NOTE TO USERS

An Investigation of

the Relationships Among Destination Image,

Place Attachment, and Visitation Intention of Heritage Tourists

by

Jiin-Ling Lin

A Dissertation Submitted to
the faculty of The Graduate School at
Middle Tennessee State University
in Partial fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
(Doctor of Philosophy)

Murfreesboro, TN
August 2011

UMI Number: 3484704

APPROVAL PAGE

An Investigation of the Relationships Among Destination Image, Place Attachment, and

Visitation Intention of Heritage Tourists

July 27, 2011

Date of Final Defense

Dr. Joey Gray, Committee Co-chair

Dr. Tara Perry, Committee Co-chair

Dr. Dana Fuller, Committee Member

Dr. Van West, Committee Member

Dr. Scott Colclough, Interim Chair, Department of Health and Human Performance

Dr. Michael D. Allen, Dean, College of Graduate Studies

Dedicated to my parents,

for their love, belief, support, and patience;

to my siblings and my best friends,

for their understanding and encouragement.

Jiin-Ling Lin, August, 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIN, JIIN-LING, Ph.D. An Investigation of the Relationships Among Destination Image, Place Attachment, and Visitation Intention of Heritage Tourists (2011)
Co-Directed by Dr. Joey Gray and Dr. Tara Perry, 166 pp.

Civil War heritage research has centered mostly on the issues of the preservation of Civil War heritage with few studies focusing on tourists' perspectives. Studies exploring tourists' travel decision-making present a challenge in tourism research due to diverse tourist backgrounds. However, this research examined the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention specific to the Civil War heritage sites. In an effort to secure more effective marketing promotional efforts for sustainable tourism, researchers must examine the relationship between first time and repeat visitors along with the relationships among the three concepts simultaneously. Hence, it is valuable to identify destination image of Civil War heritage tourists. Furthermore, examining the cognitive-affective framework of destination image and its effect on the place attachment and visitation intention could enhance the current understanding of this heritage group. Objectives for the current study included defining heritage tourists' characteristics with respect to socio-demographic and trip behavior related variables; identifying tourists' destination image; examining the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention specific to Civil War heritage sites; and examining the differences between first-time and repeat tourists in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention. Principal axis factor analysis was used to identify seven destination image factors: local unique Civil War attractions, entertainment, amenities, ease of access, attractive scenery/opportunity, well-

preserved historic structures, countryside attractions, and three place attachment dimensions. Multiple regression analysis revealed that cognitive and affective images significantly predicted tourists' place attachment. Namely, cognitive and affective images and place attachment significantly predict tourists' visitation intention. Cognitive and affective images have effects on tourists' overall destination image to the destination. Simple regression analysis found that cognitive image did not significantly predict affective image. A t-test showed that there are differences between first-time and repeat visitors in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention. Repeat visitors reported higher on overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention than first-time visitors. The findings revealed that a cognitive-affective framework can predict visitation intentions of heritage tourists. Practical application of the research findings indicates that marketing efforts should focus on local unique heritage attractions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the United States' largest industries, generating a number of job

opportunities and revenue for the destination communities. Approximately 7.4 million

travel-related jobs, $704 billion in travel expenditures by domestic and international

travelers, $113 billion in tax revenue for local, state, and federal governments, and $186

billion in travel related payroll were generated in the United States in 2008, and 10

million Americans were employed in travel industry related jobs (United States Travel

Association, 2010a). More specifically, residents and international travelers in the United

States have spent an average of $1.9 billion a day, $80 million an hour, $1.3 million a

minute, and $22,300 a second on travel and tourism (United States Travel Association,

2010a). Due to the economic benefits to be gained from tourism, many states and local

communities attempt to use different types of tourism, such as cultural, heritage, natural,

and health tourism, to revitalize local economies. Cultural heritage tourism is defined by

the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) (2010a) as "traveling to experience

the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the

past and present. It includes cultural, historic and natural resources." Heritage tourism

can generate not only travel-related jobs but also tax-return to local communities. In

addition, it can further help to improve the local quality of life and to preserve unique

local resources (NTHP, 2010b).

According to the NTHP (2010a), more than 56% of the U.S. adult population took trips to historical and cultural sites to participate in cultural or heritage activities in 2002. These cultural tourists stayed longer and spent more while visiting heritage or cultural sites compared to those who traveled to vacation destinations. This tourism revenue can help to support and maintain unique local resources. A National Heritage Area (NHA) is a site designated by the Congress of the United States and is intended to encourage historic preservation of the area and an appreciation of the history and heritage of the site (TCWNHA, 2010a). As a partnership unit with the National Park Service, the NHA program encourages its local citizens where an NHA is designated to participate more actively in the community preservation and planning process. Currently there are 49 National Heritage Areas designated by Congress, and the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA) was listed in 1996 (TCWNHA, 2010b). The TCWNHA, composed of three regions, east, middle, and western Tennessee, is administered by the Center for Historic Preservation. The Heritage Area is partnered with the National Park Service to preserve Civil War heritage, to interpret the Civil War history between 1860 and 1875, and to promote sustainable heritage tourism through historic sites such as buildings, farms, and cemeteries (TCWNHA, 2010a). A large number of important battles occurred in Tennessee, including the battles of Shiloh and Stones River, as well as the Chattanooga, Nashville, and Franklin Campaigns (TCWNHA, 2010c). In addition, much of the fighting occurred in the Middle Tennessee area including Hood's 1894 Campaign, Fort Donelson, and Stones River. These locations are mostly near the areas of railroads and the Mississippi, Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers. Besides, the

Cumberland River is a unique location and has a significant war history that brings many interested tourists to visit yearly. The most recognizable Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region include sites in the cities of Nashville, Murfreesboro, and Clarksville (NPS, 2010c; Tennessee Department of Tourists Development, 2010). Hence, findings from research focusing on Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region can contribute to a better understanding of Civil War Heritage tourists' travel behaviors.

While earlier Civil War heritage research has centered mostly on the issues of the preservation of Civil War heritage, only a few studies focus on tourists' perspectives. Furthermore, by reviewing heritage tourism research literature, several possible factors have been identified to profile heritage tourists. These possible factors, including psychological and non-psychological factors, can be used to profile heritage tourists. These factors are comprised of the tourists' socio-demographic (e.g., age, income, and level of education), psychological (motivation, perception, and personality), and travel behavior (the duration of the trip, travel group, and travel distance) characteristics, according to Carter and Bramley (2002). Additionally, research on heritage tourists has been undertaken by examining possible relationships among perception, motivation, and satisfaction (e.g., Poria, Reichel, & Avital, 2004; Waitt, 2000), the relationship between involvement and specialization (e.g., Kerstetter, Confer, & Graefe, 2001), the relationship between place attachment and destination image (e.g., Hou, Lin, & Morais, 2005), the relationship between tourists' behavior and motivation (e.g., Poria et al., 2004; Poria, Reichel, & Biran, 2006), and tourists' characteristics (e.g., Chandler & Costello, 2002;

Kerstetter et al., 2001; Taylor, Fletcher, & Clabaugh, 1993). These studies have provided

useful information to better understand heritage tourists, as well as Civil War heritage

tourists. Studying the relationship between people and places can help Decision Making

Organizations (DMOs) provide better services and marketing promotions to the

consumers, especially for those in the Middle Tennessee Area. For instance, Poria et al.

(2006) suggest that the relationship between heritage tourists' perceptions of heritage

sites and heritage tourists' feelings toward a site can be explored further. That is, studies

on the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and perceptions of the

sites are suggested as future research directions.

Over the past decade, studies focusing on the impacts of consumer buying

processes on tourists' decision-making have proliferated in the tourism field (Sirakaya &

Woodside, 2005). These studies have made significant contributions in both examining

the relationship between possible internal (i.e., motivation, attitude, belief, values) and

external (i.e., marketing mix, reference groups) variables and destination choices, and in

modeling complete decision-making processes (Sirakaya, McLellan & Uysal, 1996). The

tourists' decision-making process is a funnel-like process and heavily influenced by

psychological (e.g., motivation, perception, attitude) and non-psychological factors (e.g.,

personal characteristics, travel party, past travel experience (Sirakaya & Woodside,

2005). DMOs have acknowledged that destination image, place attachment, and visitation

intention are considered to be the most important variables in influencing tourists' travel

decision-making based on the considerable body of tourists' decision-making research,

(Bigne, Sanchez, & Sanchez, 2001; Hou et al., 2005). However, different types of tourists

might have a different perception of the destination image, different attachment to the destination, and different intentions to visit the destination. Hence, promotional efforts focused on the different segments such as first-time visitors and repeat visitors or knowledge-seeking tourists and novel-seeking tourists still remains a challenge for DMOs (Lin & Morais, 2010). Although the number of tourists who visit heritage sites grows, DMOs of heritage tourism have faced challenges in generating repeat visitation (Lin & Morais, 2010). In addition, Confer and Kerstetter (2000) indicated that it is still unclear which heritage tourists will stay loyal to heritage destinations. Confer and Kerstetter (2000) recommended studying heritage tourists' past travel experiences to help determine the market target. Oppermann (1997) also indicated that the critical issue for DMOs is to provide appropriate marketing promotion and services to different segments, first-time visitors and repeat visitors. Prentice, Gnerin, and McGugan (1998) found that first-time visitors are attracted by knowledge of attributes, and repeat visitors are attracted by symbolic value of attributes. Therefore, the relationship between destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention is worth examining in heritage tourism, especially in regard to first-time and repeat visitors.

The most influential conceptualization of tourists' decision-making is a cognitive process proposed by Woodside and Lysonski (1989), which emphasized the importance of destination awareness, a mental process, to travel decision-making. The travel decision-making process builds upon the work of several propositions and research findings from cognitive and behavioral psychology, marketing, and travel and tourism (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005). Findings from studies on the decision-making processes

indicated that tourists are cognitive tourists who make their travel decision based on the evaluation of information they perceive and process (Olson, 1994). This concept has been examined in several studies (e.g., Becken & Gnoth, 2004; Decrop, 2000; Woodside & Dubelaar, 2003; Woodside & McDonald, 1994). However, tourists' travel decisions may be dissimilar due to the types of tourists in the different types of tourism settings (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005). Woodside and MacDonald (1994) suggested that tourists' decision-making is affected by the members of a travel party and their activities. Decrop (2000) also mentioned that "it is important to remember that there are more possible decision-making processes, depending on the individual, the group, and the moment in time" (p. 129). More research on tourists' behaviors (visitation intentions) in different contexts (cultural heritage tourism, leisure travel tourism) and for the different types of tourists (first-time visitor and repeat visitor) can be further explored.

Decrop (2000), Lin and Morais (2010), Sirakaya and Woodside (2005), and Um, Chon, and Ro (2006) stated that tourists' behaviors can be understood from tourists' characteristics, such as past travel experience. Previous literature suggested that tourists' behavior can be predicted from behavior intention (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). The antecedent factors to behavior intentions include destination image (Bigne et al., 2001; Chen & Tsai, 2007), place attachment (Lee & Allen, 1999; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Williams, Patterson, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992), service quality (Baker & Crompton, 2000), perceived value (Baker & Crompton, 2000), and satisfaction (Bigne et al., 2001). However, the relationships among destination image (e.g., Bonn, Mathews, Hayes, & Cave, 2007; Caton & Santos, 2007; Poria et al., 2006), place attachment (e.g.,

Lee & Allen, 1999), and behavior intentions (e.g., Gitelson & Crompton, 1984) can be discussed further in different types of tourism context such as cultural heritage tourism.

Tourists' destination image is composed of cognitive and affective images, and it influences tourists' destination choices (Baloglu & McCleary, 1996). The cognitive image focuses on how much people know about the destinations, and the affective image is focused on how people feel about the destination. In other words, tourists' cognitive images are formed by their knowledge about the site, and tourists' affective images are formed by their feelings about the site, such as emotion and mood. Martine and Bosque (2008) indicated that tourists' cognitive images directly influence tourists' affective images. According to Russell (1980), tourists' emotional state can be categorized by the interpretation of information from environment. Tourists will use both image dimensions to form their impressions and evaluate the considered destinations in their final decision-making processes (Martine & Bosque, 2008). Prayag (2009) also supported that destination image should include affective image. Therefore, heritage destination image is composed of two dimensions, cognitive and affective images. It is important to know how tourists perceive attributes and how they evaluate those attributes to form their impressions of heritage sites. In other words, tourists develop a destination image based on the interactions with physical properties, for instance, tangible resources (e.g., landscape, house) and intangible resources (e.g., atmosphere, spirit). Tourists' images of the destination may result in dissimilar attachments and may result in dissimilar visitation intentions to the destinations (Hou et al., 2005). If DMOs are aware of the relationship among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intentions for first-time visitors

and repeat visitors, DMOs might be able to design better marketing promotions to attract and generate repeat visitors.

Place attachment is utilized to investigate the relationship between people and place. An examination of heritage tourists' place attachment may provide a better understanding of how heritage tourists develop their visitation intention to heritage sites. The construct, place attachment, has been mentioned often in relation to natural resource settings in the recreation field (Kruger, Hall, & Stiefel, 2008; Kyle, Graefe, & Manning, 2005). Place attachment is also associated with emotional constructs such as attitude to the place (Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001). Earlier studies of place attachment have been conducted in natural resource recreation, more specifically in examining participants' fee attitude toward sustainable development of the locations (e.g., Anderson & Fulton, 2008; Kyle, Absher, & Graefe, 2003). Place attachment has been suggested as a multi - dimensional construct (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Hammitt, Backlund, & Bixler, 2006; Hammitt, Kyle, & Oh, 2009; Kaltenborn & Williams, 2002; Kyle et al., 2005; Hou, Lin, & Morais, 2005). The most cited two dimensions are place identity and place dependence (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000; Moore & Graefe, 1994; Williams & Vaske, 2003). Researchers continue to explore possible dimensions such as social bonding (Kyle et al., 2005), familiarity, belongingness, and rootedness (Hammitt et al., 2006). The concept of place attachment may provide a better explanation for re-visitation by heritage tourists (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2002). It can also provide more information about how tourists are attached to the heritage sites. In current heritage tourism literature, the concept of place attachment is still ambiguous. Hence, it will be interesting to examine the relationship

between place attachment and destination image to tourists' visitation intentions, specifically relative to heritage tourists in the Middle Tennessee region addressed in this study.

The relationship between destination image and place attachment can be explored further in heritage tourism settings. In addition, tourists' visitation intention may be different from that of tourists who have a different destination image and have a different place attachment. Tourists' visitation intention is the likelihood that tourists want to visit a site (Klenosky, Leblanc, Vogt, & Schroeder, 2007; Shen, Schuttemeyer, & Braun, 2009; Spark, 2007). Two dimensions, intention to visit and intention to recommend to others to visit, are often used in re-visitation intention literature (Jeong, Kim, Ko, & Jeong, 2009). Confer and Kerstetter (2000) and Poria et al. (2006) found that tourists have dissimilar visitation intention behavior because they have different place attachment to the destinations. Repeat visitors may revisit the places due to symbolic meanings they received from the sites, but first-time visitors may recommend the places to others to visit due to available activities derived from the sites (Prentice et al., 1998). In addition, repeat visitors may have higher visitation intentions than first-time visitors. Examining the relationships between destination image and place attachment to tourists' visitation intention can enhance an understanding of tourists' decision-making. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention in order to better understand heritage tourists' travel decision-making. Further, this understanding can provide information to DMOs regarding appropriate

marketing promotions to target visitors and to provide better services to different types of visitors, first-time and repeat visitors.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention in order to better understand heritage tourists' travel decision-making. In addition, the destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention was examined for two types of tourists, first-time and repeat visitors. The first objective was to identify tourists' destination image of and place attachment to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. The second objective was to examine the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intentions of Civil War Heritage tourists. The third objective was to examine the differences in destination image, place attachment, and visitation intentions between first-time and repeat visitors.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Several research questions guided this study.

RQ1: What are the socio-demographic (e.g., gender, age, residence, marital status, education, occupational status, income, and ethnicity), and past travel behavior (e.g., visitation frequency, trip duration, trip motivation, and information resources) characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA)?

RQ2: What are the factors that comprise the cognitive component of destination image for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?

RQ3: Do cognitive and affective components of destination image influence place attachment of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?

H3a: Cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict place identity for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

H3b: Cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict place dependence for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

H3c: Cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict social bonding for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

RQ4: Do cognitive and affective components of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding influence the visitation intention of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?

H4: Cognitive component of destination image, affective component of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding significantly predict visitation intentions of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

RQ5: What is the relationship between cognitive and affective components of destination image to overall destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?

H5a: The cognitive component of destination image is significantly positively related to the Affective destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

H5b: Cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict overall destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

RQ6: Are there differences in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention based on select past travel behavior characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?

H6a: There is a significant difference between first-time visitors and repeat visitors in the overall destination image for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

H6b: There is a significant difference between first-time visitors and repeat visitors in the place attachment (place identity, place dependence, and social bonding) for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

H6c: There is a significant difference between first-time visitors and repeat visitors in the visitation intentions for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

Definitions

1. Cognitive psychology process: "The scientific analysis of human mental processes and memory structures in order to understand human behavior" (Mayer, 1947, p. 47).

2. Destination: "A country, state, region, city or town which is marketed or markets itself as a place for tourists to visit" (Bierman, 2003, p. 2).

3. Destination image: A sum of impressions derived from the perceived destination attributes which are used to make travel decisions (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a; Crompton, 1979; Phelps, 1989). The components of destination image include cognitive image, affective image, and overall destination image.

   a. Affective image: Feeling about a destination (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a).

   b. Cognitive image: Belief and knowledge about a destination (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a).

   c. Overall destination image: Composed of cognitive and affective images (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999a).

4. Destination Marketing Organization (DMOs): Refers to a convention and visitor bureau (CVB) of each state which provides tourism services to publics (Destination Marketing Association International, 2009).

5. Heritage Tourism: "Cultural heritage tourism means traveling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present" (NTHP, 2010a).

6. Heritage Tourists: "Individuals who travel to cultural sites or natural heritage sites" are considered as heritage tourists (Travel Industry Association, 1997).

7. Place Attachment: "An affective bond or link between people and specific places (Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001). The components of place attachment include place dependence, place identity, and social bonding.

    a. Place dependence: "A function of how well a setting facilitates users' particular activities" (Moore & Graefe, 1994, p. 27).

    b. Place identity: "An emotional attachment refers to the symbolic importance of place (Williams & Vaske, 2003, p. 25).

    c. Social bonding: "The emotional bonds formed by the information were the product of an interactional process between the individuals and their environment" (Kyle et al., 2005, p.170).

8. The Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area: The Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area composed of three regions, east, middle, and western Tennessee, is administered by the Center for Historic Preservation. The Middle Tennessee region includes the recognizable cities of Nashville, Murfreesboro, and Clarksville (NPS, 2010c; Tennessee Department of Tourist Development, 2010). In this study, "Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA" refers to the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area.

9. Visitation intention: Refers to visitation intentions "The traveler's perceived likelihood of visiting a specific destination within a specific time period" (Woodside & Lysonski, 1989, p. 8). The components of visitation intention include the intention

to return and the intention to recommend to others to visit the site (Bigne et al., 2001; Lin & Morais, 2010).

Delimitations

1. This study sample included tourists 18 years and older who were listed in the electronic mailing list of the Center for Historic Preservation and members of social networking (e.g., Facebook) heritage groups selected for inclusion.

2. The study focus was limited to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

3. Data collection occurred from May 8th to July 1st, 2011 through an online survey made available to members of an e-mail listing and members of identified social networking groups. A second e-mail list was obtained by May, 30, 2011, and the survey links were removed on July 1st, 2011.

4. The study was limited to those tourists who intended to visit a heritage site in the next 12 months.

Limitations

1. Generalizability of the results of this study is limited to the sample set used. This study was conducted with only those tourists who are in the electronic mail listing from the Center for Historic Preservation in Middle Tennessee, as well as tourists listed on the Facebook group pages of the heritage travel groups which agreed to participate in this study.

