

World Heritage as a placebo brand: A comparative analysis of three sites and marketing implications

Journal:	<i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>
Manuscript ID	JOST-3418.R2
Manuscript Type:	Paper
Keywords:	World Heritage Tourism, Branding, placebo brand, World Heritage brand
Abstract:	<p>The UNESCO World Heritage List is often regarded as a successful tourism brand that motivates site nominations. However, there is relatively little research dealing specifically with World Heritage (WH) brand attraction effects, and what does exist shows conflicting results. There is a significant research gap in terms of awareness of the WH brand and its potential impact on visitation, which this study seeks to fill through a comparative analysis of three diverse case studies: Independence Hall, USA; Studenica Monastery, Serbia; and the Archaeological Site of Volubilis, Morocco. Survey data (n=771) from these three sites was collected and analyzed resulting in three distinct clusters of visitors. One of the clusters does exhibit higher levels of awareness of the WH brand, but members of this group were not motivated by this knowledge when planning their site visit. It is concluded that the WH brand may function as a placebo, and that its importance may be tied more to political interests than economic advancement. Thus, dependency on the WH List for tourism development may potentially be detrimental for locations in the long-term. The WH brand's placebo effect could result in long-term problems for both the site and those whose livelihoods depend on tourism.</p>

World Heritage as a placebo brand: A comparative analysis of three sites and marketing implications

The UNESCO World Heritage List is often regarded as a successful tourism brand that motivates site nominations. However, there is relatively little research dealing specifically with World Heritage (WH) brand attraction effects, and what does exist shows conflicting results. There is a significant research gap in terms of awareness of the WH brand and its potential impact on visitation, which this study seeks to fill through a comparative analysis of three diverse case studies: Independence Hall, USA; Studenica Monastery, Serbia; and the Archaeological Site of Volubilis, Morocco. Survey data (n=771) from these three sites was collected and analyzed resulting in three distinct clusters of visitors. One of the clusters does exhibit higher levels of awareness of the WH brand, but members of this group were not motivated by this knowledge when planning their site visit. It is concluded that the WH brand may function as a placebo, and that its importance may be tied more to political interests than economic advancement. Thus, dependency on the WH List for tourism development may potentially be detrimental for locations in the long-term. The WH brand's placebo effect could result in long-term problems for both the site and those whose livelihoods depend on tourism.

Keywords: world heritage tourism; world heritage brand; branding; placebo brand

INTRODUCTION

It has long been maintained by government, industry, non-government organizations and even some academics that United Nations Education, Social, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage listing provides a significant boost to tourism numbers. Giovanni Puglisi, the President of the Italian National Commission for UNESCO, best expressed this position when he stated that "it has been proven that inscription to the [World Heritage] list increases tourism flows by between 20 and 30%" (Berni, Author's translation, 2005, p.11). These types of claims are often a significant contribution to the decision to nominate a site to the list, and are the motivation for this current work. This study focuses on the relationship

1
2
3 between the World Heritage (WH) brand and motivations for visitation. There are few studies
4 that have been undertaken which directly assess if tourists are aware of a site's WH status and
5 if this information impacted their decision to visit (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Wall-Reinius
6 & Fredman, 2007; Yan & Morrison, 2008). No existing studies have been undertaken which
7 use not only a cross-contextual analysis but also a comparative one based on different levels
8 of development. This is particularly important as less developed countries often regard WH
9 site status as a means of increasing tourist visitation (Millar, 2006). Ryan and Silvano (2011,
10 p.315) argue that the WH brand can function as a signpost for international tourists via
11 promotional materials when other local brands are not well known. Therefore, especially for
12 less developed countries, the WH brand can be seen as a desirable designation that is
13 recognizable to a larger international audience.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 Although the term 'brand' is often applied to WH it should be noted, however, that there is
24 no consensus as to whether or not WH is a recognized brand. Researchers are in disagreement
25 over whether or not the WH list attracts individuals at all, and if so, for how long. Some
26 studies (e.g., Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Moscardo, Green & Greenwood, 2001; Yang, Lin
27 & Han, 2010) noted a broad recognition of the brand though not necessarily an increased
28 inclination to visit based solely on that aspect. Others (Hardiman & Burgin, 2013; Smith,
29 2002; Tisdell & Wilson, 2002; Williams, 2004) found that tourists were generally unaware of
30 the WH status of studied sites. In their statistical analyses, neither Buckley (2004) nor Hall
31 and Piggitt (2001) could find any evidence that listing increased the number of visitors above
32 existing growth rates. Current research on WH sites provides little insight into the actual
33 brand strength of the WH list in terms of visitation or even tourist recognition of the brand
34 itself. Furthermore, while previous studies commonly focused on individual sites or a
35 collection of sites within a single country, several authors have recommended that future
36 research on WH examine broader contexts (Buckley, 2004; King & Prideaux, 2010; Poria,
37 Reichel & Cohen, 2013; Yan & Morrison, 2008). Therefore, this study fulfils a recognized
38 gap and presents a cross-contextual analysis of WH brand awareness in order to determine
39 the potential effects on tourism.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 This work is of special importance to the study and practice of sustainable tourism for two
54 main reasons. There has long been an argument that natural World Heritage Sites are the
55 most secure form of Protected Area (PA) because of the legal and political framework that
56 surrounds them (Buckley, 2004; Hall, 1992), and that PAs are more and more reliant on, and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 proponents of, sustainable tourism and its practices (Job & Becken, in press). Secondly, it is
4 increasingly recognised that marketing and sustainable tourism are strongly interlinked (Font
5 & McCabe, 2017), and branding is central to some aspects of marketing. As the number of
6 World Heritage Sites continues to grow, there is clearly a need for further examination of the
7 role of the WH brand in attracting tourists.
8
9
10

11 12 13 **CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND**

14 15 16 *Tourism Branding*

17
18
19 In order for a tourism brand to function, there should already be some level of awareness of
20 the destination or attraction. According to Leiper (1990, p.379), “at least one *generating*
21 *marker* is necessary, referring to some kind of phenomenon that acts as a *primary nucleus*,
22 before an individual can become motivated to set off on a touristic trip.” Thus, there “is a
23 necessary level of awareness of a specific aspect of a destination in order to work as a pull
24 factor for the tourist, though they will have varied expectations related to the destination
25 based on the differing levels of personal import attached to the site” (1990, p.374). From this
26 perspective, the lower the awareness of a site, the less likely that it will be prioritized in terms of
27 visitation (Lew & McKercher 2006). In contrast, Milman and Pizman (1995, p.27) argue that
28 “awareness results, at best, in curiosity that can lead to interest and eventually to trial.”
29 Nevertheless, brand image is regarded as important. Bigné, Sánchez and Sánchez (2001,
30 p.613) suggest that “an improvement in the overall image of a place held by an individual
31 enhances his or her intention to return and to recommend in the future. It also increases the
32 propensity to make a positive assessment of the stay and to perceive a higher quality.” A
33 positive brand image can also be used to attract specific tourist markets (Kozak & Baloglu,
34 2010). Thus, positive language and imagery in tourism branding can have a strong impact on
35 tourists’ decision-making process. How then does this function in terms of cultural/heritage
36 tourism?
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Destination brands need to be relatable to their clientele on a cultural level. Ng, Lee and
52 Soutar (2007, p.1505) proposed that cultural distance impacted a destination’s attractiveness
53 and that “stressing culturally similar aspects is likely to increase the effectiveness of a
54 tourism destination’s promotion and marketing activities.” In terms of cultural heritage
55 tourism, Poria, Reichel and Biran (2006, p.324), in their study of tourists to a heritage site in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Amsterdam, found that “the more tourists perceive the site as being part of their own
4 heritage, the greater interest they show in learning, feeling emotionally involved, being
5 connected to their heritage and passing the legacy on to their children.” Thus, there are both
6 emotional and cultural elements to the selection of a tourism destination. However, visitation
7 also requires a certain level of knowledge. Kerstetter, Confer and Graefe (2001) suggest that
8 more highly specialized visitors within the heritage tourism market have a higher level of
9 prior knowledge, which could explain their higher probability of expressing satisfaction with
10 their overall visit (p.271).
11
12
13
14
15
16

