

Structural system of contribution of cultural-tourist attractions to the market attractiveness of the locality

Vukan Vujović^{1,*}, Dušan Perić²

¹Singidunum University, Belgrade, Serbia

²Department of Sport and Tourism, Educons University, Novi Sad, Serbia

Email address:

vukan.vujovic@gmail.com (V. Vujović)

To cite this article:

Vukan Vujović, Dušan Perić. Structural System of Contribution of Cultural-Tourist Attractions to the Market Attractiveness of the Locality. *Science Research*. Vol. 1, No. 5, 2013, pp. 63-74. doi: 10.11648/j.sr.20130105.11

Abstract: The estimate of market attractiveness by the local management structures shows its basic shortcoming in that it does not take the impression of visitors as a relevant criterion to a sufficient extent. The abovementioned impressions, transformed into the appropriate rating system of the offered values would allow for a more efficient analysis of current cultural-tourism offers at localities. Accordingly, in a research study conducted at the site of the Petrovaradin fortress (in the northern Serbian province of Vojvodina), a testing of the modified assessment approach was performed, based on the application of the basic model of tourist valorization: Du Cross (2000). This approach is based on the conversion of quantitative parameters of assessment (numerical score on a scale) into qualitative data (attributive measurement characteristics of attractiveness). By grouping of attributive characteristics, based on the previously performed procedure of average values ranking of the scores, the conditions for creating a unique "structural list" of tourist attractions are made. The principle for grouping is the determination of direction and the size of deviation of average values from the determined arithmetic mean of ranks. Thus, in contrast to the basic model (Du Cross), in which only the position within the relevant field of the matrix of market attractiveness and robustness (MAR) is essentially determined, the possibility is offered to accurately classify the elements of attractiveness according to their importance and partially achieved contribution to the resulting /total market positioning.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage, Tourist Site, Tourist Attractions, Evaluation, Value System

1. Introduction

Tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors of the world economy, surpassing by far the growth of sectors such as industry, the miracle motor of the last few decades [1]. Roughly 30% of European tourist destinations are chosen by virtue of the presence of heritage localities. This number increases up to 45-50% if the wider cultural sector such as important festivals and other cultural events are included [2].

A synthesized mark of attractiveness of tourism resources is based on the assessment of their overall potential and importance for the development of large-scale, exclusive or alternative concept of tourism, certain types of tourism and year-round tourism offer in the analyzed area, as well as on the comparative assessment of their importance in relation to the tourism resources of (competitive) receptive area in the immediate and wider environment [3]. The same principle is true for the cultural tourism resources.

The evaluation of the potential of cultural tourism should

cover all cultural values at the destination that are valorized from the aspect of tourism, regardless of whether they are 'tangible' or 'intangible' resources. However, the decision on the inclusion of certain cultural values in the tourism product is often based on a lack of knowledge about the components / indicators that affect the popularity of certain tourist attractions and an incomplete assessment of its potential to become a primary tourist landmark that will attract tourists to the destination [4].

The value of cultural attraction lies in objects made from what can be considered to be authentic materials and by indigenous craftspeople or events and rituals that are perceived as traditional emanations of original cultures [5]. At the same time, it is particularly important to emphasize the particular, the local and the specific over the general, the universal and the eternal [6].

Destinations clearly need to be unique in order to figure on the tourism map, but they also need to offer certain levels of familiarity, comfort and security. Enclavic bubbles are

often the favoured retreat of both the masses and the 'cosmopolitan elite' [7], even if they appear to be characteristic of 'non-place' [8].

A complex tourist valorization requires a few important pre-conditions to be fulfilled - primarily, the survey of tourist perception, if tourism on destination (site) has already been developed, as well as their preferences in choosing of destination, which is here, unfortunately, very rarely done. The consequence of this approach to tourist valorization is somewhat one-sided assessment of the actual attractiveness of the destination, because the researchers are satisfied with the data provided by the tourist offer, and not by the tourist demand.

The relationship between the attractiveness of a certain tourist destination (site) and the demand is directly proportional. The attractiveness increases demand, but an increased demand also increases the attractiveness. Namely, a destination which is popular in a certain period becomes also attractive as a 'place to visit'. The link between these two terms is so great that some authors consider them synonyms [4].

1.1. Research Problem

The market attractiveness of cultural goods is determined by a number of mutually interacting complex factors at a particular geographical area / locality, whose interaction leads to the construction of specific market recognition or authentication. One of the main indicators that suggests to the consideration of the aforementioned authenticity is the attractiveness, as a visibly expressive, registering and impression-including property or characteristic. This feature creates a unique experience in the form of empirical observations and corresponding impression in the minds of visitors.

Is it possible (and if so, in what way) to use such an experience, in the reverse connotation, as a measure for assessing the cultural significance and richness of the site (from the aspect of attractiveness), at least in regard to the cultural and historical landmarks or legacies - *i.e.* 'cultural heritage' in general? This is the issue and also the main problem that this research will address.

The next question that surfaces in the consideration of the necessity for attractiveness/authenticity of a certain space characterized as a 'cultural-historic site' or 'locality' is how to effectively assess the potential it has? The purpose of this question lies in the creation of the tourism product related to current trends in supply and demand in the domain of cultural tourism, as well in getting the answer to the ancillary question, which is: what are the elements of a tourist site that significantly attract tourists and may be particularly prominent in terms of representativeness?