Significance of the Study

 Theoretical significance.

 The primary objective of this study was to determine relationships among three critical constructs to explore the concept that tourists' visitation intentions are influenced by destination image (Bigne et al., 2001; Cai et al., 2004) and place attachment (Hou et al., 2005; Lee & Allen, 1999). According to Decrop (2000), "…there are possible decision making processes depending on the individual, the group, and the moment in time" (p.129). This statement implies that each individual may have dissimilar methods of approaching problem solving and decision-making processes. Examining possible decision-making processes among different types of tourists and groups can provide an alternative framework to understand tourists' travel behaviors. Future research should focus on understanding and interpreting variations among different types of tourists such as first-time and repeat visitors in order to get a full understanding of tourists' decision-making. Last, the application of the concept of place attachment to heritage tourism may support an understanding of tourists' visitation intention behaviors being not only related to the functions of cognitive beliefs about the destinations but also to the symbolic meanings of the attributes (Klenosky et al., 2007).

 Practical significance.

 The value of generating repeat visitors has been underestimated by public and private tourism organizations in heritage tourism organizations in the United States (NTHP, 2010a). By examining the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and tourists' visitation intention across first-time and repeat visitors,

destination managers can understand how to efficiently distribute promotions to create

and manage an appropriate destination image, to increase a favorable place attachment

toward the heritage sites, and to generate re-visitation. More specifically, an exploration

of the relationship between destination image and place attachment can facilitate the

understanding of tourists' visitation intention in order to assist in the design of more

appropriate promotional materials and to target specific segments of the population in

heritage tourism.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention in order to better understand heritage tourists' travel decision-making. In addition, the destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention was examined for two types of tourists, first-time and repeat visitors. The literature reviewed for this study focuses on the following areas: (1) The background of heritage tourism, (2) The concept of destination image, (3) The concept of place attachment, (4) The concept of visitation intention, (5) Heritage tourists' characteristics, (6) The relationships among destination image, place attachment, and tourists' visitation intention, and (7) On-line survey methodology.

Background of Heritage Tourism

Numerous tourism scholars have used different perspectives to conceptualize and categorize tourism. Pearce (1986) divided tourism into different categories, such as nature tourism, culture tourism, coastal tourism, commercial tourism, health tourism, sustainable tourism, ecotourism, and green tourism, based on product characteristics. Nicholls, Vogt, and Jun (2004) have identified several types of heritage tourism, including literary tourism, legacy tourism, entertainment, dark tourism, and industry heritage tourism. Heritage tourism is one type of cultural tourism which mainly emphasizes the physical attributes of the destination site (Gelbman & Ron, 2009).

Due to the variety of physical attributes of the destination, Ahmad (1991)

indicated that in the past there has been no consistent definition and terminology to

address heritage across regions such as South Asia, Australia, New Zealand, and China.

For example, New Zealand has defined "places" as heritage, whereas China has defined

"immovable physical remains" as heritage. In the past, a different scope has been given to

the concept of heritage by the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)

and by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

For example, the former organization defines heritage as "monuments and sites," and the

latter defines heritage as "cultural property" including groups of buildings, as reported by

Ahmad (1991). Heritage sites refer to monuments, museums, battlefields, historical

structures, and landmarks (Komrad, 1982). Heritage attractions are to include natural,

cultural, and built environments according to Nicholls et al. (2004). Today, however,

UNESCO and ICOMOS have reached an agreement at the international level that the

scope of heritage should include "intangibles (e.g., living experiences, past)," "tangibles,"

and "environments." Therefore, the scope of heritage should cover both cultural and

natural heritage according to Ahmad (1991).

Owing to the variability of heritage sites, scholars have approached heritage

tourism with various definitions. Tassell and Tassell (1990) believed that the definition of

heritage tourism should include natural heritage sites, gardens, wilderness areas, and

landscape. Hardy (1988) and other scholars (e.g., Millar, 1989; Tighe, 1986) defined

heritage tourism as focusing on the physical attributes, cultural traditions, and places that

groups are proud to conserve. Cultural traditions refer to family patterns, religious

practices, folklore traditions, and social customs (Collins, 1983; Weiler & Hall, 1992).

Richardson and Crompton (1988) address cultural traditions of inheritance in which

tourists seek the link between past and present, nostalgia. Cultural and heritage tourism is

defined as a "visit by persons from outside the host community motivated in part of

interest in the historical, artistic, and scientific or lifestyle offerings of a community,

region, group or institutions" (Hausmann, 2007, p. 346). The most updated definition of

cultural heritage tourism provided by the National Trust for Historic Preservation

(NTHP) (2010a) is "traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that

authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present. It includes cultural,

historical and natural resources." The definition of cultural heritage tourism from the

NTHP was utilized in the current research study.

Topics of heritage tourism which have been studied are tourists' motivation (Poria

et al., 2004; Poria et al., 2006), heritage tourists' socio-demographic background

(Chandler & Costello, 2002), specialization (Kerstetter et al., 2001), visitors' preference

(Poria et al., 2006), and the visitor experience (Masberg & Silverman, 1996). However,

there is little research that explores the relationships among destination image, place

attachment, and visitation intentions in heritage tourism.

The National Heritage Area (NHA).

According to the National Park Service (NPS), the NHA program is designated to

protect natural, cultural, and historic assets of regions and national heritage areas by

expanding its resource stewardship to support the local community based tourism to

connect local citizens to the preservation and planning process (NPS, 2010a; NTHP,

2010a). In order for an area to be designated by the NPS as a national heritage area,

certain elements must be present. For example, the landscape must be nationally

distinctive and be able to tell a unique story about the country (NTHP, 2010a). National

heritage areas provide several opportunities for leisure, recreation, and tourism such as

walking, hiking, biking, paddling, festivals, and museums (NTHP, 2010a). Currently,

there are 49 Heritage Areas that have been designated by Congress (See Figure 1) (NPS,

2010b). The Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA) was designated by

Congress in 1996 and is administered by the Center for Historic Preservation at Middle

Tennessee State University. The TCWNHA uses partnerships to preserve Civil War

heritage, to interpret the Civil War history between 1860 and 1875, and to promote

sustainable heritage tourism through several historic sites, such as buildings, farms, and

cemeteries (TCWNHA, 2010a). The TCWNHA is composed of three regions: east,

middle, and western Tennessee (TCWNHA, 2010a; Tennessee Department of Tourist

Development, 2010). The heritage areas include national battlefields, historic houses,

museums, cemeteries, churches, towns, and neighborhoods significantly associated with

the Civil War (TCWNHA, 2010c). According to NPS (2010c), more than 10,000 tourists

visited the Tennessee Civil War Heritage Areas due to the significant battles that took

place in the battle of Shiloh, the battle of Stones River, and the Chattanooga, Nashville,

and Franklin Campaigns. In addition, much of the fighting happened in Middle

Tennessee, including Hood's 1864 Campaign, Fort Donelson, and Stones River. The

battles were mostly located around railroads and rivers such as the Mississippi,

Tennessee, and Cumberland Rivers. Railroads and Rivers in the times of the Civil War

were the key strategic land features often in the crosshair of contention between the Confederacy and Union forces according to NPS (2010c). Due to the significant war events in the past, many tourists come to visit Civil War Heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. Heritage sites in Middle Tennessee are listed in Appendix A.

The foci of the tourists' travel decision-making paradigm has changed from a traditional approach to predict and control tourists' behavior to a more recent paradigm focusing on the understanding and interpretations of tourists' behavior (Decrop, 2000; Pizam & Mansfeld, 1999). Decrop (2000) suggested that most travel decision-making processes depend on different individuals and circumstances such as time and distance. Hence, in order to fully understand tourists' travel decision-making, it is necessary to explore other possible factors and to interpret how tourists make travel decisions. That is, this developing paradigm attempts to interpret how and why tourists achieved a particular decision by exploring different possible influencing factors such as tourists' perception about the destination to their travel decisions.

Destination Image

Over the past three decades, the importance of destination image has been acknowledged in the tourism field in terms of its impact on tourists' destination choices (Gunn, 1972; Hunt, 1975; Lin, Morais, Kerstetter, & Hou, 2007), tourists' decision making (Chon, 1990; Hunt, 1975), tourists' behaviors (Jeong, Kim, Ko, Lee, & Jeong, 2009; Lee, 2009), and effective marketing promotion (Molina, Gomez, & Martin-Consuegra, 2010; Schuster, Sullivan, Morais, & Kuehn, 2008).

The most agreed upon definition of destination image in research is provided by Crompton (1979) as "the sum of beliefs, ideas and impressions that a person has of a destination" (p. 8)." Phelp (1986) further defined destination image as perceptions or impressions of a place, and Milman and Pizam (1995) defined destination image as "the visual or mental impression of a place, a product, or an experience held by the general public" (p. 25). According to consumer research, the user's perception and product image affect the consumer's attitude toward a product (Goodrich, 1977). The user's perception of product attributes is the stereotypic image of the product (Hunt, 1975). Hence, this stereotypic impression, destination image, was used to predict tourist's attitude toward a destination (Hunt, 1975; Phelps, 1986).

The conceptual study of destination image.

Although destination image has been studied for three decades, it still remains populardue to its overall usefulness in understanding tourists' conceptualization of a destination. Past research on destination image is categorized into destination image formation (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991; Gunn, 1972; Phelps, 1986), the meanings of destination image (Baloglu & McClearly, 1999b; Dann, 1996; Echtner & Ritchie, 2003; Gartner, 1993; Gil & Ritchie, 2008; Pike & Ryan, 2004; Ryan & Cave, 2005; Tasci & Gartner, 2007), the assessment of destination image (Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Jenkins, 1999; Lee, 2009; Lin, et. al., 2007; Prayag, 2009), and factors influencing destination image (Chen & Kerstetter, 1999; Martin & Bosque, 2008; Milman & Pizam, 1995).

Why is destination image valuable to tourism? The link between a destination and a tourist is the image of the site, which has influences on the tourist's destination

choice (Tapachai & Warysszak, 2000). In marketing literature, image in some cases can be substituted for perception and attitude (Sussman & Unel, 2000). Image is defined as the "net result of a person's beliefs, ideas, feelings, expectations and impressions about a place or an object," according to Kotler (1994, p. 223). Gensch (1978) stated that image is an abstract concept and is influenced by external variables such as promotion, reputation, and peer evaluation. The image can further influence consumers' preferences. Gunn (1972) found two levels of image, organic and induced images. While organic image is formed from external sources not associated with marketing promotion, such as friends' and relatives' opinions and past experiences, induced images are formed from commercial promotions (Gunn, 1972). Phelps (1986) stated that there are two stages of images, primary and secondary images, to form a destination image. The primary image is formed from actual visitation, and the secondary image is formed from information sources such as brochures and travel agents. Last, Fakeye and Crompton (1991) proposed three stages of image formation that includes organic, induced, and complex images. Organic image formulation is based on past travel experiences; induced image formulation is based on the marketing influences, and complex image formulation is based on tourists' actual visit to the destination (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). In addition, organic and induced image is formed before actual visitations, but complex image is formed after actual visitation to the destination (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991).

The meanings of destination image.

Past destination image studies often used destination attributes, focused on physical properties, such as buildings, to measure destination image (Jenkins, 1999).

Figure 1. 49 National Heritage Areas

Abraham Lincoln	Mississippi Gulf
Arabia Mountain	Mississippi Hills
Atchafalaya	Mormon Pioneer
Augusta Canal	Motor Cities
Baltimore	Muscle Shoals
Blackstone River Valley	National Aviation Heritage Area
Blue Ridge	National Coal Heritage Area
Cache La Poudre River Corridor	Niagara National Heritage Area
Cane River National	Northern Plains
Champlain Valley	Northern Rio Grande
Crossroads of the American Revolution	Ohio & Erie National Heritage Canal Way
Delaware and Lehigh	Oil Region
Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor	Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley
Essex	Rivers of Steel
Freedom's Frontier	Sangre de Cristo
Freedom's Way	Schuylkill River
Great Basin	Shenandoah Valley Battlefields
Gullah/Geechee Cultural Heritage Corridor	Silos & Smokestacks
Hudson River Valley	South Carolina National Heritage Corridor
Illinois & Michigan Canal	South Park National Heritage Area
John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley	Path of Progress National Heritage Tour Route
Journey Through Hallowed Ground	Tennessee Civil War
Turnagain Arm	Upper Housatonic Valley
Lackawanna Heritage Valley	Wheeling National Heritage Area
Mississippi Delta	Yuma Crossing

Figure 1. 49 National Heritage Areas by National Park Service (November, 2010). Retrieved: http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas

Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) suggested that two components of cognitive and affective images may give better explanations as to how a tourist generates a destination image. Martin and Bosque (2008) addressed that past destination image studies heavily used the cognitive component of destination image approach, concerned only for destination attributes such as physical properties. Likewise, the authors found that few

destination image studies have explored the relationship of tourists' psychological

perceptions to the destination image. Echtner and Ritchie (2003) adopted a more holistic

approach, two dimensions, from functional (physical attributes) to psychological

characteristics (motivation) and from holistic (general image of destination) to image

attributes to measure destination image. The authors stated that holistic attributes include

not only tangible attributes such as buildings and landscapes, but also intangible

attributes, such as atmosphere. In addition, the authors stated that functional

characteristics focused on the destination attributes, but the psychological characteristics

focused on the mental impressions to the destination. In sum, the most recent studies

support that cognitive and affective images are the components of destination image

(Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Kim &

Richardson, 2003; Lin et al., 2007; Martin & Bosque, 2008).

Assessment of destination image.

Echtner and Ritchie (2003) examined several previous destination image studies

and suggested that the concept of destination image needed to be explored from a more

holistic approach. The issue of how to appropriately measure the physical attributes has

created methodological difficulties due to attribute selection bias issues (Echtner &

Ritchie, 1993). Generally, a combination of structured and unstructured techniques is

suggested to design instruments to measure destination image. Stechenkova and Mills

(2010) and Pike (2002) suggested that in employing both qualitative and quantitative

techniques, bias issues can be reduced. Unstructured methodologies use open-ended

questions to develop a complete image attributes list without attributes selection bias, and

structured methodologies use standardized scales to measure the destination image

(Echtner & Ritchie, 1991; 1993). The application of mixed methodologies can provide a

more holistic impression of the destination.

Factors influencing destination image.

According to previous research, the antecedents of destination image have

included personal and external factors, for example, socio-demographic variables,

previous experience, information sources, and familiarity with the destination site

(Jenkins, 1999). Socio-demographic variables refer to the individual's characteristics.

These variables are associated with the individuals' perceptions of the destination and

further influence individuals' cognitive or affective images (Baloglu & McClearly,

1999b). Past experience might be more important when the need for information sources

is weak (Baloglu, 2001). As for information sources, the amount and the type of

information sources influence cognitive image formulation (Baloglu & McClearly,

1999b). Information sources play a direct effect on the perceptions of tourists to the sites

due to the amount of information the tourists received from the variety of information

sources, including advertisements and recommendations of friends and family (Baloglu,

2001). Familiarity is one component of the consumer knowledge construct, and it refers

to product related experience or accumulated experience (Milman & Pizam, 1995). Past

experiences and the information sources shape the degree of familiarity that tourists have

for the sites, and it further influences tourists' destination image to the sites (George &

George, 2004).

Similar to other studies (*i.e.,* Chen & Kerstetter, 1999; Kim & Yoom, 2003; Lin et al., 2007; Martine & Bosque, 2008; Pike & Ryan, 2004), a conceptual model of destination image, comprised of cognitive and affective components of image, was utilized to measure destination image in the current study. According to Baloglu and McCleary (1999b), cognitive image refers to belief and knowledge about an object, whereas affective image refers to a feeling toward an object, and overall image is formed from cognitive and affective components. According to Russel (1980), individual emotional state can be categorized by the information of environment. In other words, an individual's affective component of image is affected by the cognitive component of image. The cognitive component influences the affective component (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Echtner & Ritchie, 2003; Lin et al., 2007; Martin & Bosque, 2008). In line with this approach, destination image refers to a multidimensional construct that not only consists of a cognitive component of image but also an affective component of image (Martine & Bosque, 2008).

Place Attachment

Increasing numbers of tourism and recreation researchers are recognizing the importance of understanding the meaning of place and the interrelationship between people and places (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000). People create "bonds with the place" based on the sense of place derived from the meaning and value they assign to the destination (Kaltenborn & Williams, 2002; Williams, Patterson, & Roggenbuck, 1992). Much of the work on tourism or recreation and place attachment has focused on the meanings of place (Kaltenborn & Williams, 2002; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2009; Scannell

& Gifford, 2010), place dimensions (Hammitt et al., 2009; Kyle & Oh, 2009; Kyle et al., 2005), and relationships with other travel variables such as specialization and involvement (Gross & Brown, 2008; Kyle, Bricker, Graefe, & Wickham, 2004; Kyle, Graefe, Manning, & Bacon, 2004; Mark, 2009).

The meanings of place.

Place attachment refers to the sense of place, representing how people create attachments to the place they visit. Sense of place is defined by Russell and Ward (1982) as "psychological or perceived unity of the geographical environment...." (p. 654). Tuan (1974, 1977) also described sense of place that is associated with an emotional or affective bond, very deep and rooted, between an individual and a particular place. The concept of place attachment is associated with an emotional or affective construct that focuses on the relationship between people and a particular place (Tuan, 1980). Williams et al. (1992) suggested that understanding the framework of emotional and symbolic values in regard to natural sites is helpful in providing suggestions for wilderness resource planning. The interrelationships between place and people are complex and multidimensional (Low & Altman, 1992). Place does not only mean a physical setting but also includes other components such as history, experience, and symbolic meanings of the place (Walmsley & Lewis, 1984). Place attachment is a multifaceted concept that characterizes the bonding between individuals and their particular places (Low & Altman, 1992). Scannell and Gifford (2009) further defined place attachment as a tripartite organizing framework (people-place-process) which emphasized that this framework is a multidimensional concept comprised of person, psychological process,

and place dimensions. The person dimension includes both levels of individual and groups. Personal connections to the place are more associated with personal memories such as childhood memories or milestones (Manzo, 2005), but group attachment to the place is more associated with culture, gender, and religion (Virden & Walker, 1999). Individuals have different perceptions regarding different tangible and intangible attributes that a person perceived (Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001). Individuals have different place attachment to the sites according to their psychological interactions with the evaluation of destination image.

Place attachment dimensions.

Previous place attachment studies attempted to identify the dimensions of place attachment. Hammitt et al. (2006) reported that place attachment in recreation settings includes five dimensions, which are place identity, dependence, familiarity, belongingness, and rootedness. Place identity refers to a "combination of attitudes, values, thoughts, beliefs, meanings, and behavior tendencies, reaching far beyond emotional attachment and belonging to particular places" (Proshansky et al., 1983, p. 61). Place dependence refers to functions of "how well a setting facilitates users' particular activities…" (Moore & Graefe, 1994, p. 27). Place familiarity refers to the "pleasant memories, attribute and cognitive meanings, and environmental images that result from acquaintances and remembrances associated with recreation places" (Hammit et al., 2009, p. 61). Place belongingness refers to the bonding that is an individual's affiliation with the place. Individuals feel connected with the place and the people there (Hammit et al., 2009). Place rootedness refers to a strong bonding relationship between human and

place (Hammit et al., 2009). However, the two most cited dimensions of place attachment across various settings are place identity and place dependence (Kyle et al., 2005; Williams & Vaske, 2003). Recently, social bonding is suggested by Kyle et al. (2005) to get deeper understandings of the relationship between people and place. Social bonding is focused on social relationships and has been discussed in some research (i.e., Hidalgo & Hernandez, 2001; Low& Altman, 1992). In some contexts, social bonds are the primary sources of place meanings for individuals. The research findings suggested that the social bond is formed by the interactions between individuals and their social environment such as significant others (Hay, 1998; Kyle et al., 2005).