17
18 These previous studies highlight the varied ways in which WH branding can be understood
19 specifically as WH sites are simultaneously both attractions and destinations depending on
20 context. While small sites would be considered attractions, especially when located in larger
21 destination areas (i.e. Temple of Heaven, Beijing), Hall and Piggin (2002) note that size can
22 result in a WH site being considered a destination as opposed to an attraction, using the Great
23 Barrier Reef as an example. This is due to the area of the site dictating the existence of tourist
24 amenities as befits a destination. In relation to cultural WH sites (generally, cultural sites are
25 listed under Criteria I-VI and natural sites are found under Criteria VII-X), this variety of
26 facilities would be most commonly found in listed cities (i.e. Verona, Italy; Rabat, Morocco;
27 Luang Prabang, Laos). Therefore, for both attractions and destinations, the literature suggests
28 that a globally recognized tourism brand would promote visitation across varied contexts,
29 and, as was noted, strong tourism brands can result in the creation of “must-see” destinations,
30 which could work to promote tourism in destinations wherein the tourist does not have
31 cultural ties. It is in this manner that the WH list may function as a tourism brand.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 ***The World Heritage Brand***

44
45
46 Several studies have been undertaken to assess the effectiveness of the UNESCO WH brand
47 at the level of the tourist. Su and Lin’s (2014) work, for example, scrutinized the connection
48 between international tourist arrivals and WH sites on a global scale, and they found that
49 increases in tourism fell on a U-curve, with initial tourism increases occurring when no WH
50 sites exist but then only experiencing growth again once there are more than 21 WH sites.
51 “This increase means that when a country possesses sufficient WH sites, the ‘gearing effect’
52 of WH sites will emerge” (Su & Lin, 2014, p.57). This suggests that WH listing does have an
53 impact, though it is dependent on the pre-existing number of sites that a country has. In
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 contrast, Hall and Piggin's (2001) survey of WH sites in OECD countries found no evidence
4 that growth in tourism at WH sites could be distinguished from national and/or local tourism
5 growth. These works highlight the conflicting results found within the WH marketing
6 literature.
7
8
9

10
11 Some studies found that tourists were generally aware of a visited site's listed status.
12 Marcotte and Bourdeau (2006) revealed that 55% of interviewed tourists in Quebec City,
13 Canada, knew that the site was on the WH list, with 15% stating that this status led to their
14 decision to visit. In Australia, Moscardo et al. (2001) indicated that over 90% of sampled
15 visitors knew that the Great Barrier Reef was on the WH list. Palau-Saumell et al. (2012)
16 found only about half of visitors to La Sagrada Família, Spain, were aware of its WH status
17 but that "any action on the heritage building or improvement of its contents will have a much
18 greater effect on emotions and will result in greater satisfaction among the tourists that know
19 the heritage site is a UNESCO WHS" (p.373). Other studies segmented tourists by residence
20 (domestic/international). Patuelli, Mussoni and Candela (2012) noted a 4% increase in
21 domestic tourist visitation to an Italian region after listing. Yan and Morrison (2008) found
22 that 67.1% of international tourists decided to visit Huangshan, China, due, in small part, to
23 its WH status. Yang et al. (2010) in analyzing international arrivals to Chinese tourist sites,
24 found that "an increase in one World Heritage Site will induce about six times the amount of
25 international tourist arrivals for a new [highly ranked national] spot" (2010, p.834). While
26 these studies seem to indicate a strong level of brand recognition tied to touristic increases,
27 this is not always the case.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Hall and Piggin (2002, p.410), for example, found there to be no conclusive evidence as to
42 whether or not WH listing actually affected businesses in the vicinity of two New Zealand
43 sites regardless of the majority of businesses maintaining that there were positive impacts and
44 that it would work as a tourist attractor. In fact, Cellini (2011) reinterpreted Yang et al.'s
45 results and disagreed with their conclusions, noting that "UNESCO recognition appears to be
46 ineffective in fostering international tourist arrivals" (p.453). This is supported by Wall-
47 Reinius and Fredman's (2007) study of the Swedish Laponian Area World Heritage site,
48 which noted that, while almost 60% of surveyed individuals knew the site's WH status, only
49 5% indicated that it had any impact on their decision to visit. Part of the difficulty lies in the
50 usage of data immediately post-listing. For instance, Huang, Tsaour and Yang (2012, p.46)
51 discovered that, in the case of Macao, the WH inscription functions as a short-term marketing
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 method to increase tourism, but over the long-term, it is not a significant motivator. This
4 acknowledges a potential increase following listing, but it also emphasizes the potential long-
5 term problems of relying on the WH brand for its touristic potential.
6
7

8
9
10 Additionally, not all tourist increases are equal across sites. Tisdell and Wilson (2002, p.46)
11 found at Australian sites that while visitation does increase, albeit minimally, even once
12 listed, not all sites received equal visitation levels, with some experiencing very low flows
13 (see also Buckley, 2004; Hall & Piggin, 2001). A similar situation was found in Patuelli et al.
14 (2012). Their research indicated that, while WH status can cause visitation increases, there
15 are a myriad of contextual factors, which can counteract these assessed positive benefits.
16 Their results emphasize the importance of WH as a mechanism to entice visitation over
17 similar regions of the same country. Both of these studies are particularly interesting as they
18 deal with sites within the same national context. While there is no guarantee that these results
19 could be applied in a cross-contextual analysis, it could be supposed that the disparities
20 between increased visitation to WH sites in already highly popular countries would be much
21 greater than those in countries which do not experience a heightened global presence in the
22 tourism sphere. In other words, “already popular places will become more popular, while
23 unpopular, remote or contested sites will likely gain few additional visitors” (Jansen-Verbeke
24 & McKercher, 2010, p.192).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The disconnect between the positive and negative levels of recognition and tourism increases
37 were well expressed in a study undertaken by Poria, Reichel and Cohen (2013, p.273) in
38 Israel, wherein the WH list was seen as a “global recommendation to visit” by the
39 interviewees while they simultaneously were incapable of identifying the WH logo. In
40 another study at religious Israeli WH sites, Poria, Reichel and Cohen (2011b) found “that the
41 title WH [Site] does not serve as a magnet for tourists.” Cuccia, Guccio and Rizzo (2013)
42 explained the problems related to the use of the UNESCO listing for tourism purposes as
43 being two-fold with an overemphasis on extreme, short-term increases due to listing without,
44 generally, a concise long-term plan to not only assist in the maintenance of visitation
45 numbers but also create a sustainable environment for the potential visitation increases (see
46 also Hall, 2006). As stated by Hall and Piggin (2003, p.218), there is no indisputable
47 indication that WH listing has any direct impact on visitation numbers. Lo Piccolo, Leone
48 and Pizzuto (2012) found this to be true in their research related to visitation levels at
49 Agrigento and the Aeolian Islands, where visitation actually declined by 13.3% in the nine
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 years after listing. Thus, not only is there an unsubstantiated belief that WH listing will
4 increase tourist numbers outside of pre-existing trends, but this assumption, in turn, can pose
5 problems for planning.
6
7

8
9
10 Furthermore, there exist several studies which indicate that tourists are not always cognizant
11 of a site's status or WH in general. Hardiman and Burgin (2013, p.64) found that there was a
12 very low level of awareness of the Australian WH areas among visitors to the Greater Blue
13 Mountains site, and about half were completely incapable of naming any sites at all.