Due to these reasons, the aim of the research has just been re-directed to the appreciation and analysis of potentials cultural tourism. In order for the overall result of the performed evaluation to be observed as being more relevant, it must be based on a more detailed analysis of the components of attractiveness. Accordingly, there is a

stimulation of a further adapting of the promotion and correcting of possible marketing failures, which directly affect the scope and quality of the market offer.

The primary tasks of the research are as follows:

- To extend and improve the basic model of the valorization of tourism potentials (according to [9]) and actually link it with the attractions of the researched locality;
- To examine the attitudes and opinions of foreign tourists, as well from the visitors of a fortification, about the actual status of the cultural-historic locality (controlled sample);
- To consider more specifically the impacts of tested indicators within the overall system through the individual participation and contribution in taking the appropriate positions;
- To provide further and deeper analysis of the current situation, through a systematic insight into the structure and meaning of the constituent elements of the existing market attractiveness.
- To point out those aspects of the tourist attractiveness, to which insufficient attention is paid and that would need, with minimal investments and changes, to a higher level of market promotion.

The research establishes the main hypothesis (H_0): *The indicators of market attractiveness, viewed on the basis of visitors' opinions, can be a relevant measure of the current market position of the site.*

1.2. Cultural Heritage Tourism

The purpose of recognizing and setting apart the culture from the ordinary and the everyday is not to deny the importance of the 'high' arts, heritage and classical performances. It is rather, to recognize the realities of cultural changes, different forms of creativity, and the importance of the overall experience in tourism. The spaces that cultural tourism occupies are frequently shared with and/or inherited from other functions and other symbolic uses, and as such are subject to contestation [10].

There is also an opinion that place and culture are inextricably intertwined, with culture helping to shape local character and place differentiation [11]. If the purpose of the site is to be maintained or enhanced, a balance must be struck between the emphasis that is placed on heritage and the celebration of contemporary culture and arts. Care must be taken not to 'overwrite' the significance of heritage with new developments, whilst the diversity of both indigenous and non-indigenous local community cultures.

Cultural heritage resources are certainly in the basis of international tourism and have certainly facilitated its growth and allowed various societies and sections of societies to participate in the development process [12]. There is a wide variety of resources that can be considered as cultural. Then it is possible to include religious and historical buildings, historical urban centers and different kinds of monuments. These resources have been referred to

as the basis for the 'cultural heritage tourism' [13]. The popularity of tourist attraction in cultural tourism can be achieved by the successful 'commoditization' of cultural property in the tourist product. This points to the need for some standardization in the formation of a tourist product in order to meet a tourist demand [14]. It also points out that: 'successful cultural attractions must be attractive both for the local population and tourists, who should value them as interesting, unique and with a clear reason to visit' [15].

Cultural heritage tourism is driven by a search for historical depth and authenticity of culture, human continuity and universal cultural values. This orientation is strongly related to the notion of the educated and culturally interested person who establishes his or her identity through the integration of authoritative historical and cultural knowledge. However, heritage tourism has, in recent years, lost its lead as a paradigmatic form of cultural tourism. Cultural heritage institutions are counteracting this development through new forms of cultural learning, which abandon the authoritative approach of knowledge formation in favor of educational programs that stimulate curiosity, interaction, discovery and active construction of cultural meaning [16].

For those destinations which do not have an existing reputation for cultural tourism or global cultural icons to attract cultural visitors, there is a need to develop new products and attractions which will catch the attention of the global 'cultural values' [17]. Planning must take into consideration local structures of meaning and experience if it is to avoid the aforementioned problems of serial monotony, blandscapes, placelessness, etc. [18].

From the aspect of potential for the tourism development, more attractive and more important is the space in the vicinity of the attractive natural and/or cultural resources, features more locations that meet the basic criteria of physical planning and allow conceiving, evaluation and choice between several options of tourist contents within the limits of sustainable development of destination offers. From the aspect of tourist, more attractive is the space that is landscaped, features aesthetic qualities and allows freedom of choice of activities and experiences in creating a tourism product. In doing so, it should be noted that the attractiveness of tourist destinations reflects the belief, feelings and attitudes that an individual visitor has about the possibilities of space to satisfy his very specific travel needs [19].

The potential of cultural heritage in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) is very specific and decisive for its cultural identity. The main value of this potential is its multiculturalism and authenticity. CEE cultural tourism offers acquaintance with a rich multicultural heritage [20].

Cultural environment is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition to be immersed in an authentic cultural tourism experience. Different reasons and motives have been identified as the basis for visiting historical cities, demonstrating different kinds of behavior and consumption [21]. Similarly, big differences have even been detected

between the 'specific' and 'general' cultural tourists [22, 23].

Cultural localities with a rich and interesting history, attractive location, architectural designs, urban planning and so on, including the historic fortresses, can have great impact and significance for the promotion of specific tourist regions. Awareness and image of a destination in the minds of potential visitors are, not surprisingly, some of the most important factors that affect destination competitiveness and recognizability. Indeed, as the role of most destination management organizations centers around the promotion of the destination, a considerable amount of attention, effort and activity is devoted to the task of developing a strong awareness of the destination in key markets, and shaping the formation of a favorable, attractive and enticing image of the destination in order to attract tourists [24].

Whilst finding new attractive contents which motivate tourists to travel, the newest researches [25-27] shows that more and more countries, as well as less the affirmed world tourist regions, are focusing on the attractive cultural resources and potentials, both the traditional ones and those more recent.