Thus, people may have different place attachments when they visit different leisure and recreation settings, especially in regard to heritage sites. Individuals often visit specific places not only for simple aesthetic responses, but also due to a feeling or bond with the places (Bricker & Kerstetter, 2000). Three dimensions, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding, were used to measure heritage tourists' place attachment in this study. Kyle et al. (2005) implied that three dimensions are more reliable to measure place attachment.

Relationships with other travel variables.

An individual's relationship to his or her surroundings often refers to the sense of place. Knowledge about the relationships between place attachment and other travel related variables such as perception of the sites may provide a better understanding of individuals' behavior. Bricker and Kerstetter (2000; 2002) explored the place meanings and the level of specialization regarding peoples' attachment to South Fork River. The

authors found that the relationship between place attachment and specialization is highly

correlated with each other. Individuals with higher specialization often have higher place

attachments to the site. Smaldone, Harris, & Sanyal (2008) suggested that time is an

important factor that connects people to the sites. The authors found that the strength of

the relationship between place and people is highly associated with time. This implies

there is an enduring relationship between place and people when the people are involved

with a place over a longer period of time so that recreationists have higher involvement

with the setting (Low & Altman, 1992; Moor & Graefe, 1994; Schroeder, 1991; Tuan,

1977). For example, Moor & Graefe (1994) examine the relationship among place

attachment, identity, and dependence to recreation trail usage. The authors found that

there is a positive relationship among length of association, frequency of participation,

and proximity. Place attachment has been studied for several decades. It has been mostly

focused on natural or heritage resource management or the relationship between the

locals and community development (Anderson & Fulton, 2008; Hunt, 1975; Kaltenborn

& Williams, 2002; Kerstetter & Bricker, 2009). Kyle et al. (2004) studied the relationship

between involvement and place attachment by examining hikers' activities and settings.

Recently, however, the paucity of research on the people-place relationship between

heritage tourists and their destination, especially place attachment, has gotten scholars'

attention to explore this area further (Kyle et al., 2005; Tsai & Shiue, 2010). Mark (2009)

examined the relationship between place attachment and an interpretation program. The

result also indicated that repeat visitors have higher place attachment after experiencing

interpretative tours. In addition, Mark (2009) confirmed that the quality of the

interpretation program contributed to greater place attachment for repeat visitors. Hence, the relationship between other travel variables, such as repeat visitation in heritage sites and tourists' place attachment, is worth further investigation.

The effect of destination image on place attachment.

Early research focused on the meaning and formation of destination image, and later research focuses on its relationship to other travel variables, such as behavior intentions (i.e., willingness to revisit, willingness to recommend to others to visit) (Chen & Tsai, 2007; Lee, 2009; Prayag, 2009). According to the cognitive-affective framework, place attachment might be affected by the cognitive component of destination image (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu & McClearly, 1999a). Although the cognitive component of destination image aids the understanding of an individual's intention to visit the destination, the relationship between cognitive or affective components of destination image to place attachment remains unclear. Therefore, this study attempted to investigate the relationships between destination image and place attachment and destination image and visitation intention in order to more fully understand tourists' behaviors.

Visitation Intention

Behavior intention has been utilized as a variable to predict consumers' actual behaviors (Bigne et al., 2001; Castro et al., 2007) and behavior intention can be predicted by several antecedent variables such as past experiences, satisfaction, and perceived value (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980; Huang & Hsu, 2009). Behavior intention refers to "a person's subjective probability that he will perform some behavior" according to Ajzen and Fishbein (1980, p. 288). Based on this perspective, Woodside and Lysonski (1989)

proposed that tourists' behavior intention, visitation intentions, is the "perceived likelihood of revisiting a specific destination within a specific time period," (p. 8) and further, Baker and Crompton (2000) defined visitation intention as the likelihood that a person would visit a site. Due to different approaches to the study of visitation intention, there is no standardized instrument to measure visitation intentions. Spark (2007) suggested that future intention studies can be measured by multi-item scales. In addition, Chen and Tsai (2007) and Baker and Crompton (2000) suggested that two dimensions, intention to return and intention to recommend to others, can be used to measure visitation intentions. Therefore, this study used intention to return and intention to recommend to others to visit the site to measure tourists' visitation intention.

Some scholars used factors (satisfaction, perceived value, involvement, motivation, perceived constraint, and past experience) along with the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) to predict visitation intentions (i.e., Huang & Hsu, 2009; Petrick, Morais & Norman, 2001; Shen, Schuttemeyer, & Braun, 2009; Spark, 2007). In Shen et al. (2009), cultural tour involvement (CTI) and past experience have been applied along with TPB to predict visitation intention. Huang and Hsu (2009) indicated that destination image is important for attracting a person to visit, and the motivation to learn is important for repeat visitors. In recent research, the concept of place attachment has been incorporated into the enhanced behavior intention model in order to better predict tourists' visitation intention (George & George, 2004; Halpenny, 2006; Klenosky, LeBlanc, Vogt, & Schroeder, 2007). Lennon and Foley (2000) mentioned that negative place attachment may keep a person from visiting a site and draw a person to a site due to his or her

curiosity about the sites. Klenosky et al. (2007) advised that exploring the possible

relationships between place attachment and intentions to visit in recreation settings is

essential.

Several scholars suggest that destination image is positively related to tourists'

visitation intention (Bigne et al., 2001; Castro et al., 2007; Chen & Tsau, 2007;

Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007; Sonmez & Sirakaya, 2002). Baloglu (1999b) indicated that

both cognitive and affective images are positively related to visitation intention. Jeong et

al. (2009) further suggested that destination image influences tourists' visitation

intention. The authors stated that tourists whose cognitive and affective component of

horse racing image is related to wholesomeness and excitement expressed a higher

intention to visit.

In sum, according to previous studies, destination image and place attachment

may play an important role to predict tourists' visitation intention separately. However,

the combination effect of destination image and place attachment may play an important

role to predict tourists' visitation intention.

Heritage Tourists' Characteristics

Cultural heritage tourism is one of the fastest growing segments in today's travel

market (Nicholls et al., 2004; NTHP, 2010b; Silberberg, 1995). Past research has shown

socio-demographic influences on tourists' motivation, perception, attitude and travel

decision making (Mathieson & Wall, 1982). Kerstetter, Confer, and Graefe (2001) stated

that heritage tourists have higher involvement with the places rather than simply enjoying

the environment. The typical heritage tourists are middle-aged, have a higher than

average household income, and tend to be more educated and stay longer and spend more at the destinations sites than general tourists (Alzua, O'Leary, & Morrison, 1998; Confer & Kerstetter, 2000; Nicholls et al., 2004; NTHP, 2010b). Heritage tourists in general are motivated primarily by learning and fun (Confer & Kerstetter, 2000; Hawley, 1990). However, increasing numbers of heritage tourists today are motivated more by a search for whole heritage experiences than by a detailed search for their family history according to Confer & Kerstetter (2000). Heritage tourists are more attracted by atmosphere and ambiance with the sites (Mawson, 1994; Peterson, 1990). Some scholars also addressed the concept that heritage tourists are heterogeneous, referring to distinctive segments between heritage tourists in terms of their motivation and visiting sites (Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998; Prentice, Witt, & Hamer, 1998). Pan (2008) suggested six functional motivations to determine tourists' main reason for traveling. The six functional motivations are learning, novelty-seeking, pleasure, escape, socialization, and value -expressive motivations. Heritage tourists continued to develop into "types" of heritage tourists based on their pursuit of heritage experiences, according to Kerstetter et al. (2001). Among those types of tourists, it remains unclear which types of tourists will stay loyal to heritage destinations (Kerstetter et al., 2001).

The types of tourists.

Confer and Kerstetter (2000) posited that the possible variables to predict tourists' visitation to heritage sites are motivation, decision making time, the length of stay, group size, age, and visitation status. Lau & KcKercher (2004) found that two types of tourists, first-time visitors and repeat visitors, often exist in the destinations. First-time visitor

refers to tourists who first visited the destination, and repeat visitor refers to tourists who

had visited the place at least twice (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984). Opperman (1997)

suggested that repeat visitation is important for destinations in order to have stable

tourism revenue to maintain the destination. In addition, repeat visitors are more likely to

seek relaxation, tend to be older, tend to be more willing to pay more for their travel, and

tend to revisit destinations (Gitelson & Crompton, 1984). On the other hand, first-time

visitors are seeking more novel and authentic experiences and are more willing to pay to

travel. Fakeye and Crompton (1991) indicated that first-time visitors develop destination

image based on information collected from natural, cultural, and accommodations

attributes but repeat visitors develop destination image based on previous travel

experiences, affective image, and social relationships. Therefore, to explore the

relationships between people and place may provide some helpful information to

understand tourists' visitation intention behavior.

The Relationships among Destination Image, Place Attachment, and Tourists'

Visitation Intention

Based on previous literature, in this study the researcher attempted to utilize the

framework of cognitive information processes to propose that tourists' intention to visit

can be predicted by destination image and place attachment. The most popular issue of

tourism research is tourists' decision making (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005). According to

Decrop (2000), tourists' decision making can be approached by a cognitive information

process, a cognitive model. The cognitive model proposes that tourists' decision-making

is a cognitive psychological process. This cognitive psychological process is used to

investigate how psychological variables affect tourists' decision-making, and states that

individuals have a positive attitude toward an object which also can help to develop a

behavior intention (Sirakaya & Woodside, 2005). The cognitive psychological process

refers to the cognitive-affective framework. This approach proposed that tourists'

behavior (visitation intentions) can be understood by a framework of cognitive and

affective factors proposed by Woodside and Lysonski (1989). The definition of cognitive

psychology is given by Mayer (1947) as "Cognitive psychology is the scientific analysis

of human mental processes and memory structures in order to understand human

behavior" (p. 47). The cognitive psychological process as applied to tourist behavior is to

study tourists' mental activity, how they process information, and use that information to

perform certain tasks. In other words, the cognitive psychological process means that

cognition influences affect, and both cognition and affect make up an overall destination

image (Weiner, 1980; Williams, Zainuba, & Jackson, 2003).

Conducting Tourism Research Online

Increasing numbers of people prefer to obtain destination information online

(Dolnicar, Laesser, & Matus, 2008). Tierney (2009) indicated tourists are more likely to

request brochures online rather than onsite and have higher visitation intentions to visit

those destinations. In addition, social networking as a means of communicating online

has become more popular, and the number of users keeps growing (Hogeboom,

McDermott, Perrin, Osman, & Bell-Ellison, 2010; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). More

specifically, one common social networking site, Facebook, has been utilized in research

in medicine as well as in other fields (Mark, 2009). Coomer (1997) and Couper (2000)

indicated that an e-survey is an alternative method to collect research data. However,

little tourism research has been done using e-survey formats. Tierney (2009) has

reviewed two major journals in the tourism field, *Journal of Travel Research* and *The

Annals of Tourism Research*, from 2005 to 2007. The results were that the majority of

past tourism surveys still used a postal survey (37%), followed by self-administered

surveys (25%), and a small percentage utilized e-mail and online surveys (10%) While

not as popular, the advantage of using an e-survey is the access to a greater number of

participants to examine the research hypothesis (Stepchenkova & Mills, 2010). Dolnicar

et al. (2008) suggested that an online survey has additional advantages, such as lower cost

and higher response rate, unbiased responses between postal and online surveys,

sampling frame, and survey format. There are two ways, e-survey and web survey, for

on-line survey. An e-mail list is needed for e-survey and web server is needed for web-

survey. Hewson (2003) suggested the benefits of using e-survey over using web-survey

to prevent the problems of sampling procedure and response rate. There are some

limitations in using e-surveys such as the reliability and external validity, response rate,

and randomized sampling issues (Stepchenkova & Mills, 2010). Due to no population

frame, the results can only be generalized to the internet populations. In addition, some

techniques can be used to overcome the limitations. For example, an invitation letter,

short survey format, and follow-up reminder email can be used in order to increase

response rate (Andrews, Nonnecke, & Preece, 2003; Dolnicar et al., 2008).

Some tourism researchers collect data online for specific topics, such as

information sources or visitation intention to visit destinations (Tierney, 2000). In

heritage tourism studies, heritage tourists report using a range of information resources such as brochures, tourism websites, books, videos, and reference groups for planning their trip. Therefore, the application of online surveys for heritage tourism may be a valid alternative for collecting research data.

Due to the benefits of using an online survey, the use of an on-line survey in this study can allow the researcher to overcome geographic, time, and cultural limitations to recruit larger numbers of participants who have visited Civil War sites in the Middle Tennessee region. In addition, increasing numbers of tourists obtained their trip information through visiting the websites of tourist destinations, so it is worthwhile to explore these internet users' behaviors.

SurveyMonkey program.

SurveyMonkey is an e-survey tool that was used in this study to collect data. Survey monkey is a cost-effective, web-based survey program that enables researchers to quickly and efficiently gather survey results on their own (SurveyMonkey User Manual, 2010). The manual indicated that this program includes *15* question types and a series of survey templates that can be used to collect participants' response through online research. SurveyMonkey provides four collection paths including the web link, email invitation collector, embed/Popup survey, and Facebook collectors for sending the survey to the participants. SurveyMonkey also works through a cryptographic system that secures a connection between users and server. This protocol ensures the capacity to obtain confidential user information (SurveyMonkey User Manual, 2010).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the research methods and data analyses that were utilized to address the research questions and test the study hypotheses. First, the research instrument and study variables are discussed. Second, the data procedures, including the questionnaire review, study site, sampling, data collection, and data analyses, are presented.

To meet the purposes of this study, the research questions and hypotheses were analyzed to describe demographic and travel behavior characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA). Second, the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and the visitation intention of these heritage tourists were examined. Destination image was composed of cognitive and affective components of destination image plus an overall destination image. Place attachment was composed of three dimensions: place identity, place dependence, and social bonding. Visitation intention consisted of intention to revisit the destination and intention to recommend the destination to others. Third, the overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention were to be examined to determine if there was a significant difference between first-time and repeat visitors to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA.

Instrument Development

The study instrument was a researcher-designed questionnaire that was administered to participants through an on-line survey. The instrument consisted of six foci: (1) respondents' characteristics, (2) past travel experiences, (3) travel motivation, (4) place attachment, (5) destination image, and (6) visitation intention. Section I, section II, and section III focused on respondents' background including socio-demographic characteristics, past travel behavior variables, and travel motivations, respectively. Past travel behavior variables included visitation frequency, travel party make-up, length of stay, and information sources used. Socio-demographic gathered from participants consisted of gender, age, residence, marital status, education, occupational status, annual household income, and ethnicity. Respondents were provided categorical choices for each question/variable. For example, respondents were asked how many times (0, 1, or 2 or more) they had visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. Travel party make-up was measured by asking participants to check one or more of the following categories: family, friends, both family and friends, alone, organized groups, and others.

The length of stay was measured by the following categories: half day, one day, more than one day, and other. Regarding the question of how heritage site information was obtained, participants were asked to check one or more categories, including brochure/travel guide, tour operator, travel agents, friends/family members, books/movies, article/news, advertisements, internet, and other. Similarly, socio-demographic information was gathered by having participants either fill in a blank (age

and residence) or choose among categorical responses (gender, marital status, education, occupational status, annual household income, and ethnicity). Section III addressed travel motivations. To assess participant travel motivations, participants were provided a list of motivations including learning, novelty-seeking, pleasure, escape, socialization, and opportunity to express personal values (Pan, 2008). They were asked to rate their level of agreement on a five point Likert scale; each listed reason was a motivation for their travel to an identified Civil War heritage site in the Middle Tennessee area. Participants were asked prior to beginning Section III of the questionnaire to identify a Civil War heritage site in the Middle Tennessee region that they had recently visited; Participants used this site to address questions specific to travel motivation, place attachment, destination image, and visitation intention.

Place attachment.

Section IV was evaluated with a multi-dimensional measurement adopted from previous studies (Kyle, Graefe, & Manning, 2005; Williams & Vaske, 2003). The concept of place attachment was measured by three dimensions: place identity (six items), place dependence (six items) (Williams & Vaske, 2003), and social bonding (four items) (Kyle et al., 2005) with a five point scale of agreement (1= strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) (See Figure 2). According to Williams and Vaske (2003), items with *Cronbach alphas* from .81 – .94 with acceptable reliability *alphas* (.79 – .91) were used to measure participants' place identity and place dependence. Kyle et al.'s (2005) four items with *Cronbach alphas* (.62) were used to measure social bonding of visitors to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area.

Figure 2. Place Attachment

1. This site means a lot to me.
2. I am very attached to this site.
3. I identify strongly with this site.
4. I feel like this site is part of me.
5. This site is very special to me.
6. Visiting this site says a lot about who I am.
7. Visiting this site is more important than visiting any other place.
8. Doing what I do here is more important to me than doing it in any other place.
9. I wouldn't substitute any other site for doing the types of things I do here.
10. This site is the best place for what I like to do.
11. No other place can compare to this site.
12. I get more satisfaction out of visiting this site than from visiting any other area.
13. I have a lot of fond memories about this site.
14. I have a special connection to the site and the people who visit here.
15. I do not tell many people about this site.
16. I will bring people whom I care about to this site.

Figure 2. Items were modified from "The Measurement of Place Attachment: Validity and Generalizability of a Psychometric Approach," by D. Williams and J. Vaske, 2002, *Forest Science, 49*(6), p. 830-839 and "Testing the Dimensionality of Place Attachment in Recreational Settings," by A. Kyle, A. Graefe, and R. Manning, 2005, *Environment and Behaviors, 37*, p. 153 -177.

Destination image.

Section V addressed destination image, which was a sum of individuals' attributes that make up tourism experiences (Milman & Pizam, 1995). The tourism experience involves a variety of services, activities, and social interactions. According to previous studies, destination image is a multi-dimensional construct; the issue of how to measure destination image without bias is controversial (Echtner & Ritchie, 1993, 2003; Fakeye & Crompton, 1991). Thus, a two-step process was utilized in this study to develop the attribute-based items to measure the cognitive component of destination image. This two-

step procedure was based on the work of Echtner and Ritchie (1993) and Chen and

Kerstetter (1999), who suggested that a combination of unstructured and structured

methodologies be used to measure destination image.

In the first step, the focus group was composed of three heritage tourism experts

(from the Tennessee Tourism Department, Heritage Center of Murfreesboro, and Middle

Tennessee State University) and three residents of Rutherford County, Tennessee. The

age range of members of the focus group was 20 to 60 years old. Informed consent forms

for focus group members were collected before conducting the focus group interview

(See Appendix B). The focus group members were asked to answer three questions to

obtain additional input for destination image. The three questions were as follows: (1)

What are the images or characteristics that come to mind when you think about visiting

Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area? (2) How would you describe the

atmosphere or mood that you would expect to experience while visiting Civil War

heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area? (3) Please list several distinctive or unique

tourist attractions you can think of when visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle

Tennessee area. This step produced a more complete set of destination attributes.

A focus group agenda was used to conduct the interview (See Appendix C). This

procedure avoids bias derived from the interactions between interviewers and

interviewees (Krueger, 2000). Namely, the focus group agenda reduced the errors due to

conscious or inadvertent push-polling of the interviewee by the interviewer. Next, content

analysis of the responses to these three questions was employed to identify the critical

attributes that composed the cognitive component of the destination image of Civil War

heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee Area. The same focus group was then asked to review an initial list of general destination image attributes, comprised of 32 items, developed through previous destination image studies by Chen and Kerstetter (1999), Chen and Tsai (2007), Jenkins (1999), Lee (2009), and Lin et al. (2007). This step was to eliminate redundancies in questionnaire items.

The word frequency of attributes found 27 cognitive attributes (See Appendix D) based on the two open-ended interview questions: "What are the images or characteristics that come to mind when you think about visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area?" and "Please list several distinctive or unique tourist attractions you can think of when visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area." These 27 resulting cognitive attributes were briefly discussed with the recommendations of the focus group and their responses to the two open-ended questions. Next, the master list of cognitive attributes was first modified based on the work of the six-member focus group.