14
15
16 Furthermore, the site's WH status did not appear to have been a motivating factor for
17 visitation five years post-listing, and the majority of tourists were not conscious of their
18 having visited a WH site. Tisdell and Wilson (2002) emphasized that tourists in Australia
19 were not always aware of a site's WH status prior to visitation, which suggests a lack of
20 influence of the WH brand on site choice. King and Prideaux (2010) noticed a similar trend
21 in relation to visitor awareness of WH status in their visitor-based study on Australian natural
22 WH sites. However, they did find that "a small percentage of visitors at each site self-
23 identified as a World Heritage Area collector" (King & Prideaux, 2010, p.243).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 At natural sites in Australia and one in the USA, King and Halpenny (2014) noted a lack of
33 awareness, particularly in being able to recognize and correctly identify the WH symbol. In
34 the USA, Williams (2004, p.413) indicated that while favourable benefits could be noted
35 from listing, in general, the average visitor to a listed US national park is totally unaware of
36 WH status. This ignorance at American parks was also noted by Hazen (2008, p.259), who
37 stated that over 40% of individuals had no firm opinions regarding the WH Convention,
38 which was attributed to the fact that most stated that they were not knowledgeable enough
39 about the subject. In Macao, Dewar, du Cros and Li (2012, p.325) discovered that "it is clear
40 that the average visitor has only a vague understanding of WH." Smith (2002) also found a
41 lack of overall awareness of Maritime Greenwich's WH status. However, she noted that WH
42 listing "appears to be valued more as a catalyst for investment, regeneration and tourism
43 development than as a significant icon in its own right" (p.146). In relation to an
44 archaeological WH site in Israel, Poria, Reichel and Cohen (2011a) noted not only low levels
45 of awareness of the WH logo and name but also a higher motivation to visit a non-listed site
46 in comparison with a listed one.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57
58 Fyall and Rakic (2006, p.165) refer to the overemphasis on the WH List as a guaranteed
59
60

1
2
3 tourist attractor as “naïve” as it “overly simplifies the nature of visitor trends at World
4 Heritage Sites.” Moreover, the continuously growing list could actually work against those
5 who are actively trying to utilize the WH brand as a tourism promotion tool. Logan (2012)
6 notes that with a constantly expanding list, many sites no longer fulfil the requirements of
7 Outstanding Universal Value, but are instead of specifically national interest. Therefore, the
8 universality of “Outstanding Universal Value” is being called into question. “Overexposure
9 of the World Heritage ‘brand’ is likely to dilute the benefits to be derived from such a quality
10 ‘trademark’ with the source of differentiation achieved through brand recognition no longer
11 carrying influence in the market” (Fyall & Rakic, 2006, p.171).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 This is especially important for countries who find themselves on the lower end of the
20 Human Development Index. As Timothy and Nyaupane (2009) noted
21
22

23
24
25 ...there is a scramble in [Less Developed Countries] to inscribe as many heritage sites
26 as possible on UNESCO’s World Heritage List (WHL). As developing countries often
27 have lower levels of global visibility, they frequently use the WHL as a way of making
28 their countries visible (p.11).
29
30
31

32
33 Millar (2006) remarked that “in states with weak economies World Heritage Site status was
34 eagerly sought as a kite mark for the promotion of mass tourism, under the guise of
35 international cultural tourism” (pp.38-39). Ashworth and van der Aa (2009) similarly note
36 that there is a greater emphasis on economic gains than on the actual purpose of the WHC,
37 site preservation and conservation in such countries. This is a precarious strategy, as Dewar et
38 al. (2012, p.324) indicated, there are “tangible disadvantages at site level or places relying
39 heavily on the tourist dollar for management and conservation revenue.” Thus it can be seen
40 as potentially problematic to rely heavily on the WH brand. As more seek to reap the
41 unsubstantiated benefits from listing they are, in turn, potentially diluting the ‘special’ WH
42 brand.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 51 **METHOD**

52 53 54 *Study Context*

55
56
57
58 In order to test the brand effectiveness of the UNESCO World Heritage List, three cultural
59
60

1
2
3 sites (Independence Hall, USA; Studenica Monastery, Serbia; Archaeological Site of
4 Volubilis, Morocco) were selected. Independence Hall, listed in 1979, is located in
5 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. It is of great national importance as the site of the signing
6 of the United States Declaration of Independence as well as the Constitution. It is listed under
7 Criterion VI. Studenica Monastery, which is located in Southwestern Serbia, was inscribed
8 on the WH List in 1986 under the recommendation of what was then Yugoslavia. Following
9 the Balkan Wars, Serbia succeeded to the WH Convention in 2001 and Studenica fell under
10 its auspices. It is one of the oldest monasteries in Serbia, the site where the Serbian Orthodox
11 Church was created, and it also houses the remains of the first kings of Serbia. It is listed
12 under Criteria I, II, IV, and VI. The Archaeological Site of Volubilis (hereafter referred to as
13 Volubilis) is found in the province of Meknès El Menzeh, Morocco. Volubilis was founded in
14 the 3rd century B.C. as the capital of Mauritania and would later fall under Roman control.
15 The town continued to exist, with evidence of Christian habitation followed at some point by
16 conversion to Islam, and was briefly the Idrissid capital in the 8th century A.D. It became part
17 of the WH List in 1997 under Criteria II, III, IV, and VI.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 To be selected, the sites needed to fulfil specific requirements in terms of geographic
31 position, level of human development, and specificities of the cultural attraction. The sites
32 were required to be set in geographically diverse locations in order to maximize differences
33 in potential visitor origins, which in this case consisted of North America, Europe, and North
34 Africa. Furthermore, each site was required to be accessible to domestic and international
35 tourists while simultaneously not being located in the most famous tourist locations within
36 each country. Additionally, the sites were located in countries with different levels of human
37 development, based on the United Nations Development Programme's Human Development
38 Index (HDI). "The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be
39 the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone"
40 (UNDP, 2015). According to the UNDP (2015), the USA is more developed, Serbia
41 moderately developed, and Morocco less developed. These criteria were used in order to
42 observe if there were certain trends that overrode geographical or development-based factors.
43 Additionally, the three sites were also required to fulfil certain site-specific requirements.
44 Namely, they had to be listed under the first six UNESCO criteria (UNESCO, 2015), which
45 are distinctly cultural, and have defined entry and exit points in order to ensure that all
46 potential survey respondents had visited the site.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Survey Instrument

In order to fully assess the impact of the WH status on tourist decisions to visit a specific site, it was determined, based on previous research methodologies (Dewar et al., 2012; Hall & Piggin, 2001; Hardiman & Burgin, 2013; Yan & Morrison, 2008), that a survey was the most appropriate, with the questions developed in light of the existing literature. It should be noted that the data used in this work is part of a larger study. Awareness of the WH status was measured by two items: 'I have heard of the UNESCO World Heritage List' and 'I knew this site was on the UNESCO WH list prior to the visit,' which, on the survey, were the first and second questions respectively. These were measured using a yes/no option. A positive answer to the first question prompted a response to the second. If both responses were affirmative, the respondents were asked to respond to a set of five questions which were related to the influence of the WH brand on their decision to visit this specific site, their previous experience with WH sites, and whether or not they generally chose to visit WH sites. The responses were measured using a five point Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree and 5= Strongly agree).

An additional section presented the ten listing criteria and an additional four (protection, management, authenticity, and integrity) and assessed, through the use of a five point Likert scale (1=Strongly Disagree and 5= Strongly agree). This section required respondents to indicate how much they agree that the site that they had just visited represented each of the criteria. Demographic and travelling characteristics were also measured. The surveys were available in English, Serbian, Arabic, and French. The English survey was translated into French by a native speaker and then crosschecked by the researcher. As the researcher did not speak Serbian or Arabic, heritage academics that natively spoke the two languages translated the survey in collaboration with the researcher. The survey instrument can be provided by the corresponding author upon request.

