm, you know, “We welcome you, whatever your problem is we want to hear about it.” And we had the air conditioning didn’t work and we had to keep calling them back, and you know, it was just, well, you don’t really care.”
(G-35, Para.40)
Also a Gourmand, Alison wanted to feel welcomed, to feel that her hosts cared whether she had a good or bad stay. She goes on to express disappointment that she does not have a warm memory to look back on:

“...there was nothing to say, “Oh, Geoff, remember the nice little lady that helped us?” You know what I mean? No, I was surprised, because I expected to have people just like being so welcome”
(G-35, Para.52)

Table 7.30: Grazer/Gourmands Tourist/Host Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-04 Para. 34</td>
<td>You could with a bit more, I think, really, that’s the only thing. They’re both a bit... they don’t stand out that much when you do your initial search for them, it’s a bit unclear which the official web sites are, and I found myself going off into things to do with websites that were owned by companies that were… It doesn’t sort of look like... I suppose in England you have the tourist authority ones which are much more obvious. They weren’t so obvious coming up here, as to what was what.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-11 Para. 168-172</td>
<td>Mike: We’re in a city centre hotel, anyway, but how do we get out to here? And... I must say that the Lothian bus site, the Lothian buses web site, was brilliant. First Bus’s was absolute crap. And... you think, well, why? First group is a huge group, yet it can’t tell you what bus you need to get from Princes Street to here... if they do a bus... who knows? CMG: The Lothian site, I would agree. I used it to research what I was doing down here and it is, it’s very helpful, isn’t it? Mike: It really is good. And... we’re intending to go to Falkirk, to the Falkirk Wheel, and again, you know, just two web sites and we found how to get from the station to the ... well, the leaflet tells you anyway, but its, its just where do you pick your bus up and just the links on, and you've found it. But again, nothing with First Bus’s. It was ridiculous. It takes you back to the main website. Well, who wants the main web site? You want the local one, and it just would not come up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-02 Para. 67-75</td>
<td>Marie: It was the lady that runs the place. I mean, it’s a self catering place, not a very big one, but we asked her this morning and she suggested, she sort of asked what we like to do, and we said we like to walk so she suggested we come down here. She must have been here before. Paul: She gave us a choice of London travel books to borrow... CMG: So that's made a difference to your stay, has it, with her being helpful? Marie: Yes, yes. On the booking accommodation, we just booked over the internet, and I mean, just feedback from her, once, and then backwards and forwards, you know?&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appeared to be little difference between Grazer/Gourmets and outright Gourmets, in that Grazer/Gourmets also made a form of judgement against standards in talking about encounters with hosts. Anthony (E-RYB-05), a Grazer/Gourmet, referred to what he considered the right way to treat guests when recounting examples of poor standards and behaviour in his hotel, as did the two ladies with sick husbands (Section 7.4.1.1). By contrast, Grazer/Gourmands as well as Gourmands cited instances of encounters where they were made to feel more or less welcome, but for some Grazer/Gourmands these seemed to be related to their need for reassurance. Two talked about their pre-visit
encounters via information websites: Matthew (E-Castle-04) had used a variety of tourist information sites, and Mike some Edinburgh bus operator sites. Both interviewees had expectations that the web sites would give accurate and easy to access information, and when this did not materialise, were left frustrated and in need of further reassurance. More positively, Paul and Marie (G-02) seemed to have been made to feel welcome by their self catering hostess through internet correspondence in advance of their visit, and by her asking what sort of things they enjoyed (Table 7.30).

7.4.2.2 Tourist/Resident Encounters
Fewer interviewees spoke about direct encounters with residents, as noted in Table 7.29 above. In some cases, the anecdotes gave rise to a more general reflection about either standards the interviewee expected or comparisons with other situations. For example, Charles and Sara recalled an incident from a previous visit to the north west of Scotland, when local people in a fish and chip shop had switched to speaking Gaelic. They felt this was distinctly unwelcoming, even downright rude:

“\emph{If someone is very, very friendly, even if he was speaking Gaelic, and someone comes in that’s speaking English, maybe he would switch to a language and speak less. For example, when French tourists come in, you make an effort to speak their language. And it seems really doubly unfriendly to switch to the language they can’t. If someone does do that, really they are being rude, there’s no two ways about it. I mean, it doesn’t really matter, and we’ve only ever had it, come across it once, and that was right at the northern part … when we went to the fish and chip shop…”} 

(E-Castle-06, Para.151)

Although Charles and Sara’s experience was negative, most of the encounters were positive, as illustrated in Table 7.31 below.

Interestingly, two of the three Gourmand anecdotes about encounters with residents are concerned with the exotic. Barbara and Carol (E-CASTLE-05) recalled the incongruity of walking down Princes Street and coming across the Scottish Indian Association bagpipe parade, whereas Edward and Martha (E-SW-02) commented on the fact that what to them is exotic or unusual is the everyday and unnoticed for local people:

\emph{“Well, we said to the girl in the, our, restaurant on Sunday night… We had a meal there and it’s a beautiful view out the window, you know? You can see all over the city, and she said, “Everybody says that to me but because I see it every day, I don’t see what you see.” And it’s just they’ve grown up with it so it’s nothing, it’s normal. Where we live, the oldest house is around six years old, so that’s… you look out the window and you see the water, which is lovely, but it’s nice to look out the window and see history, yeah. I don’t know if I’d like to live like that all the time, I don’t know…it’s just, you know, at this moment, it’s great.”} 

(E-SW-02, Para.179)
Table 7.31: Tourist/Resident Positive Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th>E-CASTLE-06</th>
<th>Para. 180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>It's very much chance, isn't it? Who you meet when you first come off... I mean, I was talking, I said, “Oh we need to go to Princes Street”, and somebody said, “Are you looking for Princes Street? It's round here” He overheard us and butted in.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grazer/Gourmet</th>
<th>G-10</th>
<th>Para. 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Uh, I’m just trying to think, I mean, every time we've ever asked anybody a question, its been answered immediately and everybody's been very helpful, to the point where we were looking at the map yesterday, this person asked us if he could help. Mind you, maybe you'd find that in any kind of city, but certainly, anytime we've asked anybody anything, it's been easily answered.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grazer/Gourmet</th>
<th>G-29</th>
<th>Para. 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Well the one that always stands out for me happened in Italy, years ago. This older gentleman... We were there with our kids, and they were under the age of fifteen, I think the oldest one was around that age, in Milan. We were obviously confused as to where we were going. This fellow jumped out of his car, nearly got himself killed crossing the traffic... He was determined to help us. It was early, we were looking for some place to eat which you just don’t find in Milan. And he took us into a restaurant, he sat us down and he got the owner, who was preparing for a wedding at that time... That's always the one that always stands out for me. I just always found people very helpful.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grazer/Browsing</th>
<th>G-12</th>
<th>Para. 14 &amp; 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>I met a lady on a train and she was telling me all these different spots, “You've got to go here and here and here” and I'd never heard of most of them. Horrible, I know. She pointed out a lot of things. “You need to take the river tour so you can see everything”, so I said “OK”...</em>&lt;br&gt;She was telling me everything, she pulled out her map, she said, “OK, I'll stop talking now” and I'm like, “No, tell me where I should go, I'm here for a couple of days, so I want to see the main things”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these and other encounters, current experience seems to be measured against standards and/or expectations from previous experiences. For Gourmets, this may be a more formal, related to standards (codes of practice, accepted behaviour, quality standards) whereas for Gourmands it may be more related to the way they feel as a result of the encounter. For example, Edgar (G-11) and Claire (G-10) talked about encounters which have set a benchmark for them, and Martha (E-SW-02) compared her home circumstances to those of the girl in the restaurant. This is summarised in Figure 7.7 and the process of comparison will be discussed in more detail in the section on Making Sense below.
7.4.2.3 Commenting on residents and hosts

The previous sections have considered actual encounters between tourists and either local residents or frontline staff within the destination. Even when there was no direct interaction, as in actual encounter, the interviewees nevertheless experienced a form of interaction simply by observing residents and hosts.

Table 7.32: Tourist/host and tourist/resident comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guides and tourist staff</th>
<th>E-Castle-01</th>
<th>G-19, Para. 30</th>
<th>G-26, Para. 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-01</td>
<td>“It was a nice tour guide, good sense of humour, and it was amazing, the things you found out, you know, about the different buildings…”</td>
<td>“I found the museum staff very polite, very helpful”</td>
<td>“They’re not proper commentators [guides on City Cruises] but he was absolutely super and had so much of interest to tell us of what we were passing by”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail and transport staff</th>
<th>E-Castle-04, Para. 54</th>
<th>E-SW-01, Para. 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-04, Para. 54</td>
<td>“…the bus driver was very helpful. He gave us a map of the city and he was shouting out where we were, and when to get off, as well.”</td>
<td>“…they can tell you’re not local, normally, if you’re buying, you know, souvenirs and things, stuff like that. They say, ‘Have a nice day’ or ‘Where are you staying?’ Sometimes you get quite nice chats.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glasgow vs. Edinburgh</th>
<th>E-RYB-02, Para. 62</th>
<th>E-RYB-09, Para. 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-RYB-02, Para. 62</td>
<td>“The tourist agency, the Glasgow tourist agency found me a fantastic deal on a hotel, and things like that. It seems to me it’s got the same level of tourism quality experience as here”</td>
<td>“No matter where you go, they [Glaswegians] are helpful. I found Edinburgh, and we’ve been here twice and this is our third time, they’re a bit more… a little bit colder, maybe it’s the tourist thing…”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.32 Cont: Tourist/host and tourist/resident comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents and Welcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-Castle-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It's just the friendliness and willingness to help you out and give you advice. Nothing seems too much trouble at all.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-08, Para. 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We’ve had random acts of kindness and that's really reassuring and that’s nice.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10, Para 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I guess anytime we’ve bumped into anybody they’ve always been very helpful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-22, Para. 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I guess most of the people I have encountered here have been friendly”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated by the examples in Table 7.32, comments on residents and hosts could be divided into comments on frontline staff, comments relating to the difference between Glasgow and Edinburgh, and general comments relating to how welcome the interviewees felt.

Table 7.33: Tourist/host and tourist/residents – positive reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-RYB-02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…well, I had to deliver a photo…A friend of mine was here two months ago and she had a photo taken in her favourite bar and I had to strike out and… it was a restaurant, really, not just a bar, and, they took … she stayed at the same bed and breakfast I’m staying at and she said to me, “Oh, they’ll tell you how to get there.” Well, sort of, so half way there I had to ask somebody on the street and she was nice and helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-SW-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re in an apartment, actually, that ah has a complete kitchen, and we were directed to a local market in St. Andrew’s Square… We’d walked right past it and didn’t see it so we just stopped a woman coming out of an office building, I think it was Scottish Life Assurance building on Queen Street, and she said, “Sure, I’m going that way,” and she took us right to it. That was nice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para. 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well, everyone’s been really pleasant, haven’t they, John? Anyone we’ve asked and we’ve been shown, and it’s what you want to see… everyone has been very helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The welcome in here was lovely, and everybody smiled. And so, that is nice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas there were a third more anecdotes about encounters with hosts as opposed to residents, there were similar numbers of comments about both sectors of the host community. However, Gourmets and Grazer/Gourmets made more comments about residents than did Gourmands and Grazer/Gourmands. Most interviewees made general comments to the effect that residents and hosts were friendly and helpful both in
Edinburgh and Greenwich, and the wider destinations of Scotland and London, giving rise to a sense of being welcomed, and enhancing their pleasure in the destination. A selection of these comments is given in Table 7.33.

Some interviewees had more neutral or even negative comments, particularly one or two who were particularly keen to engage with local people, or felt that frontline staff should be more welcoming. It was noticeable, however, that interviewees were not allowing such reserve or the lack of welcome, to deter them from planning to return. Elizabeth noted that “one is never greeted spontaneously, so there is that reserve” (G-07, Para.47) and that occasionally this becomes outright rudeness. Ruth commented about the lack of acknowledgement from shop assistants, which together with an incident from her trip to Dover, reinforced her impression that the English are pretty unfriendly: “they don’t talk, I find, nobody talks to you.” (G-03, Para.69). Nevertheless, she is already planning a return visit:

“we’re going to start saving up our rands again, because I really, I think London, England itself, is beautiful, I really do. Its not going to stop me from coming again. When I come again in two years or so, people will change…” (G-03, Para. 73)

Interestingly, another interviewee, Jessie, tries to ensure that her behaviour and attitude is such that it will not irritate or upset local people because of what she observes at home. Although American, she lives in what she described as a “touristic area” of France where they are “invaded every summer by UK residents”. As a result of what she has experienced at home, and her observations which “aren’t very pleasant in rapport to the visitors” that they have, she tries “not to imitate the same mistakes when I’m elsewhere” (G-28, Para. 38).

This same comparison with the home situation and destination experience, coupled with a refusal to be put off by interactions with the local community, whether residents or frontline staff, can be seen in interviewee comments on feeling safe and/or seeing beggars. Sometimes the interviewee had brought negative media images with them, more notably in Edinburgh, where both Trainspotting and recent media coverage of murders in Glasgow were mentioned. In all three instances, however, the interviewees either refused to let the media image put them off the destination or found that their own experience did not bear out the image. Kirsty, for instance, mentioned that four murders had taken place the night she stayed in Glasgow, and her friend had also warned her to be careful, but would not let that stop her exploring, despite being a solo traveller:
“No, and I’m here alone. Not at all, in fact, I’d tell anybody I think they’d be secure here alone. You know, I hadn’t travelled on my own for a while, and my boyfriend thought I actually wouldn’t carry forward on it, but I had a life before him. So I really, I wasn’t that nervous, and of course, everybody speaks English here. It’s not like going somewhere where you have to worry about the language.” (E-RYB-02, Para. 71)

There seems to be more than one factor at work here: a refusal to be put off by the media stories whilst at the same time there is an acknowledgement that not having to speak a foreign language helps to lessen any concern. In addition, there is a sense that Kirsty’s self esteem has been bolstered by travelling on her own and proving to her boyfriend that she is comfortable doing so. All of these are elements discussed above as being predispositions, and here they are interconnected with the way Kirsty reacts to this particular part of her destination experience.