A focus group feedback form was used to gather the agreements of focus group between an initial cognitive and step developed cognitive lists (See Appendix E). Some of the resulting 27 cognitive attributes were assigned into the initial 32-attribute categories by rephrasing original attributes or by creating one new attribute. Taking the initial attribute one, "a variety of festivals, concerts, and events," as an example, when the focus group agreed on this attribute, the group gave examples such as festivals, concerts, events, walking tours, and driving tours. As another example, the initial attribute four, "plentiful cultural and historical sites and museums," the group gave examples such as historic houses, plantation homes, and museums. The initial attribute

six, "national parks," was revised based on the examples the focus group gave, such as

parks, urban parks, and national parks. The initial attribute seven (attractive scenery) was

revised into "attractive scenery such as railroads, open hills, and camping sites." The

initial attribute eight (natural attractions) was revised into "natural attractions such as

natural traces, areas, farm lands, open landscapes, and woods. Hence, five initial

cognitive attributes were revised based on the recommendations of the focus group. That

process resulted in 11 out of 27 resulting attributes being assigned into the initial

attributes, and 16 resulting attributes being grouped based on similarities, to present three

additional cognitive attributes. These additional attributes were "well preserved historical

structures, landscapes, towns, interpretive sites, and authentic preservations, and public

and private spaces," "a variety of reenactments, reproductions, and demonstrations," and

"plentiful historic sites such as battlefields, battles, forts, cemeteries, and cannons." These

three attributes were added into the initial cognitive attributes. In addition, the focus

group also recommended revising attribute 31 (a variety of reenactments, reproductions,

and demonstrations) into "a variety of reenactments, handcrafted reproductions, and

demonstrations." The last attribute 32 was revised into "plentiful historical sites such as

battlefields, forts, and cemeteries" by removing cannons into attribute 30 and deleting

battles. Therefore, three additional attributes replaced the three removed attributes.

After reviewing the initial cognitive attributes, the focus group suggested

removing three initial cognitive attributes based on disagreement and agreement

discussed in the interview. Half (50%) of the focus group (three out of six) agreed to

remove three irrelevant attributes. The attributes removed were "good nightlife

possibilities," "lots of things to do in the evening," and "good local transportation."

Hence, the master list composed of 29 initial cognitive attributes, and three additional

cognitive attributes were combined to present the cognitive attributes for the Civil War

heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. The focus group master list of 32 cognitive

attributes developed from the two-step procedure was reviewed and was agreed upon by

the same focus group (See Appendix F). Finally, this master list of cognitive attributes,

developed through the focus group meetings, was further examined and revised by three

tourism experts. According to the feedback of the three experts, 32 items were revised to

improve the face validity of the cognitive destination image. Items were reduced from 32

to 29. Nine items suggested by the three experts were removed due to the items'

irrelevance, 10 items were revised to be more precise, and 13items were kept. That is,

three experts suggested attribute items needed to be more specific and precise to the sites.

Deleted items were "good climate," "fresh air," "lack of crime," "many places of interest

to visit," "a wide variety of recreation activities," "lots of parks, urban parks, and national

parks," "good shopping facilities," "lack of traffic congestion," and "quality service. Ten

items were revised using the items from the three additional inputs and the initial items.

The final version of the master list was revised and re-ordered according to the

recommendations of the three experts (See Appendix G). As can be seen in Figure 3, the

master list consisting of 29 items with a five point scale of agreement (1= strongly

disagree, 5 = strongly agree) was used to measure the cognitive component of destination

image of Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area.

Additional information was collected from the focus group regarding the feelings they experienced when visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. The focus group members reported the following feelings toward the Civil War heritage sites: "satisfaction, respectful, proud, surprised, thankful, animosity, death, somber, regret, no misunderstanding, fun, enjoyed, interesting, empathy, and sadness." While this information was not incorporated into the current questionnaire, it may be helpful in future development of measures of affective image for heritage tourists.

In Section V, cognitive and affective components of destination image were measured to examine the relationship between destination image and place attachment. According to previous studies (e.g., Baloglu & Brinnberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Lin et al., 2007; Walmsley & Jenkins, 1993), the scale measuring the affective component of destination image included four variables: arousing–sleepy, pleasant–unpleasant, exciting–gloomy, and relaxing–distressing, on a seven point semantic differential scale. The reliability of the affective component of destination image was .80 (Lin et al., 2007). Respondents were asked to indicate a rating of which word in each pair of affective descriptors best described how they felt about the destination before visiting the site. An overall affective image was calculated based on the average mean of the four items (Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b). Overall destination image was measured by a single item indicating the respondent's feeling toward the Civil War heritage site visited in the past.

The question, "Please rate your overall feeling toward the site," with a seven point overall destination image measurement scale, ranging from 1 (strongly negative) to 7

(strongly positive), was adopted from Baloglu and McCleary (1999a) and Lin et al. (2007).

Visitation intention.

Section VI consisted of two questions to measure the visitation intention of tourists who visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. The two questions were as follows: (1) How likely are you to visit the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area in the next 12 months? (2) How likely are you to recommend to others to visit the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area? These two questions were scored with a five point Likert scale, 1= very low and 5 = very strong (Chen & Tsai, 2006). The construct reliability of visitation intention items was .92 (Chen & Tsai, 2006).

Data Procedures

Questionnaire review.

The questionnaire was sent to three tourism experts for review. Once feedback from the experts was compiled and the questionnaire revised as recommended, the questionnaire was pilot-tested by two groups. To accomplish a diversity of respondents in the pilot group, 15 college students from Middle Tennessee State University and 15 members of a heritage social network website (i.e., Facebook) were asked to complete the questionnaire. The purpose of this pilot test was to ensure the questionnaire was functional as disseminated through SurveyMonkey. The questionnaire was revised based on the results of the pilot test. Among 30 people, 26 agreed to participate in the pilot test, and 15 people completed the questionnaire.

Figure 3. Cognitive attributes

1. A variety of festivals and events
2. A variety of tours and programs
3. Historical railroads related to the Civil War era
4. Plentiful historic houses and homes, and museums
5. Plentiful museums
6. A living history, customs, and culture
7. Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods
8. Attractive scenery and landscapes
9. Many interpretive sites
10. Souvenir shops.
11. A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions.
12. Public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era
13. Ample local information.
14. A variety of accommodations.
15. A variety of restaurants.
16. Good opportunities for local tours
17. Good accessibility in terms of transportation, cost, and time
18. Historical buildings, churches, and courthouses
19. Affordable price
20. Walking tour programs related to Civil War era
21. Walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era
22. Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts, and cemeteries
23. A variety of reenactments and demonstrations
24. Friendly people
25. Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere
26. Opportunities for learning
27. A variety of family-oriented activities
28. Well preserved historic structures and landscapes
29. Fame/ Reputation

Figure 3. Cognitive Image Attributes of Civil War Heritage Sites in the Middle Tennessee Area consisting of 29 items developed by the focus group members and tourism experts.

Based on the feedback from the pilot group, the researcher moved the part of the questionnaire dealing with socio-demographic information to the end of the questionnaire and added one category "other" into the question of identifying your recent visit to the

Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. The final survey is shown in Appendix K.

Study site.

According to the National Park Service (NPS, 2010b), there are 49 national heritage areas designated by Congress in the United States. According to NPS (2010a) criteria, the landscape must have nationally distinctive natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources in order to be able to tell its unique story about the area. Each heritage area must meet the criteria to be considered for designation by Congress. The Civil War was a significant event in American history. A large number of important battles occurred in Tennessee, including the battles of Shiloh, Stones River, Chattanooga, Nashville, and Franklin. The historic sites encompass buildings, farms, cemeteries and battlefield attractions that appeal to a number of tourists (TCWNHA, 2010a). Thus, the study sites were limited to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA) due to its significance during the Civil War timeline (1860-1875) and its unique geographic location during the Civil War (TCWNHA, 2010a). The Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee are listed in Appendix A.

Sampling.

A convenience sample was used in this study. The subjects were individuals 18 years or older who had visited the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area at least once in the last three years. Cooper et al. (1993) suggested that an individual who is older than 16 can take responsibility for making travel decisions. Surveys were

distributed using two e-mail lists maintained by the agency that administers the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area (TCWNHA), where tourists submitted their contact information to receive an electronic newsletter and trip information. Using an e-mail list can enable one to overcome geographic constraints in order to survey remote participants who visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area in the past. Additionally, surveys were distributed to the members of selective heritage interest groups through social networking sites (i.e., Facebook). The selective heritage groups from Facebook were chosen according to key words such as "Civil War," "Heritage tourism," "Tennessee vacation," "Historical preservation," and "Cultural tourism."

Data collection.

Prior to the study, the researcher obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee (Appendix H). The sample was drawn from the list of tourists' e-mails provided by the Center for Historic Preservation. A permission letter to use the E-mail list was obtained from the Middle Tennessee State University Center for Historic Preservation (Appendix I). The researcher had received two lists of tourists' emails provided by the administrator of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area. Members of social networking groups were also surveyed. All participants were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation, informed that there were no risks to their participation, and assured confidentiality and anonymity regarding their responses through an inform consent form (See Appendix J). The questionnaire was posted online through SurveyMonkey, a software program for internet surveys. A modified Dillman method was used to conduct

the survey (Dillman, 2000). The first e-mail containing the study introduction, the

invitation to participate in the study, and the survey link was sent to the lists of

participants one week prior to activation of the survey link on SurveyMonkey. The

questionnaire was posted online for a total of five weeks in order to increase the

timeframe for recruiting enough participants to take the survey. The second week, a

second e-mail containing the survey link with the informed consent on the first page of

the survey was sent to participants to take the on-line survey. Participants were directed

to the SurveyMonkey website and were asked to complete the brief survey. When

respondents clicked "Continue" on the first page, they gave consent to their data being

used in this study, and they were able to access the rest of the questionnaire. Furthermore,

a statement was included on the first page of the survey that read, "Please complete this

survey only one time." This prevented overlapping samples. The third week, a reminder

e-mail with a survey link was sent to the participants to complete the online survey. In the

fifth week, a final message of thanks was delivered to the participants. At the end of that

week, the survey was removed from the link site. The same procedure and a modified

Dillman method was applied to conduct the survey for the heritage groups on Facebook.

All information, including the invitation and reminder letters, as well as the thank you

note, was posted on the discussion boards of each heritage group.

Data Analyses

All data collected to address the study hypotheses were coded, entered and

analyzed using the SPSS 18.0 program. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, means,

and standard deviations were employed to answer research question one: "What are the

socio -demographic (e.g., gender, age, residence, income, marital status, education, occupational status, and ethnicity), and past travel behavior (e.g., visitation frequency, the travel party make-up, the length of stay, trip motivation, and information resources) characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Exploratory factor analysis was employed to answer research question two: "What are the factors that comprise the cognitive component destination image of tourists who visit the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Internal reliability analysis was used to examine the construct reliability of destination image. For the best result of using exploratory data analysis, Nunnally (1978) suggested that the subject-to-item ratio for exploratory factor analysis should be 10:1, and Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) recommended that sample sizes for exploratory data analyses were sensitive at 286. However, Osborne & Costello (2004) cited that the minimum subject-to-item ratio recommended by Gorsuch (1983) and Hatcher (1994) should be set at least 5:1. Therefore, the sample size needed to be at least 150 to meet the basic criteria to test the hypotheses. Thus, because there were approximately 29 items that comprised the cognitive component of destination image, the estimated sample size for this hypothesis was 300 with a minimum of 150 or greater.

Multiple regression analysis was used to test research question three: "Do cognitive and affective components of destination image influence place attachment of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" and research question four: "Do cognitive and affective components of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding influence the

visitation intention of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c, and 4 were examined in this section. A number of respondents between 200 and 400 was recommended and accepted as the critical sample size for a multiple regression (Hair et. al., 1992). Therefore, the targeted usable sample size for these research questions and respective hypotheses was expected to be set at 400 with a minimum of 200. Simple regression was used to test research question five: "What is the relationship between cognitive and affective components of destination image to overall destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Hypothesis 5a was examined in this section. Hypothesis 5b was examined using multiple regression analysis. A t-test was used to investigate any differences for hypotheses 6a, 6b, and 6c for research question six: "Are there differences in overall destination image, place attachment, (place identity, place dependence, and social bonding) and visitation intention based on past travel behavior characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?"

In summary, a targeted sample size for the research study was expected at 300 with a minimum of 200, encompassing the suggested sizes for the exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression analyses. A confidence level for these analyses was set at 95 % (α = .05).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the major findings of this study. The results are summarized

in three sections: rate of response, sample characteristics, and hypotheses testing results.

Rate of Response

A total of 13,961 subjects were invited to participate in this study. Of these, 594

subjects were from the mailing list provided by the Center of Historical Preservation, and

an estimated 13,367 subjects were from the Facebook groups, including the Battle of

Franklin, Civil War Sesquicentennial Network, Civil War News, National Trust for

Historical Presentation, Civil War Roots, Civil War, Tennessee Civil War, Gozaic

Connecting Through Places That Matter, Tennessee National Heritage Area, Tennessee

State Museum, and the South Central Tennessee Tourism Association. From both e-mail

list and social networking sites, 314 participants agreed to complete the online survey,

making the participation rate in this survey 2.3 %. However, 108 of the 314

questionnaires were unusable due to failure to complete sections on place attachment,

destination image, and/or demographic information. Thus, a total of 206 participants

completed the on-line survey, making the response rate in this study 1.5 %. More

specifically, the participation rate for the e-mail list was 31.31 % (186 out of 594 cases

were collected) and for the social networking site (i.e. Facebook groups) 1 % (128 out of

13,367 cases were collected).

The total usable surveys yielded a response rate of 75.5 % for the e-mail sampling (146 out of 186 cases were usable) and 47.0 % for the social networking sites (i.e. Facebook groups) (60 out of 128 cases were usable).

Sample Characteristics

The first research question was: What are the socio -demographic characteristics and past travel behavior of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA? The socio-demographic characteristics included gender, age, residence, level of education, average yearly household income, marital status, occupation, race status, and residence. The average age of respondents was 49 (*SD* = 14.24). The oldest individual was 89 years old, and the youngest was 23 years old.

The sample consisted of slightly more female (51.9%) than male (48.1%) respondents. Nearly half of the participants (44.7%) had post-secondary education. An average annual household income that ranged from $50,000 to $74,999 was reported by 30.6 % of the participants; 30.1 % of the participants reported a household income greater than $75,000. The category of "other" addressed by the participants was unstable pay such as seasonal and hourly pay. The median household income, including tax, in the United States was $49,777 in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Thus, these results indicated the sample participants tended to have higher than average annual household incomes. In addition, nearly 70 % of the participants reported being married (See Table 1).

Table 1

Gender, Education, Income, and Marital Status

	n	*Percentage*
Gender (N = 206)		
Female	107	51.9
Male		
	99	48.1
Highest education		
Graduate School	92	44.7
4 years college	81	39.3
Tech or 2 years college	21	10.2
High School		
	12	5.8
Household yearly income		
$75,000 or more	62	30.1
$50,000 -$74,999	63	30.6
$25,000 -$49,999	48	23.3
$ less than 25,000	18	16.0
Other	15	7.3
Marital status		
Married	144	69.9
Single	62	30.1

Note: Other = unstable pay

The majority of participants worked full-time (69.9%); 12.1 % of participants were retired. With respect to residency, more than four-fifths of the participants reported residency in Tennessee (87.4 %). Regarding ethnicity, the majority of participants were Caucasian (88.8%); 5.8 % of the participants were Asian; a small percentage were African American (2.9%), and a much smaller percentage (2.5%) reported American Indian, Hispanic, and other ethnicities (See Table 2). Participant past and present travel behaviors are examined in this section. Past travel behaviors include past visitation frequency to Civil War heritage sites both within and outside of Middle Tennessee.

60

Table 2

Occupation, Residence, and Ethnicity

	n	*Percentage*
Occupation (N= 206)		
Full time	144	69.9
Retired	25	12.1
Part time	23	11.2
Unemployed	14	6.8
Residence		
Tennessee	180	87.4
Out-of-state	26	12.6
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	183	88.8
Asian	12	5.8
African American	6	2.9
American Indian, Hispanic and other	5	2.5

Participant past and present travel behaviors are examined in this section. Past travel behaviors include past visitation frequency to Civil War heritage sites both within and outside of Middle Tennessee. Recent visitation data includes frequency of visitation to Civil War sites inside Middle Tennessee, trip duration, information resources, and travel party make-up. More than half of the participants (55.3%) reported they had visited other Civil War heritage sites outside Middle Tennessee. In addition, the majority of the participants (91.7%) reported that they had visited Civil War heritage sites more than once in Middle Tennessee in the past three years. As for recent trips to the sites, more than half of participants (67%) were repeat visitors. With respect to the time duration of

the visits, more than half (60.7%) of the participants reported half-day or less than half-day trips (See Table 3).

As for travel information sources used by tourists, brochure was the most favored choice (52.9%), followed closely by family and friends (52.4%). Articles/news (39.3%) and the Internet (27.7%) were also frequently used. With regard to travel party make-up, nearly half of the participants (46.6%) reported traveling with family, followed by both family and friends (29.1%), friends (19.9%), organized trip (25.7%) (See Table 3).

Regarding motivation for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area, participants reported that the learning motivation (M = 4.21) was higher than the pleasure motivation (M = 4.00), socialization motivation (M = 2.76), opportunity to express personal values (M = 2.68), escape motivation (M = 2.66), and novel-seeking motivation (M = 2.42). The *alpha* value of the motivation construct was .605, indicating an acceptable reliability (See Table 4).

Participants indicated their average overall destination image tended to be positive (M = 5.56, SD = 1.43). In addition, participants indicated they are likely to revisit the site (M = 4.15, SD = 1.23) and are likely to recommend to others (M = 4.24, SD = 1.12) to visit the site.

Hypotheses Testing Results

The second research question was: What are the cognitive and affective factors that comprise destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA? Exploratory factor analysis was performed to examine cognitive components of destination image.

First, the 29 questions used to identify cognitive factors were subjected to a principle component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. Varimax rotation was used to refine the original factors matrix. The results of a principle component factors with Varimax rotation produced a solution of seven cognitive items with *eigenvalues* greater than one. The data analysis revealed seven cognitive factors: 1) Local unique Civil War attractions, 2) Entertainment, 3) Amenities, 4) Ease of access, 5) Attractive scenery and learning opportunities, 6) Well-preserved historic structures, and 7) Countryside attractions. These seven cognitive factors explained 68.2 % of the total variance.

Reliability was calculated using *Cronbach's alpha* to test the internal reliability of each cognitive factor. Items with factor loadings greater than .40 were selected to make up each cognitive factor. The results indicated that the *alpha* coefficients for the seven factors ranged from .61 to .89, indicating good reliability, as .50 is the minimum value for the reliability test (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Cognitive factor results are presented in Table 5.

Cognitive destination image factors.

Factor one—Local unique Civil War attractions. Nine items loaded on the local unique Civil War attractions. This dimension was named by the first two items that loaded high: 1) Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts, and cemeteries and 2) A variety of reenactments and demonstrations.

Table 3

Past Travel Behavior

	n	*Percentage*
Number of past trips to the sites outside Middle TN		
Yes	114	55.3
No	92	44.7
Number of past trips to the sites inside Middle TN		
2 -4	80	38.8
8 -10 or more	60	29.1
5 -7	47	22.8
1	19	9.3
Number of recent trips to the sites		
First time visitors	68	33.0
Repeat visitors	138	67.0
Trip duration		
Half day	95	46.1
One day	47	22.8
More than one day	34	16.5
Less than half day	30	14.6
Information resources [a]		
Brochure	109	52.9
Family and friends	108	52.4
Articles/News	81	39.3
Internet	57	27.7
Book/Movie	39	18.9
Advertisement	30	14.6
Tour operator	7	3.4
Travel agents	0	0
Travel party [a]		
Family (N = 206)	96	46.6
Friends (N = 206)	41	19.9
Both family and friends(n= 206)	60	29.1
Organized tours (N = 206)	53	25.7
Other (N = 206)	29	14.1

Note: N = 206

[a] n = 206. The total percentage adds up to more than 100% because participants could select multiple categories. The category of other indicated by the tourists were co-worker), history educators, and classmates.