1.3. Researched Case Study

Petrovaradin Fortress is located on the right bank of the Danube, near the eponymous settlement: Petrovaradin. The fortification is considered to be a cultural heritage locality of an exceptional historical significance and tourism potential. It is a trademark symbol of the city of Novi Sad and its surroundings.

The locality of the Fortress was protected on two separate occasions: the first time in year 1948, by the Institute for the Protection and Research of Cultural Monuments of Serbia, based on the Law on Protection of Cultural Monuments and Natural Rarities; and the second time by a revision of this solution when the 'Upper and Lower Fortress with the Suburb' was proclaimed an immovable cultural good of great importance (1991) and spatial cultural and historical locality, which is, according to the Law on Cultural Heritage (from 1994), an urban or rural settlement (or parts thereof) or a place with more immovable goods of great importance [28].

The area corresponding to the tourist zone surrounded by the 'Fruška Gora' hills to the south and the navigable section of the Danube – the 'International river corridor 7', to its northern side. The border of cultural landscape is the line that coincides with the outer line of green park area around the fort. This border separates the space of the Petrovaradin Fortress and its surrounding area from the area for other purposes, according to the general plan of the city of Novi Sad until the year 2021. It was also accepted that Danube is placed in the protection zone of cultural landscape in its entire width, along the protected right bank.

In general, the spatial planning of Petrovaradin Fortress preserved to this day can be considered sufficiently complete, in terms of representativeness. A several changes that were made in the nineteenth and twentieth century did not affect the appearance of fortification complex inasmuch

that it loses an authentic look.

Within the Fortress complex the three separate levels or plateaus can be determined: 'Lower Plateau or Lower Fortress' (Wasserstadt and Lower Town), 'Central Plateau' (Hornwerk) and 'Upper Plateau' (Upper Fort). Each of these levels has its own distinct attractions and landmarks. On the lower plateau there are 29, on the middle 12 and on the top 14 of them. A special feature of this property is the underground corridors and galleries with 5 separated attractions. Thus, the total number of cultural-tourist attractions, according to the author's evidence is 60.

When it comes to the total number of visits to the site, according to the current data of the City Museum of Novi Sad, located at the site of the Fortress, the following trend was noted in the past 12 years (Figure 1): The first peak of marked attendance was recorded in 2003 as the result of a growing popularity of the famous 'EXIT' music festival (which is held at the fort since 2000). At that time the number of visitors was about 65.000. In the period from 2007 to 2009, a significant decrease in the total number of visits was recorded. It has fluctuated only about 40.000. The reasons stemmed from the increased regional instability caused by the general political and economic situation and reflecting social influences in the region, which also drastically affected the tourism sector. In recent years, beginning with the transitional period of 2009/10, a trend of increase and stagnation of the total number of visitors was noted, persisting to the present day.




Figure 1. Trend of the number of visitors. (Source: The City Museum of Novi Sad, 2012)

However, the above mentioned data do not refer exclusively to the spatial entity of the Petrovaradin complex, but also include the visitors from urban areas in the immediate vicinity, owing to an enriched offer of the tourist attractions and museum exhibitions in the form of cultural-historical 'points' (primarily in the area of Sremska Kamenica and Sremski Karlovci).

2. Methodology

The research was conducted during the period April-June 2012. The main characteristic of the sample was as follows:

- The sample consisted of 200 respondents. They hailed from the neighboring countries (Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria), as well as from Central and Western Europe (Slovakia, Czech Republic, Germany and England);
- The sample is controlled and heterogeneous, of a stratified type.

The sample structure is shown in the following chart (Figure 2):




Figure 2. The structure of the sample

When selecting the criteria for the formation of the final sample, the fact that has not been left out is the fact of the presence of the socio-cultural diversity / specificity among the defined groups of respondents (*i.e.* 'stratus'-es). This refers to their countries of origin or, the emission centers. The mentioned particularities refer primarily to the unique interpretation of the notions of 'attractive' and 'interesting', depending on the affiliation to the corresponding mother culture (community), with specially constructed systems of evaluation of traditional and cultural values. Accordingly, owing to the different viewpoints of observation of attractive potentials by the respondents sampled, more objective conditions were created for the implementation of the research.

The initial research method of assessment [9] is based on the use of twenty-nine separate indicators of market attractiveness (IMA). Indicators were marked with ordinal labels (SubInd1-SubInd29). There are two different groups of these indicators, as market markers:

- Indicators of tourism sector
- (Market attractiveness/Multi1, designing of a tourism product/Multi2);
- Indicators of management sector
- (Cultural importance/Multi3, robustness and management/Multi4).

All of defined indicators were applicable on the researched locality. The maximum sum marks for both groups of indicators is 60, on the basis of which is constructed a matrix of market attractiveness/robustness (MAR), by division of summary marks into the three intervals of values: 0-20, 20-40, and 40-60. Thus, a scheme of nine fields is formed to determine the market position of the locality in terms of market attractiveness and robustness.

In determining the IMA, a starting point was the application of the written research technique, with the preparation of the quantitative questionnaire (of closed type). The following research technique was scaling. The questions from the survey included the offered range of marks for the value assessment of indicators.