Other interviewees commented on things like crime and/or begging, but rather than being put off by this aspect of the destination, seemed to compare it with home and accept it. Edward and Martha mentioned that they had been “approached in the street for money”, as did Gareth and Frances, but both couples immediately went on to say that this was unfortunately commonplace now. Gareth came from “Matlock, and there can be people, you know, begging in the streets there. It’s just a common thing, isn’t it?” (E-RYB-8, Para. 41). Pauline (G-09) took a positive pleasure in the fact that she felt much less threatened by street crime in London than she did at home in South Africa:

“Pauline: But its lovely here, not to ... I’m told, obviously, I carry ... this is my bag and I’m hanging onto it all the time because I’ve got my daily money in it, because my passport and air ticket is locked in the hotel safe.  
CMG: And using the Tube and things, you have no worries ...  
Pauline: Not at all. And that is part of the holiday. It’s wonderful to do that, because at home we’re watching over our shoulder every second. We live like animals, its instinctive now; we don’t know we’re doing it. And here, yes, I hang on to it, but I’m not... everyone does it, pickpockets are everywhere, but with the Tube you don’t have to worry about, you know, violent crime. That’s what I’m talking about.” (G-09, Paras. 75-80)

It is beginning to emerge that the interplay of motivations and their impact both on strategies for negotiating the destination experience and tourist interactions are complex. The data from this study demonstrate that consumption of the destination experience (place, people, interactions), the way it is reported and made sense of by visitors is contingent upon the predispositions they bring with them. Tourists interact with each other and with the host community (residents and frontline tourist staff), either directly in face to face encounters or indirectly by taking part in the same activity or being in the
same space. The complexity of the way in which tourists and visitors consume the destination experience is also beginning to emerge in the interplay of motivations, selection strategies, consumption style and interaction. The interactions discussed above form part of the overall destination experience, and the following sections/chapter will discuss how they influence both the tourist’s perceptions of the destination and the destination image carried away and transmitted to others. The discussion will explore further the interactions not only between people, but also between predispositions and experience in the sense making and sense giving process.

7.5 Sense Making and Sense Giving

In the preceding sections, the elements of destination experience and interactions have been considered as they emerged from the lived experiences of the interviewees. The researcher was most probably the first audience for some of these comments and anecdotes, relating to the current holiday in either Edinburgh or Greenwich/London and was therefore able to see how the interviewees were making sense of the destination experience as they were talking about it, and which elements might become the word of mouth image they would pass on to others. This section will first discuss the way interviewees seemed to be making sense of the destination for other people, and then how and if that differs from the way they make sense of it for themselves. In this way, the third research question will be addressed: How are visitor destination interactions and perceptions of a destination related and how is this manifested in or through visitor stories of destination experience?

7.5.1 Reporting

As well as drawing out changes in interviewees’ perceptions as a result of their visit, the responses to the general question, “What would you say about Edinburgh/Greenwich?” suggested differences in the way interviewees talked about the destination. In order to investigate this, the responses were collected into a node, Reporting. This was combined with the material relating to the different aspects of Perceptions, and gathered into a new node, Perceptions OR Reporting. This was reviewed with the Perceptions and Reporting nodes highlighted to assess the level of overlap between these two nodes. An overlap between Reporting and Perceptions seemed to indicate the interviewee was reporting their own experience, whereas when text coded at Reporting was discrete from that coded
to Perceptions, they were considering the question in terms of potential recommendations and taking into account the possible tastes/interests of the listener.

The structure of the responses was analysed by breaking the extracts into sections using headings, which uncovered five different styles of answer:

- Talking about things to see and do
- Talking about ways of seeing/doing - as in “just wander around” or “soak in the history”
- Talking about their own experience
- Using their own experience to illustrate a particular recommendation
- Relating to possible interests of the person asking about the destination

There appeared to be little relationship between style of consumption and these styles of answer. The majority (26) responded by talking about things to see and do. Some started off with almost a tour guide style list of options. Many people referred to things which they had experienced, starting with a list of places or things to see and do, and then illustrating these with their own experience/reflections. Some people launched straightaway into positive recommendations, rather than a list, based on their own experiences and perceptions. Still others simply repeated some of what they had already said about their experiences, leaving the interviewer or person listening to draw their own conclusions as to what to visit. The most enthusiastic of these could almost be described as evangelising about the destination:

*Ruth: Enthusiastic from own experience*

It’s small enough to be able to walk from one end to the other, which is marvellous. I find that fantastic, that you can get the Tube, you can come down here, you can go and see the Cutty Sark. . . There’s just so much to do. You can go to one of the pubs. It’s really wonderful. I would say to anybody, “you must go.”

(G-03, Para.95) (Researcher emphasis)

In only 13 of the 47 extracts did the interviewees mention the possible interests/tastes of the listener. Some very clearly recognised that not everyone was interested in other people’s travel tales. Most tempered their recommendations with phrases like “if they’re interested in that sort of thing” or “if you’re interested in history”, whilst in two interviews in the National Maritime Museum (Greenwich 19, 23), the interviewees specifically related their comments to the interests of a particular person such as their son or grandchildren, as in the following extract:
Rowena:
Things to see/do
I would just say it was a really beautifully done museum, it is very accessible, it’s easy to get here, it’s a short walk from public transport, beautifully set out, just an exceptionally enormous range
Awareness of others’ interest – specific group
I mean it’s wonderful for children. I have grandchildren and I was thinking about them as I came through here, thinking that the older one would just love it. And when they know more about history, you know, for them to come here when they are about ten or eleven would just be wonderful
Telling own experience
I mean, to see Cook’s handwriting, to see Scott’s signature… I mean, that’s fantastic
(G-19, Paras.80-81, 84) (Researcher emphasis)

There seems to be an understanding by some interviewees that other people may view a destination through a different lens. Some temper their holiday stories or recommendations as a result, while others view the destination not only through their own preconceptions but assess it partly with those others in mind. This section has discussed the way visitors report on their experience, i.e. give a sense of it to others; the following sections will consider the mechanisms by which they make sense of that experience primarily for themselves.

7.5.2 Forgiven Not Forgotten

This node was created as a free node at an early stage in the initial analysis of the Edinburgh interviews, to capture instances where interviewees talked about mildly to completely unpleasant or unsatisfactory experiences, but at the same time seemed to be reacting with a degree of empathy with either the situation or the other person. The understanding, coupled with the refusal to allow these incidents to create a negative image of the destination, as in the discussion earlier of social comment under tourist/resident interactions (Section 7.4.2.3), suggested that the destination was in some way forgiven. Nevertheless, the incident still forms part of the story the interviewee tells about the destination, indicating that although they may have explained it away to themselves, they have not forgotten it, hence the node title. It was then slotted into the node structure as a form of Reaction, in the sense of a response to a particular experience. However, as will now be discussed, extracts coded to this node also give some insight into how the interviewee is making sense of these particular incidents.

Charles and Sara (E-Castle-06) are Gourmets, considering themselves reasonably well travelled and experienced. They therefore do not let the fish and chip shop incident, recounted above (Section 7.4.2.2) put them off that part of Scotland, using their
experience from other parts of the UK as a reference point for making sense of the apparent unfriendliness to themselves, i.e. tempering the initial unpleasantness. Nevertheless, they still talk about the incident, and their listeners may not regard the incident in the same light, having a different set of standards of experiences through which to mediate the outcome.

Similarly, Marilyn and Rachel would have explored more of the attractions on offer in Edinburgh, but their husbands had both had ‘flu and then caught a stomach bug, so they “just did the girls’ things” (E-RYB-04, Para.43). They were clearly unimpressed with the treatment they received in their hotel, where the staff did not appear to empathise with their concerns for their partners, one of whom was diabetic and despite being ill needed food. All the hotel could provide was:

“toast and some butter, and I mean that was the only thing on the whole menu that they could actually offer him… it was disgusting.”
(E-RYB-04, Para.62)

Marilyn and Rachel might not have noticed the offhand attitude of the staff were they not affected by their husbands’ illness, but having received this treatment made them feel that “I wouldn’t like to come back to Hotel A”* (E-RYB-04, Para.80) and that when talking to people, “If they were going to Edinburgh, you wouldn’t say “Go to Hotel A” (E-RYB-04, Para.88). Although this experience will not affect their view of Edinburgh because they have enjoyed other aspects of the city, such as the Closes and the Royal Yacht Britannia, it has clearly made an impact and is something they will talk about. It is possible that the impression they convey to others as a result of their experience is that people in Edinburgh are offhand and unwelcoming, even if the attractions are worth visiting. This incident illustrates not only that, as mentioned earlier, the well-being of travel companions can affect visitor experience in itself, but that it can affect perceptions of related tourist/host interactions and as a result, the images they transmit through their holiday stories.

7.5.3 Comparison

The purpose behind interviewing people whilst they were actually on holiday was to capture the freshest impressions of their destination experience, before their holiday stories had been worked on, consciously or unconsciously, for an audience. Reading the Edinburgh transcripts, it became clear that some visitors were trying to make sense of the current destination experience in Edinburgh by comparing it with previous experiences.

*The name of the hotel has been changed in the interests of anonymity
There was a range of different reference points, both internal such as their own previous experience or their own standards and values, and external, such as information gathered from other people, the media or guidebooks and web sites. This was noted, and a node created to gather these references. Comparisons arose again in the Greenwich interviews as a means of making sense of the experience.

At the simple level, interviewees used comparison to convey a context for their comments or reactions. For example, the sense of awe, of touching history discussed above under Experience of Place arose not only from the physical power of the particular site, but seemed to gain added value because of the contrast with the interviewees’ perception of the lack of history or heritage of their own country. Some interviewees were impressed, almost overwhelmed, by the sheer numbers of people in London in comparison to what they were used to at home:

*Well, I mean, I don’t like crowds, but I mean, we expected that because we knew London’s very busy, we expected that, that’s not unexpected. It’s just like, we got on at Victoria, the train station, and I mean, you just sort of go with everybody or you get left behind. I mean that’s nothing like at home; we have a lot of people catching trains but nothing like here.*

(G-02, Para. 101)

As noted earlier, a number of interviewees made socio-political comments and observations about what they had seen of local residents. Paula and Jemima commented on the large numbers of what they called “black-skinned Britons” (G-01, Para.84):

*“Paula: And therefore, when we came back from visiting All Saints in Margaret Street, we walked further along and once again we saw these… dark skinned, or black skinned, Brits they are Brits, they’re from India or Pakistan, or you know, they’re from the Colonies, like we are, but they’re dark and I bet there’s no white skinned Britons who would do the jobs, but the streets are so clean, gutters, streets, you know, you barely see a bus ticket.
Jemima: Well it’s not really a job you’d like to do… A lot of Australians would take the dole rather than do that…
Paula: Well, no, but some people, their pride … they would rather take a job that pays them money, an honest shilling, rather than claiming a handout… But I didn’t see a… even a couple of kids who looked like supervisors, they were all, all dark skinned….”*

(G-01, Paras.78-82)

Whether or not their assumption was correct, they were using the comparison with their home country to try to understand this aspect of their destination experience. This is also true of Edward and Martha (E-SW-02) and Gareth and Frances (E-RYB-08) and their reaction to coming across people begging on the streets of Edinburgh, and links into the category Forgiven not Forgotten discussed above. The interviewees recognise that there
are beggars at home, or in other destinations, so by creating a comparison are able to rationalise their presence in the holiday destination as nothing unusual and therefore, crucially, nothing to disturb their holiday experience. In this sense, their presence is “forgiven”, but at the same time, it still forms a part of their holiday story and thus of the perceptions transmitted to their audience.

**Figure 7.8: Comparison**

The instances of comparison above, summarised in Figure 7.8, are general and have little relation to whether the interviewee shows Gourmet or Gourmand tendencies. However, there are other instances of comparison which may be related to Consumption Style. There are some examples where the interviewee appears to compare their own attitude towards the experience of visiting a particular site and what they think other people’s purposes, intentions or motivations might be. Rowena, for example, queried what some of the other visitors to the National Maritime Museum might be getting from their visit:

“I mean, it’s quite specifically maritime, really, it’s not going to be good for everybody. I mean, I sort of looked at the people and wonder why they want to be here”

G-19, Para.62

The implication, conscious or otherwise, is that she has the interest, knowledge or understanding to benefit from the exhibits, but that perhaps other visitors do not. Christine and Henry, Gourmets, are quite specific that they want to see fewer things in depth, considering themselves different to people they talk to who seem to have been to a lot of places but not really seen them. Barbara and Carol, on the other hand, are Gourmands who want to see as much of Edinburgh as possible, and so recognise that unlike their friends, they need to spend more time there:
“Someone else said we had to go to the Highlands, the Scottish Highlands, all that sort of stuff, so it's kind of hard because as Carol says, a lot of people said, “Oh you know, two days is enough”, but I think it depends on what sort of person you are, you know, whether you want to get the whole history and culture and all that sort of stuff, and we are. And so I think you've got to take your time, a lot longer than someone who doesn't. I definitely need more time here.”

E-Castle-05, Para.74

In the discussion of interactions in section 7.4 above, it became clear that there is a difference in the way in which Gourmets and Gourmands viewed their encounters with other people, whether other tourists, hosts or residents. Here again, comparison played a part in processing the experience in that interviewees were either applying a set of standards or judging one experience by comparing it to a previous one: Alison (G-35), a Gourmand, compares the way she feels about the welcome in various hotels whereas Anthony, a Grazer/Gourmet, tends to benchmark against a set of national standards for accommodation quality. This brings out one of the key differences between the two ends of the consumption style spectrum, namely the degree to which Gourmets tend to the ascetic, slightly distanced, the intellectual in the way they experience and the destination, whereas the Gourmands are more immediate, perhaps more visceral and sensual in their appetite for what the destination has to offer.