Table 4

Travel Motivation

Statements	*M*	*SD*
Learning motivation	4.21	0.99
Pleasure motivation	4.00	0.97
Socialization motivation	2.76	1.25
Opportunity to express personal value	2.68	1.29
Escape motivation	2.66	1.26
Novel-Seeking motivation	2.42	1.12
Overall reliability		.605

Note: Scores measured with a 5-point Likert type scale, with 1 equal to strongly disagree and 5 equal to strongly agree.

The rest of the items, many interpretive sites, public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era, walking tour programs related to Civil War era, walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era, fame/ reputation, good opportunities for local tours, and souvenir shops were grouped together to present this factor. Local unique Civil War attractions had a *Cronbach alpha* of .89 with an *eigenvalue* of 10.50 and accounted for 15.73 % of the variance explained.

Factor two—Entertainment. Four items loaded on the entertainment dimension: 1) A variety of restaurants, 2) A variety of accommodations, 3) A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions, and 4) A variety of family–oriented activities. The entertainment dimension accounted for 12.5 % of the variance explained and had an *eigenvalue* of 2.57 and a *Cronbach alpha* of .81.

Factor three—Amenities. Four items loaded on the Amenities factor: 1) A variety of festivals and events, 2) A variety of tours and programs, 3) Living history, customs,

and culture, and 4) Plentiful museums. The amenities factor accounted for 11.26 % of the variance and had an *eigenvalue* of 1.72 with a *Cronbach alpha* of .83.

Factor four—Ease of access. Four items loaded on the ease of access dimension: 1) Good accessibility in terms of transportation, cost, and time, 2) Affordable price, 3) Friendly people, and 4) Ample local information. This dimension had a *Cronbach alpha* of .75 with an *eigenvalue* of 1.54, and it represented 9.37 % of the variance.

Factor five—Attractive scenery and learning opportunities. The attractive scenery and learning opportunities dimension was comprised of three items: 1) Attractive scenery and landscapes, 2) Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere, and 3) Opportunities for learning. The *Cronbach alpha* was .70 with an *eigenvalue* of 1.26 and accounted for 7.25 % of the variance.

Factor six—Well-preserved historic structures. This factor was comprised of three items: 1) Historical buildings, churches, and courthouses, 2) Well-preserved historic structures and landscapes, and 3) Plentiful historic houses and homes. Well-preserved historic structures had a *Cronbach alpha* of .71 with an *eigenvalue* of 1.17 and accounted for 6.44 % of the variance explained.

Factor seven—Countryside attractions. Two items loaded on this factor and comprised the countryside attractions dimension: 1) Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods and 2) Historical railroads related to the Civil War era. This dimension had an acceptable *Cronbach alpha* of 0.64 with an *eigenvalue* of 1.01, and it represented 5.60 % of the variance.

To provide further analysis, a grand mean for each of the seven factors was also computed. The seven cognitive factors with its grand mean were 1) Local unique Civil War attractions ($M = 3.26$; $SD = 1.04$) , 2) Entertainment ($M = 3.04$; $SD = 0.93$), 3) Amenities ($M = 3.08$; $SD = 1.03$), 4) Ease of access ($M = 3.80$; $SD = 1.01$), 5) Attractive scenery and learning opportunities ($M = 4.04$; $SD = 0.83$), 6) Well-preserved historic structures ($M = 3.41$; $SD = 0.80$), and 7) Countryside attractions ($M = 3.00$; $SD = 1.10$).

Affective destination image.

The mean, standard deviation, and reliability coefficients for affective attributes are presented in Table 6. The affective attributes with the highest rating included pleasant ($M = 5.65$, $SD = 1.38$) and relaxing ($M = 5.51$, $SD = 1.43$). Conversely, the affective attributes with the lowest rating included exciting ($M = 5.15$, $SD = 1.37$) and arousing ($M = 5.05$, $SD = 1.27$). Tourists' overall destination image of a Civil War heritage site tended to be positive ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 1.43$). Additionally, for affective destination image, a reliability of .89 was achieved, to measure the affective destination image of tourists who visit the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area.

The study identified seven cognitive factors. The seven cognitive factors consisted of local unique Civil War attractions, entertainment, amenities, ease of access, attractive scenery and learning opportunities, well-preserved historic structures, and countryside attractions. The four affective images based on participants' agreements were relaxing, pleasant, exciting, and arousing.

The third research question was: Do cognitive and affective components of destination image influence place attachment of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites

in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA? Three hypotheses were examined to test this research question.

Place attachment.

Place attachment, which included the three dimensions of place identity, place dependence, and social bonding, was identified from exploratory data analysis as well. In an effort to identify place attachment dimensions, sixteen place attachment items were subjected to a principle component factor analysis with Varimax rotation. The analysis produced a solution of three place attachment factors with *eigenvalues* greater than one. The above three place attachment factors explained 74.42 % of the total variance. Reliability analysis for each factor was examined. Items with factor loadings greater than .40 were selected from each place attachment factor. The results indicated that the *alpha* coefficient for three place attachment factors ranged from .57 to .94. All factors with reliability coefficients above .5 were considered to be acceptable in this study. The resultant place attachment factors can be seen in Table 7.

Factor one—Place Identity. Eight items were combined into one factor and entitled place identity due to the nature of related items. The eight factors were 1) I am very attached to this site, 2) I identify strongly with this site, 3) This site means a lot to me, 4) This site is very special to me, 5) I have a special connection to the site and the people who visit here, 6) I have a lot of fond memories about this site,7) I feel like this site is part of me, and 8) Visiting this site says a lot about who I am. The place identity dimension accounted for 34.81 % of the variance with a reliability coefficient of .94 and had an *eigenvalue* of 8.63.

Table 5

Factor Loading for Exploratory Analysis With Varimax Rotation of Cognitive Attributes

Statements	Local unique Civil War attractions	Entertainment	Amenities	Ease of access	Attractive scenery/ learning opportunity	Well-preserved historic structures	Country-side attract-ions
Mean	3.26	3.04	3.08	3.80	4.04	3.41	2.90
A variety of reenactments and demonstrations	**.743**	.249	.311	.062	.154	-.108	.084
Many interpretive sites	**.693**	.211	.261	.104	.081	.214	.100
Public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era	**.634**	.088	.047	.074	.221	.469	.086
Walking tour programs related to Civil War era	**.624**	.165	.193	.337	.196	-.029	.158
Walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era	**.584**	.129	.093	.359	.126	-.077	.467
Fame/ Reputation	**.552**	.010	.257	.154	.141	.111	-.349
Good opportunities for local tours	**.485**	.435	.128	.393	.022	.003	-.228
Souvenir shops	**.472**	.414	.265	.027	.248	-.047	.222
A variety of restaurants	.103	**.812**	.061	.073	-.064	.161	.102
A variety of accommodations	.118	**.799**	.139	.185	.010	.190	.086
A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions	.102	**.599**	.285	-.126	.392	-.006	.139
A variety of family-oriented activities	.409	**.520**	.431	.071	.280	-.125	.001
A variety of festivals and events	.098	.177	**.802**	.233	-.031	-.016	.058
A variety of tours and programs	.343	.168	**.764**	.173	-.014	.067	.024
A living history, customs, and culture	.260	.091	**.726**	.078	.029	.297	.113
Plentiful museums	.230	.430	**.502**	-.150	.162	.303	.010

Note: Cognitive Destination Image was measured with a 5-point Likert type scale, with 1 equal to "strongly disagree," 3 equal to "neutral," and 5 equal to "strongly agree."
Items in bold were used to formulate composite scales.

Table 5

Factor Loading for Exploratory Analysis With Varimax Rotation of Cognitive Attributes

Statements	Local unique Civil War attractions	Entertainment	Amenities	Ease of access	Attractive scenery/ learning oppor- tunity	Well- preserved historic structures	Country- side attract- tions
Good accessibility in terms of transportation, cost, and time	.142	.148	.134	**.750**	.205	-.023	.129
Affordable price	.148	-.012	.008	**.742**	.100	.097	.067
Friendly people	.139	-.006	.350	**.537**	.267	.322	.120
Ample local information	.190	.422	.354	**.451**	.128	.214	.054
Attractive scenery and landscapes	.160	.249	.032	.186	**.753**	.053	.163
Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere	.219	-.141	-.014	.193	**.675**	.099	.191
Opportunities for learning	.349	.124	.036	.395	**.560**	.127	-.198
Historical buildings, churches, and courthouses	.033	.451	.188	.265	-.021	**.642**	.017
Well preserved historic structures and landscapes	.460	.059	.157	.299	.182	**.573**	-.002
Plentiful historic houses and homes	.096	.389	.486	-.252	.151	**.521**	.028
Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods	.146	.146	.116	.191	.266	.113	**.769**
Historical railroads related to the Civil War era	.253	.501	.146	.056	.055	-.008	**.540**
Valid number of cases	206	206	206	206	206	206	206
Percentage of variance explained	15.73	12.50	11.26	9.37	7.25	6.44	5.60
Cumulative variance explained	15.73	28.23	39.50	48.87	56.12	62.56	68.16
Eigenvalues	10.50	2.57	1.72	1.54	1.26	1.17	1.01
Cronbach alpha	.89	.81	.83	.75	.70	.71	.64
Alpha				.94			

Note. Cognitive Destination Image was measured with a 5-point Likert type scale, with 1 equal to "strongly disagree," 3 equal to "neutral, " and 5 equal to "strongly agree."
Factors in bold were used to formulate composite scales.

Table 6

Affective Destination Image (N = 206)

Image Item	*M*	*SD*	*Cronbach alpha*
Affective attributes [a]			.89
Unpleasant☐Pleasant	5.65	1.38	
Distressing☐Relaxing	5.51	1.43	
Gloomy☐Exciting	5.15	1.37	
Sleepy☐Arousing	5.05	1.27	
Overall destination image [b]	5.56	1.43	

Note: [a] Scores measured with a 7-point scale ranging from 1, negative affective image, to 7, positive affective image.

Factor two—Place Dependence. Six items comprised the place dependence factor: 1) I wouldn't substitute any other site for doing the types of things I do here, 2) Doing what I do here is more important to me than doing it in any other place, 3) I get more satisfaction out of visiting this site than from visiting any other area, 4) Visiting this site is more important than visiting any other place, 5) No other place can compare to this site, and 6) This site is the best place for what I like to do. This dimension accounted for 30.91 % of the variance with a reliability coefficient of .93 and an *eigenvalue* of 2.25.

Factor three—Social Bonding. Two items, "I do not tell many people about this site" and "I will bring people whom I care about to this site" were together to present one factor "social bonding." This dimension accounted for 8.71 % of the variance with a reliability coefficient of .57. It had an *eigenvalue* of 1.03.

This study found three factors of place attachment for heritage tourists. The three factors were place identity, place dependence, and social bonding. To conduct a more

extensive analysis, a grand mean for each of the three place attachment dimensions was also computed. The three dimensions with its grand mean were 1) Place identity (M = 3.20; SD = 1.30), 2) Place dependence (M = 2.19; SD = 1.10), 3) Social bonding (M = 3.85; SD = 0.91).

Hypothesis 3a stated that cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict place identity for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA. The researcher used multiple regression analysis with "Enter all" method to examine hypothesis 3a. Seven cognitive factors and four affective images were treated as independent variables to predict place identity (See Table 8 for descriptive Statistics). Multiple regression analysis was used to test if the cognitive and affective images significantly predicted tourists' place identity (See Table 9). The results of the regression in Table 9 indicated the eleven predictors together explained 18.3 % of the variance (Adj R^2 = .183, F (11, 194) = 5.171, p < .001). However, there is no significant single variable to predict place identity. By examining the collinearity diagnostics, the results indicated that condition index showed the value, 43.90, which was over 30.00. That result indicated that multicollinearity existed between the relaxing (.81) and pleasant (.93) variables, as well as between ease of access (.53) and attractive scenery/learning opportunity (.51) variables. Relaxing and ease of access were excluded from the model and the regression model was re-estimated.

Table 7

Factor Loading for Exploratory Analysis With Varimax Rotation of Place Attachment

Statements	Place Identity M = 3.20	Place Dependence M = 2.19	Social Bonding M = 3.85
I am very attached to this site	**.879**	.221	.184
I identify strongly with this site	**.862**	.263	.125
This site means a lot to me	**.828**	.145	.262
This site is very special to me	**.824**	.296	.187
I have a special connection to the site and the people who visit here	**.763**	.289	-.030
I have a lot of fond memories about this site	**.733**	.223	-.016
I feel like this site is part of me	**.732**	.469	.007
Visiting this site says a lot about who I am	**.554**	.495	.175
I wouldn't substitute any other site for doing the types of things I do here	.179	**.839**	.132
Doing what I do here is more important to me than doing it in any other place	.347	**.838**	.036
I get more satisfaction out of visiting this site than from visiting any other area	.247	**.827**	.035
Visiting this site is more important than visiting any other place	.332	**.823**	.001
No other place can compare to this site	.172	**.818**	-.127
This site is the best place for what I like to do	.258	**.804**	.127
I do not tell many people about this site [a]	.114	-.033	**.921**
I will bring people whom I care about to this site	.543	.199	**.555**
Valid number of cases	206	206	206
Percentage of variance explained	34.81	30.91	8.71
Cumulative variance explained	34.81	65.72	74.42
Eigenvalues	8.63	2.25	1.03
Cronbach alpha	.94	.93	.57
			.94

Note: Place attachment was measured with a 5-point Likert- type scale, with 1 equal to strongly disagree, 3 equal to neutral, and 5 equal to strongly agree.
[a] An item was reverse coded but was the same as a statement in an online survey.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for All Variables (N = 206)

Variables	M	SD
Attractive scenery/learning opportunity	4.04	0.83
Ease of access	3.80	1.01
Well-preserved historic culture	3.41	0.80
Local unique Civil War attractions	3.26	1.04
Amenities	3.08	1.03
Entertainment	3.04	0.93
Countryside attractions	3.0	1.10
Relaxing	5.51	1.15
Pleasant	5.65	1.43
Exciting	5.15	1.38
Arousing	5.05	1.37
Place identity	3.20	1.30
Social bonding	3.85	0.91
Place dependence	2.19	1.00
Overall destination image	5.56	1.43
Visitation intention	4.19	1.10
Cognitive image	3.40	0.72
Affective image	5.34	1.32

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that the nine predictors

(local unique Civil War attractions, entertainment, amenities, attractive scenery/learning

opportunity, well-preserved historic structures, countryside attractions, pleasant, exciting,

and arousing) can significantly predict place identity (Adj R^2 = .184, F (9, 196) = 6.148, p

< .001). It was found that "amenities" significantly predicted place identity (β = .183, p

= .047) (See Table 9). The results provide limited support for hypothesis 3a, indicating

that one cognitive component of destination image (i.e., amenities) was a significant

predictor of place identity.

Hypothesis 3b stated that cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict place dependence for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA. Multiple regression analysis was used to test if the cognitive and affective images significantly predicted tourists' place dependence. The results of regression indicated the eleven predictors together explained 12 % of variance (Adj R^2 = .120, F (11, 194) = 3.545, p < .001). It was found that "Local unique Civil War attractions" significantly predicted place dependence (ß = .219, p = .036) (See Table 10). Therefore, the results only partially supported hypothesis 3b, indicating that cognitive and affective components of destination image were significant predictors of place dependence.

Hypothesis 3c stated that cognitive and affective components of destination image significantly predict social bonding for tourists who visit the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA. Multiple regression analysis was used to test if the cognitive and affective images significantly predicted tourists' social bonding. The results of regression indicated the eleven predictors together explained 20.6 % of variance (Adj R^2 = .206, F (11, 194) = 5.840, p < .001). It was found that "local specific Civil War attractions" significantly predicted social bonding (β = .216, p = .030), as did "entertainment (β = −.259, p = .004)," "ease of access (β = .369, p < .001)," and "exciting affective image (β = .206, p = .042)" (See Table 11). Therefore, the results support hypothesis 3c, indicating that cognitive and affective components of destination image were significant predictors of social bonding.

Table 9

Regression Model for Predicting Place Identity

Variable	B	SE	β	95% CI B
Constant	.210	.475		[-0.727, 1.147]
Local unique Civil War attractions	.092	.112	.083	[-0.128, 0.313]
Entertainment	-.098	.091	-.097	[-0278, 0.082]
Amenities	.180	.095	.174	[-0.008, 0.368]
Ease of access	.137	.111	.110	[-0.083, 0.357]
Attractive scenery/learning opportunity	.142	.107	.110	[-0.069, 0.354]
Well-preserved historic structure	.051	.082	.054	[-1.111, 0.213]
Countryside attractions	.087	.072	.095	[-0.056, 0.230]
Relaxing	.031	.100	.042	[-0.226, 0223]
Pleasant	-.002	.114	-.002	[-0.166, 0.227]
Exciting	.064	078	.085	[-0.088, 0.217]
Arousing	.080	.070	.098	[-0.059, 0.219]
$R = .476$ $R^2 = .227$ Adj $R^2 = .183$				

* $p < .05$

Table 10

Regression Model for Predicting Place Dependence

Variable	B	SE	β	95% CI B
Constant	4.94	.467		[-0.426, 1.414]
Local unique Civil War attractions	.231	.110	.219*	[0.015, 0.448]
Entertainment	-021	.090	-.022	[-0.198, 0.156]
Amenities	.172	.094	.176	[-0.012, 0.357]
Ease of access	.094	.109	.079	[-0.122, 0.309]
attractive scenery/learning opportunity	-.085	.105	-.069	[-0.293, 0.123]
Well-preserved historic structure	-018	.081	-.020	[-0.177, 0.142]
Countryside attractions	-.008	.071	-.010	[-0.149, 0.132]
Relaxing	-.019	.098	-.027	[-0.237, 0.204]
Pleasant	-.016	.112	-.023	[-0.212, 0.174]
Exciting	.122	.076	.170	[-0.028, 0.272]
Arousing	.023	.069	.030	[-0.113, 0.160]
$R = .409$ $R^2 = .167$ Adj $R^2 = .120$				

* $p < .05$

75

Table 11

Regression Model for Predicting Social Bonding

Variable	B	SE	β	95% CI B
Constant	1.764	.413		[0.950, 2.578]
Local unique Civil War attractions	.212	.097	.216*	[0.021, 0.404]
Entertainment	-.231	.079	-.259*	[-0.387, -0.074]
Amenities	-.109	.083	-.120	[-0.273, 0.054]
Ease of access	.407	.097	.369**	[0.216, 0.598]
Attractive Scenery/learning opportunity	.012	.093	.010	[-0.172, 0.196]
Well preserved historic structure	.025	.071	.030	[-0.116, 0.166]
Countryside attractions	.073	.063	.091	[-0.051, 0.197]
Relaxing	.045	.086	.071	[-0.255, 0.135]
Pleasant	-.060	.099	-.090	[0.125, 0.216]
Exciting*	.138	.067	.206*	[0.555, 0.271]
Arousing	-.018	.061	-.024	[-0.138, 0.103]
$R = .499$ $R^2 = .249$ Adj $R^2 = .206$				

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

In summary, the results provided support for hypotheses 3 a, 3b, and 3c, showing that cognitive and affective components of destination image were significant predictors of place attachment components.

The fourth research question was: Do cognitive and affective components of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding influence the visitation intention of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA? Multiple regression analysis with enter all method was used to examine hypothesis 4. Seven cognitive factors, four affective images, and three dimensions of place attachment were treated as independent variables to predict visitation intention. Multiple regression analysis was used to test if cognitive and affective

cognitive image and affective image were treated as independent variables to predict

overall destination image.