One than interprets average marks for each indicator, according to the offered answers ('items'). There were three to four 'items'. Thus for each of the marks, *i.e.* quantitative parameters, the qualitative or attributive meaning is assigned. This completes the process of converting the qualitative into a quantitative data (Table 1):

Table 1. The principle of determining the position of IMA in the structural list – quantitative (a) and qualitative (b) part of assessment

Label	Range of marks	Average mark	Value of mark
Subind1	0-5	4.38	positive
Subind2	0-5	3.40	neutral
Subind3	0-5	4.32	positive
Subind4	0-5	3.93	positive
Subind5	0-5	4.22	positive
Subind6	0-5	3.81	positive
Subind7	0-5	3.14	neutral
Subind8	0-5	2.36	neutral
Subind9	0-5	3.10	neutral
Subind10	0-4	2.30	neutral
Subind11	0-3	1.62	neutral
Subind12	0-3	1.80	neutral
Subind13	0-5	1.01	negative
Subind14	0-2	1.70	positive
Subind15	0-2	1.84	positive
Subind16	0-2	1.54	positive
Subind17	0-2	1.61	positive
Subind18	0-2	1.56	positive
Subind19	0-3	2.89	positive
Subind20	0-4	3.48	positive
Subind21	0-4	2.88	neutral
Subind22	0-4	1.14	negative
Subind23	0-5	1.46	neutral
Subind24	0-5	1.23	neutral
Subind25	0-5	3.48	positive
Subind26	0-5	2.78	neutral
Subind27	0-5	1.46	negative
Subind28	0-5	2.54	neutral
Subind29	0-5	2.95	neutral

(a)

Meaning of attitude	Mean rank	Rank position	Contributions level
good	24.56	1	high
slightly	19.28	14	middle
yes	24.19	2	high
yes	22.12	4	high
excellent	23.65	3	high
yes	21.43	5	high
to some extent	17.84	15	middle
to some extent	13.40	21	middle
to some extent	17.43	16	middle
limited	12.90	22	middle
facilitated	9.22	24	middle
accessibility	10.43	23	middle
weak	6.77	29	low
high	9.29	10	high
high	10.07	9	high
high	8.52	13	high
high	8.84	11	high
high	8.47	12	high
uniquely	16.54	8	high
good	19.72	7	high
considerable	16.21	18	middle
weak	6.50	28	low
in standby	8.81	25	middle
partly	8.05	26	middle
good	19.56	6	high
middle	15.42	19	middle
little	25.19	27	low
middle	14.17	20	middle
middle	16.44	17	middle

(b)

The preparation of 'structural list' was preceded by determination of the rank positions of IMA, divided into four groups:

- Subind1-Subind9 (Multi1)
- Subind10-Subind13 (Multi2)
- Subind14-Subind20 (Multi3)
- Subind21-Subind29 (Multi4)

The final classification is done by selecting the indicator according to two criteria. The first was the meaning of the average mark, and the second the appropriate rank position. By crossing these two criteria, of the final position of indicator in the 'structural list' and the partial contribution to the overall attractiveness of the site were precisely determined.

3. Results and Discussion

The results of the quantitative evaluation were as follows. The total score of indicators for the tourism sector amounts

to: 39.39, while the total score of indicators of management sector amounts to: 34.54, which means that the current market position of these values by crossing the coordinate axes (*i.e.* at the point) corresponds to the matrix cell or field labeled as M (2.2). Based on the average marks of visitors it was found the following position of researched site in the MAR (Figure 3):



Figure 3. The matrix of 'market attractiveness-robustness' / MAR

The matrix MAR shows that the locality is of middle cultural significance/robustness and middle market attractiveness. In order to clarify thus established position, the qualitative part of the procedures of new approach is initialized in the interpretation of researched results. Thus, the baseline assessment model was further deepened [9] and opportunities for analysis expanded.

By insight into the 'structural list' it is possible to determine which of the researched groups of IMA is the most common among those of high yielding varieties, and vice versa, as well as the exact contribution of each of individual indicator (see Appendix 1).

It is clearly visible which of the IMA are singled out as especially attractive, on the one hand, and which indicators could be devoted more attention in the future, on the other hand. In this particular case, the most influential group, with the largest contribution, are the indicators of market attractiveness (Multi1) and the indicators of cultural significance (Multi3).

As such, they almost perfectly mirrored the state of the current market positioning, which has already been presented by appropriate position within the field of MAR matrix (Figure 3). This information may become the characteristics of those of 'crucial importance' for DMO structure of the appropriate locality.

The results of this research indicate the neglect of the elements associated with an organizational base and destination marketing with the primary utilization of elements of natural and rustical attractiveness, which the respondents in this case study characterized in form of the expected commitment to the elements by the destination management, in accordance with their views. But, on the other hand, existence of a completely different situation

could have been ascertained, or an inconsistency on the said relation.

By applying the Friedman test when processing data through the SPSS software application, the following results in the field of descriptive analysis were obtained (Table 2):

Table 2. The excerpt from the results of the descriptive statistics

Variable	N	Percentiles		
		25th	50th (Median)	75th
Multi1	200	3,4444	3,6667	3,8889
Multi2	200	1,2500	1,5000	2,0000
Multi3	200	2,0000	2,1429	2,2857
Multi4	200	2,3333	2,5556	2,7778

The highest range of average values (Min. / Max. = 0.25 to 4.00) was observed at the variable: Multi2. While the smallest deviation out from the ideal arithmetical mean, proportional to the range width of corresponding ordinal scale, was recorded at the variable: Multi3. This refers to the indicators of designing of a tourism product and cultural importance.

By analysis of the interval dispersion of processed data, it was found that the highest mutual deviation of recorded values according to the separate segments of the quarterly / percentiles of appropriate statistical series, as the scale distance from the central values /median (25th/75th = 1.2500 to 2.000), also exist at the variable: Multi2.