These differences in consumption style and the way in which Gourmets and Gourmands make sense of their destination experience are summarised in Table 7.34. As discussed in section 7.3 above, Gourmets are at one end of the spectrum and Gourmands at the other. Grazers were characterised as such because they appeared to be browsing across the destination without the drivers evinced by either Gourmets or Gourmands, although most Grazers demonstrated a tendency either towards one or other, depending upon whether they were Sampling (Gourmet) or Working Through a List (Gourmand). These constituted the majority of Grazers (11 Sampling and 12 Working Through a List) in this study. The remaining 5 Grazer interviews, which followed a Browsing consumption strategy, did not provide clear characteristics beyond an openness to whatever experience was on offer. This analysis has therefore largely concentrated on the two ends of the spectrum.
Table 7.34: Summary of Gourmet and Gourmand Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gourmet</th>
<th>Gourmand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality not quantity: fewer experiences in depth</td>
<td>See and do as much as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self image: connoisseurs, discerning</td>
<td>Self image: Well travelled, seen everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engages at intellectual level</td>
<td>Engages at emotional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting closer through intellectual understanding, appreciating historic, cultural or artistic merits</td>
<td>Getting closer through making connections with own personal or family situation or history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employs cultural, artistic and/or behavioural standards in assessing destination experience</td>
<td>Assesses destination experience in terms of physical/emotional comfort of self and others in group; inclusive, enjoys sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to presence of other people: do they affect ability to engage at intellectual level?</td>
<td>Reaction to presence of other people: do they affect ability to see/experience everything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with hosts/residents: evaluated against standards</td>
<td>Interactions with hosts/residents: relates directly to own comfort and well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some intellectual superiority</td>
<td>Making sense: compares against own previous experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making sense: compares against standards,</td>
<td>Forgiven not Forgotten is empathic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiven not Forgotten is understanding not empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5.2.1 The Gourmet

Gourmets come to the destination looking for quality rather than quantity of experience, like Christine and Henry (G-16). Their bundle of Predispositions (Motivations, Holiday Attitude and Mode of Interaction) tends to the intellectual rather than the emotional/sensual. Their motivations include Getting Closer, Self Enhancement and Escape, and they seek to engage with the experience on offer, but these tend to be expressed as intellectual rather than emotional interests. For example, they talk about imagining what a place might have looked like in the past (Carolyn, E-SW-04), understanding on an intellectual plane what life was like for the people who lived there (Karen, E-Castle-03), or appreciating the artistic and/or cultural aspects of the destination experience (Dutch, G-18). This can be translated into a form of intellectual superiority, conscious or unconscious, so that the self enhancement motivation is connected to improving or enhancing their self image as cultured, educated, knowledgeable people. Whether they are observing, engaging or interacting, they seem to be doing so in a way which evaluates what they observe against some standard or values they may hold, as
when Edgar (G-11) talked about the Athenian guide (see Section 7.3.4). There is a cerebral rather than empathic appreciation of the experience.

Dutch (G-18) seems to be motivated by a need for balance and harmony. He has come to Greenwich specifically to see the Inigo Jones buildings, and finds the Palladian layout of the site particularly pleasing. The need for a rational, balanced approach, nothing to excess, adherence to civilised rules of behaviour, seems to go beyond his reaction to the site at Greenwich, however, and to extend to his reactions to the people he observes in various destinations. He places emphasis on good manners, respect for others and for surroundings, and this informs his comparison of the experience he finds when travelling with his home town of Amsterdam:

“I come from a country where we have very bad manners, Holland, and we are very down in the pits. The way the English handle their foreign problem, foreigners, the multicultural society is so much better. There is a discipline here. People may not like the foreigners, but at least there is an outward discipline. . . . When I go to Cairo, I found a hundred times more friendly. In Holland, people will look at you, and through you, right through you, and they will look at you like ‘I am not going to speak to you.’ In Egypt, I mean, people go around you. They notice you, but then they don’t say a word. It’s not a matter of country, it’s a matter of . . . respect.”

(G-18, Para.64)

“The way people behave here. . . . I mean, talking about manners, it is. . . . The only noise I’d really want is those classes (indicating school parties) . . . whereas in Holland, everyone is loud. ‘I’ve got a right to be here, I’ve got a right to speak my mind.’ Children are horribly bad mannered there because they get free range. I am used to Italy, I lived a lot in Italy, so I can compare but still, people don’t think that maybe they are loud. . . . People lower their voices here, when you go around in the Queens House, people lower their voices.”

(G-18, Para.118)

Dutch’s answer to the question what would he say about Greenwich shows that his perception of the destination is equally informed by his need for balance, for a quietness of attitude as well as environment and this seems to be allied to his way of escaping from the disharmony of the everyday:

“Well I would recommend this place. . . . there was all this tremendous quiet, just 15 minutes from the West End. That’s what I would recommend. They should come here to recharge their batteries.”

(G-18, Para.135)

**7.5.2.2 The Gourmand**

By contrast, the Gourmand arrives in a destination wanting to see and do as much as possible, limited only by time, physical and, in some cases, financial considerations. Some, like John and Jancis (G-27), are aware of the possibilities of excess leading to exhaustion and others of the dangers of cultural indigestion (Alison G-35). Whereas
Gourmets may need reassurance about the quality of the experience they are about to have, Gourmands are more worried about missing out key elements and therefore are likely to have a list to work through. This can be related to how they wish to appear to others, the concern that they may not be considered to have “done” the destination if they have missed out key items, hence Fiona and Gareth’s concerns about the lack of information available in Edinburgh (E-RYB-08).

Gourmands connect more immediately with the destination experience by reference to their family and other personal things, as with Matthew and his appreciation of links to his family in the Chapel at Edinburgh Castle, cited earlier (E-Castle-04). Appreciating the historical or cultural aspects can be associated with giving a sense of reality to the material they learned at school, for example (Jancis, G-27), or really imagining themselves in the shoes of past inhabitants (Martha, E-SW-02):

“It’s history that we’ve learnt at school, it’s things we’ve seen on TV, and to actually be here and touch it, see it, feel it, it’s amazing.”
(G-27, Para.12)

“I got this feeling in Versailles that it was.. obscene. The actual... It’s really difficult to explain, but with all that wealth and with all that, all those poor people, people... the poverty... So I think that that wealth, that’s not... It’s so different, it’s obscene. And it must have been just a revolution, a revolution we had to have, you know, like one of our prime ministers said, it was a ... We had a recession, and it was a recession we had to have, so I think it was.. I think, so that’s what I think of the revolution. It was a revolution we had to have, yeah.”
(E-SW-02, Para.66)

This sympathetic, even empathic, quality colours their interactions with others in their travel party: their own enjoyment is affected by the quality of their companion’s enjoyment and well being, as in the case of Paula and Jemima (G-01). Equally, their perception of interactions with or the presence of others in the destination can centre on whether that presence has a positive or negative effect on their own comfort and their ability to fulfil their desire to see as much as possible (Jake and Jeannette, G-21).

This concern with physical and emotional comfort also colours the way Gourmands perceive the destination experience, assess it and transmit it to others. Their reference points for comparison are not external standards or values, but much more their own experiences and memories of how those experiences affected their comfort. Alison’s recollections of hotel staff (G-35, cited section 7.4.2.1 above) reflect her desire to feel welcome and that her wellbeing is paramount. She carries the memory of a previous experience as a benchmark, based on how she felt about the way she was treated:
"I mean, I've got experience in our own country, where I was leaving the motel and I had a problem and the lady helped me like she would have helped somebody coming in, and I have never forgotten that. I said, “What's your mission statement?” I said, “that they teach you that when I am leaving, you stop what you're doing to help me get the Yellow Pages to get my car pulled out of your thing.” Most people would say, “Well, we should just concentrate on people coming in” and her thing was, “No, our mission statement is that, when you're away from home, we are your home.” And that's what came across. But I didn't feel that at all on our tour, I mean we slept in beautiful motels, but I never felt that, or even that they were trying to help me with speaking, because we don't speak the language, but it wasn't like, “We'll get someone who does”, or, it's just like, you know, too bad.”

These characterisations describe ideal or extreme types and this thesis is not arguing that all visitors and tourists fall irrevocably into one or other type. However, it does argue that this typification, related as it is to selection strategy, can help illuminate how destination experience is mediated by factors visitors bring with them such as motivation, previous experience, anticipations, by the selection strategies they follow and the way they prefer to interact with the destination, and how they make sense of that destination experience.

7.6 Conclusion

This study set out with research questions intended to discover what interviewees brought with them to the destination, what their experience had been and how that experience had affected their perceptions of the destination, both in terms of how they recalled it for themselves and talked about it to others. In the course of the foregoing analysis of interviewees' responses, anecdotes and narratives, it has become clear that visitors arrive with their own set of anticipations and predispositions which they carry into their destination experience. That experience comprises a set of interactions with people and places which are affected by and made sense of through those predispositions (motivations, consumption style, holiday attitude). The mechanisms for making sense include a process of comparison, of rationalisation, and simple reporting. The output from these processes can be the stories visitors tell others about their experience, sense giving, and/or the memories and perceptions of the destination which the visitor carries away (sense making) and which, in turn, become part of the suitcase of anticipations and predispositions they carry to their next destination experience. This dynamic, cyclical, process is illustrated in Figure 7.9.
The categories of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand, whilst not intended as a definitive typology, have been explicated and proved useful in furthering an understanding of the way in which visitors approach and move through the consumption process. Regardless of the individual’s location on the spectrum between Gourmet and Gourmet, and of differences between types of holiday and destination, it is considered that the visitor’s anticipations and predispositions are mediating factors in the way they make sense of their destination experience both to themselves and others. This sense making process and its implications for our understanding of visitor experience and destination image will be discussed further in the following chapter.
CHAPTER EIGHT
Discussion

8.1 Introduction

The previous chapter analysed the findings of interviews with visitors in a variety of locations within Edinburgh and Greenwich, both of which are recognised visitor/tourist destinations. From the basic categorisation of responses to identify the elements of the destination experience it was suggested that these visitors brought with them a variety of anticipations and predispositions. These included their reasons for choosing the destination, their motivations in terms of the benefits they sought, and their preferences for the way they liked to be on holiday. It was demonstrated that within the destination, visitors interacted with place, with people and with place mediated by people. The interviews revealed that visitors appeared to make sense of their experiences using the mechanism of comparison – assessing the current destination experience in relation to previous knowledge, experiences or anticipations. The outcomes of that process were adjusted perceptions of the destination which fed back into the anticipations carried to the next destination or holiday, and travellers’ tales which would be told to family, friends and colleagues, in turn feeding into their set of anticipations and colouring their image of these destinations. The analysis thus demonstrated a process of sense making and sense giving which both affects the visitors’ own image of the destination and the one they transmit to others.

This chapter concentrates on addressing the second part of the fourth research question, “How can we understand these visitor stories and what can we learn from them”. It will therefore discuss the findings presented in the previous chapter in the wider context of the existing research into tourist destination image, tourist motivation and experience considered in the literature review chapters. It does so by reconstructing the sense giving and sense making model layer by layer to show how that process contributes to destination image formation (sense giving) and reformation (sense making). It will identify where the study links to or builds on existing work, where it addresses acknowledged lacunae in the literature, and thus its contribution to knowledge and understanding of the visitor sense making and sense giving processes. It will also consider the merits of the phenomenological approach taken to the visitor stories. Finally, it will point to the implications of the research for destination marketing and management which are set out more fully in the concluding chapter.
8.2 Sense Making

Part of this study’s contribution to knowledge lies in the demonstration of the dynamic nature of the visitor’s sense making and sense giving processes and the way those processes are mediated by visitor characteristics, anticipations and motivations. One objective of this study was to use inductive methodologies to derive a model of the impact of destination interactions on visitor perceptions and destination image. The model presented at the end of the previous chapter has been derived from the themes and categorisations which emerged from the visitor narratives captured in the destination. It describes the dynamic process whereby visitors make sense of the interactions they have with the destination, both for themselves and for others. The model has been developed by employing a phenomenological methodology to arrive at an understanding of the visitor stories, and through the stories, of their lived experience of destination interactions. In conveying their experience and perceptions of the destination to others, these visitors are contributing to the store of impressions and knowledge which make up what Gali Espelt and Donaire Bonito (2005) refer to as a priori destination images held by their audience, yet at the same time developing their own a posteriori destination images, those which they will relive in memory and photographs.

There is a sense, moreover, in which the in situ perceptions are also contributing to the visitors’ own future a priori images: they will become part of the bundle of anticipations taken forward to the next holiday or destination. This was shown by the way in which numerous interviewees used memories of previous destinations or interactions to evaluate and help them make sense of their current experience of Greenwich or Edinburgh. This demonstrates a sense making and sense giving process founded upon the interaction of the visitor’s pre-existing knowledge and anticipations of the destination with their experience of people and place, and the comparison of current with previous destination experience. In other words, the individual mixture of motivations, anticipations and previous knowledge or experience acts as a filter for the current experience. Previous experience and anticipations colour both the actual interaction and the reflection after the event, both for the visitor him or herself (sense making) and in the way they retell their holiday stories for others (sense giving).

For the purposes of discussion, the model derived at the end of the previous chapter can also be represented in a more linear fashion. In this section, the process is stripped down to its basic elements, and then built up layer by layer. This will reveal the complexity of the interplay between predispositions, anticipations, experience and interactions which leads
to the sense making and sense giving which emerge through the visitor stories. Figure 8.1 below illustrates the basic elements of the process.

**Figure 8.1**

From a phenomenological perspective, the visitor’s stock of knowledge is the bundle of anticipations and predispositions they bring to the destination. It is made up of the visitor’s own previous experiences, skills and recipes for dealing with people and situations (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973), and serves as the framework through which they interpret their experiences. As it both shapes and serves to mediate those experiences, it appears in the model both before and after the actual interactions with people and place.

Beforehand, these anticipations may shape the way the visitor experiences an interaction: if the visitor anticipates being excited or overawed by being in front of a particular painting or historic object, they may be more irritated by the press of other visitors than someone who is merely ticking off the object from their list. On the other hand, as demonstrated by Melanie, who went up in the London Eye just to avoid splitting her travel party, a visitor with few, or negative, anticipations can experience much greater pleasure when these are confounded. However, the bundle of anticipations and predispositions can only serve for interpretation after the particular experience; when the visitor is in a souvenir shop or standing in front of Nelson’s coat, their attention is taken up by living the experience, rather than being aware of the experience as such. They can only be attentive to the act of being in front of Nelson’s coat by stopping and thinking about it, for example when the researcher asks them about the highlights of their visit.

Meaning is not inherent in experience, but conferred by the visitor when they reflect on it (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973, p.53). The visitor on a skiing holiday who has a good day on the slopes, skiing at the top of their ability, is so concentrated on the activity itself, so caught up in the flow, or peak experience, that the full meaning and value of the experience is only recognised in reflecting upon it afterwards. At the time, there is simply
the exhilaration of the good run. Afterwards, the skier can recognise the combination of mental and physical achievement, the high of tackling a difficult run successfully, and the feeling of accomplishment. In phenomenological terms, therefore, sense making and sense giving is necessarily carried out in retrospect: the visitor can only fully understand the impact of experience, and the elements of that experience, whether place or people, after it has happened.

All visitors will experience and build up their knowledge of a destination as individuals, but they do this in relation to other people, and on an assumption that they share some basic conditions, experience aspects of the destination in a similar way and have similar reference points for making sense of the destination. When a couple, family or group are on holiday, each individual will have a data set based on their own experiences and history, but a part of that data set will also be the result of joint or shared experiences. For example, Katie (E-Castle-04) has childhood memories of Edinburgh and her partner Matthew has family connections with the fallen soldiers commemorated in the Chapel at Edinburgh Castle, but at the same time they have shared experiences from previous holidays taken together. There is thus a social stock of knowledge, a set of understandings, experiences, skills and recipes for dealing with people and situations which is rooted in the social milieu; in this case, the travel group, home country or community to which the visitor belongs. The individual uses his or her stock of knowledge to make sense and discover meaning in the experience and in addition, the things they hold in common with others enable them to create a shared meaning from the experience.