Table 12

Regression Model for Predicting Visitation Intention

Variable	B	SE	β	95% CI B
Constant	.981	.465		[0.064, 1.899]
Local unique Civil War attractions	.148	.106	.125	[-0.061, 0.357]
Entertainment	.021	.086	.019	[-0.150, 0.191]
Amenities	-.186	.090	-.169*	[-0.364,- 0.07]
Ease of access	.149	.108	.112	[-0.064, 0.362]
Attractive Scenery/learning opportunity	.164	.101	.119	[-0.034, 0.363]
Well preserved historic structure	.111	.076	.111	[-0.040, 0.261]
Countryside attractions	-.166	.068	-.173**	[-0.299, -0.033]
Relaxing	.058	.092	.075	[-0.245, 0.172]
Pleasant	-.036	.106	-.046	[-0.124, 0.240]
Exciting	.003	.073	.004	[-0.141, 0.147]
Arousing	-.041	.066	-.047	[-0.171, 0.088]
Place identity	.371	.088	.350**	[-0.197, 0.544]
Place dependence	-.148	.082	-.132	[-0310, 0.014]
Social bonding	.348	.085	.290**	[0.180, 0.517]
	$R = .646$	$R^2 = .418$		$Adj\ R^2 = .375$

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .001$

Multiple regression analysis was used to test if the cognitive and affective

destination images significantly predicted tourists' overall destination image. The results

of the regression analysis indicated the cognitive and affective images together explained

26.2 % of the variance (Adj R^2 = .262, F (2, 203) = 37.476, $p < .001$). The data revealed

that cognitive image significantly predicted overall destination image (β = .40, $p < .001$),

as did affective image (β = .285, $p < .001$) (See Table 13). The results provided partial

support of hypothesis 5a and 5b, showing that cognitive and affective components of destination image were significant predictors of tourists' overall destination image.

Table 13

Regression Model for Predicting Overall Destination Image

Variable	B	STD	β	95% CI B
Constant	.950	.547		[-0.129, 2.028]
Cognitive destination image	.810	.119	.410**	[0.576, 1.044]
Affective destination image	.354	.075	.285**	[0.207, 0.502]
	$R = .519$	$R^2 = .270$	Adj $R^2 = .262$	

* p < .05 ** p < .01

The sixth research question was "Are there differences in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention based on select past travel behavior characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" A *t*-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between first-time and repeat visitors in overall destination image to examine Hypothesis 6a. Using an *alpha* of .05, the independent *t*-test indicated the average overall destination image for first-time visitors ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.54$) was significantly different than the average overall destination image for repeat visitors ($M = 5.86$, $SD = 1.28$), t (204) = -4.098, $p < .001$). Repeat visitors reported more positive overall destination image than first-time visitors.

A *t*-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between first-time and repeat visitors in place attachment (i.e., place identity, place dependence, social bonding) for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee

region to examine Hypothesis 6b. The independent *t*- test indicated the average place

identity for first-time visitors (M = 2.57, SD = 0.85) was significantly different than the

average place identity for repeat visitors (M = 3.49, SD = 1.0), t (204) = −6.516, p <

.001). Repeat visitors reported higher place identity than first-time visitors. Repeat

visitors (M = 2.3, SD = 1.0) reported higher place dependence than first-time visitors (M

= 2.0, SD = 0.9): t (204) = −2.083, p < .001). Repeat visitors (M = 4 07, SD = 1 22)

reported higher social bonding than first-time visitors (M = 3.40, SD = 1.0; t (204) =

−5.213, p < .001) (See Table 14).

Table 14

Relationships Between Tourists' Past Travel Behaviors (Visitation Status) and Overall Destination Image, Place Attachment, and Visitation Intention

	n	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*d*
Overall destination image						
First-time visitors	68	4.97	1.54	4.098	204	0.63
Repeat visitors	138	5.86	1.28			
Place identity						
First-time visitors	68	2.57	0.85	6.516	204	1.0
Repeat visitors	138	3.49	1.0			
Place dependence						
First-time visitors	68	2.0	0.9	2.083	204	0.32
Repeat visitors	138	2.3	1.0			
Social bonding						
First-time visitors	68	3.40	1.22	5.213	204	0.60
Repeat visitors	138	4.07	1.22			
Visitation intention						
First-time visitors	68	3.61	1.22	5.222	204	0.81
Repeat visitors	138	4.48	0.92			

Note: d = .2 indicating small effect size; d = .5 indicating medium effect size; d = .8 indicating large effect size

In summary, it was found that there was a significant difference between first-time and repeat visitors in place attachment (place identity, place dependence, and social bonding) for tourists who visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region. The effect size for visitation intention was the largest among other predictors.

An independent t-test was used to determine whether there was a significant difference between first-time and repeat visitors in visitation intention for tourists who visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region to examine Hypothesis 6c. The results indicated that repeat visitors reported higher visitation intention than first-time visitors did.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Chapter five consists of four sections. The first section summarizes the findings

on tourists' characteristics and the results of the research questions and hypotheses. The

second section includes the discussion and theoretical implications of those findings,

while the third section considers the practical implications of this study. Lastly, the fourth

section addresses limitations and provides suggestions for future research.

Summary

Tourist characteristics.

The study participants consisted of heritage tourists visiting Civil War heritage

sites in Middle Tennessee within the past three years. The majority of the participants

reported being married and were 49 years old on average. There were slightly more

female tourists than male tourists, and most lived in the state of Tennessee. Most of the

tourists were Caucasian, graduate-school educated, held full-time jobs, and had an

average annual household income of at least $50,000. Participants reported that the most

frequently identified motivation for their travel to Civil War heritage sites is learning.

Respondents had a positive overall destination image toward the sites and were likely to

revisit the sites in the future.

Tourist past travel behaviors.

The average number of past trips to Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee

taken by this group during the previous three years was between two to four trips.

The majority of participants were repeat visitors to the sites in Middle Tennessee. Participants spent a half day in the sites and typically obtained trip information from brochures and their friends/family. The majority of participants traveled with their family to Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee.

Summary of research findings.

Research question two asked "What are the cognitive and affective factors that comprise the destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region?" To answer this question, an exploratory factor analysis was used to identify cognitive image factors. This study identified seven cognitive attributes: 1) Local unique Civil War attractions, 2) Entertainment, 3) Amenities, 4) Ease of access, 5) Attractive scenery and learning opportunity, 6) Well-preserved historic structures, and 7) Countryside attractions. In addition, four affective image factors were identified: 1) Relaxing, 2) Pleasant, 3) Exciting, and 4) Arousing.

Research question three queried "Do cognitive and affective components of destination image influence place attachment of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Results were ambiguous for hypothesis 3a which examined place identity. This may be due to the existence of multicollinearity in the pleasant and relaxing predictors. Only one cognitive attribute, local unique Civil War attractions, predicted place dependence in hypothesis 3b.

Three predictors (local unique Civil War attractions, ease of access, and exciting affective image) positively predicted social bonding, and one predictor (entertainment) negatively predicted social bonding in hypothesis 3c. Additionally, the result indicated

the effect size for the cognitive and affective images to social bonding was near large (R^2 = .21 < .26).

Research question four asked "Does the cognitive component of destination image, the affective component of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding significantly predict visitation intentions of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Multiple regression analysis was employed to address this question. The results revealed that cognitive and affective components of destination image, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding were significant predictors of tourists' visitation intention. Additionally, the result indicated the effect size for the cognitive, affective images and place attachment to the visitation intention was large (R^2 = .375 > .26).

Research question five inquired "What is the relationship between cognitive and affective components of destination image to overall destination image of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA?" Simple regression was used to answer this question. The result indicated cognitive image did not significantly predict affective image of heritage tourists. However, cognitive and affective images significantly predicted visitation intention. The result indicated the effect size for the cognitive and affective images to overall destination image was large (R^2 = .26).

A t-test was conducted to answer the sixth research question: Are there differences in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention based on select past travel behavior characteristics of tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites

in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA? The results revealed that there were significant differences in overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention between first-time and repeat visitors. Repeat visitors reported higher overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention than first-time visitors. The range of effect size for overall destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention to the types of tourists' group (first-time visitors and repeat visitors) were between small ($d = .32$) to large ($d = .81$).

Theoretical Implications

This study attempted to explore the cognitive and affective components of destination image for tourists who visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the TCWNHA. The study supported that destination image is multi-dimensional, consisting of cognitive and affective evaluation of place which is consistent with previous studies (Lin et al., 2007; Martin & Bosque, 2007). The combined method of using structured and unstructured techniques was adopted to capture more holistic and unique components of destination image in this study. Based on the research of Echtner and Ritchie (2003), a focus group interview was recommended to collect the cognitive image attributes in order to design the instrument to measure destination image. In the present study, the focus group identified several tangible and intangible resources specific to the Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. With respect to the development of cognitive attributes of destination image, the focus group identified several unique attributes, such as a variety of reenactments and demonstrations, public and private preserved spaces related to the Civil War era, many interpretive sites, and walking trails

and trails with signage related to the Civil War era. These items tended to be more unique characteristics of the sites.

The scale of affective image previously developed by Baloglu and Brinberg (1997) has been utilized in a variety of destination settings. It, however, has not been tested with Civil War heritage sites. Therefore, it was worthwhile to utilize this instrument in this study. The present study showed that the result was consistent with previous studies and confirmed the scale of affective image with good reliability (e.g., Baloglu, & Brinnberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Lin et al., 2007; Walmsley & Jenkins, 1993). Additionally, however, the results from the focus group interviews conducted in the present study have provided insights on how Civil War heritage tourists feel about the sites. That is, the focus group discussion has given an alternative perspective on the affective image of heritage tourists who visit these sites. The majority of the focus group participants indicated that their feeling toward the sites can be described as "respect and understanding." The focus group stated that their feeling toward the sites was not celebratory but rather to gain an understanding of the past history of the sites. The focus group interview results helped to explore possible affective expressions that may be useful in measuring Civil War heritage tourists' affective image in future studies. It would be interesting to develop a more targeted measurement of affective image in a future study.

This present study supported that destination image of Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee should be composed of two dimensions: cognitive and affective components. Using the instrument of cognitive attributes developed by the mixed

method, seven cognitive components of destination image were identified according to the characteristics of each item. Among the seven cognitive attributes, attractive scenery/ learning opportunity was given the highest score, followed by ease of access, well-preserved historic structures, local unique Civil War attractions, amenities, entertainment, and countryside attractions. By looking at the items closely, attractive scenery, peaceful/tranquil atmosphere, and learning opportunities tended to be psychological in nature. The item, attractive scenery, provided an appealing site characteristic to attract tourists visiting the sites; the second item, peaceful/tranquil, described how tourists perceived the site; the third item, learning opportunities, described how tourists think of the site. The three items are close to internal psychological variables of motivation and perception (Echtner & Ritchie, 2003; Mayo& Jarvis, 1981). These factors tended to be more intangible resources (psychological driver) that influenced heritage tourists' perceptions about the site. Therefore, the cognitive components of destination image should be composed of not only physical attributes but also psychological attributes derived from the tourists' side.

Baloglu and McCleary (1999b) proposed that cognitive and affective image comprised overall destination image. Moreover, the researchers proposed that affective image served as a mediating variable between cognitive image and overall destination image. Therefore, this researcher attempted to examine the relationship between cognitive and affective images and the relationship between cognitive and affective images and overall destination image. The findings of the current study only partially support Baloglu and McCleary's proposed model and Martine and Bosque's (2008)

findings that tourists' cognitive images directly influence tourists' affective images. Cognitive attributes in this study did not significantly predict affective image. This may be due to the small sample size of this study. Another possible explanation could be that the affective components of destination image used in this study did not accurately measure the feelings experienced by heritage tourists to Civil War heritage sites; the affective images identified by the focus group members differed from the affective attributes used in the questionnaire. Additionally, cognitive and affective images did significantly predict overall destination image, which indicates that cognitive and affective image should be examined at the same time while measuring tourists' overall destination image specific to Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee.

In Woodside and Lysonski's (1989) model, destination preferences are an antecedent to intention to visit, while the affective image is an antecedent to destination preference. Lin et al. (2007) proposed that overall destination image is an antecedent of the destination preference model by integrating cognitive image and affective image to present overall destination image. Therefore, in this study, the researcher attempted to explore the relationship between cognitive and affective image and overall destination image in the Civil War Heritage site setting. Although cognitive image did not significantly predict affective image in the Civil War heritage setting, cognitive and affective image together can significantly predict overall destination image. This finding implies cognitive image still influenced overall destination image as affective image does. Hence, this study supports the findings of Morais, Kerstetter and Hou (2007) that overall destination image is comprised of both cognitive and affective image.

The relationship between place attachment and visitation intention has been documented in some recreation settings (e.g., Chen & Tsau, 2007; Kaplanidou & Vogt, 2007; Sonmez & Sirakaya, 2002). However, to date, Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee have not been examined. In line with Woodside and Lysonski's (1989) model, this study explored the antecedents of visitation intention by incorporating two concepts, destination image and place attachment. In this study, the relationships among destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention have been examined simultaneously. The results indicated that incorporating two concepts of place attachment and destination image to predict visitation intention can help to understand tourists' behaviors. This study also found that variables in the cognitive and affective components of destination image such as amenities and countryside attractions and place attachment, such as place identity and social bonding, can significantly predict tourists' visitation intention specific to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area. Therefore, destination marketing organizations could develop promotional packages incorporating these identified attributes to increase tourists' visitation intention.

The concept of place attachment has been examined in several recreation settings. However, the present investigation is the first study to examine place attachment in Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. Previous research indicated that the three dimensions of place attachment are stable across different settings (Kyle, Graefe, & Manning, 2005). The current study also found that three dimensions of place attachment, place identity, place dependence, and social bonding, are relevant to tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. Based on the findings of the present study,

it appears place attachment plays an important role in influencing visitation intention. Therefore, incorporating the concept of place attachment into the cognitive-affective framework can facilitate a better understanding of the formulation of heritage tourists' visitation intention. This study also indicated that local unique attractions significantly predict place dependence. Additionally, unique local attractions, entertainment, ease of access, and exciting (as an affective component) significantly predict social bonding. Although there is no single cognitive and affective image variable that can predict place identity, the present study found that a combination of cognitive and affective image components significantly predicts place identity. A possible explanation for no single variable that predicted place identity in this study may be due to the multicollinearity relationship between the pleasant and relaxing affective images that existed in this measurement scale. Hence, shortening the instrument by deleting either the pleasant or relaxing affective image is recommended for future studies that measure Civil War heritage tourists' affective image.

According to the findings of Hou et al. (2005), place meaning is different among various types of tourists. Hakka visitors developed a symbolic meaning to the Hakka village. In this study, two types of tourists were classified by tourist' selective past travel behavior (i.e., visitation status). The results showed that there are significant differences between first-time and repeat-visitors on overall destination image, place identity, place dependence, social bonding, and visitation intention. That is, different types of tourists have different perceived images, different attachments, and different visitation intentions to the sites in Middle Tennessee. The finding of the current study is not consistent with

Hou et al. (2005) which stated that repeated visitors developed higher symbolic meaning to the sites and lower functional meaning to the sites than the first-time visitors. This result implied that, in general, repeat visitors developed higher place attachment, overall destination image, and visitation intention. More investigations that focus on different types of tourists in the Civil War heritage sites are encouraged, and studies that focus on the travel decision-making processes among different groups are needed in the future.

Practical Implications

The current study supported that the framework of cognitive and affective destination image could be applied to the study of Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region. According to Chen and Tsai (2006), destination image is the most important variable that influences tourists' visitation intentions. That is, improving tourists' destination image can increase tourists' visitation intention. Therefore, knowing which cognitive and affective components have the most profound effects on destination image can increase understanding of how to attract people to revisit places. Klenoky, LeBlanc, Vogt, and Schroeder (2007) suggested that exploring the possible relationship between place attachment and visitation intention could provide more insight to understand tourists' decision-making processes. In this current study, tourists with higher attachment to the place tended to re-visit the sites more often. Tourists with higher place attachment agreement on place identity and social bonding and with lower destination image agreement on amenities and countryside attractions tended to have higher visitation intention to the Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. In other words, tourists who developed higher symbolic meaning and a social connection with sites and

who perceived less commercial tourism promotion, such as a variety of advertisements and tourist sites, tended to revisit Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. Place attachment is an emotional construct that can provide more insights on why people revisit the sites. According to Mark (2009), repeat visitors who experienced an interpretive program had higher place attachment than first-time visitors. Therefore, knowing which place dimensions have the most important effects on visitation intention can provide useful information to design better promotional packages for the tourists. Namely, knowing which cognitive and affective destination images have the most important effects on place attachment can provide useful information for developing effective marketing strategies to strengthen repeat visitors' bonding to the places and to encourage first-time visitors to become repeat visitors. This study also found that place attachment was composed of three dimensions, including place identity, place dependence, and social bonding, for tourists who visit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area.

The study results revealed that the local unique heritage Civil War attractions were significant variables to predict place dependence. Hence, facilitating information about local unique Civil War attractions to tourists could enhance tourists' dependence on the sites. Marketing promotion packages should focus on developing a better picture of local unique Civil War resources that can enhance tourists' place dependence to the sites. Namely, marketing promotion packages should facilitate information about local unique heritage Civil War attractions and local accessibilities, in terms of transportation, cost, location, and people; providing an exciting travel experience and lessening the focus on

the commercial aspects of the site can enhance tourists' social bonding to the sites. To strengthen tourists' visitation intention, marketing packages should provide less information about commercial tourism development and more information about tourists' personal and social connections related to the sites. According to the additional information revealed from focus group members regarding their feelings toward the sites, a recommended marketing strategy may be to use "testimonials" to provide the link between the tourists and the sites to enhance tourists' place attachment to the site. Promotional efforts should also be directed to different types of tourists, including first-time and repeat visitors.

General Conclusion

Overall, the findings showed that the three concepts of destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention can be applicable to heritage tourism in general and specifically to the Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. More specifically, the cognitive-affective framework may provide a better understanding of tourists' conceptualization of destination image. Tourists' destination image should be comprised of two dimensions, cognitive and affective (Baloglu, 2001; Baloglu & Brinberg, 1997; Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Kim & Richardson, 2003; Lin et al., 2007; Martin & Bosque, 2008). This present study also identified several components of cognitive and affective destination images for Civil War heritage sites in Middle Tennessee. However, this study did not support a direct effect of the cognitive image to affective image found in previous studies (e.g., Baloglu & McCleary, 1999b; Echtner & Ritchie, 2003; Lin et al., 2007; Martin & Bosque, 2008). However, the findings suggested that the cognitive

image still plays an important role in formulating tourists' overall destination image.

Additionally, this researcher attempted to develop an instrument to measure tourists'

cognitive destination image. The findings suggest that a two-step method, structured and

unstructured interviews, can provide more insights for generating a more complete and

holistic attributes list of the site and generating alternative affective components of

destination image. The additional useful information obtained from focus group

discussion on tourists' feelings about the sites (i.e., affective components of destination

image) was about the respect, understanding, and appreciation of the heritage. That is,

both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies are necessary to identify the

destination image. The findings also revealed that three dimensions of place attachment

existed for tourists who visit Civil War Heritage sites: place identity, place dependence,

and social bonding. The last finding is that the cognitive-affective framework may

provide a better understanding of tourists' travel decision-making among different types

of tourists (first-time and repeat visitors).

Limitations and Future Studies

The first limitation of this study was associated with the sampling frame. Only

tourists who were in the electronic mailing list of the website of the Tennessee Civil War

National Heritage Area and who were members of heritage groups on Facebook were

selected for inclusion in this study. If other heritage groups such as on-site visitors, had

participated in this study, the responses might have been different. However, one of the

limiting factors of choosing to work with on-site visitors to national Civil War heritage

sites is the timeframe needed to complete the research approval process required by

federal regulating agencies. Thus, the generalizability of the findings was limited to

Internet-savvy populations. Future research would be needed to sample a wider diversity

of tourists, including offline, on-site tourists, so that the researcher can validate claims

made in this study about the factors of destination image and place attachment.