This is also a variable that corresponds to the indicators of designing a tourist product and thereby shows the highest degree of variability / non-conformities, in the case of tested measures of central tendency.

Friedman's test was also applied by observing of four groups of indicators / variables as dependent subsamples of the basic set. The test results were as follows (Table 3):

Table 3. The statistics of Friedman's test

Test Statistics ^a	
N	200
df	3
$\chi^2=468.859$	(Sig.=0.000)

In this way it is possible to accurately formulate the crucial test question (T-quest.), which will be used to confirm or refute the main hypothesis of the research:

T-quest.: Is there a statistically important (i.e. significant) difference in the results measured by summary scales of attitudes in relation to the analyzed group of indicators / IMA?


The results of Friedman's non-parametric test: χ^2 (3, N =

300) = 468.86, ($p < 0.05$); Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.00 (* Sig. < 0.05) show a statistically significant difference between the results measured on summary scales of attitudes in relation to the analyzed groups of indicators, *i.e.* indicators of market attractiveness, indicators of designing of a tourism product, indicators of cultural significance and indicators of robustness and management. The overview showed a median decrease from the first / Multi1 (Med = 3.67) to the second observed groups / Multi2 (Med = 1.50), followed by growth of marks from the second / Multi2 (Med = 1.50) to the third observed groups / Multi3 (Med = 2.14), and finally the further growth of marks from the third / Multi3 (Med = 2.14) to the fourth observed groups / Multi4 (Med = 2.55).


The application of Wilcoxon's 'post-hoc' test enabled the subsequent testing the significance of differences between the results of all six possible combinations of the groups of variables / indicators (Multi1-Multi4).

The results of 'post-hoc' test are: $Z = -12.250, -12.264, -12.090, -7.626, -10.660, -10.676$; Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.00 (* Sig. < 0.05). These values are based on positive or negative ranks and the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. On the basis of the results analysis, it can be concluded that there is a highly significant (non-random) difference among all six observed combinations of indicators: Multi1-Multi2, Multi1-Multi3, Multi1-Multi4, Multi2-Multi3, Multi2-Multi4 and Multi3-Multi4.


As an aid in perceiving the descriptive parameters the diagrams of relations between independent / predictor and dependent / criterion variables were used, *i.e.* variables: 'Country' and Multi1-Multi4. This is a 'Box-plot diagram', which comparatively analyses the representative descriptive statistical parameters of different subsamples. The distribution of the respondents' average marks in relation to the central arithmetical mean and measuring ranges of numerical scales was as follows (Figure 4):




(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)

Figure 4. The results of quantitative statistics – indicators of market attractiveness (a), designing of a tourism product (b), cultural importance (c), robustness and management

In all of the researched groups there are evident departures and deviations of the obtained results, both in relation to the total range and the range of sequences of measurement scales covered by the interval. It should be taken into account that the meaning of such one distribution does not indicate a marked degree of non-conformity of attitudes. Taking into account the compatibility and different directions of measuring scales, predominant values were those that indicated the medium and high contribution of attractive cultural-tourist elements.

The lowest values of average ratings for the first group of indicators (4a) were recorded by the German, in the second and fourth groups (4b, 4d) by the Hungarian and the third group (4c) by the Slovak visitors. The reasons in the first case should be looked for in a very well-kept and organized social system (Germany), the second in development activities and systematically constructed planning (Hungary), and third in an insufficiently-developed national awareness of the historical and cultural treasures and heritage (Slovakia). Relying on the traditional experience of visitors from developed and medium developed European countries, as well on the aforementioned interpretation of ratings, the results are not at all surprising, but quite objective.

The results presented in the 'structural list' of indicators (Appendix 1) point to the same facts that explaining much closer the achieved market position of the locality (Figure 3). Owing to these results, it is possible to identify and clearly separate the influence of each individual indicator in the above-mentioned list.

3.1. Indicators of High Contribution

The order of the indicators of this group was as follows:

- Ambience (SubInd1): has the greatest attractiveness. This fact has been confirmed even before in the numerous studies of the EXIT music festival, whose respondents, as the main reason for their visit mentioned primarily the authenticity of the settings.
- Value as a national symbol (SubInd3): the assigned mark, despite the detected failures in tourism marketing, shows that the Fortress still held its own as an important symbol for the visitors.
- Evocation of a narrative story (SubInd4): again, a high degree of affirmation was present, which refers to the current possibility of commercialization and re-adaptation of historical informations to the needs of visitors.
- Attractiveness for the special needs (SubInd6): was proved to exist. The respondents clarified that they valued the ability to organize events and activities in general, not solely those related to the hosting of a popular music festival.
- Authenticity (SubInd5): this landmark is primarily related to the visibility and transparency. The other characteristics are still not clearly expressed. The responsibility mostly lies in the lack of willingness to provide material support for the serious ideas of

professional experts, as well as many difficulties in complying with the organized control.