In the Schutzian life-world, there is a distinction between the world within actual reach and that which lies within potential reach (Schutz and Luckmann, 1973). For visitors, the destination is the world within actual reach, their immediate surroundings, whereas their experience of other destinations or elements of destinations whether at home or on previous holidays, such as hotels, attractions, shops or interactions with hosts or tourists, can be said to constitute part of the world within potential reach. The visitor has experienced those situations and can retrieve them as guidelines or templates for making sense of the current destination. Thus Ruth (G-03) feels unwelcome and unacknowledged in English shops because the assistants do not greet her on arrival or say goodbye when she leaves; this is in contrast to what she has come to expect from South African shop assistants. On a more positive note, Pauline (G-09) has brought with her apprehensions about crime which arise from her experience at home, and is delighted by the feeling of safety she encounters in London. Experiences are unique to the
individual, but it is possible to sort them on the basis of either explicit or implied preconceptions, founded in a mixture of previous knowledge and experience, motivations and behavioural characteristics: the anticipations and predispositions identified as categories in the previous chapter (Table 8.1) and illustrated in Figure 8.2 which appears on page 198.

Table 8.1: Anticipations and Predispositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipations</th>
<th>Individual Attributes</th>
<th>Stereotypes</th>
<th>Previous Experience</th>
<th>External Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destination Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Word of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predispositions</th>
<th>Interactive Mode</th>
<th>Holiday Attitude</th>
<th>Motivations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Prioritising</td>
<td>Getting Closer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectating</td>
<td>Free &amp; Easy</td>
<td>Self Enhancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Welcomes the Exotic</td>
<td>Something Different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing</td>
<td>Seeks Reassurance</td>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seeking Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always Wanted to Go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individuals will have differing combinations of these elements both in advance of and during a visit. The data in the previous chapter showed how their knowledge of, and anticipations about, the destination are derived from a variety of sources: internal in the sense of their previous experiences and stereotypical beliefs about the services, facilities and culture; external in terms of information acquired from brochures, word of mouth and media images. These anticipations combine with the various predispositions to shape the way visitors approach the destination experience and interactions. Thus a visitor who has “always wanted to go” to a particular destination will invest considerable time and money in making the trip; as a result, they may research using guidebooks, recommendations from friends and family or internet blogs, so they can plan and prioritise how they will spend their time to get the most value from their visit, whatever that value is perceived to be. For some visitors, it will be Getting Closer to family or cultural heritage, whereas for others it may be Self Enhancement, for example, doing a particular activity or pushing themselves to master a particular skill. At the same time, they may seek reassurance from those same guides and other sources of information that they are indeed getting the best experience and not missing out on anything. Another visitor may be motivated more by a desire for something different, either from their daily routine or their home culture, and more open to taking the experience as it comes. They will still have anticipations based
on a mixture of stereotypical conceptions, their previous experience and media images which will affect the way they approach the destination experience.

The bundle of anticipations and predispositions which the interviewees in this study brought with them to the destinations consisted of a mixture of the cognitive, affective and conative elements of destination image as described in Gartner’s model of image formation (Gartner, 1993). Many of them had acquired information from brochures or the internet, but also from news and entertainment media, as well as from family and friends. In addition, they referred to impressions of Greenwich as being historic, and Edinburgh as old and historic but having plenty of shops and being lively. These cognitive elements came out very readily in response to the initial question, “What made you choose Edinburgh/Greenwich? What did you expect to find?” and were coded as various aspects of the category Anticipations. In terms of the distinction made above, these can be classed as being explicit anticipations and form part of the criteria used to evaluate, or make sense of, destination experience and interactions, discussed later in Section 8.2.3. The affective and conative elements were more apparent in the material coded under various aspects of Predispositions. Gartner (1993) suggests that affective elements of image relate to benefits sought, or motives for selecting a particular destination. This was certainly true of many of the interviewees in this study and was to a greater or lesser degree implicit rather than explicit. Some, like Matthew (E-Castle-04), did answer the initial question with an explanation of why they had come on holiday, referring to family connections or to coming to experience history (G-01). With other interviewees, however, the affective element was not explicitly stated in answer to the initial question, but emerged during the course of the interview as the interviewee was encouraged to talk more about their experience. For example, it was not until half way through the interview that Shirley (G-06) revealed that she and her husband had come on a short break to get away from a stressful situation, and that she had specifically chosen to come to Greenwich because she felt it would be something her husband would particularly enjoy.

Theories of image formation identify different elements which make up an image, as discussed in the review of destination image literature in Chapter Three. This study indicates that it is relatively straightforward to identify and separate out cognitive aspects of image, i.e. tangible attributes of a destination such as buildings, climate, facilities and attractions. However, the relationship between affective and conative aspects of image, and predisposition factors identified in this study, such as motivation and holiday attitude, is more complex. Gavin and Fiona (E-RYB-08), for example, were in Edinburgh on a short break. Their bundle of anticipations and predispositions included a need for
reassurance, which was partly bound up with their media induced perception of Edinburgh as a destination rife with drug addicts and associated violence. However, they also had a need to acquire as much information about the attractions and places they visited in order to reassure themselves that they had not missed out on any significant places or material and could therefore maintain their image of themselves as being well travelled. In other words, their need for reassurance was related to psychological comfort. The role of comfort in the sense making process will be discussed further later in this chapter.

The literature identifies numerous different types of factors in destination image. However, this study demonstrates that these factors are not completely separate, but rather they interact with each other. Numerous authors concentrate on a priori image and its importance in destination choice (Baloglu, 1998, 2001; Baloglu and Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu and McCleary, 1999; Beerli and Martin, 2004b; Chon, 1991; Crompton, 1979a; Echtner and Ritchie, 1993; Kozak and Rimmington, 1999; Leisen, 2001; O’Leary and Deegan, 2005; White, 2004; White, 2005). The findings from the current study show that actual experience and interactions feed back into a priori image factors, both for the visitor themselves and for the people to whom they tell their holiday stories. The influence of visitation has been noted by a few authors (Beerli and Martin, 2004b, 2004a; Fakeye and Crompton, 1991; Lehto et al., 2004; Selby and Morgan, 1996), but how visitation and particularly interaction with the destination affects image, i.e. the process whereby the visitor makes sense of their destination experience and transmits it to others, has not been explored until the current study. Part of this study’s contribution is thus that it demonstrates a dynamic and ongoing process of sense making mediated by visitor characteristics, anticipations and motivations.

Encounters or interactions with people and place are major parts of the destination experience, and in many cases the two are combined. The experience of place can be mediated either by a direct interaction with other people, or by the impact of the simple presence of others. For example, the press of large numbers of other tourists impeded the interviewee’s ability to obtain the value they sought from attending a particular exhibition (G-21). The key themes emerging from the interviews in relation to place, sense of history, atmosphere and making connections, were connected to categories of motivation such as getting closer and self enhancement, and reactions such as pleasure and awe. That these combinations differ from interviewee to interviewee, and in relation to the interviewee’s categorisation as having Gourmet, Grazer or Gourmand tendencies, suggests that the interaction between motivation and experience is more complex than much of the literature allows. Pearce (Pearce, 1993; Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983;
Pearce and Moscardo, 1986) admitted that tourists can move up and down the travel career ladder and indeed, proposed that the term travel career pattern might be more appropriate (Pearce and Lee, 2005, p.227). This study indicates, however, that tourists can experience a combination of several different motivations within the one holiday, related to different factors. For example, Malcolm was motivated both by the desire to find out more about his family roots in south London as well as by a wish to spend time with his partner, and ensure both have an enjoyable holiday. The two ladies in Edinburgh whose husbands were ill during their stay were clearly motivated by concern for their husband’s physical comfort, but also by a desire to share the experience of the various attractions with them and had consequently limited their activity to “girls things” whilst the husbands were recovering (E-RYB-04, Para.47). Other interviewees showed different combinations of motivations. Martha and Edward (E-SW-02) had “always wanted to go” to Scotland, felt they had to get as much value from the trip as possible because they had travelled so far and saved to get to the UK, wanted to get closer to the history and the legends that Scotland represented, and had chosen to do something different to their normal vacations by going further afield than usual and by not having every element of their itinerary planned in advance.

Figure 8.2

These and other examples in this study indicate that the interplay of motivations, experience and other predispositions is a dynamic process, illustrated in the further development of the model in Figure 8.2. Each individual has their own combination of anticipations and predispositions, but this is modified by their interaction with others in the travel party and by what they find in the destination itself. For example, some interviewees had an overall plan to ensure they obtained the most value from their visit,
but demonstrated a degree of flexibility in that they were prepared to change their daily plan depending on weather, availability of options or preferences of others in their group. This indicates that priorities are to some extent contingent upon the circumstances encountered in the destination. However, the visitors make sense of their experience and decisions to themselves in the act of recounting those same experiences and decisions to others, i.e. through the sense-giving narrative of their holiday stories.

### 8.2.1 Gourmet, Grazer, Gourmand: Variations in Sense Making

The combination of anticipations and predispositions discussed above not only shapes the interactions within the destination, it also acts as a lens or filter through which the visitor processes that experience and begins to make sense of it. The elements of the destination experience are the same – people and places – but individual visitors both make sense of and present the experience in different ways, contingent upon their particular combinations of selection strategy, predispositions and anticipations.

**Figure 8.3**

The analysis in Chapter Seven indicated there are common sets of motivations for visiting, and common sets of reactions to the experience on offer in, a destination and that these are experienced and expressed differently depending upon whether the visitor tends to Gourmet, Grazer or Gourmand characteristics. These ideal types complement recent research (de Guzman et al., 2006) which suggests tourists can be segmented according to their motivations, as the Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand categories help to explain how motivations, anticipations and predispositions combine to colour the individual’s interactions with, and evaluation of, the people and places they encounter in a destination.
These categories have therefore been incorporated into the sense making model at Figure 8.3.

The differences in the way interviewees experienced Place (Sense of Place, Sense of History, Atmosphere) are incorporated into the sense making model in Figure 8.4. These, together with the way they expressed that experience and what this revealed of their motivations can be related to the various forms of authenticity discussed in the literature. This thesis is concerned with the impact of visitor-destination interactions on destination image, rather than with the validity of authenticity as a concept. However, as discussed in Chapter Five, the degree of authenticity experienced is put forward in the literature as one way of evaluating visitor experience, although the literature review concluded that the concept of authenticity was problematic. The following section discusses the contribution this study makes to that debate from the perspective of the sense making and sense giving process.

Figure 8.4

Both Gourmets and Gourmands can be said to seek one or more forms of objective authenticity (Chronis, 2005; Jamal and Hill, 2004; Pearce and Moscardo, 1986; Reisinger and Steiner, 2006; Wang, 1999), but at the same time they may also be seeking forms of existential, constructed or phenomenological authenticity (Jamal and Hill, 2004; Wang, 1999). Gourmets, motivated by a desire for self enhancement and learning, appear to seek constructive or symbolic authenticity conferred by historical or factual accuracy, validated by authoritative bodies. At the same time, sharing this constructive/symbolically
authentic experience with their travelling companions may deliver a form of inter personal existential authenticity. At the other end of the continuum, the Gourmand is more likely to experience what Chronis (2005) categorised as originality (the original site, the very spot where…) as well as forms of intra and inter personal existential authenticity relating the destination experience to their own history, culture and family ties either through nostalgia, romance or communitas (Wang, 1999).

The review of existing work on authenticity in Chapter Five noted the many interpretations of what constitutes authenticity and the recent suggestion by Reisinger and Steiner (2006) that object authenticity, i.e. the question of whether toured objects are real, genuine or unique, should be abandoned by researchers. They argued that attention should instead be directed to “the diverse and personal nature of tourist experiences” (Reisinger and Steiner, 2006, p.81). It was also shown in the review that motivations and authenticity are closely linked elements of tourist experience. For example, Cohen's (1979) modes of experience are based on the degree of engagement or otherwise the tourist feels for his/her daily existence and therefore the level of engagement they seek in their vacation experience. This study extends this notion of “degree” of experience: in developing an ideal typification based on the interactions between motivations, holiday attitude and selection strategy to describe the style in which the destination is consumed, it adds “type” of experience as determined by the categories of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand.

The idea of authenticity is very much an academic construct and certainly interviewees in this study did not use the term when talking about their experiences. However, the variety in the reactions to elements of destination experience, and particular the different forms of Sense of History, indicate an inter-relationship between motivations and reactions, reflecting the connections made in the literature between motivation, experience and authenticity, as well as suggesting there are different forms of sense making. These seem to be dependent, or contingent upon, an interaction between prior knowledge, preferred Interactive Mode (Engaging, Spectating, Observing, Learning) and Motivation which then colours both the experience and the reaction to it. In the three examples below, these prior factors come together with different results. One set of visitors is looking for what they consider to be an authentic experience, another is more open to what might be called a pastiche, in that it includes elements of performance and interpretation, whilst the third are more concerned with relating themselves to the destination. In effect, these are examples of the individual visitor’s predispositions acting as the filter through which they make sense of their experience and retell that experience (sense giving) to others, in this case, the researcher.
Some visitors have an intellectual appreciation of the historical significance of a place or artefact, a connection based on either a pre-existing knowledge of the object’s place in history, or the facts presented in the interpretation of the site or artefact. This visitor expects a greater depth of information, attention to historical detail if objects are restored or reproductions, and looks for guides to be knowledgeable about the site/artefacts in their care eg, Edgar (G-11), Rowena (G-19), and Terry (G-36). Learning, and enhancing their own self image as cultured, knowledgeable or well educated, self improving people, can be an important motivation for these visitors. Whilst they may appreciate the use of computerised displays to allow them to drill down for more information, they may be less likely to appreciate the use of costumed guides or animateurs unless they can see that these are truly adding to the accurate presentation of the site. Elizabeth, for example, does not “always care for that kind of costumed thing - it’s a little artificial” (G-07, Para.75).

There is a sense in which this kind of interpretation is regarded as a performance, judged on accuracy of portrayal rather than on atmosphere and emotional involvement.