Sampling, Data Collection, and Analysis

As there was no data in terms of average number of visitors to each site prior to commencing the research periods, a probability sampling technique could not be used. As a result a convenience sampling method was chosen. This allowed for the surveying of visitors to the individual sites upon completion of their visit. These visitors were asked if they wished to fill

1
2
3 in the survey, and there was a concerted effort to avoid any bias in the selection of
4 individuals. As Richards (2010, p.20) notes, “surveying all visitors enables an analysis to be
5 made of the relationship between different visitor groups and to contrast motivations,
6 behaviour and background of local residents and tourists”.
7
8
9

10
11 The sampling period began at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, USA, from July 31 to August
12 10, 2013, followed by Studenica Monastery, Serbia, from September 7 to September 21,
13 2013, and ending with Volubilis, Morocco, from October 7 to October 21, 2013. Surveys
14 were completed by the respondents in either English or the dominant language(s) of the
15 country in which the site was located: English at Independence Hall, Serbian and English at
16 Studenica Monastery, and English, French, and Arabic at Volubilis. At both Studenica
17 Monastery and the Archaeological Site of Volubilis, sampling occurred within the confines of
18 the site itself, while permission at Independence Hall was given only for the area near to the
19 exit gate, but outside of the security perimeter. In total, 771 surveys were collected across the
20 three sites (See Table 1 for a site-by-site breakdown). In regards to Independence Hall,
21 visitation numbers were available post-study, and it was found that 71,563 individuals visited
22 the site in August 2013, which is used as the base month since more than 90% of the
23 surveying occurred then (National Park Service, n.d.). As there were on average 2,308
24 individuals at the site each day (approx. 25,393 over the 11 day period), the sample size of
25 396 usable surveys is found to have a confidence interval of 4.89 at a 95% confidence level.
26 Reliable visitor statistics for the other two sites were not available. The sample size of 771
27 meets the requirements ($70 \times$ number of items used for clustering) for effective data driven
28 segmentation (Dolnicar, Grün, Leisch, & Schmidt, 2014).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 <Insert Table 1 here>
44
45

46 The data from all three sites were pooled together to identify homogeneous visitor groups
47 based on similarities in perceptions of the four criteria (protection, management, authenticity
48 and integrity). The use of these criteria is supported by the positive qualities attributed to all
49 WH sites by nature of the brand as a marker of quality and authenticity (Rakic & Chambers,
50 2007; Ryan & Silvanto, 2011). WH Criteria I-X were still assessed though they were deemed
51 too specific to the individual sites, which are diverse in nature. Data were analyzed in three
52 stages. In the first stage, similar to previous data driven segmentation studies (Sarigöllü &
53 Huang, 2005; Park & Yoon, 2009; Prayag, 2012; Khoo-Lattimore & Prayag, 2015) the raw
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 scores were used to derive the segments using cluster analysis. The use of raw scores
4 produces more accurate or detailed segmentation by preserving a greater degree of the
5 original data (Sheppard, 1996; Dolnicar & Grun, 2008). Accordingly, a non-hierarchical K-
6 means clustering algorithm was used to develop two, three, four and five cluster solutions.
7
8 An examination of group membership and group sizes, as suggested in previous studies (Park
9 & Yoon, 2009; Prayag & Hosany, 2014; Sarigöllü & Huang, 2005), confirmed the three
10 cluster solution as the most appropriate. In the second stage, the appropriateness of the three
11 cluster solution was further verified using discriminant analysis (Prayag & Hosany, 2014). In
12 the final stage, the clusters were profiled on the basis of respondents' prior knowledge of, and
13 potential influence of, WH status and site specific criteria, as well as, demographic
14 characteristics.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 To assess for bias due to common-method variance (CMV), we employed Harman's single
24 factor test, which requires all of the variables being loaded in an exploratory factor analysis
25 (EFA). Given that none of the factors accounted for more than 25% of the variance, it
26 suggests that CMV is not a pervasive issue in this study (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986)
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 RESULTS

34 *Demographic Profile of Samples*

35
36
37 The demographic profile of respondents for each individual site can be seen in Table 2.
38
39 Except for the Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco), the sites had a higher percentage
40 of male respondents. As expected, Independence Hall (USA) and Studenica Monastery
41 (Serbia) had higher percentages of respondents from North America (77.6%) and Europe
42 (92.9%) respectively. To identify significant differences between the demographic profiles of
43 each site, chi-square tests were conducted. No significant differences were found between the
44 sites on the basis of visitors' gender. There was a significant difference between the sites on
45 the basis of residence of visitors ($\chi^2=237.64$, $p<0.001$). The Independence Hall site attracted
46 more local (12.7%) and rest of country visitors (60.8%) compared to the other sites. The
47 Volubilis site attracted more visitors from abroad (86.7%) compared to the other two sites
48 (see Table 2). As expected, the sites of Studenica Monastery (92.9%) and Volubilis (52.6%)
49 attracted more visitors from Europe compared to the Independence Hall site, which attracted
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more visitors from North America (77.6%). This difference was statistically significant
4 ($\chi^2=444.14$, $p<0.001$). There was also a significant difference between the sites on the basis
5 of the age of visitors ($\chi^2=53.79$, $p<0.001$). The site of Volubilis attracted older respondents
6 (>60 years old, 24.2%) more than the other two sites, while the Independence Hall site
7 attracted younger visitors (20-29 years old, 37.8%) more than the other two sites. A
8 significant difference was also noted on the basis of travel party size ($\chi^2=46.95$, $p<0.001$).
9 Studenica Monastery attracted more solo travellers (11.8%) compared to the other two sites,
10 while Independence Hall attracted (86.3%) a party size of between two to five visitors more
11 than the other two sites. There was a significant difference between the three sites on the
12 basis of the education level of visitors ($\chi^2=32.21$, $p<0.001$). The Studenica Monastery
13 attracted more visitors that had completed secondary school (20%) in comparison to the other
14 two sites. The sites of Volubilis (41.9%) and Independence Hall (40.3%) attracted more
15 visitors that had postgraduate qualifications (Masters/PhD) compared to Studenica Monastery
16 (25%). The site of Volubilis attracted more retirees (21.1%) while the site of Independence
17 Hall attracted more students (22.1%) compared to the other two sites. These differences were
18 statistically significant ($\chi^2=63.32$, $p<0.001$).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 <Insert Table 2 here>
32
33

34 ***Identification of Clusters Based on WH site general criteria*** 35

36
37
38 As mentioned above, the three-cluster solution was chosen for interpretation given that it
39 achieved the highest percentage of correct classification (97.6 %) of the original grouped
40 cases, using discriminant analysis, compared to the four cluster (97.3%) and five cluster
41 (95.3%) solutions. From Table 3, it can be seen that Cluster 2 (n=203) and 3 (n=447) are
42 larger in size in comparison to Cluster 1 (n=85). Cluster 1 can be labelled as 'Unpleased
43 Visitors', given that this group tends to neither agree nor disagree that the sites were authentic
44 (M=3.74) while disagreeing that the sites were well protected (M=1.55), well managed
45 (M=1.68) or maintained their integrity (M=2.52). Clusters 2 was labelled 'Undecided
46 Visitors' given that this group agreed that the sites were authentic (M=4.15) but neither
47 agreed nor disagreed with the remaining three criteria. Cluster 3 was labelled 'Pleased
48 Visitors', given that this group agreed that the sites were well protected (M=4.46), well
49 managed (M=4.53), authentic (M=4.53), and maintained their integrity (M=4.56).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

<Insert Table 3 here>

The Influence of Previous Knowledge on Clusters

To identify the influence of prior knowledge about the WH status of the sites, the clusters were profiled on the basis of two questions (I have heard of the UNESCO World Heritage List and I knew this site was on the UNESCO World Heritage List prior to my visit). Chi-square tests revealed significant differences between the clusters and previous knowledge of WH status ($\chi^2=41.99$, $p<0.001$). The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had a higher proportion of visitors (38.3%) that had not heard about the UNESCO World Heritage list compared to 'Unpleased Visitors' (14.1%) and 'Undecided Visitors' (16.7%). Only those who answered affirmatively to the previous question were required to respond to the second question. The results of the chi-square test revealed a significant difference between the clusters on the basis of visitors' knowledge that the site was on the UNESCO World Heritage List prior to their visit ($\chi^2=28.57$, $p<0.001$). Of those who had heard about the UNESCO WH List, the 'Unpleased Visitor' cluster had a higher percentage (76.7%) of those who knew the site was on UNESCO WH List prior to their visit compared to the cluster of 'Undecided Visitors' (66.3%) and 'Pleased Visitors' (47.1%). The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had a higher percentage (52.9%) of those that did not know that the site was on UNESCO WH List prior to their visit compared to the 'Undecided Visitors' (33.7%) and 'Unpleased Visitors' (23.3%).