- Investment potential for the stakeholders (SubInd25): was observed in terms of planning and organization of tourism at the locality of the Fortress. It is possible to conclude that there is a richness of the initial base and diversity of the opportunities for potential tourism programs and projects.
- Representativeness (SubInd20): recognized in this way, indicates a visible respect of the visitors to the researched locality that should not be treated as a range of activities that should be ignored (because the representativeness is an indirect reflection of the state of the complex, which requires continuous work).
- Rarity of site (SubInd19): may be accepted as a completely objective and real fact, because it was confirmed with a high degree of agreement in relation to the total number of respondents.
- Historical value (SubInd15): in an environment where there are not so many evident traces of the ancient past, such a complex may certainly represent a kind of historical wealth.
- Esthetical value (SubInd14): is closely related to the current appearance of the complex, which is not absolutely incorrigible. It is possible to perform certain constructional refreshments in the form of a restoration.
- Social value (SubInd17): was considered from the point of social gathering of different people, in different occasions, and as the possibility to meet people and make social contacts. As such, it proved to be prominent.
- Scientific and research value (SubInd18): was observed by respondents. Indeed, many studies and scientific projects on the topic of the Fortress and its immediate environment were realized.
- Educational value (SubInd16): although particularly present, it was not perceived in entirety by the respondents. The cause may be the lack of direct awareness of foreign visitors of the available scientific material, *i.e.* the absence of a quality story about the mentioned value of the site.

3.2. Indicators of Middle Contribution

The indicators of this group were distributed as follows:

- Familiarity outside the local area (SubInd2): is partly a result of hosting of the mentioned music festival, and also the fact that almost in the entire Vojvodina there are no fortifications on a similar scale, or even on the approximate level of the state of preservation as a whole.
- Complementarity in the tourist market (SubInd7): according to the opinions of the respondents, this segment of tourist appearance has not achieved an extremely high result, either. The main reason is the lack of material investments and financial support to the approved projects.
- Associating with the culture (SubInd19): was not

perceived as prominent by the respondents, which also indicates certain deficiencies and omissions by the control management, in charge of the cultural presentation of the locality.

- Possibility of impact of modifications on the life style and cultural tradition of the community (SubInd29): refers to the disrupting of the cultural identity, which is very important and useful for the spatial planning and arranging of the surrounding space in the near future.
- Sensitivity (SubInd21): points to the fact that the current state of the complex is still under the significant risk of adverse impacts of numerous factors (air pollution, noise, vibration, deposited solid waste, etc.).
- Possibility of influence of visitors on the physical condition of the site (SubInd26): was viewed in terms of grouping and concentrating a large number of tourists (*i.e.* massiveness). This kind of exploitation of cultural values can leave visible traces on the locality.
- Possibility of impact of the modifications on the preservation of the locality (SubInd28): was considered in terms of increasing the consistency and stability of the objects inside the Fortress, after reconstruction. If this principle is applicable through any form of non-invasive development strategy, then it could be fully expressed, which is acceptable.
- Regional tourist activity (SubInd8): if one considers the total tourist and promotional support or the territory covered by advertising materials, then this fact is simply quite an objective picture of reality.
- Accessibility (SubInd10): this indicator of attractiveness was related to the possibility of general approach, disposition of the objects and tourist facilities at the Fortress. It also does not meet the criteria that could be deemed adequate.
- Proximity of other attractions (SubInd12): although there are a lot of them, not too much has been done on their links with the researched locality, which indicates that the deficiencies in relation to this structure element are still present.
- Availability (SubInd11): transport from the emitting centre to the locality was found to be an existent option, but not fully organized (for example: in the form of special transport for the needs of potential visitors), which can also be considered a slight shortcoming.
- Existence of a management plane (SubInd23): the collective impression of respondents was that it is not completely and fully specified.
- Regular monitoring and preservation (SubInd24): were observed in terms of maintenance and undertaking of necessary protective measures. The extent to which the mentioned activities are covered and fulfilled can be concluded from the position on the structural list of indicators.

3.3. Indicators of Low Contribution

The last defined group of indicators was distributed as

follows:

- Possibility of influence of visitors on the cultural style and living conditions of the community (SubInd27): from the aspect of functional and structural changes, which can damage the environment (including the proximity of settlements around the Fortress), it was concluded that this risk is not especially pronounced.
- Condition of reparation (SubInd22): was viewed through the prism of the ongoing activities and the general plan of reconstruction and revitalization of the complex. The pending works are primarily directed to the internal titivation of objects of Upper Fortress, while the arranging of the entire area is still only the current vision of managerial structures.
- Service amenities (SubInd13): this indicator took the last place in the structural list, so it is not yet indicative of the specifically designed and competitive tourism product on the Fortress.

In this way, the total market share in the promotion of the tourist site (*i.e.* locality) is accurately determined for each of observed indicators, which will improve the quality of management of cultural-tourist attractions, taking into account their meaning and significance (contribution).

The importance of separation of individual indicators of attractiveness has also been confirmed in other studies conducted in several different locations. One of them is a piece of research dedicated to the event titled "The London Architecture Biennale" held in June 2004 in Clerkenwell, UK. The morphology of the locality is rooted in medieval past and its hospitality towards migrant groups of settlers. The organizational idea of the event was the promotion and protection of architectural cultural heritage. [29]

The next identical study actually analyzes the findings of a survey conducted in several different locations in the United States: Battery Park (NY) and Liberty State Park (NJ) with the border areas in the immediate environment (Paulus Hook, Van Vorst, Lafayette), comparing the anthropological cultural values for heritage conservation. [30]

Considering the problem of value articulation - namely, the problem that some values cannot be expressed as numbers or declarative statements, in one set of studies, Satterfield [31], speculated that more inclusive portraits of value could be found in value-rich narratives if only one could elicit such narratives from lay stakeholders in a defensible manner. These studies assumed that morally resonant, image-based, and narrative-style elicitations would help respondents articulate a broader range of noncost and nonutilitarian environmental values. She presented the mentioned relative values in the same way, in the form of a set of indicators, which are distinguished on the basis of analysis of respondents' answers.