Others were happy to use their imagination to obtain an understanding of how the site might have looked in the past, or what conditions might have been like, and appreciate the use of modern technology to assist them in this. They welcomed the opportunity to be awed or overwhelmed by the achievements of past societies or cultures, but this is still an imaginative, intellectual connection rather than an empathic one. These visitors might look for informative guides and interpretation, but were also open to reconstructions, virtual imagery, or re-enactment as means to convey the story of the site. Motivated by a desire to get closer to history as much as by a need to learn, their reaction was to the experience of seeing the “real” thing, or what they understand to be an accurate representation of it. Malcolm, for example, talked about Cluny:

“They’ve not recreated the original Abbey but they have brought what’s there and made it into a live exhibit, you can walk around it. You can’t totally see the extent of this thing, but it was massive. You can see the foundation. They’ve only managed to excavate and preserve a certain portion of it, but they show you clearly on a 3D relief map the whole thing. There’s this big map that shows you. And you say, ok you’re here. This is the portico, and if you look to your left, you’ll see this is just the entrance to the Abbey. And this thing is like, it’s as big as this (indicating the Visitor Centre) and that was just the entrance. Can you imagine what the actual nave was going to be like? And you look down from the entrance and you can see all the bases of where the columns were and some of the columns are still partially there, and you just look in the distance like this and go “Oh my god!”.”

(G-30, Para.185)
For a further group of visitors, the sense of history was much more emotional, sentimental or nostalgic. These visitors made a direct connection between the history on display in the destination and either their own past, their family or their home. It might be simply coming face to face with the historical artefacts or places about which they learned in school, or finding a connection between street names in the destination and place names in their home town or country, or being in a place which has connections with their family. Rather than engaging at an intellectual level, these visitors seemed to relate themselves to the destination:

“*Its history that we’ve learnt at school, its things we’ve seen on TV, and to actually be here and touch it, see it, feel it, it’s amazing.*”  
(G-27, Para.12)

Both of the first two kinds of visitor can be said to be looking, consciously or otherwise, for a form of objective or of symbolic/constructive authenticity (Wang, 1999) in that they are evaluating the experience in terms of the accuracy of representation, whereas the latter may be relating more to an existential form of authenticity, connecting either to their own childhood through seeing in the flesh, so to speak, objects or sites about which they learned at school, or making direct connections to their own cultural or family heritage. However, this study’s findings indicate that a visitor’s destination experience may include more than one form of authenticity, just as the visitor has a number of different motivations. Wendy (G-20) enjoyed the historical side of Greenwich and could be said to be seeking museum authenticity, yet at the same time she found her own enjoyment was enhanced by her husband’s enjoyment of the more mechanical aspects, so could also be said to be experiencing Wang’s intra personal form of existential authenticity (Wang, 1999). It would seem, therefore, that the primary experience, in this case enjoying the historical aspects of Greenwich, can be enhanced or reduced by the circumstances of the visit, such as the enjoyment or discomfort of travel companions. One significant aspect of this analysis is the demonstration that the experiencing of authenticity is subjective, supporting Morgan and Pritchard’s view that “there can be no one authentic touristic experience – there are simply many different experiences” (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998, p.243).

Cohen (1979) noted that visitors might move through different modes of experience in one vacation and this was supported by Uriely’s study of backpackers (Uriely et al., 2002). However, the current study not only supports the view that tourists/visitors both seek and experience multiple forms of authenticity in one destination, but also suggests that these multiple forms can be experienced simultaneously rather than sequentially. In other
words, visitors do not necessarily move sequentially from one form of authenticity to another, in the manner suggested by Uriely (2002). Furthermore, the evidence from this study indicates that the categories of authenticity should be reviewed and supports Reisinger and Steiner’s view that the multiple kinds of object authenticity should be abandoned in favour of investigating the individual nature of tourist experience (Reisinger and Steiner, 2006, p.81). Despite the acknowledgement that the particular element of history, whether a person or an artefact, is firmly in the past, there is nevertheless a sense for some visitors that their experience of history is real because they are standing in the same place, or are in the same space as the object. The visitor’s emotional response or reaction to that experience is real, in the same way that a parent’s response to their child’s enjoyment of, say, Disneyland is real. The emotion and response are genuine, even if the object or place which provokes them is “inauthentic” in that it may be a replica, or a representation rather than the actual. McIntosh and Prentice concluded that “tourists aid in the production of their own experiences of authenticity” (1999, p.608); Reisinger and Steiner (2006), taking a Heideggerian view, argue that the significance of experience is unique to each individual because no two people have identical histories or are in the same space at the same moment. This study demonstrates that there are common categories of motivation, anticipation and predisposition, which form patterns of consumption and sense making. At the same time, as the content of these categories differs from individual to individual, so each visitor makes sense of his or her destination experience on their own terms. It is real and authentic to them.

8.2.2 Making Sense through People

Thus far, the discussion has primarily centred around visitor experience of place and place mediated by people. However, as demonstrated in the previous analysis, interactions with people, whether with tourists, hosts or residents, are a major element of destination experience. Figure 8.5 therefore expands the sense making model to include the main categories of people interactions:
In The Art of Travel, Alain de Botton (2002) suggests that the visitor’s image of a destination is romantic and attractive because incomplete, and that this is equally true of memories of travel. Before departure, the image is formed by information from brochures, travel guides and stories told by friends, all of which show only the edited highlights. The visitor’s anticipation is equally coloured by what Dann (1996) calls the conative element, i.e. what they imagine they will do once they are in the destination, and the affective element, i.e. what they expect in terms of intangibles like atmosphere. De Botton argues that actual experience of the destination, whether interactions with the place or with people, can lead to disillusion as it completes the picture with overmuch mundane detail, and creating a mismatch between the anticipations and the experienced reality. Moreover, a further mismatch is created by the inescapable fact of the visitor bringing him/herself on holiday (de Botton, 2002, p.20). From this study, it is clear that not only does the visitor bring him or herself along, but in many instances they also bring their travel companion(s), which also affects the destination experience.

In the discussion above, it was shown that there are different combinations of motivation and reaction to place. The previous chapter illustrated the different combinations of motivation identified in relation to interactions with people in a destination, whilst the analysis revealed the conscious and unconscious process of negotiation and compromise related to the need to ensure the physical and emotional wellbeing of travel companions. Enjoyment can be enhanced by the pleasure of sharing or observing a partner or travel
companion’s pleasure in the destination experience; almost a form of pleasure by proxy. On the other hand, the presence or preferences of a travelling companion might limit or amend the choice of attraction or activity, either because of physical limitations or because the individual might not want to detract from or spoil their companion’s destination experience. As suggested above, the interaction between motivation and reaction can be both explicit and implicit in the visitor’s narrative, and revealed to the audience and visitor alike through the processes of justification and comparison discussed below.

Turning to the impact of tourists outwith the travel group, Sartre’s comment that “L’enfer, c’est les autres” (Hell is other people) (Sartre, 1944) may be a pessimistic view of the human condition. Whilst the view “I am a traveller, they are tourists” may not be universal, nevertheless, in de Botton’s terms, other tourists may be considered to contribute to the overmuch mundane detail which leads to disappointment (de Botton, 2002). This study suggests that for some visitors, other tourists may constitute a form of destination purgatory, and that there is a similar process of compromise when it comes to dealing with their presence. Other tourists are accepted as a necessary evil, but the use of avoidance strategies and tactics, such as travelling out of season, or finding ways to escape from the throng, can result in a compromise between the quality of experience and possibilities of some facilities or attractions not being available. That the presence of other, stranger tourists can be a negative factor is demonstrated by stories about overcrowded attractions, lack of space to stop and stare, or being hustled through with no time to appreciate the attraction, artefacts or buildings which may deter potential tourists. Yet, at the same time, the very presence of other tourists can endorse the significance of tourist site, providing the reassurance that, say, Gareth and Fiona (E-RYB-08) require. It would appear, then, that the degree to which the presence of other tourists definitely detracts from the overall destination experience is related to the extent to which they are considered as preventing the individual from achieving what they want to from the visit, whether that is soaking up the history, having enough time to stop and stare, take visits at their own pace, or simply making the visitor feel crowded.

In discussing the literature on tourist interactions in Chapter Four, it was suggested that tourists might assess other tourists, as well as hosts and residents, in terms of cultural differences and stereotypes. There is a sense in which other tourists, as well as residents, are genuinely “Other” and can therefore be gazed upon in the same way as sites, artefacts and spectacles. Indeed, few of the interviewees talked of direct encounters with other tourists, with references to tourists outside the travel party consisting largely of
observations or comments rather than anecdotes about direct encounters. Moreover, some interviewees showed a reluctance to engage with other tourists, preferring to maintain a distance. However, this study suggests the negative impact of other tourists on destination perceptions arises much more from the sheer presence and number of other tourists giving a feeling of being crowded or too busy, than from any stereotypical notions based on nationality or culture such as discussed by Pizam and colleagues (Pizam and Jeong, 1996; Pizam and Sussmann, 1995) or Reisinger and Turner (1997, 1998), although it is accepted that this may be related to the degree of social/cultural distance between different tourists. The study findings also suggest that the visitors in this study, at least, did not look for a deeper engagement with or understanding either of other tourists or of hosts and residents, supporting McIntosh’s view that tourists are not, in fact, motivated by a form of amateur anthropology but rather are content to gaze (McIntosh, 2004).

Dann and Phillips (2001) contended that the area of tourist/tourist interactions was worthy of further research. This study demonstrates that the presence of other tourists, whether travel companions or strangers, has an impact on destination experience. Whether this impact is positive or negative depends upon the individual. Within the travel party, it is dependent upon the tourist’s motivation towards their travelling companions. If tourists feel that their travel companions are, or may be, physically or emotionally uncomfortable, their own enjoyment of the destination is compromised. Although they may have positive experiences from their holiday to counterbalance the negative, any audience to whom they recount the negative incident may not have the same balancing memories, and may, for example, extrapolate from Marilyn and Rachel’s experience that not only are staff in that hotel unfriendly, so are people in Edinburgh (E-RYB-04). More positively, the negotiation and compromise necessitated by travelling with others appears to result in an expanded consideration list of attractions and activities. This would tend to confirm that Gilbert and Hudson’s interpersonal factors are indeed valid for participation in general tourist activities, and to decision making whilst on holiday as well as in destination choice (Gilbert and Hudson, 2000). Moreover, it is not only travel companions who may shape the choice of places to visit; instances of encounters with tourists outside the travel group influencing the decision to visit a particular attraction indicate the very real power of word of mouth recommendation.
8.2.3 Sense Making through Sense Giving

The individual’s experience of place is mediated by interaction with people, whether direct encounters or just the presence of others. The impact of these encounters or the presence of others depends upon motivational factors, as does the reaction to place discussed above. The degree to which the pleasure and comfort of travelling companions is important affects the visitor’s evaluation of the destination and the report they give to others. Similarly, the presence of other tourists, and encounters with hosts and residents, affect whether the visitor is able to feel they have achieved the maximum benefit from their destination experience; in other words, whether they have obtained the value they sought. This value may have been sharing a pleasurable experience with travelling companions, learning more about their own culture or heritage, achieving mastery of or using a particular skill, or simply escaping from the stresses of their normal life.

These values may be implicitly or explicitly expressed in the stories the visitor tells about their destination experience. For example, in this study interviewees used comparison and/or justification in talking about their experiences. Comparison, as noted in the previous chapter and suggested by Bickart and Schwarz (2001), is a way of setting a context for the audience and benchmarking against previous experiences or standards. It can also imply the value being sought by the visitor and whether or not it is being achieved. In terms of word of mouth publicity, the impact the stories have on the audience will depend upon the existing knowledge and any previous experience the hearer may have. Someone hearing Karen’s tale (E-Castle-03, see Section 7.4.2.1) might conclude that the surly bus driver is representative of the general level of welcome for visitors, unless they are aware of other, more positive, aspects of the destination to counterbalance this impression.

The findings of this study identified three mechanisms whereby visitors make sense of their experience, either directly or indirectly, through telling their stories to others: Justification (Forgiven not Forgotten), Comparison and Reporting. Figure 8.6 shows these as the final stage of the sense making and sense giving model. Where interactions were negative, or resulted in feelings of discomfort, the interviewees in this study appeared to rationalise the experience so as to minimise its impact on their overall perception of the destination. Where they were positive, it would appear that interviewees distilled them into a benchmark against which to assess future interactions. Edgar (G-11) retained the memory of the Athenian guide because she gave him the level of information which suited his self image as an educated traveller, whilst Alison (G-35) used the
excellent way she was treated in a Canadian motel as her touchstone for assessing customer service. These experiences are incorporated into the visitor’s stock of knowledge and future destination experiences are evaluated against these yardsticks. In the same way, their reports about their experiences will be incorporated into the stock of knowledge of the friends, family or colleagues to whom they tell their holiday stories.

Figure 8.6

The justification mechanism, examples of which are categorised under “Forgiven not Forgotten”, is similar to what Ryan (2002a, p.74)) called “adaptive behaviour” to avoid or minimise dissatisfaction or, more pro-actively, to ensure satisfaction. However, this study’s findings suggest that the retelling of the experience, the sense giving, may be the means whereby the visitor realises why the experience or interaction was good or bad. They may be aware of their feelings or reactions at the time of the interaction, but the motivations, anticipations and values through which they evaluate the experience are clarified, consciously or unconsciously, through their post hoc narrative.

Comparison is a key mechanism in the sense making and sense giving process, both as a means of evaluating the elements of destination experience, and of giving context to that evaluation. It is potentially more complex than rating one experience against the other, because of the interplay of anticipations, predispositions and reactions which contribute to each experience. For example, a Gourmet might be well aware of the physical criteria for a two star hotel, and consider that if all he/she is doing is sleeping there, that will be fine. However, if in one two star rated hotel he or she is met with exemplary courtesy and then in the next with surly, offhand behaviour, the second hotel will be judged as disappointing
in comparison with the first. If it were to happen the other way around, the visitor would most likely doubly recommend the establishment where they were met with courtesy, simply because it was such a contrast with the offhand behaviour. A Gourmand might want to soak up as much of the atmosphere of a historic site as possible. At one site, they find they are hemmed in by the press of other tourists who prevent them seeing everything and effectively force them to move with the crowds. This will be thrown into sharp relief when contrasted with their experience in another site where they are free to wander at their own pace and there are fewer people so they can take in as much or as little interpretation and information as they wish. The experience in the first hotel or site will have been carried into the stock of knowledge and the comparison between the two forms the basis for the evaluation of the second hotel or site. When motivational factors are included in the experience, such as the illness of travel companions, or desire for physical comfort, the impact of the comparative process can be even greater.