All those that noted that they had been aware of the site's WH status were further asked to respond to five questions which focused on the influence of the WH brand on the respondent's decision to visit this specific site, their previous experience with WH sites, and whether or not they frequently chose to visit WH sites. Based on the results of a one-way ANOVA test, a significant difference in means was found in relation to two of the five questions. The first question that tested significant was 'The UNESCO World Heritage status was one of my reasons for visiting this site' ($F(2,289)=3.952$, $p=.02$). The Tukey post-hoc test results indicated that the 'Pleased Visitors' ($M=2.83$) had, on average, higher levels of disagreement in relation to this statement in comparison to the 'Undecided Visitors' ($M=3.20$). The second question that tested significantly different was 'This is my first visit to a World Heritage Site' ($F(2,283)=5.124$, $p=.007$). Based on the results of the post-hoc test,

1
2
3 the 'Pleased Visitors' (M=2.03) had, on average, lower levels of disagreement in comparison
4 with the 'Undecided Visitors' (M=1.60) and 'Unpleased Visitors' (M=1.57).
5
6

7
8 <Insert Table 4 here>
9

10 11 ***The Influence of Site-Specific Criteria on Clusters*** 12

13
14 In order to analyze the influence of site-specific criteria on the clusters, initially factor
15 analysis was undertaken on the ten original UNESCO criteria to reduce them to a more
16 manageable set. A KMO measure of sampling adequacy (0.858) and a Bartlett's test of
17 sphericity ($\chi^2=3332.06$, $p<0.001$) confirmed that the data was appropriate for factorization.
18 Based on a varimax rotation with eigenvalues greater than one, two factors were extracted
19 (see Table 5). Factor 1 is composed predominantly of natural criteria (Criteria VII through X)
20 except for Criteria V (Be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use,
21 or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the
22 environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible
23 change). The loading of Criteria V on factor 1 can possibly be attributed to the wording of the
24 criteria itself, which suggests that the criteria deals with human interaction with the
25 environment. As such factor 1 can be labelled as 'Environmental Criteria'. The items loading
26 on factor 2 pertain specifically to cultural criteria (Criteria I, II, III, IV and VI), and thus was
27 labelled 'Cultural Criteria'. The total percentage of variance explained by the two factors was
28 62.57 percent, and both factors were internally consistent (Cronbach's $\alpha > 0.7$).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 <Insert Table 5 here>
42
43

44
45 The composite scores of the two factors were used to identify significant differences between
46 the clusters on those factors. ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc comparisons revealed that the
47 clusters were not different on the basis of the environmental factor ($F(2,714)=0.306$, $p=.737$).
48 However, a significant difference existed between the clusters on the cultural factor
49 ($F(2,716)=21.04$, $p<0.001$). The post-hoc comparisons revealed significant differences
50 between each cluster. The cluster of 'Unpleased Visitors' had on average significantly lower
51 (M=3.92) agreement levels on this factor compared to both the cluster of 'Pleased Visitors'
52 (M=4.33) and 'Undecided Visitors' (M=4.12). The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had on
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

average a significantly higher agreement level with the cultural factor compared to the cluster of 'Undecided Visitors'.

The Influence of Demographics on Clusters

Finally the demographic and travelling characteristics were used to profile the clusters. No significant differences existed between the clusters on the basis of the gender, age, and education level of respondents. Chi-square tests (see Table 6) revealed significant differences between the clusters on residence ($\chi^2=91.91$, $p<0.001$), region ($\chi^2=112.09$, $p<0.001$), travel party size ($\chi^2=13.79$, $p=0.032$), and employment ($\chi^2=25.51$, $p=0.004$). The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had a higher percentage of visitors from rest of the country (53.7%) compared to the cluster of 'Undecided Visitors' (24.8%) and 'Unpleased Visitors' (20%). The cluster of 'Unpleased Visitors' had a higher percentage of visitors from abroad (74.1%) compared to the other two clusters. The cluster of 'Unpleased Visitors' (14.6%) had a higher percentage of visitors from Africa compared to the two other clusters (see Table 6). The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had a higher percentage of visitors from North America (60.5%) compared to the two other clusters. The cluster of 'Unpleased Visitors' had a higher percentage (84.7%) of those travelling in a party size of between two to five compared to the other two clusters. The cluster of 'Pleased Visitors' had a higher percentage of students (18.6%) compared to the other two clusters. The cluster of 'Unpleased Visitors' had a higher percentage of retirees (22.6%) compared to the two other clusters.

<Insert Table 6 here>

DISCUSSION

Explicit efforts to market the WH dimension of sites will only be effective if the WH list can be proven to function as a tourist attractor. This is particularly important as there are few studies that assess WH brand awareness and its impact on tourists' decision to visit through primary, demand-side studies (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Wall-Reinius & Fredman, 2007; Yan & Morrison, 2008). Of the previous works, two were undertaken in more developed countries, Sweden (Wall-Reinius & Fredman, 2007) and Canada (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006) and one in a moderately developed nation, China (Yan & Morrison, 2008). Additionally, only one of these (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006) specifically undertook their

1
2
3 study at a cultural WH site. Therefore, this work is the first of its type to be undertaken at any
4 type of site in a less developed nation, at a cultural site in a moderately developed nation, and
5 also in an African country. Furthermore, it was the first to utilize a cluster analysis to analyze
6 cross-site trends in relation to awareness levels and motivation, regardless of context.
7
8

9
10
11 When the survey data from all three sites was combined, three distinct clusters emerged:
12 Pleased, Undecided, and Unpleased Visitors. Unpleased Visitors were more predominantly
13 retirees, coming from abroad, and travelling in groups of two to five individuals. Pleased
14 Visitors were more likely to be domestic visitors (though not from the local area), from North
15 America, and were more predominantly students than the other two clusters. The Undecided
16 visitors had no significant distinguishing demographic factors. In general, Unpleased
17 Visitors, who were the smallest of the three clusters, had a higher probability of knowing not
18 only what the WH list is but also that the site they were visiting was inscribed on the list.
19 Undecided Visitors were less aware of both the WH list and the inscription status of the site.
20 The lowest level of awareness was found among the Pleased Visitors, of which almost two-
21 fifths had never heard of WH. Additionally, of those that had heard of the WH list, fewer than
22 half knew that the site was on the list. However, while there is obviously a high level of
23 awareness of WH among a specific group of tourists, it did not appear to have any strong
24 positive impact on any of the groups' choice to visit the site.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Based on these results, it becomes clear that there is a specific group of individuals who have
37 a heightened awareness of the WH list, which supports the findings of King and Halpenny
38 (2014). However, there is no evidence that this has any impact on their site selection process.
39 This contrasts with past studies which noted that there was a positive, albeit small, influence
40 of WH site knowledge on destination selection (Marcotte & Bourdeau, 2006; Yan and
41 Morrison, 2008). Therefore, WH designation was not a strong attractor at any of the sites,
42 indicating that there was no alteration based on the development level of the nation nor the
43 geographical location of the site. Based on these results, the WH brand can perhaps be better
44 understood in terms of it having a placebo effect.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 The word placebo is most commonly used in the medical field where it is defined by its
54 connection to drugs, which “[produce] an effect on the body, while a placebo primarily works
55 on the mind and imagination of the patient” (Szawarski, 2004, p.58). In relation to marketing,
56 a placebo can be understood as “a brand that claims to have certain properties that it does not
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actually possess and, through such claims, changes the consumer's behavior" (Ling, Shieh, &
4 Liao, 2012, p.265). McDowell and Dick (2002), in their study of news brands, found that
5 brand awareness can result in positive appraisals of the product regardless of actual quality,
6 an insight echoed by Hsiao, Hsu, Chu and Fang (2014) in their study of consumer product
7 brands. These trends are also evident in relation to WH, but it is important to note that WH
8 tourism is not merely a service product as there is a cultural aspect that needs to be
9 considered when discussing its brand impacts.
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Martínez's (2014) analysis of poet name recognition is one of the few studies dealing
17 specifically with cultural brand awareness. His analysis revealed that "the name of the author
18 significantly influences the subjective evaluation that is made of the work" (Author's
19 translation, Martínez, 2014, p.142). In a similar fashion, WH, as a cultural brand, is often
20 perceived to be of higher quality due in part to its name and its perceived "global"
21 significance. Interestingly, however, these placebo effect trends are evident not among the
22 tourist consumers but instead among politicians, site managers, and local businesses, who
23 often view WH as a brand imbued with the power to attract tourists (Leask, 2006; Ashworth
24 & van der Aa, 2009; Hall & Piggin, 2002). Nonetheless, as has been seen in this work, this
25 has been proven to be untrue. Therefore, assertions as to its significance for tourism may be
26 more bound up with local and national politics and the leverage of public funds by business
27 and sectional interests, including conservation and tourism groups, than evidence-based
28 policy making (Hall, 1992; Buckley, 2004).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 CONCLUSIONS