The following table (Table 4) provides an overview of the common selected indicators from all described pieces of researchs in contrast to the current one, including the defined order according to their presence in responses:

Table 4. Comparative overview of the selected indicators of research

Position of Indicators	Analysed Case Studies		
	Evans (2004)	Low (2002)	Satterfield (2001)
1.	Atmosphere	Affordability	Esthetic
2.	Historical value	Eshtetic	Historical value
3.	Esthetic	Educational value	Identification
4.	Accessibility	Authenticity	Scientific-research value
5.	Service amenities	Inability to influence of visitors	Cultural symbolism (associating)
6.	Possible influence on the social community	Influencing on the quality of social community	
7.	Affordability		

As can be seen from the table, in all of the case studies the presence of some identical indicators has been established. The average agreement with the current research, according to their number, is 25%. What can be concluded by comparing the showed results is a dominant separation of the environmental features and aesthetic values of the site, as major elements of attractiveness.

A key drawback of this approach is the impossibility of mutual classification and immediate linking with the adequate ranking position.

4. Conclusions

This case study shows and points out that the expectations of visitors, despite the results of the research, sometimes can be contrary to what is specifically presented in the form of main attractions and as of having the greatest importance at the locality. There are a few practical solutions for this problem.

One of them is to exactly determine what each of the indicators of the applied valorization model represents to the visitors of locality. This approach results in a more realistic and objective assessment of attractive elements, on the basis of which a justification and validity of the existing acting priorities should be considered.

The used approach allows the consideration of the total offer in terms of the contribution of individual elements to the overall market attractiveness. This significantly extends and enhances the efficiency and practical applicability of the basic research model [9].

With this model of assessment of space attractiveness, which focuses the achievement of objectivity based on direct observations, the possibility of theoretical and practical application of the results to any other researched locality is provided, by means of influencing the impact on management decisions-making of the DMO structures.

This kind of approach was also found in other examples of research with a similar theme. By comparing the similarities and differences through the results it is possible to draw

certain conclusions of general importance, *i.e.* of universal character. Common to all of the aforementioned studies is the separation of the individual elements of the market attractiveness of localities / events /, while the diversity of this research is reflected in the choice of evaluation criteria - that is, the principle of final assessment.

The main specificity is that in the above-mentioned research only quantitative-based methods of assessment were applied, whereas in this study a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was used (*i.e.* scaling technique with the technique of ranking). The second specificity is reflected in the fact that in other studies the purpose of separating of indicators was to determine their overall presence in the promotion, while the aim of this research was primarily argumentation of the current market position. Finally, the third specificity is reflected in the possibility of the precise classification of indicators according to their achieved contribution and importance.

Since in the creation of the final marks the visitors themselves take a part, by respecting their recommendations and taking them into account, a more meaningful and complete interaction is established, based on actual data, which ultimately results in improvement and changes in the strategy of market penetration and promotion (regardless of which form of the existing tourism potential, or locality is about).

The issue of scientific importance is reflected in confirmation of the main hypothesis that the attitudes of visitors, mapped on the current tourism offer, reflect a status of achieved market position of the locality and discover the problems of organization and coordination of promotional activities.

Acknowledgements

A special gratitude is owned to the staff of the City Museum of Novi Sad for the realized cooperation on this research.

Appendices

Appendix 1. The structural list of the Indicators of Market Attractiveness (IMA)

Rank position	IMA	Label	Group	Contribution
1	<i>Ambience</i>	SubInd1	Multi1	HIGH
2	<i>Value as a national symbol</i>	SubInd3	Multi1	
3	<i>Evocation of a narrative story</i>	SubInd4	Multi1	
4	<i>Attractiveness for the special needs</i>	SubInd6	Multi1	
5	<i>Authenticity</i>	SubInd5	Multi1	
6	<i>Investment potential for the stakeholders</i>	SubInd25	Multi4	
7	<i>Representativeness</i>	SubInd20	Multi3	
8	<i>Rarity of site</i>	SubInd19	Multi3	
9	<i>Historical value</i>	SubInd15	Multi3	
10	<i>Esthetical value</i>	SubInd14	Multi3	
11	<i>Social value</i>	SubInd17	Multi3	
12	<i>Scientific and research value</i>	SubInd18	Multi3	
13	<i>Educational value</i>	SubInd16	Multi3	
14	<i>Familiarity outside the local area</i>	SubInd2	Multi1	MIDDLE
15	<i>Complementarity in the tourist market</i>	SubInd7	Multi1	
16	<i>Associating with the culture</i>	SubInd9	Multi1	
17	<i>Possibility of impact of modifications on the life style and cultural tradition of the community</i>	SubInd29	Multi4	
18	<i>Sensitivity</i>	SubInd21	Multi4	
19	<i>Possibility of influence of visitors on the physical condition of the site</i>	SubInd26	Multi4	
20	<i>Possibility of impact of the modifications on the preservation of the locality</i>	SubInd28	Multi4	
21	<i>Regional tourist activity</i>	SubInd8	Multi1	
22	<i>Accessibility</i>	SubInd10	Multi2	
23	<i>Proximity of other attractions</i>	SubInd12	Multi2	
24	<i>Availability</i>	SubInd11	Multi2	
25	<i>Existence of a management plane</i>	SubInd23	Multi4	
26	<i>Regular monitoring and preservation</i>	SubInd24	Multi4	
27	<i>Possibility of influence of visitors on the cultural style and living condition of the community</i>	SubInd27	Multi4	LOW
28	<i>Condition of reparation</i>	SubInd22	Multi4	
29	<i>Service amenities</i>	SubInd13	Multi2	