Padgett and Allen (1997) and Thompson et al. (1989) suggest that consumers, in this case visitors, make sense of their experience through narrative. At the time, the visitor simply lives the experience, and it is in retrospect, through sense giving as they retell that lived experience (van Manen, 1990) to others (friends, family or in this case the researcher) that they can also make sense of it for themselves. However, the narrative process seen in this study also reveals the complexity of the interplay between predispositions and destination experiences. The two ladies (E-RYB-04) might not have taken such exception to the hotel staff attitude if their perceptions had not been coloured by concern for their husbands’ well being, nor would they have revised their opinion of that particular hotel chain downwards from the higher opinion based on previous experience. An hotelier, Alan (E-RYB-05) has prior knowledge of the standards set for a three star hotel and understands the impact on guests of being forced to sit with other tourists due to lack of space in a hotel dining room. This influences his interactions with hotel staff and his evaluation of their interactions with other guests. All of this becomes apparent in his retelling of the experience during the course of the interview: how he, and the others, make sense of the experience.

Visitor narratives thus contain both an explicit statement of how the visitor values the experience and an implicit expression of the values they hold which affect their interaction, their perception of it and the way in which they talk about it others. This is apparent both from the sense giving described above, and from the discussion earlier in this chapter in relation to the variations in sense making and degrees of authenticity. This study demonstrates that visitor destination experience involves not only interactions with people
and places within the destination but also interactions between the visitor’s predispositions and their experience. These latter interactions serve as a filter through which the visitor’s perceptions of the destination are revised and influence the destination image they carry away and transmit to others. The next section will discuss how and why the hermeneutic phenomenological approach adopted for this study has enabled the researcher to gain insight into these complex processes.

First, however, it is appropriate to reflect on the findings in relation to the literature reviewed in earlier chapters. The basic descriptive categories which emerged from the first reading of the interview transcripts confirmed that visitors’ anticipations, their pre-visit image of the destination, is indeed a compound of organic and induced elements acquired through a variety of sources. Existing work suggests that visitation affects destination image, but has focussed on identifying what is changed by visitation, rather than how that change is effected. This study has uncovered the process by which changes in perception take place, and demonstrated that interactions with the people and place in the destination do indeed affect both the image retained by the visitor and that transmitted to others through visitor’s holiday tales.

Motivation was identified as one of key elements of pre-visit destination image formation (Baloglu and McCleary, 1999), and discussed under Dann’s headings of escape, ego-enhancement and fantasy (Dann, 1977, 1981). This study has both confirmed these categories and demonstrated they are interconnected. Moreover, in capturing visitor stories, it has been able to overcome the issue visitors’ reluctance or inability to talk about other than surface motives for going on holiday or choosing a particular destination (Dann, 1981), and uncover the complexity of tourist motivation. That interviewees evinced different motivations in their stories supports the view in the literature that motivation is a dynamic concept. By taking a phenomenological approach, rather than separating out different factors, this study has been able to demonstrate that not only do combinations of motivations differ from individual to individual, and situation to situation, but that the relative importance of each element will vary with destination context. This is particularly evident in the impact of travel companions upon destination experience, which in turn confirms the inter-relationship between motivations and interactions within the destination.

The findings of this study have been discussed in relation to the literature on authenticity and visitor experience earlier in this section. The process by which the visitor makes sense of their destination interactions and experience is complex in terms of the various factors involved and the way in which they are themselves interactive, more so than the
existing literature suggests. However, it is possible to understand this complexity using the typifications and model developed in this study to explain the visitor’s sense making and sense giving processes.

8.3 Reflections on the Phenomenological Approach

As discussed in earlier chapters, there is growing recognition by tourism researchers that tourism experience comprises an amalgam of physical, environmental and emotional elements, and each individual’s experience is unique, contingent upon their own particular combination of motivations, expectations, prior knowledge, consumption style and strategy. It is for this reason that authors have increasingly called for qualitative approaches to elicit richer information than can be obtained through standard, a priori, researcher defined surveys, as detailed in Chapter Six. This study therefore sought to capture respondents’ lived experience through semi structured interviews, to encourage the interviewees to recount their destination stories and through analysing those narratives, uncover the means whereby they made sense of their experience to themselves and others (sense giving). This section reflects upon the effectiveness of this approach and the value of the resultant model of the sense making and sense making process.

The analysis in Chapter Seven and the foregoing discussion demonstrated the complexity of destination interactions and the inter-relation between the elements of destination experience. None of this complexity would have emerged through using a standardised research instrument, nor any of the richness of the data which has allowed the sense-making and sense-giving process to emerge from the interviewees’ narratives. The use of the unstructured interview allowed the interviewees to talk freely about their impressions and interactions. In particular, a standardised instrument would not have uncovered as much data in relation to motivations, because as Dann argues, people cannot always express or understand their own motivations (Dann, 1981, pp. 202-203). It is therefore the role of the researcher to interpret motivations, always provided s/he does so from the perspective of Verstehen, or understanding. Such an interpretive explanation, or intuition of meaning, can then assist in developing a theoretical structure such as the sense making and sense giving model arising from this study (Coser, 1977).

It is this sense of Verstehen, or understanding, which underpins the development of the Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand categories set out in the previous chapter. These are
descriptive categories which explain the variations in the way anticipations and predispositions affect visitors’ behaviour in a destination and how the sense making processes are carried out. The categories are therefore akin to Weber’s ideal types, i.e. accentuations of typical ways of acting, constructs to enable the researcher to measure similarities and differences in concrete cases (Coser, 1977). They are not intended as universal types, but as a means to achieve understanding of the process whereby visitors make sense of their destination experience and interactions. There is thus a double hermeneutic, in that the categories arise from the researcher’s interpretation of the interviewees’ understanding of their experience, as expressed in their destination stories. The same double hermeneutic has been employed to tease out the role of the comparison and justification mechanisms. The researcher is interpreting the visitors’ narrative (sense giving) to arrive at an understanding of the sense making process.

The categories of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand are in effect points along a continuum. Visitors will exhibit a tendency to one extreme or the other, but this is mediated by the presence of other people and circumstances. Nevertheless, the categories can be a useful tool for explaining some visitor behaviours. For example, the business visitor with a spare afternoon in their programme still faces the same choices as the leisure visitor. A Gourmet might well have researched the attractions that interest him/her and choose to spend the entire afternoon enjoying an in depth visit to one gallery, museum or event, whereas the Gourmand might prefer to tick off as many items as possible in the time available. Grazers with Gourmet tendencies might browse or sample with a view to coming back later for a more in depth visit, whereas Grazers with Gourmand tendencies might sample as much as possible in order to identify what they “should” include on any future visit. A key component of the categorisation is thus the strategy visitors employ for choosing among the various elements of the destination experience. This strategy, and the priorities it implies, therefore contributes to the sense making process.

Van Manen (1990) writes of capturing lived experience to arrive at a description and elucidation of a phenomenon and thence its essential characteristics: reflection upon conscious experience uncovers the structures through which meaning is assigned to that experience. A phenomenological approach enables the researcher to explore the richness of individual’s lived experience, using it to explicate and illuminate the key characteristics of that experience, thereby arriving at an understanding which “resonates with our sense of lived life” (van Manen, 1990, p.27). Applying this approach has enabled the researcher to explore visitors’ destination experience through their narratives. The resulting sense making and sense giving model explicated above is not prescriptive, but is
rather a mechanism for explaining the role and relationship of the elements which combine in the destination sense making and sense giving process and will allow researchers to investigate these processes further, whether in the overall destination context or in more specific contexts such as the consumption of heritage attractions, theme parks, nature attractions and activities or accommodation settings.

8.4 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the findings of this study in the wider context of existing research into destination image, tourist motivation and experience. It has built up and examined the sense making and sense giving model, layer by layer, suggesting that the bundle of predispositions and anticipations visitors bring to a destination are their stock of knowledge, serving as a framework through which they interpret their experience for themselves and for others. The elements in the bundle of predispositions and anticipations were compared to the cognitive, affective and conative elements of destination image described in the literature. It was argued that the study shows these elements are not separate but interact with each other, and are both incorporated into the visitor’s stock of knowledge, or image of the destination, and transmitted and fed into the stock of knowledge of the audience to whom they tell their holiday stories.

It has been shown that there is a great degree of interplay and connection between motivations, anticipations and predispositions – all precursors to the destination experience – and the elements of that experience. Visitor reactions to and evaluation of their experience is affected by the bundle of anticipations and predispositions they bring with them. This study demonstrates that all these are elements in a dynamic process in which visitor priorities are contingent upon the circumstances encountered within the destination. In particular, the relationship between motivations and reactions suggests there are many and varied forms of sense making, dependent upon the particular predispositions of the individual. Visitors not only experience combinations of motivations and of authenticity, but all or any of these elements can be experienced simultaneously rather than necessarily sequentially, as suggested by Pearce and colleagues (Pearce and Caltabiano, 1983; Pearce and Moscardo, 1986; Pearce and Lee, 2005) and Uriely (2002).

Visitor experiences are assessed and evaluated by being filtered through the individual’s particular predispositions, whether for themselves or for others. The processes of justification and comparison are important mechanisms in the sense making and sense
giving process. Justification appears to be the way visitors minimise negative impacts and maximise benefits of destination experience to themselves and others, and is recognised as having similarities with adjustive behaviour (Ryan, 2002a). However, whilst the impact of justification may be to adjust their view of the experience to enable the positive to be fed into the visitor’s own stock of knowledge, the impression which may be transmitted to their audience, whether friend, family member or colleague, may be predominantly negative, depending upon that audience’s own stock of knowledge relating to that destination. This in itself reinforces the importance of comparison, which is both a mechanism for setting a context for the person hearing the travellers tales, and a manifestation of the way in which the visitor uses their internal dataset to make sense by evaluating the current destination experience against previous ones.

The sense giving and sense making model derived from this research should be a useful tool for both academics and practitioners. At the theoretical and conceptual level, it will allow researchers to study the processes which underpin the formation or alteration of destination image as a result of visitation. It brings together the elements of destination image formation and destination experience in a manner which explains how visitors make sense of their destination experience and how that evaluation is passed on to others through word of mouth in travellers’ tales. The three ideal types, or categories, of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand, are a mechanism for understanding how the different combinations of motivations, anticipations and preferences for engagement and holiday attitude affect the reaction to people and places, and thence the anecdotes told.

This research, and the model derived from it, will contribute to future researchers and practitioners’ ability to understand the logic underlying the reasons for visiting particular destinations, and may be useful in investigating and predicting the potential of as yet undeveloped destinations or attractions. In demonstrating the interactions between the elements of the sense making process, and particularly the simultaneous and multiple combinations of motivations, reactions and experience, this study supports arguments for concentrating on individual tourist experience in all its diversity and abandoning the search for a single, unified concept of object authenticity.

The practical benefits and implications of this study for destination managers are set out in Chapter Nine. However, in summary, this study will assist destination managers and marketers to understand the impact of people, place and place mediated by people on visitor perceptions and the word of mouth publicity and information they transmit. It will help them to understand the potential effect of changes in visitor flows, addition or
removal of facilities, and meeting or not meeting not only expressed but implicit visitor needs. It also suggests that whilst targeting specific visitor segments, they should bear in mind the impact of travel companions and signpost to benefits which might not be applicable to the target segment, but to their companions.

Finally, the analysis and discussion of the findings in this study demonstrate the value of an interpretive approach and the usefulness of investigating lived experience to understand the processes of destination experience and interactions. The study has not only captured the visitors’ lived destination experience but has been able to uncover the complex processes which lie beneath that experience and enable the visitors to make sense of their experience, feeding back into their stock of knowledge for future visits. Allowing visitors to talk freely about their destination experiences, transcribing their narratives verbatim and then teasing out the explicit and implicit meanings through a constant movement from the parts to the whole and back again has enabled the researcher to develop an understanding of the interactions at the heart of destination experience.
CHAPTER NINE

Conclusions

9.1 Introduction

The initial research questions, outlined in Chapter One, were born out of the researcher’s personal and theoretical curiosity as to whether and how visitors’ encounters within a destination affect the image of that destination which they carry away with them. At the same time, a question was raised as to whether the standardised questionnaires commonly used in visitor satisfaction and destination benchmarking surveys were able to capture the full richness of the visitor’s destination experience. This concern arose because such studies imposed criteria for evaluation rather than allowing the visitor to express freely their impressions and perceptions of the destination.

Reviewing existing research relating to tourist destination image, tourist motivation and visitor experience revealed a number of areas for investigation. It was noted that studies into destination image have tended to focus on destination attributes as indicators of image, either in relation to image formation and change over time and distance, or in relation to visitor behaviour as evidenced by intention to return or recommend. There appeared to have been little direct research into whether actual visitation affects image, or into the role of destination interactions in image formation. Motivation was acknowledged in the literature as a major factor in destination choice and expectation formation, and seen to be a complex and dynamic phenomenon which differs from person to person and situation to situation. The interview data showed that these motivation factors were not experienced as discrete motivations and that more than one motivation factor could be operating simultaneously on any one individual in any specific destination context. The interview data also showed that these motivation factors affect an individual’s interactions with the people, facilities, and built and natural environment in a destination.

Turning to the ways in which visitors might assess and comprehend their destination experience, it was seen that increasingly commentators are recognising the individual and personal nature of tourist experience. That experience has been conceptualised variously as modes (Cohen, 1979), gaze (Urry, 2002), performance (Perkins and Thorns, 2001) and consumption (Inglis, 2000; McIntosh and Prentice, 1999; Voase, 2002). Building upon the literature, it was proposed that individual tourist experiences combined to form a process of destination consumption, and that as motivations and expectations
affect experience of specific attractions or places, they might equally affect the experience of a destination as a whole. Existing literature on tourist interactions had largely concentrated on tourist/host interactions in relation to their impact on the host community rather than on tourist experience and impact on destination image. Analysis of the visitor stories captured in this study revealed the process whereby that experience is digested and understood by the visitor, becoming absorbed into the expectations and anticipations carried forward into future holidays.

The literature review had identified a number of areas where there was little or no existing work: the impact of actual visitation on destination image, the interplay between the motivations, anticipations and predispositions which the visitor brings to a destination and their interactions within that destination, in particular interactions with other tourists, and the ways in which post visit image is transformed and transmitted through visitor stories, or word of mouth publicity. Moreover, the majority of destination image and visitor satisfaction studies had been carried out from a post-positivist, or quantitative, perspective. This study developed an interpretive phenomenological approach to explore and understand visitor-destination interactions through visitors’ own narratives. The fieldwork, in the form of interviews, provided answers to some of the questions raised, and the analysis of the interview transcripts led to the development of a new model which describes and explains the processes by which visitors make sense of their destination experience.