41
42 The WH brand has been praised as a method to increase tourism in a given area, which is
43 especially important for developing nations (Millar, 2006; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009).
44 However, there has been no site-level research undertaken in less developed nations to date
45 that specifically gauges visitor awareness of the WH brand. Additionally, prior to this work,
46 there had been no studies that tested the impact of the WH brand at cultural sites which were
47 located in diverse geographical, cultural, and developmental contexts. Thus, the results from
48 this research are distinct in that they were found to apply to diverse sites with different
49 visitors at different times.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While the analysis of the literature suggested that measurement of the WH brand's impact
4 produces varied results, the significant findings in this study were fairly consistent across all
5 the sites. The WH brand itself was not strongly indicated as a motivation to visit any of the
6 three sites. Furthermore, though a specific group that was more aware of the WH brand was
7 found to exist, in general, they did not appear to plan their visits based on the WH brand. As
8 WH listing was not a strong attractor at any of the sites, this work has suggested that the WH
9 brand functions as a placebo. More specifically, those who promote the sites for tourism
10 development may perceive the brand as a functional tourist attractor without, as previously
11 mentioned, appropriate evidential proof. Thus, based on the tourism importance ascribed to
12 WH listing by tourism and heritage conservation proponents (See Berni, 2005; Buckley,
13 2004; Hall, 1992) in comparison with the results found in this study, the WH brand's placebo
14 effect could result in long-term problems for both the site and those whose livelihoods are
15 dependent on tourism, especially in areas that are developed specifically based on the listing
16 of a site. This study therefore does not deny at all the extremely significant heritage
17 conservation role that WH listing provides, but it does suggest that there needs to be much
18 greater caution with respect to the role of WH as a brand that attracts tourists.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 While the results of this study prove interesting, there are some limitations to the work that
32 need to be acknowledged. The most notable of these is in relation to the relatively small
33 sample size, which was impacted not only by the time spent surveying at each site but also by
34 a lack of visitation data necessary to appropriately determine a required sample size. Indeed,
35 a significant long-term issue in undertaking research at many WH sites is that not only are
36 accurate site specific visitor data not maintained but that the perceptions of management
37 authorities with respect to the nature and extent of site visitation may be significantly
38 different from on the ground reality (Hall & Piggin 2001). Perhaps the largest limitation of
39 this study is its applicability to other cultural WH sites. As sites and cultural contexts can
40 vary significantly, it is difficult to generalize. However, some of these limitations can be
41 overcome in future research, most notably by expanding the research to more sites as well as
42 extending the surveying period. Future research should also seek to replicate the site-specific
43 studies after the initial data collection as part of longitudinal studies in order to determine if
44 there have been any significant alterations in terms of the visitor population.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 REFERENCES

56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Adie, B.A., & C.M. Hall (2017). Who visits World Heritage? A comparative analysis of three
4 cultural sites. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 12(1), 67-80.

5
6
7
8 Ashworth, G.J., & van der Aa, B.J.M. (2006). Strategy and policy for the World Heritage
9 Convention: Goals, practices and future solutions. In A. Leask and A. Fyall (Eds.), *Managing*
10 *World Heritage sites* (pp. 147-158). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

11
12
13
14 Berni, I. (2005). Verso la Cultura l'Italia Ostenta una 'Attenzione Distratta': Siamo un Paese
15 Fortunato ma non lo Meritiamo [In terms of culture, Italy flaunts a 'Distracted Attention': We
16 are a fortunate country but we do not deserve it] *Siti*, 1(2), 10-12. □

17
18
19
20
21 Bigné, J.E., Sánchez, M.I., & Sánchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and
22 after purchase behaviour: Inter-Relationship. *Tourism Management*, 22, 607-616.

23
24
25
26 Buckley, R. (2004). The effects of World Heritage listing on tourism to Australian national
27 parks. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12, 70-84.

28
29
30
31 Cellini, R. (2011). Is UNESCO recognition effective in fostering tourism? A comment on
32 Yang, Lin and Han. *Tourism Management*, 32, 452-454.

33
34
35
36 Cuccia, T., Guccio, C., & Rizzo, I. (2013). *Does UNESCO inscription affect the performance*
37 *of tourism destinations? A regional perspective*. No. AWP-04-2013. The Association for
38 Cultural Economics International. Retrieved 15th July, 2017, from
39 www.grupposervizioambiente.it/aisre_sito/doc/papers/cuccia_guccio_rizzo.pdf
40
41
42

43
44
45 Dewar, K., du Cros, H., & Li, W. (2012). The search for World Heritage brand awareness
46 beyond the iconic heritage: A case study of the historic centre of Macao. *Journal of Heritage*
47 *Tourism*, 7, 323-339.

48
49
50
51 Dolnicar, S., & Grün, B. (2008). Challenging 'factor – cluster segmentation.' *Journal of*
52 *Travel Research*, 47, 63-71.

53
54
55
56 Dolnicar, S., Grün, B., Leisch, F., & Schmidt, K. (2014). Required sample sizes for data-
57 driven market segmentation analyses in tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 53, 296-306.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Font, X., & McCabe, S. (2017). Sustainability and marketing in tourism: its contexts,
5 paradoxes, approaches, challenges and potential, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 869-
6 883.
7
8

9
10
11 Fyall, A., & Rakic, T. (2006). The future market for World Heritage sites. In A. Leask and A.
12 Fyall (Eds). *Managing World Heritage sites* (pp. 159-175). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
13
14

15
16 Hall, C.M. (1992). *Wasteland to World Heritage: Preserving Australia's Wilderness*
17 *Heritage*. Carlton: Melbourne University Press.
18
19

20
21 Hall, C.M. (2006). World Heritage, tourism and implementation: What happens after listing.
22 In A. Fyall and A. Leask (Eds). *Managing World Heritage Sites* (pp. 18-32). Oxford:
23 Butterworth Heinemann.
24
25

26
27
28 Hall, C.M., & Piggin, R. (2001). Tourism and World Heritage in OECD countries. *Tourism*
29 *Recreation Research*, 26(1), 103-105
30
31

32
33 Hall, C.M., & Piggin, R. (2002). Tourism business knowledge of World Heritage sites: A
34 New Zealand case study. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 4, 401-411.
35
36

37
38 Hall, C.M., & Piggin, R. (2003). World Heritage sites: Managing the brand. In A. Fyall, B.
39 Garrod and A. Leask (Eds). *Managing visitor attractions: New directions* (pp. 203-219).
40 Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
41
42

43
44 Hardiman, N., & Burgin, S. (2013). World Heritage area listing of the Greater Blue
45 Mountains - did it make a difference to visitation? *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 6, 63-
46 64.
47
48

49
50
51 Hazen, H. (2008). 'Of outstanding universal value': The challenge of scale in applying the
52 World Heritage Convention at national parks in the US. *Geoforum*, 39, 252-264.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hsiao, Y-H., Hsu, Y-H., Chu, S-Y., & Fang, W. (2014). Discussion of whether brand
4 awareness is a form of marketing placebo. *International Journal of Business and Information*,
5 9(1), 29-60.
6
7

8
9
10 Huang, C-H., Tsaur, J-R., & Yang, C-H. (2012). Does the World Heritage list really induce
11 more tourists? Evidence from Macau. *Tourism Management*, 33, 1450-1457.
12

13
14 Jansen-Verbeke, M., & McKercher, B. (2010). The tourism destiny of World Heritage
15 cultural sites. In Pearce, D.G. and R. Butler (Eds.), *Tourism research: A 20-20 vision* (pp.
16 190-202). Oxford: Goodfellow Publishers.
17

18
19
20
21 Job, H. & Becken, S. (in press) Protected Areas in a neoliberal world and the role of
22 tourism in supporting conservation and sustainable development: a review and
23 assessment of strategic planning, zoning, impact monitoring and tourism management at
24 229 natural World Heritage Sites. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Kerstetter, D.L., Confer, J.J., & Graefe, A.R. (2001). An exploration of the specialization
31 concept within the context of heritage tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 267-274.
32