References

- [1] Costache, S. (2012). Tourism, Friend or FOE to the Economic Sustainability of Developing Countries. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 7 (2), 60-76.
- [2] Linty, P. and Cavilli, M. (2006). Developing Cultural Tourism products (Report No. 6). Retrieved from <http://www.ectn.eu.com/uploads/FinalECTNReport012007.pdf>
- [3] Stankovic, S. (2000). *Turisticka geografija* [Tourism geography]. Belgrade: Faculty of Geography.
- [4] Hadzic, O. (2008). *Upravljanje održivim razvojem kulturnog turizma u Novom Sadu* [Managing of sustainable development of cultural tourism in Novi Sad]. Novi Sad: Faculty of Natural Sciences.
- [5] Macleod, N. (2006). Cultural Tourism: Aspects of Authenticity and Commodification. In M. Smith and M. Robinson (Eds.), *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World: Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation* (pp. 177-190). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- [6] Philo, C. (2000). Foucault's geography. In M. Crang and N. Thrift (Eds.), *Thinking Space* (pp. 205-238). London: Routledge.
- [7] Bauman, Z. (2001). *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*. Cambridge: Polity.
- [8] Augé, M. (1995). *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso.

- [9] Du Cros, H. (2000). *Planning for Sustainable Cultural Heritage Tourism in Hong Kong SAR* (Final Report). Hong Kong: Lord Wilson Heritage Trust.
- [10] Robinson, M. and Smith, M. (2006). Politics, Power and Play: The Shifting Contexts of Cultural Tourism. In M. Smith and M. Robinson (Eds.), *Cultural Tourism in a Changing World: Politics, Participation and (Re)presentation* (pp. 1-17). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- [11] Evans, G. (2001). *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?*. London: Routledge.
- [12] Keating, M. (2001). Rethinking the region: Culture, institutions and economic development in Catalonia and Galicia. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 8 (3), 217-234.
- [13] Hughes, H. (1996). Redefining cultural tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(3), 707-709.
- [14] Hughes, H. (1998). Theatre in London and the Interrelationship with tourism. *Tourism Management*, 19 (5), 445-452.
- [15] McKercher, R. (2001). Attitudes to a non-viable community-owned heritage tourist attractions. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 9 (1), 29-43.
- [16] Geser, G. (2007). European Historic Towns and Cultural Tourism in the Experience Economy. In F. Niccolucci (Eds.), *Digital Applications for Tangible Cultural Heritage: Report on the State of the Union Policies, Practices and Developments in Europe* (pp. 35-59). Budapest: Archaeolingua.
- [17] Richards, G. and Wilson, J. (2006). Developing Creativity in tourist Experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture?. *Tourism Management*, 27, 1209-1223.
- [18] Smith, M.K. (2007). Towards a Cultural Planning Approach to Regeneration“. In M.K. Smith (Eds.), *Tourism, Culture and Regeneration* (pp. 1-11). Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- [19] Etlin, R.A. (1996). *In Defense of Humanism: Value in the Arts and Letters*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Bachvarov, M. and Wilus, R. (2008). Cultural tourism: A new challenge in Central-Eastern Europe. In G. Richards and J. Wilson (Eds.), *The changing context of cultural tourism: Part I* (pp. 11-17). Arnhem: Association for Tourism and Leisure Education.
- [21] Gómez-Borja, M.Á., Romero, C.L., Descals, A.M. and Mondéjar-Jiménez, J.A. (2010). Building a tourist typology based on motivations for visiting a cultural city. In M. Kozak, J. Gnoth and L. Andreu (Eds.), *Advances in Tourism Destination Marketing* (pp. 233-243). London: Routledge.
- [22] McKercher, B. (2002). Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4 (1), 29-38.
- [23] McKercher, B. and Du Cros, H. (2003). Testing a Cultural Tourism Typology. *Journal of Business Research*, 59 (1), 647-652.
- [24] Brent, R.J.R. and Crouch, G.I. (2003). *The Competitive Destination: A Sustainable Tourism Perspective*. Wallingford: CABI Publishing.
- [25] Rodríguez, J.R.M. and Abdul-Jalbar, B. (2012). Cultural Tourism and Planning Trip: A Case Study. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 8, 41-47.
- [26] Saravanan, A. and Rao, Y.V. (2002). Equitable Tourism Development: Need for Strategic Partnership. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(2), 344-356.
- [27] Salazar, N.B. (2012). Community-based Cultural Tourism: Issues, Threats and Opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20 (1), 9-22.
- [28] Udički, I. (2010). *Područje Petrovaradinske tvrđave – identifikacija i procena predela* [The Territory of the Petrovaradin Fortress - Identification and Assessment of the Landscape], (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Belgrade, Serbia.
- [29] Ayesha, R. and Evans, G.L. (2004). Viva City: Mixed-use and Urban Tourism. In M.K. Smith (Eds.), *Tourism, Culture and Regeneration* (pp. 35-48). London: CABI Publishing 2004.
- [30] Low, S.M. (2002). Anthropological-Ethnographic Methods for the Assessment of Cultural Values in Heritage Conservation. In M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 31-49). Los Angeles: Getty Conservations Institute.
- [31] Satterfield, T. (2002). Numbness and Sensitivity in the Elicitation of Environmental Values, In M. de la Torre (Eds.), *Assessing the Values of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 77-99). Los Angeles: Getty Conservations Institute.