### 9.2 Key Findings

The first research question concerned the identification of the elements of visitor-destination interactions. Initial analysis of the interview data yielded descriptive categories which could broadly be differentiated into those components which the visitors brought with them (anticipations, holiday attitude, interactive mode and motivations) and those which they encountered within the destination (people, place and their reactions to those encounters). Moreover, the visitor stories captured in the interviews clearly demonstrated that visitation and interactions with and within the destination had affected the destination image held by the interviewees. The study has therefore extended the literature on this aspect of destination image.
This research has also shown that there are common categories of visitor experience which shed light on patterns of destination consumption. Further investigation of the interactions between holiday attitude, interactive mode and motivation revealed differences between interviewees in terms of the way they approached the destination experience, which suggested that destination experience might be part of a process of consumption. Analysis showed that some individuals were concerned about the possibility of “cultural indigestion”, whereby they might suffer a surfeit of sights and experiences, and others referred to picking and choosing, perhaps with a view to returning for a more in-depth or comprehensive experience at a later date.

Three consumption styles were thus identified and described: Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand. Differences in strategy for experiencing what the destination had to offer were also discerned, indicating that interviewees either picked a few things to see and do in more depth, ranged over the whole destination but without any particular direction, or else made a determined effort to see and do as much as possible. Consumption strategy and style were related to the individual’s holiday attitude and consumption style: those categorised as Gourmets had a free and easy, take it as it comes attitude but preferred to see fewer things “properly”, whereas those categorised as Gourmands were most often working through a prioritised list to ensure they either did not miss anything or had “done” as much as possible within the particular constraints relating to their holiday, such as time, money or physical condition. As the majority of Grazers identified in the study demonstrated a tendency towards either Gourmand or Gourmet behaviour, with remaining Grazers exhibiting no clear characteristics beyond openness to experience, the analysis concentrated on the two ends of the spectrum.

The categorisations of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand are ideal typifications, based on characteristics and behaviour exhibited by the interviewees. They were developed from the consumption styles and selection strategies, and facilitated understanding of the ways in which destination experience is mediated by the factors visitors bring with them (motivations, anticipations, previous experience), the selection strategies they follow (browsing, sampling, working through a list), the way they prefer to interact with a destination and how they then make sense of that experience. By thus encapsulating a number of characteristics and behaviour practices into discrete groupings, the Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand categorisations make possible some predictions about visitor behaviour.
Visitors at any point on the continuum between Gourmet and Gourmand might experience the same forms of motivation (economic, social, self image or reputation) but these were shown to manifest themselves differently. Gourmets want value in terms of more thorough, longer visits to fewer attractions so that they can really feel they have grasped those aspects of the destination, engage with experience as connoisseurs who want to learn to improve understanding or who may even feel themselves to be somewhat apart from other tourists in that they either have greater knowledge and understanding or feel that they do. Gourmets seem to use more formal standards when judging or comparing experiences, such as expected standards of behaviour, or external criteria such as star ratings.

Gourmands, on the other hand, feel they have to see as much as possible either to justify the expense of a trip for which they have saved both money and holiday allowance, to maintain their self image as someone who is well travelled and knowledgeable, or to ensure they have seen everything that can be regarded as the “right” things to see. The Gourmand’s concern with physical and emotional comfort, both their own and that of their travelling companions, colours both their enjoyment of the destination experience and their interactions within the destination. Their criteria for judging and assessing experience are based more on an emotional response, how they feel or are made to feel by an interaction. This might be making an empathic connection with places and people through their own family history, bringing things they learned at school to life, or imagining themselves in the shoes of past inhabitants, or it might be a benchmark relating to how welcome hotel staff make them feel.

The classification and model developed in this study assist researchers to understand better the way in which the bundle of anticipations, predispositions and motivations which each visitor brings with them affects their perceptions of the destination experience. For example, the Gourmet parents taking their children on a skiing holiday might be motivated by the desire to afford their children the chance to learn and enjoy a new skill, to appreciate the different cuisine, language and customs of the resort, or perhaps the different forms of wildlife in mountain country in winter. They will be more likely to focus on whether the teaching in ski school is of an approved standard leading to a recognised award at the end of the week. They will then take pride in and share their children’s pleasure at the achievement. In contrast, Gourmand parents may be more likely to want their offspring to sample as many winter sports activities as are available and appropriate to their age (skiing, boarding, ice skating, tobogganing), for them to cover as much of the skiing area as possible, and to sample as much as possible of the après-ski. If poor
weather closes the pistes, the Gourmet parents might look for alternative activities which will inform and educate as well as entertain their children, whereas the Gourmand might simply want to ensure their children do not miss any of the other activities and facilities available, to feel that nevertheless, they have “done” the winter sports holiday “properly”. The implication of this for destination managers is that they need to be aware of the different ways in which motivations, anticipations and predispositions affect the visitor’s overall impression of a destination and in addition to signposting to a range of additional activities and facilities, they must be able to reassure visitors as to the quality as well as breadth of experiences available.

This thesis has argued throughout for a qualitative approach to the present subject which might capture the visitor’s lived experience, and do so in particular whilst still fresh and before overlaid with the accretions of memory and repeated retelling. Chapters Two and Six, in particular, developed an interpretive approach to the analysis of visitor stories: grounded in a phenomenological openness to the subject, with constant movement from foreground to background, it was suggested that this approach would yield a richer comprehension of the destination sense making process. Chapter Six set out the criteria for trustworthiness in qualitative research (credibility, dependability, transferability and confirmability) and proposed a constant movement to and fro between data and concepts, constant checking for negatives and exceptions in the interview data, and using computer assisted qualitative data analysis software as various means of addressing these issues.

This study has demonstrated the utility of the phenomenological approach: by privileging the visitors’ narratives, it has enabled the researcher to develop a richer and deeper understanding of ways in which the main elements of destination interaction are inter-related, and so reveal the visitor’s sense making and sense giving processes. In so doing it has answered the calls for increased recognition of the value of qualitative approaches, provoked by the predominance of research based on a priori, research determined attributes and hypotheses noted in the literature review. It is clear from this research that visitor stories about their destination experience can indeed be a window to understanding the relationship between visitor characteristics, motivations, anticipations and their interactions with people and place. The act of retelling and reliving the experience allows the visitor to reflect on aspects which, although present, might not have been in the foreground at the time due to the absorption in the moment. The comparisons or justifications used to convey context or make allowances for what might otherwise be negative impressions are mechanisms by which the visitor makes sense of their
experience and absorbs it into the bundle of anticipations they take forward into future destination experiences.

9.3 Contribution and Implications of the Research

This work contributes to the understanding of image formation processes by providing an explanation of the impact of visitation upon the destination image held by the visitor, an area of research which appears to have been neglected in the literature to date. The findings demonstrate that there is a complex and dynamic inter-relationship between the cognitive and affective aspects of destination image. Prior knowledge derived from guidebooks, the internet, media sources and word of mouth, as well as from previous experience, together with motivations and predispositions in terms of the way visitors like to engage with the experience on offer, all combine in different ways for each individual in each destination situation. As a result, the meaning encapsulated in the image of a destination held by any one individual is mediated by their stock of knowledge, the particular combination of predispositions, motivations and characteristics they bring with them as well as by their interactions and encounters with people and place whilst in the destination.

As noted in the literature review, there has been debate regarding the value of authenticity as a concept, and whether, indeed, the visitor recognises the distinctions between the various forms of authenticity described by the academic literature. This study demonstrates that the complex interaction between predispositions, motivations and anticipations can mean not only that the visitor may seek and experience more than one of the forms of authenticity outlined by academics, but that they actively make their experience authentic each in their different ways according to their particular combination of these factors. This contributes to the debate by showing that regardless of academic theory, experience is real, and therefore authentic, to the visitor as they construct and live it.

Discussion of visitor experience in the literature has focussed largely on experience of place. Where research has concentrated on tourist interactions, it has been largely related to tourist-host interactions. This study extends this literature by revealing the impact of tourist-tourist interactions, and particularly the relationship between visitor characteristics, motivations and tourist-tourist interactions. It has shown that the pleasure of others within the travel group can enhance visitor experience and, conversely, that
concern for the wellbeing of travel companions can limit that experience. It has thus demonstrated that intra group dynamics not only affect pre-trip destination choice, but also choice of activities within the destination. The study has also illustrated the impact of the presence of other tourists, those outwith the travel group, on destination experience, by revealing various avoidance strategies used. In so doing, it has shown why tourist-tourist interactions are a worthwhile area for qualitative tourism research, begun to address the gap in knowledge identified by Dann and Phillips (Dann and Phillips, 2001) and extended understanding of the role of other tourists in the overall destination experience.

As discussed in the literature review in Chapter Six, the traditional, standardised attraction or destination satisfaction questionnaire provides information on what elements of a destination or attraction the visitor used and how they rated them, but may not reveal the underlying values and factors which influenced those ratings, nor, importantly, how they affected the visitor experience. By employing a phenomenological approach to capture the visitor’s lived experience, this study has generated insight into the processes whereby visitors evaluate and make sense of their destination experience.

This study has thus contributed to knowledge in this area in a number of ways:

- It has identified lacunae in the literature, notably a dearth of research examining tourist-tourist interactions or the impact of actual visitation on destination image formation, and has designed research to address these topics through the capture and analysis of visitors’ destination narratives.
- It has provided a model which explains the interaction between the visitor’s anticipations, motivations and predispositions, and how this interaction affects not only their experience of people and place within a destination, but also how they perceive that experience and transform it into a changed image of the destination.
- It has provided a means of encapsulating visitor characteristics and behaviour through developing the ideal typifications of Gourmet, Grazer and Gourmand.
- It has shed light on the impact of tourists’ interactions with their fellow tourists, and revealed the compromises necessitated by the presence of other tourists, whether travel companions or strangers.
- Finally, it has shown the utility of the phenomenological approach for investigating and understanding visitors’ lived experiences.

The implications of the study for theory, research and practice are set out in the following sections.
9.3.1 Theoretical and Research Implications

In theoretical and research terms, the model derived from this study (Figure 8.6) provides a means whereby researchers can investigate, for any destination or attraction, how different sets of predispositions and anticipations impinge on the experience of place and/or people. It also assists in understanding how those interactions create both the sense making which feeds into future anticipations, and the sense giving which transmits destination image to others.

The model can be applied to existing destinations and attractions to gain a deeper insight into why they attract visitors and what benefits those visitors derive from their experience. It can also be used to uncover the potential of new attractions and non traditional destinations. For example, the model could be applied to understanding how visitors make sense of their experiences at an existing industrial heritage attraction. This might reveal an interaction between motivations such as getting closer to their own family history, wanting to share that with friends or family and wanting to spend time with their travel companions, and their reactions to the experience on offer in the attraction. These might be a combination of awe at the harshness of conditions, a recognition of some elements which may not have changed much or which the visitor might have seen in their own family homes or photographs, and a like or dislike of guides or costumed interpreters. Understanding how these visitors made sense of their experience in one particular industrial heritage attraction, what they valued, could provide indicators which would help identify hitherto undeveloped sites or attractions. In other words, the model gives an insight into the logic of an attraction or destination, enabling a better understanding of place, as visitor destination, as subjectively consumed by the visitor. This logic can then be used to uncover the potential of new or non traditional destinations and perhaps to reconsider existing destinations.

This study shows that even when the visitor travels/holidays alone, they affect and are affected by other visitors. Moreover, each visitor brings their own individual bundle of motivations, predispositions and anticipations, none of which are entire unto themselves either, but combine in different permutations to affect the destination experience and the way it is evaluated, made sense of, and transmitted to others. This suggests that whilst segmentation can be a useful tool for marketing purposes, there is a need to recognise that even within a single destination, the visitor is impelled by a complex mixture of motivations, and seeks a similarly complex range of benefits, modes of authenticity and experiences. Furthermore, the individual’s bundle of anticipations, motivations and
predispositions affects and is affected by interaction with their travel companions, which in turn has an impact on the choice of activities and the eventual assessment of the destination experience.

This study shows that, regardless of motivation, expectation, consumption style or strategy, visitors all use comparison as a way of making sense of their experience. As demonstrated in the analysis and discussion in Chapters Seven and Eight, they will still talk about the negative as well as the positive in their holiday stories, however much they may have rationalised the negatives for themselves. Visitors evaluate their experience against standards of behaviour or quality assurance (Gourmet) or against indicators such as the way they feel or the degree of comfort they sense (Gourmands). Rather than necessarily matching these elements of product and service provision against target segments, then, it may be more beneficial to strive for service and product provision of the highest quality, as no matter whether judged against Gourmet or Gourmand criteria, the aspects of the destination experience are still the same: interpersonal communication in the form of greetings, attention to customer needs and wants; quality of food and service; interpretive information; ancillary services and so on. All of these affect visitors’ interactions with people and place; those interactions, in turn, influence the immediate enjoyment of the experience, and have been shown to be reflected in the word of mouth publicity passed on by those visitors.

**9.3.2 Benefits for Policy Makers and Practitioners**

Understanding the way visitors make sense of their destination experience has benefits and implications for policy makers and practitioners at both a strategic and an operational level.

For policy makers, the model developed in this study can be used as a tool to understand the attraction of existing destinations and plan development of new facilities and services. Given the usual practical and financial constraints experienced by destination policy makers and practitioners, the approach taken in this study could be adapted for use with focus groups of different kinds of visitors to or residents in a destination to assess existing experience and image and reveal potential alternative or additional facilities or services to enhance that experience and image. The model can also be used to develop scenarios relating to potential or planned new destinations, attractions, facilities or services which can then be explored in focus group discussions with current and potential visitors.
This understanding can also be used by policy makers to engage local stakeholders in the development and promotion of their destination, by using it as a tool to explain why visitors come to that destination. This can be particularly valuable in urban and non-traditional destinations. Such understanding can engender a greater pride of place among residents and businesses, together with a more welcoming attitude to visitors and support for efforts to improve local facilities. It may also support strategies to develop local ambassadors by encouraging residents, who are after all the locality’s potential day visitors, to value their built, natural and cultural heritage more highly and to talk favourably about this to other potential visitors such as friends, family and colleagues.

This research and the model derived from it provide an insight into the interactions of anticipations and predispositions on individual experience, as well as into the compromises and negotiations involved in choosing destinations and activities once in the destination. Policy makers can use these insights to engage with stakeholders in developing visitor management and marketing strategies. In terms of visitor management, this research shows that there is a tipping point where a destination can become too crowded for visitors to enjoy their experience. Not only does this research support initiatives to spread visitor stays across the shoulder and even winter months, by providing insight into the compromises and trade-offs visitors are willing to make, it can assist policy makers in deciding which elements of the destination can be encouraged to remain open for business in the low season.

The operational challenge in extending the season is that while there are fewer visitors in the shoulder and off season months, these same lower numbers make it uneconomic for some visitor attractions and facilities to operate. This in turn means that those visitors who come out of season do not have the opportunity to experience everything the destination has to offer and may feel disappointed. Here again, this study helps practitioners to understand the different approaches taken by visitors to consuming destination experiences and may suggest marketing campaigns to emphasize the quality of experience over the variety of things to see and do during the low season, thereby attracting those with Gourmet tendencies, or making a virtue of the chance for a sampling or browsing experience as an appetizer for a return visit at a later date.