33
34 Khoo-Lattimore, C. & Prayag, G. (2015). The girlfriend getaway market: Segmenting
35 accommodation and service preferences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*,
36 45, 99-108.
37
38

39
40
41 King, L.M. & Halpenny, E.A. (2014). Communicating the World Heritage brand: Visitor
42 awareness of UNESCO's World Heritage symbol and the implications for sites, stakeholders
43 and sustainable management. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 22(5), 768-786.
44
45

46
47
48 King, L.M., & Prideaux, B. (2010). Special interest tourists collecting places and
49 destinations: A case study of Australian World Heritage sites. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*,
50 16, 235-247.
51
52

53
54
55 Kozak, M., & Baloglu, S. (2010). *Managing and marketing tourist destinations: Strategies to*
56 *gain a competitive edge*. Abingdon: Routledge.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Leask, A. (2006). World Heritage site designation. In A. Leask and A. Fyall (Eds.),
4 *Managing World Heritage sites* (pp. 5-19). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
5
6

7
8 Leiper, N. (1990). Tourist attraction systems. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 367-384.
9

10
11 Lew, A., & McKercher, B. (2006). Modeling tourist movements: A local destination analysis.
12 *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33, 403-423.
13

14
15
16 Ling, I-L., Shieh, C-H., & Liao, J-F. (2012). The higher the price the better the result? The
17 placebo-like effects of price and brand on consumer judgements. *Theoretical Economic*
18 *Letters*, 2, 264-269.
19
20

21
22
23 Lo Piccolo, F., Leone, D., & Pizzuto, P. (2012). “The (controversial) role of the UNESCO
24 WHL management plans in promoting sustainable tourism development.” *Journal of Policy*
25 *Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 4, 249-276.
26
27

28
29
30 Logan, W. (2012). States, governance and the politics of culture: World Heritage in Asia. In
31 P. Daly & T. Winter (Eds). *Routledge handbook of heritage in Asia* (pp. 113-128).
32 Routledge: Abingdon, UK.
33
34

35
36 Marcotte, P., & Bourdeau, L. (2006). Tourists’ knowledge of the UNESCO designation of
37 World Heritage sites: The case of visitors to Quebec City. *International Journal of Arts*
38 *Management*, 8(2), 4-13.
39
40

41
42
43 Martínez, J.A. (2014). El efecto placebo en productos artísticos; el caso de la poesía [The
44 placebo effect on artistic products; the case of poetry]. *Cuadernos de Gestión*, 14(1), 127-
45 146.
46
47

48
49
50 McDowell, W.S., & Dick, S.J. (2002). We’re number one: Manipulating perceived market
51 rankings to induce a placebo effect in credibility evaluations of a local newscast. *New Jersey*
52 *Journal of Communication*, 10, 228-241.
53
54

55
56
57 Millar, S. (2006). Stakeholders and community participation. In A. Leask and A. Fyall
58 (Eds). *Managing World Heritage sites* (pp. 37-54). Butterworth-Heinemann: Oxford.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1995). The role of awareness and familiarity with a destination:
6 The Central Florida case. *Journal of Travel Research*, 33(3), 21-27.
7

8
9
10 Moscardo, G., Green, D., & Greenwood, T. (2001). How great is the Great Barrier Reef!
11 Tourists' knowledge and understanding of the World Heritage status of the Great Barrier
12 Reef. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 26(1), 19-25.
13
14

15
16 National Park Service (n.d.). *Independence NHP Report Date: Aug 2013*. Retrieved 14th July,
17 2017 from
18 [https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/SSRSReports/Park%20Specific%20Reports/Park%20YTD%20Ver](https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/SSRSReports/Park%20Specific%20Reports/Park%20YTD%20Version%201?Park=INDE)
19 [sion%201?Park=INDE](https://irma.nps.gov/Stats/SSRSReports/Park%20Specific%20Reports/Park%20YTD%20Version%201?Park=INDE)
20
21
22

23
24
25 Ng, S.I., Lee, J.A., & Soutar, G.N. (2007). Tourists' intention to visit a country: The impact
26 of cultural distance. *Tourism Management*, 28, 1497-1506.
27
28

29
30 Palau-Saumell, R., Forgas-Coll, S., Sánchez-García, J., & Prats-Planagumà, L. (2012).
31 Tourist behavior intentions and the moderator effect of knowledge of UNESCO World
32 Heritage Sites: The case of La Sagrada Família. *Journal of Travel Research*, 52, 364-376.
33
34

35
36 Park, D.B., & Yoon, Y.S. (2009). Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean
37 case study. *Tourism Management*, 30(1), 99-108.
38
39

40
41 Patuelli, R., Mussoni, M., & Candela, G. (2012). The effects of World Heritage Sites on
42 domestic tourism: A spatial interaction model for Italy. *Working Paper DSE N° 834*,
43 Department of Economics, Università di Bologna, Italy.
44
45
46

47
48 Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems
49 and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12(4), 531-544.
50
51

52
53 Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site perceptions and motivations to visit.
54 *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 318-326.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Cohen, R. (2011a). World Heritage site: An effective brand for an
4 archaeological site? *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 6(3), 197-208.
5
6

7
8 Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Cohen, R. (2011b). World Heritage site-is it an effective brand
9 name? A case study of a religious heritage site. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(5), 482-495.
10
11

12
13 Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Cohen, R. (2013). Tourists perceptions of World Heritage site and
14 its designation. *Tourism Management*, 35, 272-274.
15
16

17
18 Prayag, G. (2012). Paradise for who? Segmenting visitors' satisfaction with cognitive image
19 and predicting behavioural loyalty. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 14(1), 1-15.
20
21

22
23 Prayag, G., & Hosany, S. (2014). When Middle East meets West: Understanding the motives
24 and perceptions of young tourists from United Arab Emirates. *Tourism Management*, 40, 35-
25 45.
26
27

28
29 Punj, G., & Stewart, D.W. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and
30 suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research*. 20, 134-148.
31
32

33
34 Rakic, T., & Chambers, D. (2007). World Heritage: Exploring the tension between the
35 national and the 'universal' *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2, 145-155.
36
37

38
39 Richards, G. (2010). The traditional quantitative approach. Surveying cultural tourists:
40 lessons from the ATLAS cultural tourism research project. In G. Richards and W. Munsters
41 (Eds.), *Cultural tourism research methods* (pp.13-32). Wallingford: CABI.
42
43
44

45
46 Ryan, J., & Silvano, S. (2011). A brand for all the nations: The development of the World
47 Heritage brand in emerging markets. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29, 305-318.
48
49

50
51 Smith, M. (2002). A critical evaluation of the global accolade: The significance of World
52 Heritage Site Status for Maritime Greenwich. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 8,
53 137-151.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Sarigöllü, E. & Huang, R. (2005). Benefits segmentation of visitors to Latin America.
4 *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 277-293.
5
6
7
8 Sheppard, A.G. (1996). The sequence of factor analysis and cluster analysis: Differences in
9 segmentation and dimensionality through the use of raw and factor scores. *Tourism Analysis*,
10 1, 49-57.
11
12
13
14 Su, Y.-W., & Lin, H.-L. (2014). Analysis of international tourist arrivals worldwide: The role
15 of World Heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 40, 46-58.
16
17
18
19 Szawarski, Z. (2004). The concept of placebo. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 10, 57-64.
20
21
22
23 Timothy, D.J., & Nyaupane, G.P. (Eds.) (2009). *Cultural heritage and tourism in the*
24 *developing world: A regional perspective*. London: Routledge.
25
26
27
28 Tisdell, C., & Wilson, C. (2002). World Heritage listing of Australian natural sites: Tourism
29 stimulus and its economic value. *Economic Analysis & Policy*, 32, 27-49.
30
31
32
33 UNDP (2015). *Human development data (1980-2015)*. Retrieved 14th July, 2017 from
34 <http://hdr.undp.org/en/data>
35
36
37
38 UNESCO (2015). *Operational guidelines for the implementation of World Heritage*
39 *Convention*. Paris: UNESCO.
40
41
42
43 Wall-Reinius, S., & Fredman, P. (2007). Protected areas as attractions. *Annals of Tourism*
44 *Research*, 34(4), 839-854.
45
46
47
48 Williams, K. (2004). The meanings and effectiveness of World Heritage designations in the
49 USA. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7, 412-416.
50
51
52
53 Yan, C., & Morrison, A.M. (2008). The influence of visitors' awareness of World Heritage
54 listings: A case study of Huangshan, Xidi, and Hongcun in Southern Anhui, China. *Journal*
55 *of Heritage Tourism*, 2, 184-195.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Yang, C-H., Lin, H-L., & Han, C-C. (2010). Analysis of international tourist arrivals in China: The role of World Heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 31, 827-837.