Understanding the elements of the compromise can also give direction to strategies for visitor dispersal during the main season. The more visitors and tourists are attracted to an area, the greater potential income to the destination generated by visitor spend on accommodation, attractions and facilities. It is important to balance the economic impact
against the potential negative impacts of overcrowding on the visitor experience, as voiced by Pauline who noted that Greenwich is developing as a tourist destination and is glad she has visited now, “because in five or ten years’ time it will be much, much busier and to me, might have lost a bit of its appeal”. Such a perception is likely to deter visitors from making a repeat visit, but may also deter potential visitors to whom they talk about their experiences.

Segmenting the potential market according to socio-demographic and/or lifestyle characteristics may be considered to maximise efficient use of marketing and service resources. However, this study demonstrates that during a visit to any one destination, the visitor seeks a complex set of benefits and experiences, arising from the particular combinations of motivations, predispositions and anticipations, and travelling companions they bring with them. The model assists destination managers and marketers to understand how the visitor makes sense of their experience, and how the motivations, predispositions and anticipations affect both the people and place experience and the way it is spoken about. In so doing, it will help practitioners to develop and enhance aspirational marketing and promotion campaigns which speak much more effectively to those underlying motivations and characteristics.

For example, as noted above, the majority of tourists travel in groups, whether couples, families or groups of friends. At the same time as promoting a particular message to a specific market segment, therefore, it is important to signpost other options within the destination so that even if the primary aim of a holiday is to soak up culture, for example, there is the opportunity for others in the travel party to do or see other things. This study thus provides destination managers with additional understanding and tools to ensure they are meeting the needs of all their visitors and not just those at whom the main marketing messages are primarily addressed. This then needs to be followed through in terms of visitor information provision within the destination, so that the marketing messages are supported by practical information and any strategies for visitor dispersal are implemented effectively. Destination managers will need to pay careful attention to visitor flow through the destination and its constituent attractions and facilities, working with local managers to identify and ease bottlenecks and pinch points. Where capacity is limited, it might be preferable to increase or introduce the use of timed entrance tickets and advance booking to manage visitor flows, using marketing and information messages designed to meet the concerns of Gourmets (limited numbers allows for a better quality experience) or Gourmands (timed tickets or advance booking ensures they will have a chance to experience everything the attraction has to offer).
At a practical level, this research demonstrates the importance and effect of destination interactions in shaping the word of mouth publicity transmitted by visitors, and can be adapted for use as a visitor service training aid. Destination practitioners can use the model derived from this research to develop training scenarios to help in improving services and facilities within the destination. Such scenarios can illustrate to destination product and service providers how and why their behaviour and that of their staff can affect not only the immediate visitor, but also the stories, and hence word of mouth publicity, that the visitor passes on to others. In particular, by explaining the complex interaction between motivations, predispositions and anticipations, it can help to show how a negative story can have a disproportionate impact on potential visitors, who may only hear about the negative incident or impression without any other background knowledge or information to counterbalance it, and thus retain a less favourable image of the destination overall. It will similarly explain how a positive story can outweigh or overrule any pre-existing negative aspects of the destination image held by the listener.

In summary then, in addition to the theoretical implications and contribution set out above, this research is of practical benefit to policy makers and destination practitioners in a number of ways. In particular, the model can be used:

- At a strategic level, to understand the current attractiveness of a destination and explore and assess possibilities for future destination improvements and developments
- To support the strategic development of visitor information, visitor management and customer care programmes
- To support strategic initiatives and operational programmes designed to balance the economic impact of ever greater numbers of visitors with the potential detrimental effect of those numbers on individual visitor experience
- To complement existing segmentation by suggesting additional signposting messages for the target markets, based on an understanding of within travel party tourist-tourist interactions, thereby assisting with the development of more effective aspirational marketing campaigns and extending the visitor season into the current shoulder and low season periods
- To provide training which promotes understanding among industry providers of how their behaviour and that of their staff not only affects visitors directly, but indirectly influences the word of mouth publicity transmitted through visitors' holiday stories, and thus has the potential to affect future business.
9.4 Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

9.4.1 Heritage Destinations

The interviews for this study took place in Edinburgh and Greenwich, two destinations where cultural and built heritage in the form of castles, museums and links to significant national and international history are a large component of the attraction for visitors. Whilst the interpretive research approach taken in this work does not rely upon representative sampling, as there was no intention to generalise the findings to a particular population, it is acknowledged that the nature of the destination and the interview location may have contributed to the larger number of older couples among the interviewees. It was noted in the analysis of the results that had interviews been carried out in Edinburgh at International Festival time, there might have been more, younger interviewees whose anticipations would relate more to events and activities, for example. It would be interesting, therefore, to repeat this study by interviewing either in overseas heritage destinations, or in other types of destinations within the UK, such as coastal resorts, urban/metropolitan destinations, or at non heritage sites within such destinations. Moreover, such applications of the model would serve to verify its relevance and utility in unusual or different destination circumstances, and might suggest some hitherto unsuspected, or unexpected, attractions.

9.4.2 Languages/Cultures Other than English

Given the interpretive nature of this research, it was decided in the very early stages to conduct interviews only with English speaking visitors. This was intended to avoid the pitfalls of trying to interpret meaning which might have been imperfectly conveyed by an interviewee’s limited ability to express themselves in a foreign language. It is recognised, however, that this has resulted in the majority of the interviewees coming from a broadly similar cultural background, where the heritage associations in particular are more likely to provide means of making connections to the individual’s own cultural heritage. Conducting and analysing a further set of interviews in those same destinations with, say, Japanese or European visitors in their own language, would provide useful insight into their anticipations, motivations and predispositions, whether these differ from those revealed by the current study, and any differences in the way in which these factors interact in the sense making process. An alternative might be to interview English speaking visitors holidaying in destinations where English is not the predominant language. Increased understanding of these differences would enable destination managers to encourage product and service providers to invest in any necessary staff training or additional facilities to improve the experience for these groups of visitors.
**9.4.3 Further Explorations in Sense Making**

This study has developed a model which illustrates and explains the factors and interactions involved in the process whereby visitors make sense of their destination experience. Further research could be carried out to gain deeper understanding of the ways in which previous experience is carried forward into the visitor’s stock of knowledge by concentrating on the criteria by which they assess their experience. Equally, there is scope for future research into the dynamics and impact of the interactions among and between travel companions, perhaps by interviewing each member of a group or couple separately, and similarly between hosts and tourists. It is suggested that these and the further investigations outlined above may add to the range of categories within each element of the process and reveal different balances in the interactions between anticipations, motivations, predispositions and experience, but that the basic process is likely to remain as described in this thesis. Such further studies should serve to deepen understanding of that process as experienced in different destination and/or visitor contexts.

**9.5 Concluding Remarks**

This study has investigated the impact of visitor interactions on the image those visitors hold of a destination, and the word of mouth publicity they disseminate through their holiday stories. It has demonstrated the utility of the phenomenological approach in gaining an understanding of the visitor’s lived experience and presented a model to describe the complexity of the interactions between the predispositions and anticipations which the visitor brings to the destination and the experiences of people and place they encounter during their visit. Finally, it has suggested a number of theoretical, research and practical implications arising from the findings.

This would not have been as interesting a research journey without the support of both destination management colleagues and academic supervisors. Like the best craft masters, the latter have been constructively critical, unstinting in encouragement and generous in collaboration. Practitioner colleagues were equally generous in facilitating access and actively supporting the data collection process. This thesis would not exist, however, without the willingness of the interviewees to take time out of their visit to talk about their destination experiences. It is my hope that the resulting model will be a useful tool for those who seek to understand and improve the visitor’s destination interaction and experience.
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TECHNICAL GLOSSARY
Technical Glossary

This glossary gives a short explanation of the NVivo terminology used in this thesis. It is not intended as a comprehensive guide to the NVivo software package.

Coding in NVivo
NVivo offers three types of nodes for categorising data: free, tree and case.

Free nodes
These can be used as containers for data in the early stages of analysis, before linkages and associations emerge, and in the later stages to hold data which the researcher thinks might be important but which at that precise moment do not seem to belong within the emergent theoretical structure.

Tree nodes
These are used to group related ideas in the data. The point at which tree nodes are introduced will follow the methodology being used. If a study is being carried out using pure grounded theory, for example, it is likely that a node tree will be developed quite late in the analysis, as relationships emerge from the initial coding. On the other hand, in a study of the impact of policy, for example, where the issues or themes are known about in advance or indicated by the literature review or study of other background documents, there may already be some branches of a node tree which can be used when the initial reading and coding takes place, always provided that the researcher is open to ideas or concerns which may be important and which are not already included in the tree structure.

Placeholder nodes
This term refers to nodes which sit as part of the node structure, with a number of child nodes depending from it, but which do not themselves contain coded text. An example in the current study would be Holiday Attitudes, which is the parent node for the four nodes Planning and Prioritising, Free and Easy, Welcomes the Exotic and Seeks Reassurance.

Case Nodes
NVivo’s case nodes are a way of keeping all documents or text relating to an individual together. In studies where the same people might be interviewed on two or three occasions, creating a case node for that individual enables the researcher to quickly
and easily extract all material relating to that person. In the current study, as some interviews were with couples or small groups rather than individuals, a case node was created for each individual, and an attribute table holding basic descriptive data (age group, country of origin, location of interview) was created in Excel and then imported into NVivo so that it would be possible at a later stage to interrogate the data using these attributes, for example to see what Australian visitors to Greenwich said about their experience and compare it with the experience of Australian visitors to Edinburgh.

**Coding Stripes**
Vertical lines down the side of a document which show the nodes to which the selected text has been coded. Useful to see at a glance what has been coded, and in text returned by searches, to see where there are overlapping codes.

**Documents in NVivo**
There are three main types of document in NVivo.

**Document**
Documents can either be created directly in NVivo, or imported as rich text files (RTF) from word processing programmes such as Word. The ability to import as rich text files means that from the outset, different typefaces and headings can be used to differentiate sections within documents and facilitate later batch coding.

**Memo**
Memos are used to record thoughts on the developing analysis, either in relation to individual documents, nodes, or search results. They can be linked to documents, proxy documents and nodes (see DocLink)

**Proxy Document**
These are used to record data relating to documents and items which cannot be imported into NVivo, such as journal articles, book chapters, films, web sites.

**Organising in NVivo**
NVivo provides a number of ways in which to organise information and material in a project and create links between project items. The main ones used in this study are briefly explained below.
Attributes
These are properties assigned to nodes or documents. In this study, interviews were given attributes relating to the interviewee age, gender, party size and country of origin, as well as the interview location and date. Later on, they were also assigned attributes indicating consumption style and selection strategy.

Databites
These are a way of annotating documents within NVivo, or of hyperlinking to external items such as diagrams. Within a proxy document recording notes about a journal article, for example, a databite might link to a diagram.

DocLinks
These create links between documents, or between nodes and documents. For example, an entry recoding thoughts about a particular interview could be linked directly to that interview transcript. The links can be a top level link, i.e. a link from the document or node as a whole, or can be connected directly to any point in the document’s text.

Sets
These are a way of grouping documents or nodes together which allow them to be handled by NVivo as a single unit. In this study, sets were created to group together items such as interview transcripts, Edinburgh interview transcripts, Greenwich interview transcripts, to separate overseas from domestic visitors, and to ease retrieval of the researcher’s record of the analysis by keeping all theoretical memos and node memos in one set. These sets were then used to set the scope for various searches.

Searching in NVivo
Data can be examined and interrogated in a variety of ways in NVivo, from simple searches on text strings within a document or range of documents, to complex matrix searches on specific attributes and/or coding. A brief explanation of the types of searches used in this study is given below.

Difference Search (AND NOT)
This search finds text which is coded by the first node, but only where that text is not coded by the second node or other search term. For example, a Difference search on the node Tourist-tourist Interactions but not the node Crowds would return all text where interviewees talked about encountering or observing other tourists, excluding text also coded to Crowds. This would allow further investigation of other aspects of tourist-tourist interactions.
**Intersection Search (AND)**
A search which returns only text coded by all of two or more search terms specified, this is useful for drilling down through the data to refine categories. In this study, Intersection searches were used to develop and refine the Gourmet and Gourmand categories.

**Matrix Search**
Search which takes all the first named search terms and all the second named search terms and returns all the possible paired combinations across the two groups as a cross tabulation table. Matrix Intersection searches on the attribute Selection Strategy (Sampling, Browsing, Working Through a List, Unknown) and Motivations (always wanted to go, Getting Closer, Seeking Value, Something Different, Self Enhancement, Comfort, Escape) were used to examine the different ways motivations were expressed depending upon the selection strategy chosen.

**Scope**
This is the range of data which is going to be searched. Scope items can be individual documents, sets of documents, nodes, or sets of nodes.

**Text string search**
A search which returns all instances of one or more specific strings of text within one or more documents. In this study, text string search was used to collect together all instances where interviewees commented on “so much to see and do”, “too much to see and do”, lots to see and do” and so on, as part of the development of the Gourmet/Gourmand categorisation.

**Union Search (OR)**
A search which finds all text coded to any of the search terms selected. Useful for gathering together different categories of data for further investigation. For example, a Union search on Surprises and Mismatch was used to investigate whether these were really different categories and what that difference was. The search results were viewed using the Coding Stripes and Coder to identify the areas of overlap and difference.
APPENDIX 1

Interview Record (Chapter 6)
Edinburgh Interview Record Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Forename: | |
| Age: | 18-24 | 25-34 | 35-44 | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65+ |
| Occupation: | |
| Home town: | |
| Contact details: | |

| Reason for trip: | |
| Party size: | |
| How long in Edinburgh: | |

Good morning/afternoon. Could I ask if this is your first visit to Edinburgh? The reason I ask is that I'm researching for a PhD in tourism at the Robert Gordon's University in Aberdeen. I'm particularly interested in hearing what visitors think and feel about their experiences of places they visit. I wonder if you would be prepared to spend fifteen minutes or so, over a cup of coffee, perhaps, talking to me about your holiday experiences here in Edinburgh? What has been good or bad about your visit, and how your visit has changed your perception of Edinburgh.

May I record our conversation? It will remain completely confidential. I will be transcribing it for analysis, but I will not identify individual interviewees in relation to any quotes I use in my thesis or any articles. Thank you.

First of all, I'd like to ask a few simple questions about you and your party which will help me to analyse the information later and compare it with other interviews. It will also help to ensure I'm talking to a good cross section of people.