For Peer Review

Table 1 Survey Response Rate by Site

Sites	Usable	Collected	Approached	Response Rate
USA (Independence Hall)	396	401	472	85%
Serbia (Studena Monastery)	104	105	109	96.3%
Morocco (Volubilis)	271	274	343	79.9%
Total	771	780	924	84.4% (average)

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2 Demographic Profile of Sites

Demographic Characteristics	USA (Independence Hall)	Serbia (Studenica Monastery)	Morocco (Volubilis)	Total	χ^2 test, p-level
<i>Gender</i>					$\chi^2=3.64, p>0.05$
Male	215 (54.7%)	55 (52.9%)	128 (47.2%)	398 (51.8%)	
Female	178 (45.3%)	49 (47.1%)	143 (52.8%)	370 (48.2%)	
<i>Residence</i>					$\chi^2=237.64, p<0.001$
Local Area	50 (12.7%)	10 (9.7%)	10 (3.7%)	70 (9.1%)	
Rest of Country	239 (60.8%)	51 (49.5%)	26 (9.6%)	316 (41.2%)	
Abroad	104 (26.5%)	42 (40.8%)	235 (86.7%)	381 (49.7%)	
<i>Region</i>					$\chi^2=444.14, p<0.001$
North America	301 (77.6%)	4 (4%)	36 (13.4%)	341 (45.2%)	
Europe	73 (18.8%)	92 (92.9%)	141 (52.6%)	306 (40.5%)	
Middle East	6 (1.5%)	0	5 (1.9%)	11 (1.5%)	
Asia	4 (1%)	3 (3%)	7 (2.6%)	14 (1.9%)	
Latin America	2 (.5%)	0	10 (3.7%)	12 (1.6%)	
Australia and Oceania	2 (.5%)	0	31 (11.6%)	33 (4.4%)	
Africa	0	0	38 (14.2%)	38 (5%)	
<i>Age</i>					$\chi^2=53.79, p<0.001$
16-19	22 (5.6%)	2 (1.9%)	4 (1.5%)	28 (3.7%)	
20-29	149 (37.8%)	28 (27.2%)	68 (25.3%)	245 (32%)	
30-39	56 (14.2%)	25 (24.3%)	52 (19.3%)	133 (17.4%)	
40-49	58 (14.7%)	20 (19.4%)	29 (10.8%)	107 (14%)	
50-59	73 (18.5%)	11 (10.7%)	51 (19%)	135 (17.6%)	
>=60	36 (9.1%)	17 (16.5%)	65 (24.2%)	118 (15.4%)	
<i>Travel Party Size</i>					$\chi^2=46.95, p<0.001$
Solo Traveler	25 (6.3%)	12 (11.8%)	9 (3.3%)	46 (6%)	
2-5	340 (86.3%)	71 (69.6%)	208 (77%)	619 (80.8%)	
6-10	27 (6.9%)	8 (7.8%)	33 (12.2%)	68 (8.9%)	
>10	2 (.5%)	11 (10.8%)	20 (7.4%)	33 (4.3%)	
<i>Education Level</i>					$\chi^2=32.21, p<0.001$
Primary School	5 (1.3%)	2 (2%)	1 (.4%)	8 (1%)	
Secondary School	36 (9.2%)	20 (20%)	26 (9.6%)	82 (10.8%)	
Vocational Education	25 (6.4%)	4 (4%)	35 (13%)	64 (8.4%)	
Bachelors	168 (42.9%)	49 (49%)	95 (35.2%)	312 (40.9%)	
Masters/PhD	158 (40.3%)	25 (25%)	113 (41.9%)	296 (38.8%)	
<i>Employment</i>					$\chi^2=63.32, p<0.001$
Employee	221 (56.1%)	54 (52.4%)	136 (50.4%)	411 (53.6%)	
Self Employed	44 (11.2%)	16 (15.5%)	47 (17.4%)	107 (14%)	
Retired	26 (6.6%)	12 (11.7%)	57 (21.1%)	95 (12.4%)	
Full Time Parent	8 (2%)	0	2 (.7%)	10 (1.3%)	
Student	87 (22.1%)	14 (13.6%)	23 (8.5%)	124 (16.2%)	
Unemployed	8 (2%)	7 (6.8%)	5 (1.9%)	20 (2.6%)	

Table 3 Cluster Analysis Results

Site Characteristics	Cluster Means		
	Cluster 1 Unpleased Visitors (<i>n</i> =85)	Cluster 2 Undecided Visitors (<i>n</i> =203)	Cluster 3 Pleased Visitors (<i>n</i> =447)
Protection	1.55	3.06	4.46
Management	1.68	3.09	4.53
Authenticity	3.74	4.15	4.53
Integrity	2.52	3.69	4.56

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4 One-way ANOVA Profiling Clusters in Relation to Significant Motivation and Previous Experience

		<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	Post-hoc Results
The UNESCO WH status was one of my reasons to visit.	I. Unpleased Visitors	56	2.893	II&III (p<.05)
	II. Undecided Visitors	108	3.204	
	III. Pleased Visitors	128	2.828	
This is my first visit to a WH site.	I. Unpleased Visitors	53	1.566	I&III (p<.05)
	II. Undecided Visitors	108	1.602	II&III (p<.05)
	III. Pleased Visitors	125	2.032	

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 5 Factor Analysis Results

	Environmental Criteria	Cultural Criteria	Communalities
Criteria IX	.916	.020	.840
Criteria X	.894	-.014	.799
Criteria VIII	.839	.138	.723
Criteria VII	.721	.353	.644
Criteria V	.579	.491	.576
Criteria III	.005	.782	.612
Criteria II	.095	.768	.599
Criteria I	.193	.691	.515
Criteria IV	.335	.662	.551
Criteria VI	.017	.650	.423
Eigenvalues	4.265	2.017	
% of Variance	42.652	20.172	
Cronbach's α	.878	.777	

Bold figures indicate significant loadings

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 6 Profiling of Clusters by Demographic Characteristics

		Cluster 1 Unpleased Visitors	Cluster 2 Undecided Visitors	Cluster 3 Pleased Visitors
Residence	Local Area	5 (5.9%)	12 (5.9%)	52 (11.7%)
	Rest of Country	17 (20%)	50 (24.8%)	239 (53.7%)
	Abroad	63 (74.1%)	140 (69.3%)	154 (34.6%)
Region	North America	14 (17.1%)	54 (26.9%)	266 (60.5%)
	Europe	45 (54.9%)	106 (52.7%)	135 (30.7%)
	Middle East	1 (1.2%)	4 (2%)	5 (1.4%)
	Asia	1 (1.2%)	7 (3.5%)	4 (0.9%)
	Latin America	4 (4.9%)	3 (1.5%)	4 (0.9%)
	Australia and Oceania	5 (6.10%)	15 (7.5%)	13 (3%)
	Africa	12 (14.6%)	12 (6%)	13 (3%)
Travel Party Size	Solo Traveler	4 (4.7%)	11 (5.5%)	26 (5.8%)
	2-5 Travelers	72 (84.7%)	156 (78%)	369 (82.7%)
	6-10 Travelers	7 (8.2%)	16 (8%)	40 (9%)
	>10 Travelers	2 (2.4%)	17 (8.5%)	11 (2.5%)
Employment	Employed	44 (52.4%)	109 (54%)	244 (54.7%)
	Self Employed	14 (16.7%)	29 (14.4%)	60 (13.5%)
	Retired	19 (22.6%)	32 (15.8%)	39 (8.7%)
	Full Time Parent	1 (1.2%)	1 (0.5%)	6 (1.3%)
	Student	6 (7.1%)	26 (12.9%)	83 (18.6%)
	Unemployed	0	5 (2.5%)	14 (3.1%)

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60