Additionally, few subjects actually participated in the study. This might be explained by

certain features of Facebook, such as the "Like" button or the default setting. It is

possible that many people clicked "like" for the group page to be a member of that group,

only to neglect it thereafter. Rarely visited Facebook pages caused difficulties in audience

outreach, even though the number of memberships in each heritage group on Facebook

was high. A possible recommendation for future researchers would be to request the

administrators of each target heritage group on Facebook to send the survey invitation

letter on behalf of the researcher, through the message function in Facebook, rather than

simply posting the survey link in the post discussion board.

A second limitation of this study may be the narrow geographic region chosen for

the study site. Tennessee has the second highest rate of visitation specific to Civil War

tourism in the United States and is considered a "hot spot" for heritage tourism. However,

this study site was limited to the Middle Tennessee region. If Civil War heritage sites of

other regions in Tennessee, as well as sites in other geographic regions of the country,

were included, the results may differ. Hence, the highly localized findings were

applicable to Middle Tennessee only. Including Civil War sites from more geographic

regions could provide a more general perspective of heritage tourism and the relevance of

the concepts addressed in this study.

A third limitation of this study was related to the questions of tourists' past travel behaviors. During the data gathering process, the researcher received feedback from some participants specific to the timeframe of having visited Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area within the past three years. Many participants indicated that they had visited the Civil War sites four and five years ago but not within three years. Hence, many participants were unable to complete the survey, resulting in a larger number of unusable surveys (108 cases). In future studies, questions that rely on the timeframe for past visitation should be thoroughly reconsidered to avoid unusable data. A possible remedy would be to extend the timeframe of visitation to within the past four or five years.

A fourth limitation of this study was related to the duration of data collection. The level of visitation to Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region is not as high as that of other commercial destinations, for example, Smokey Mountain National Park. Hence, it may take a longer time to recruit participants who visit these locations. In this study, the survey was only posted online for 5 weeks in the summer. Some participants were on vacation without checking e-mails or using automatic reply features to indicate they were not available to answer e-mails during the time the survey was viable. This may explain the low response rate from the mailing lists. A possible recommendation would be to extend the time for data collection.

The final limitation of this study was related to the method of exploratory data analysis. In hindsight, it may have been better to allow the factors to correlate (e.g., using the Promax rotation method). Additionally, cross-loading items on each factor could be

eliminated, and at least four items on each factor are preferred to more clearly define a

factor. If the factors are refined, the regression analyses would need to be revisited.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Z. (1991). The influence of the components of a state's tourist image on product positioning strategy. *Tourism Management, 12*(4), 331-340.

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behaviour*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Alzua, A., O'Leary, J., & Morrison, A. (1998). Cultural and heritage tourism: identifying niches for international travellers. *Journal of Tourism Studies, 9*, 2-13.

Andrew, D., Nonnecke, B., & Preece, J. (2003). Electronic survey methodology: A case study in reaching hard-to-involve internet users. *International Journal of Human Computer Interaction, 16*(2), 185-210.

Baker, D., & Crompton, L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research, 27*(3), 758-804.

Baloglu, S. (2001). Image variations of Turkey by familarity index: Information and experiential dimensions. *Tourism Management, 22*(2), 127-133.

Baloglu, S., & Brinberg, D. (1997). Affective images of tourism destinations. *Journal of Travel Research, 35*(4), 11-15.

Baloglu, S., & McCleary K. (1999a). U.S. International pleasure travelers' images of four Mediterranean destinations: A comparison of visitors and nonvisitors. *Journal of Travel Research, 38*(2), 144-152.

Baloglu, S., & McCleary, K. (1999b). A model of destination image formation. *Annals of Tourism Research, 26*(4), 868-897.

Becken, S., & Gnoth, J. (2004). Tourist consumption systems among overseas visitors: Reporting on American, German, and Australian visitors to New Zealand. *Tourism Management, 25*(3), 375-385.

Beerli, A., & Martin, J. (2004). Tourists' characteristics and the perceived image of tourist destinations: A qualitative analysis–A case study of Lanzarote, Spain. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(3), 657-681.

Bierman, D. (2003). *Restoring tourism destinations in crisis: A strategic marketing approach.* Sydney: Allen & UnWin

Bigne, J., Sanchez, M., & Sanchez, J. (2001). Tourism image, evaluation variables and after purchase behavior: Inter-relationship. *Tourism Management, 22*(6), 607-606.

Bonn, M., Joseph -Mathews, S, Dai, M., Hayes,S., & Cave,J. (2007). Heritage/Cultural Attraction Atmosphere: Creating the right environment for the heritage/cultural visitor. *Journal of Travel Research, 45,* 345-354.

Bricker, K., & Kerstetter, D. (2000). Level of specialization and place attachment: An exploratory study of whitewater recreationists. *Leisure Sciences, 22,* 233-257.

Bricker, K., & Kerstetter, D. (2002). An interpretation of special place meanings whitewater recreationists attach to the South Fork of the American River. *Tourism Geographies, 4*(4), 396-425.

Cai, L., Feng, R., & Breiter, D. (2004). Tourist purchase decision involvement and information preferences. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 10*(2), 138-148.

Carter, R., & Bramley, R. (2002). Defining heritage values and significance for improved resource management and an application to Australian tourism. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 8*(3), 175-199.

Castro, C., Armario, E., & Ruiz, D. (2007). The influence of market heterogeneity on the relationship between a destination's image and tourist future behavior. *Tourism Management. 28*, 175-187.

Caton, K., & Santos, C. (2007). Heritage tourism on route 66: Deconstructing nostalgia. *Journal of Travel Research, 45*(4), 371-386.

Chandler, J., & Costello, C. (2002). A profile of visitors at heritage tourism destinations in East Tennessee according to Plog's lifestyle and activity level preferences model. *Journal of Travel Research 41*(2), 161-166.

Chen, P., & Kerstetter, D. (1999). International students' image of rural Pennsylvania as a travel destination. *Journal of Travel Research, 37*(3), 256-266.

Chen, C., & Tsai, D. (2007). How destination image and evaluative factors affect behavioral Intentions. *Tourism Management, 28*(4), 175-187.

Chon, K. (1987). An assessment of images of Korea as a tourist destination by American tourists. *Hotel and Tourism Management Review, 3*, 155-170.

Chon, K. (1990). The role of destination image in tourism: A review and discussion. *The Tourist Review, 45*(2), 2-9.

Cohen, J. (1988), *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.)*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, R., (1983). Tourism and heritage conservation—The Pacific experience. *Heritage Australia, 2*(2), 58-59.

Coomer (1997). Dangerous drug adulteration - an international survey of drug dealers using the Internet and World Wide Web (WWW). *International Journal of Drug Policy, 8,* 71-81.

Confer, J., & Kerstetter, D. (2000). Past perfect: Explorations of heritage tourism. *Parks & Recreation, 35*(2), 28.

Cooper, C., Fletcher,J., Gilbert D., & Warnhill, S. (1993). *Tourism principles and practices.* Essex, UK: Addison-Wesley.

Couper, M. (2000). Websurveys: A review of issues and approaches. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 64*(4), 464-494.

Crompton, J. (1979). An assessment of the image of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image. *Journal of Travel Research, 17*(4), 18-23.

Dann, G. (1996). Tourists' images of a destination - An alternative analysis. *Recent Advance in Tourism Marketing Research, 5,* 41-55.

Decrop, A. (2000). Tourists' decision -making and behavior processes. In Piza & Mansfeld (Eds). *Consumer Behavior in Travel and Tourism* (pp. 103-133). New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press.

Destination Marketing Association International (2009). Retrieved from http://www.traveldailynews.com/pages/show_articles_per_category/14

Dillman, D. (2000). *Mail and Internet Surveys*. New York: John Wiley.

Dolnicar, S., Laesser, C., & Matus, K. (2008). Online versus paper: Format effects in tourism surveys. *Journal of Travel Research, 47*(3), 295-316.

Echtner, C. (1991). *The measurement of tourism destination image* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (UMI Number: 3390931)

Echtner, C., & Ritchie, B. (1993). The measurement of destination image: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Travel Research, 31*(4), 3-13.

Echtner, C., & Ritchie, B. (2003). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *The Journal of Tourism studies, 14*(1), 37-48.

Fakeye, P., & Crompton, J. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of Travel Research, 30* (2), 10-16.

Gartner, W. (1993). Image formation process. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 2*, 191-215.

Gensch, D. (1978). Image -measurement segmentation. *Journal of Marketing Research, 15*(3), 384-394.

George, B., & George, B. (2004). Past visits and the intention to revisit a destination. *The Journal of Tourism Studies, 15*(2), 51-66.

Gitelson, R., & Crompton, J. (1984). Insights into the repeat vacation phenomenon. *Annals of Tourism Research, 11*(2), 199-217.

Glebman, A., & Ron, M. (2009). Heritage and cultural tourism: The present and future of the past. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(1), 127-129.

Goodrich, J. (1977). A new approach to image analysis through multidimensional scaling. *Journal of Travel Research, 16*(3), 3-7.

Gross, M., & Brown, G. (2008). An empirical structural model of tourists and places: progressing involvement and place attachment into tourism. *Tourism Management, 29(* 6), 1141-1151.

Gunn, C. (1972). *Vacationscape: Designing tourist regions.* Washington DC: Taylor & Francis/University of Texas.

Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tathum, R., & Black, W. (1998). *Multivariate Data Analysis (5th ed.).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Halpenny, E. (2006). Examining the relationship of place attachment with pro - environmental intentions. *Proceedings of the 2006 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.* GTR-NRS-P-14

Hammitt, W., Backlund, E., & Bixler, R. (2004). Experience use history, place bonding and resource substitution of trout anglers during recreation engagements. *Journal of Leisure Research, 36*(3), 356-378.

Hammitt, W., Kyle, G., & Oh, C. (2009). Comparison of place bonding models in recreation resource management. *Journal of Leisure Research, 41*(1), 57-72.

Hardy, D. (1988). Historical geography and heritage studies. *Area, 20,* 333-338.

Hausmann, A. (2007). Cultural Tourism: Marketing challenges and opportunities for German cultural heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 13*(2), 170-184.

Hawley, P. (1990). Historic preservation and tourism. In J. Ziegler (Eds.), *Enhancing*

rural economies through amenity resources: A national policy symposium.

University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Hay, R. (1998). Sense of place in a developmental context. *Journal of Environmental*

Psychology, 18, 5-29.

Hewson, C.,Yule, P., Laurent, D., & Vogel, C. (2003). *Internet research methods: A*

practical guide for the behavioural and social sciences. London: Sage.

Hidalgo, M., & Hernandez, B. (2001). Place attachment: Conceptual and empirical

questions. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 21*, 273-281.

Hogeboom, D., McDermott, R., Perrin, K., Osman, H., & Bell -Ellison, B. (2010).

Internet use and social networking among middle aged and older adults.

Educational Gerontology, 36, 93-111.

Hou, J., Lin, C., & Morais,D. (2005). Antecedents of attachment to a cultural tourism

destination: The case of Hakka and non -Hakka Taiwan visitors to Pei -Pu, Taiwan.

Journal of Travel Research, 44(2), 221-233.

Hu, L. & Bentler, P. (1995). Evaluating model fit. In Hoyle (Eds.), *Structural equation*

modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications (pp. 76-99). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Hu, Y., & Ritchie, B. (1993). Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual approach.

Journal of Travel Research, 32(2), 25-34.

Huang, S., & Hsu, C. (2009). Effects of travel motivation, past experience, perceived

constraint, and attitude on revisit intention. *Journal of Travel Research, 48*(1), 29-

44.

Hunt, J. (1975). Image as a factor in tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research,*

13(3), 1-7.

Jenkins, O. H. (1999). Understanding and measuring tourist destination

images. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 1*, 1-15.

Jeong, C., Kim, Y., Ko, Y., & Jeong, I. (2009). Horse racing image: Re-examination of

relations between image and intention to visit. *Journal of Quality Assurance in*

Hospitality & Tourism, 10, 194-217.

Kaltenborn, B., & Williams, D. (2002). The meaning of place: Attachments to

Femundsmarka National Park, Norway, among tourists and locals Norsk

Geografisk Tidsskrift. *Norwegian Journal of Geography, 56*, 189-198.

Kaplanidou, K., & Vogt, C. (2007). The interrelationship between sport event and

destination image and sport tourists' behaviors. *Journal of Sport & Tourism, 12*,

183-206.

Kerstetter, D., & Bricker, K. (2009). Exploring Fijian's sense of place after exposure to

tourism development. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 17*(6), 691-708.

Kerstetter, D., Confer, J., & Bricker, K. (1998). Industrial heritage attractions: Types and

tourists. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing, 7* (2), 91-104.

Kerstetter, D., Confer, J., & Graefe, A. (2001). An exploration of the specialization

concept within the context of heritage tourism. *Journal of Travel Research, 39*,

267-274.

Kim, S., & Yoon, Y. (2003). The hierarchical effects of affective and cognitive

components on tourism destination image. *Journal of Travel & Tourism

Marketing, 14* (2), 1-22.

Klenosky, D., Leblanc,C., Vogt, C., & Schroeder, H. (2007). Factors that attract and

repeat visitation to urban recreation sites: A framework for research. *Proceedings

of the Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium.* GTR-NRS-P-23.

Konrad, V. (1982) Historical artifacts as recreational resources. In Wall, G. & Marsh, J.

(Eds.), *Recreational land use: Perspectives on its evolution in Canada*, (pp. 392-

416). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

Kotler, P., Haider, D., & Rein, I. (1993). *Marketing places: Attracting investment,

industry, and tourism to cities, states, and nations.* New York: The Free Press.

Krueger, R. & Casey, M. (2000). *The Focus groups: A practical guide for applied

research.* California: Sage Publication.

Kruger, L., Hall, T., & Stiefel, M. (2008). Understanding concepts of place and recreation

research and management (GTR-PNW-GTR-744). Portland, OR: U.S.

Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

Kyle, G., Absher, J., & Graefe, A. (2003). The moderating role of place attachment on the

relationship between attitude toward fees and spending preferences. *Leisure

Sciences, 25*, 33-50.

Kyle, G., Bricker, A., Graefe, A., & Wickham, T. (2004). An examination of

    recreationists' relationships with activities and settings. *Leisure Sciences, 26*, 123-

    142.

Kyle, G., Graefe, A., & Manning, R. (2005). Testing the dimensionality of place

    attachment in recreational settings. *Environment and Behaviors, 37*, 153-177.

Lee, C., & Allen, L. (1999) Understanding individuals' attachment to selected

    destinations: An application of place attachment. *Tourism Analysis, 4*, 173-185.

Lee, T. (2009). A structural model to examine how destination image, attitude, and

    motivation affect the future behavior of tourists. *Leisure Science, 31*, 215-236.

Lennon, J., & Foley, M. (2000). *Dark tourism: The attraction of death and disaster*.

    London:Continuum.

Lin, C., & Morais, D. (2010). Why do first -time and repeat visitors patronize a

    destination. *Annals of Tourism Research, 35*(3), 790-808.

Lin, C., Morais, D., Kerstetter, D., & Hou, J. (2007). Examining the role of cognitive and

    affective image in predicting choice across natural, developed, and theme park

    destination. *Journal of Travel Research, 46*(2), 183-194.

Litvin, S., & Kar, G. (2001). E -surveying for tourism research: Legitimate tool or a

    researcher's fantasy? *Journal of Travel Research, 39*(3), 308-314.

Low, S., & Altman, I. (1992). Place attachment: A conceptual Inquiry. In Altman

    & Low (Eds.), *Place Attachment* (pp. 1 - pp. 13). New York: Plenum Press.

Manzo, L. (2003). Beyond house and haven: Toward a re-visioning of emotional

    relationships with places. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 23*, 47-61.

Mark, M. (2009, January 1). Interpretation and place attachment: implications for

cognitive map theory *The Free Library*. Retrieved from

http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Interpretation and place attachment: implications

for cognitive map... -a0207779315

Martine, M. & Bosque, I. (2008). Exploring the cognitive-affective nature of destination

image and the role of psychological factors in its formation. *Tourism Management,*

29(2), 263-277.

Masberg, B., & Silverman, L. (1996). Visitor experience at heritage sites: A

phenomenological approach. *Journal of Travel Research, 34* (4), 20-25.

Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts.*

Prentice Hall.

Mawson, R. (1994). *Summary report: Who visits historic houses and why*. Washington,

DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mayer, R. (1947). *The Promise of Cognitive Psychology*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman

and company.

Mertler, C. (2002). Demonstrating the potential for web -based survey methodology with

a case study. *American Secondary Education, 30*(2), 49-61.

Millar, S. (1989). Heritage management for heritage tourism. *Tourism Management,*

10(3), 9-14.

Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1995). The role of awareness and familiarity with destination:

The central Florida case. *Journal of Travel Research, 33*, 7-21.

Molina, A., Gomez, M., Martín -Consuegra, D., (2010). Tourism marketing

information and destination image management. *African Journal of Business

Management, 4*(5), 722-728.

Moore, R. & Graefe, A. (1994). Attachments to recreation settings: The case of rail -trail

users. *Leisure Sciences, 16*, 17-31.

Morais, D., & Lin, C. (2010). Why do first time and repeat visitors patronize a

destination? *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 27*(2), 193-210.

Moutinho, L. (1984). Vacation tourist decision process. *Quarterly Review of Marketing, 9,*

8-17.

National Park Service (2010a). A National Heritage Area. Retrieved from

http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/FAQ/

National Park Service (2010b). 49 National Heritage Areas. Retrieved from

http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/VST/INDEX.HTM

National Park Service (2010c). Tennessee. Retrieved from

http://www.nps.gov/state/TN/index.htm

National Trust for Historic Preservation. (2010a). Cultural Heritage Tourism. Retrieved

from http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/heritage-tourism/

National Trust for Historic Preservation. (2010b). 2009 factsheet. Retrieved from

http://www.preservationnation.org/issues/heritage-tourism/additional -

resources/2009 -CHT -FactSheet.pdf

Nicholls, S., Vogt, C., & Jun, S. (2004, September). Heeding the call for heritage tourism.

Park & Recreation, 38-47.

Nunally, J. (1978). *Psychometrics Theory (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

O'Leary, S., & Deegan, J. (2003). People, pace, place: Qualitative and quantitative images of Ireland as a tourism destination in France. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 9*(3), 213-226.

Olson, E., Bowman, M., & Roth, R. (1984). Interpretation and nonformal education in natural resources management. *Journal of Environmental Education, 15*, 6-10.

Oppermann, M. (1997). First-time and repeat tourists to New Zealand, *Tourism Management, 18*(3), 177-181.

Pan, J. (2008). Image formation process and future intentions through tourists functional motivation and perceived value in cultural heritage tourism (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (UMI Number: 3390931)

Pearce, P. (1986). Tourism developments: An Australian view. *Annals of Tourism Research, 13*, 670-673.

Petrick, J., Morais, D., & Norman, D. (2001). An examination of the determinants of entertainment vacationers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research, 40*, 41-48.

Peterson, K. (1990). The heritage resource as seen by the tourist: The heritage connection. In *The Tourism Connection: Linking Research and Marketing*, (pp. 209-218). Salt Lake City, UT: Travel and Tourism Research Association.

Phelps, A. (1986). Holiday destination image: The problem of assessment. *Tourism Management, 7* (3), 168-80.

Pike, S. (2002). Destination image analysis — a review of 142 papers from 1973–2000. *Journal of Travel Research, 23*, 541-549.

Pike, S., & Ryan, C. (2004). Destination positioning analysis through a comparison of cognitive, affective, and conative perceptions. *Journal of Travel Research, 42*(4), 333-342.

Poria, Y., Butler, R. & Airey, D. (2004). Links between tourists, heritage, and reasons for visiting heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research,4*(1), 19-28.

Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site management: Motivations and expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research,33*, 162-178.

Prayag, G. (2009). Tourists' evaluations of destination image, satisfaction, and future behavior intentions - The case of Mauritius. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 26*, 836-853.

Prentice, R. (1993). *Tourism and Heritage Attraction.* London: Routledge

Prentice, R. (2004). Tourist familiarity and imagery. *Annals of Tourism Research, 31*(4), 923-945.

Prentice, R., Guerin, S., & McGugan, S. (1998). Visitor learning at a heritage attraction: A case study of discovery as a media product. *Tourism Management, 19*(1), 5-23.

Prentice, R., Witt, S., & Hamper, C. (1988). Tourist experience: The case of Heritage Parks. *Annals of Travel Research, 25*(1), 1-24.

Proshansky, H., Fabian, A., & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place -identity: Physical social world socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 3*, 57-83.

Raacke, J., & Bonds -Raacke, J. (2008). MySpace and Facebook: Applying the uses and gratifications theory to exploring friend -networking sites. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 11*(2), 169-174.

Richardson, S., & Crompton, J. (1988). Cultural variations in perceptions of vacation attributes. *Tourism Management, 9,* 128-136.

Russell, J., & Pratt, G. (1980). A description of affective quality attributed to environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38* (2), 311-322.

Ryan, C., and Cave, J. (2005). Structuring destination image: A qualitative approach. *Journal of Travel Research. 44* (2), 143-150.

Scannell, L., & Gifford, R. (2010). Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environment Psychology, 30,* 1-10.

Schaefer, D., & Dillman, D. (1998). Development of a standard email methodology. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62,* 378-397.

Schreyer, R. & Roggenbuck, J. (1981). Visitor images of national parks: The influences of social definitions of places on perceptions of behavior. In Lime, D, & Field, D. (Eds.), *Some recent products of river recreation research* (pp. 39-44). USDA Forest Service, GTR- NC-63. St Paul, MN: North Central Experiment Station.

Schroeder, H. (1991). Preference and meaning of arboretum landscapes: Combining quantitative and qualitative data. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 11,* 231-248.

Schuster, R., Sullivan, L., Morais, D., & Kuehn, D. (2008). Using destination image to predict visitors' intention to revisit three Hudson river valley, New York,

communities. *Prceeding of the 2008 Northwestern Recreation Research Symposium, USA. GTR-NRS-P-42.*

Shen, S., Schuttemeyer, A., & Braun, B. (2009). Visitors' intention to visit world cultural heritage sites: An empirical study of Suzhou, China. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 26,* 722-734.

Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism Management, 16,* 361-365.

Sirakaya, E., McLellan, R., & Uysal, M. (1996). Modeling vacation destination decisions: A behavioral approach. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing, 5,* 57-75.

Sirakaya, E., & Woodside, A. (2005). Building and testing theories of decision making by travellers. *Tourism Management, 26*(6), 815-832.

Smaldone, D., Harris, C., & Sanyal, N. (2008). The role of time in developing place meanings. *Journal of Leisure Research, 40*(4), 479-504.

Sönmez, S., and Sirakaya, E. (2002). A distorted destination image? The case of Turkey. *Journal of Travel Research, 41*(2), 185-96.

Spark, B. (2007). Planning a wine tourism vacation? Factors that help to predict tourists' behavior intentions. *Tourism Management, 28,* 1180-1192.

Stepchenkova, S., & Mills, J. (2010). Destination image: A meta-analysis of 2000–2007 research. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Environment, 19,* 575-609.

SurveyMonkey User Manual. (2010). Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/SurveyMonkeyFiles/UserManual.pdf

Appendix A

The Civil War Heritage Sites in the Middle Tennessee Area	
41	Fort Hill and Museum
42	Fort Redmond
43	Franklin County
44	Giles County
45	Greenwood Cemetery
46	Gravel Hill Community
47	Harrison Barracks
48	Hartsville
49	Historic Chockley Tavern
50	Historic Lairdland Farm House and Civil War Museum
51	Historic Lebanon Square
52	Humphreys County Museum & Civil War Fort
53	Iron Furnaces
54	John Hunt Morgans Raid to Ohio
55	Johnsonville State Historic Park
56	Lewis County
57	Lewis County Courthouse Square, Hohenwald
58	Liberty Gap
59	Livingston Historic Courthouse & Square
60	Macon County Courthouse Square
61	Manchester
62	Marshall County
63	Marshall County Courthouse Square, Lewisburg
64	McGavock Confederate Cemetery
65	Mount Pleasant
66	Nashville National Cemetery
67	Nashville Old City Cemetery
68	Old Graveyard Memorial Park
69	Pickett's Chapel Methodist Church
70	Portland Historic Business District

Appendix A

The Civil War Heritage Sites in the Middle Tennessee Area	
71	Puryears Ferry
72	Putnam County
73	Rest Hill Cemetery
74	Robert L. Caruthers House
75	Robertson County Courthouse Square
76	Rutherford County Courthouse & East Main Street Historic District
77	Sam Davis Trail
78	Shelbyville
79	Smith County Courthouse Square
80	South Tunnel Site
81	Stones River National Battlefield
82	Surrender House/Dover Hotel
83	Tennessee Antebellum Trail
84	Tennessee Civil War Railroad Driving Tour
85	Tennessee State Capitol, Nashville
86	Wilson County
87	Winchester City Hall, Winchester

The List of Heritage Sites in Middle Tennessee by Tennessee Department of Tourist
Development (2010). Retrieved
http://www.tnvacation.com/civil -
war/trails/listing/?type=154&city_id=0&region_id=2&per_page=60

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form (Focus Group)

Appendix B

Informed Consent

Principal Investigator: Jiin-Ling Lin
Study Title:

An Investigation of the Relationships Among Destination Image, Place Attachment, and
Visitation Intention of Heritage Tourists

Institution: Department of Health and Human Performance

Name of participant: _____ Age: _____

The following information is provided to inform you about the interview and your
participation in it. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you
may have about this interview and the information given below. You will be given an
opportunity to ask questions, and your questions will be answered. Also, you will be
given a copy of this consent form. Your participation is voluntary and you are also free
to withdraw at any time.

You are being asked to participate in this interview because your response can improve
and enhance the development of cognitive attributes to be included in a questionnaire
used in this study to measure heritage tourists' cognitive component of destination image.

You will be asked to participate in two meetings. During the first meeting, you will be
asked to respond to three open-ended questions related to the destination image of Civil
War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National
Heritage Area (TCWNHA). Then, you will be asked to review and provide your feedback
on a master list of cognitive component items developed from previous destination image
studies. The purpose of these steps is to improve the instrument to be used to collect data
for this study. In the second meeting, you will be asked to review the resulting list of
cognitive items to finalize the items for the instrument.

There is no risk to your participation in this interview process. Your participation is
voluntary, and you may choose to stop participation at any time. This is an opportunity to
provide your input based on your experiences with and knowledge of Civil War heritage
sites in the Middle Tennessee region.

The data gathered in this study is not confidential with respect to your personal identity unless you specify otherwise. When this material becomes available, it may be read, quoted, or cited from and disseminated for educational and scholarly purposes.

If you should have any questions about this interview please feel free to contact Jiin-Ling Lin at 615-898-2901 or my Faculty Advisor, Dr. Tara Perry at 615-904-8293. For additional information about giving consent or your rights as a participant in this interview, please feel free to contact the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918.

STATEMENT BY PERSON AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS INTERVIEW

☐ **I have read this informed consent document and the material contained in it has been explained to me verbally. I understand each part of the document, all my questions have been answered, and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate in this interview.**

_____   _____

Date   Signature of Interviewee

Consent obtained by:

_____   _____

Date   Signature of Interviewer(s)

_____

Printed Name and Title

Appendix C

Focus Group Agenda

Appendix C

Focus Group Introduction

Welcome

Thanks for agreeing to be part of the focus group. I appreciate your willingness to participate.

Introductions

Moderator (Jin Lin)

Purpose of Focus groups

The reason we are having these focus groups is to facilitate the development of a questionnaire to measure heritage tourists' destination image of the Civil War national heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region. We need your input and want you to share your opinion and thoughts with us.

Ground rule

1. Your opinions and ideas are key to the development of the questionnaire.

2. There are no right or wrong answers
   Everyone's input is important; a wide range of opinions would be beneficial to this process
3. The comments expressed in the focus group will be kept confidential by us and by the other focus group members
4. We will be recording the conversation for accuracy of transcription
   i) No one will be identified by name in our report. You will remain anonymous.

Are there any questions before we start the discussion?

Focus Group Introduction

Date: _____   **Time:** _____

Place: _____   **Moderator:** _____

This interview includes two sections: three open-ended questions and cognitive image attributes. Please first write down your thoughts and be ready to give your opinion later.

(Modified from Echtner, C., & Ritchie, J. (2003). The meaning and measurement of destination image. *The Journal of Tourism studies*, *14*(1), 37-48.)

DIRECTIONS:

You will be provided a list of the Civil War National Heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region. Please give your thoughts to the following statements. Statements in this section assessing the cognitive component of destination image regarding those sites listed in the Middle Tennessee region will be finalized through the results of the focus group.

(1). What are the images or characteristics that come to mind when you think about visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area as a tourist destination?

Example: any buildings or landscape

> Can you talk about that more?
> Help me understand what you mean?
> Can you give an example?

(2). How would you describe the atmosphere or mood that you would expect to experience while visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area?

Example: Your feeling or your emotion such as pleasant, happy, or sad.

> Can you talk about that more?
> Help me understand what you mean?
> Can you give an example?

(3). Please list several distinctive or unique tourist attractions you can think of when visiting Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area.

Example: Sam Davis home, Stones River Battlefield.

> Can you talk about that more? Help me understand what you mean?
> Can you give an example?

This section focuses on your destination image regarding the Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee area you have visited in the past.

For example: What are the things needed to present the destination image?

DIRECTIONS: Please review the list and give your comments as to whether or not these statements should be kept or removed from the list.

This place provides....	Comments
1. A variety of festivals, concerts, and events	
2. Good nightlife possibilities	
3. A wide variety of recreation activities	
4. Many places of interest to visit	
5. Lots of things to do in the evening	
6. Plentiful cultural and historical sites/museums	
7. A living history, customs, and culture	
8. National Parks	
9. Attractive scenery	
10. Natural attractions	
11. Souvenir shop	
12. A variety of handicrafts/local crafts	
13. Good shopping facilities	
14. Ample local information	
15. Good local transportation	
16. A wide variety of accommodations	

This place provides....	Comments
17. A wide variety of accommodations	
18. A wide variety of restaurants	
19. Good opportunities for local tours	
20. Good accessibility	
21. Architecture/buildings	
22. Costs/prices are low	
23. Good climate	
24. Fresh air	
25. Lots of walking trails	
26. Lack of crime	
27. Lack of traffic congestion	
28. Friendly people	
29. Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere	
30. Opportunities for learning	
31. Family oriented	
32. Quality of service	
33. Fame/ Reputation	
Others:	

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey. Your response is very important for the success of this study. At this time, I am going to close the interview.

Appendix D

27 Cognitive Attributes

Appendix D

Cognitive Attributes obtained from a focus group

This place provides _____ to visit.

1. Historical house
2. Battlefields
3. Plantation homes
4. Battles
5. Cannons
6. Cemeteries
7. Church
8. Courthouse
9. Reproduction
10. Reenactments
11. Walking and driving tour
12. Well preserved historic structures and landscape around them
13. Authenticity in preservation
14. Interpretive sites
15. Open landscape
16. Historic Towns
17. Landscapes including towns, church in existence from that era
18. Both public and private spaces
19. Fort
20. Open Hills
21. Natural areas
22. Nature Trace
23. Farm land
24. Woods
25. Lots of Parks and Urban Parks
26. Trains
27. Camping

Appendix E

A Focus Group Feedback Form

Appendix E

A focus group feedback form

(Please review and check agree or disagree)

Section one:

1. A variety of festivals, concerts, and events
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.

   A variety of festivals, concerts, tours, programs, and events.

   Agree ( ) or Disagree ( )   (Please check one)

   Comment:

2. Plentiful cultural and historical sites/Museums
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.

   Plentiful historical houses, homes, and museums.

   Agree ( ) or Disagree ( )   (Please check one)

   Comment:

3. National Parks
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Lots of parks, urban parks, and national parks

   Agree ( ) or Disagree ( )   (Please check one)

   Comment:

4. Attractive scenery

   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Attractive scenery such as railroad, open hills, and camping sites

   Agree ( ) or Disagree ( )   (Please check one)

   Comment:

5. Natural attractions

> This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
> Natural attractions such as natural traces, areas, farmlands, open landscapes, and woods

> Agree (   ) or Disagree (   )   (Please check one)

> Comment:

Added based on the result of focus group

9. Well preserved historic structures, landscape, town, interpretive sites, authentic preservations, and public and private preserved spaces.

> Agree (   ) or Disagree (   )   (Please check one)

> Comment:

10. A variety of reenactments, reproductions, and demonstrations.

> Agree (   ) or Disagree (   )   (Please check one)

> Comment:

11. Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, battles, fort, cemeteries, and Cannons.

> Agree (   ) or Disagree (   )   (Please check one)

> Comment:

Section Two:

Cognitive attributes	Comments
This place provides.... to visit	Focus group interview

1. A variety of festivals, concerts, and events
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   A variety of festivals, concerts, tours, programs, and events.
	#11

2. Good night possibilities	Remove
3. A wide variety of recreation activities	
4. Many places of interest to visit	
5. Lots of things to do in the evening	Remove

6. Plentiful cultural and historical sites/museums
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Plentiful historical houses, homes, and museums
	# 1, 3

7. A living history, customs, and culture	

8. National Parks
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Lots of parks, urban parks, and national parks
	#25

9. Attractive scenery
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Attractive scenery such as railroad, open hills, and camping sites
	# 20, 26-27

10. Natural attractions
   This statement is revised below based on the comments from the focus groups.
   Natural attractions such as natural traces, areas, farm lands, open landscapes, and woods
	# 15, 21-24

11. Souvenir shop	
12. A variety of handicrafts/local crafts	
13. Good shopping facilities	
14. Ample local information	
15. Good local transportation	Remove
16. A wide variety of accommodations	
17. A wide variety of restaurants	
18. Good opportunities for local tours	
19. Good accessibility	
20. Architecture, buildings, churches, and courthouses	# 7, 8

21. Costs/Price are low	
Cognitive attributes	Comments
This place provides.... to visit	Focus group interview
22. Good climate	
23. Fresh air	
24. Lots of walking trails	
25. Lack of crime	
26. Lack of traffic congestion	
27. Friendly people	
28. Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere	
29. Opportunities for learning	
30. Family oriented	
31. Quality of service	
32. Fame/ Reputation	
33. Well preserved historic structures, landscape, town, interpretive sites, authentic preservations, and public and private preserved spaces	# 5,12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 Add this new item from the results of focus group interview
34. A variety of reenactments, handcrafted reproductions, and demonstrations.	#9-10 Add this new item from the results of focus group interview
35. Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, fort, cemeteries	#2, 4, 6, 19 Add this new item from the results of focus group interview

Appendix F

The Focus Group Master List of 32 Cognitive Attributes

Appendix F

The focus group version of cognitive attributes (The master list)

Cognitive attributes
This place provides.... to visit
1. A variety of festivals, concerts, tours, programs, and events*
2. A wide variety of recreation activities**
3. Many places of interest to visit**
4. Plentiful historic houses, homes, and museums.*
5. A living history, customs, and culture
6. Lots of parks, urban parks, and national parks**
7. Attractive scenery such as railroads, open landscapes, and camping sites*
8. Natural attractions such as natural traces, farm   land, open landscapes, and woods*
9. Souvenir shop
10. A variety of handicrafts/local crafts*
11. Good shopping facilities**
12. Ample local information
13. A wide variety of accommodations
14. A wide variety of restaurants
15. Good opportunities for local tours
16. Good accessibility*
17. Architecture, buildings, churches, and courthouses*
18. Costs/Price are low*
19. Good climate**
20. Fresh air**
21. Lots of walking trails*
22. Lack of crime**
23. Lack of traffic congestion**
24. Friendly people
25. Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere
26. Opportunities for learning
27. A variety of family-oriented activities
28. Quality of service**
29. Fame/ Reputation
30. Well preserved historic structures, landscapes, towns, interpretive sites, authentic preservations, and public and private preserved spaces*
31. A variety of reenactments, handcrafted reproductions, and demonstrations*
32. Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts, and cemeteries

Note: 32 items were reduced into 29 items according to the expert feedbacks
* Revised (10 items) ** Deleted (9 items)

Appendix G

The Final Version of Mater List

Appendix G

The expert version of cognitive attributes

Cognitive attributes
This place provides…. to visit
1. A variety of festivals and events
2. A variety of tours and programs
3. Historical railroads related to the Civil War era
4. Plentiful historic houses and homes, and museums
5. Plentiful museums
6. A living history, customs, and culture
7. Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods
8. Attractive scenery and landscapes
9. Many interpretive sites
10. Souvenir shops.
11. A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions.
12. Public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era
13. Ample local information.
14. A variety of accommodations.
15. A variety of restaurants.
16. Good opportunities for local tours
17. Good accessibility in terms of transportation, cost, and time
18. Historical buildings, churches, and courthouses
19. Affordable price
20. Walking tour programs related to Civil War era
21. Walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era
22. Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts, and cemeteries
23. A variety of reenactments and demonstrations
24. Friendly people
25. Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere
26. Opportunities for learning
27. A variety of family-oriented activities
28. Well preserved historic structures and landscapes
29. Fame/ Reputation

Note: 16 items revised (9 items deleted and 10 items revised from the master list);
13 items were kept from the master list;

Appendix H

IRB Approval Form

Appendix H

December 15, 2010

Jiin-Ling Lin
Department of Health and Human Performance
jl2v@mtmail.mtsu.edu , tperry@mtsu.edu

   Protocol Title: "An Investigation of the Relationships among Destination Image, Place Attachment, and Visitation Intention of Heritage Tourists"

Protocol Number: 11-160

Dear Investigator(s),

The MTSU Institutional Review Board, or a representative of the IRB, has reviewed the research proposal identified above. The MTSU IRB or its representative has determined that the study poses minimal risk to participants and qualifies for an expedited review under 45 CFR 46.110 Category 7.
Approval is granted for one (1) year from the date of this letter for 400 participants, pending your faculty advisor receives updated IRB training by February 2011.
According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to provide a certificate of training to the Office of Compliance. **If you add researchers to an approved project, please forward an updated list of researchers and their certificates of training to the Office of Compliance (c/o Emily Born, Box 134) before they begin to work on the project.** Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change.

Please note that any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918.

You will need to submit an end-of-project report to the Office of Compliance upon completion of your research. Complete research means that you have finished collecting and analyzing data. **Should you not finish your research within the one (1) year period, you must submit a Progress Report and request a continuation prior to the expiration date.** Please allow time for review and requested revisions. Your study expires **December 15, 2011**.

Also, all research materials must be retained by the PI or faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Emily Born
Compliance Officer
Middle Tennessee State University

Appendix I
Permission letter to use E-mail List

TENNESSEE Partnering to Interpret Legacies of the Civil War and Reconstruction

December 10, 2010

Dear IRB reviewer:

I, Laura Holder, give my permission to use the e-mail list of the Tennessee Civil War

National Heritage Area and Center for Historic Preservation that I provided for Jin Ling

Lin, a doctoral student in leisure studies in the Health and Human Performance

Department of Middle Tennessee State University for the study of an investigation of the

relationship between destination image, place attachment, and visitation intention of

heritage tourists.

Sincerely,

Laura S. Holder

_____   ___12/13/10___

(Signature)   (Date)

Appendix J

Inform Consent Form (Questionnaire)

Appendix J

Informed Consent

Hello, everyone! My name is Jiin-Ling Lin, a doctoral student in the Leisure Studies specialization in the Department of Health and Human Performance at Middle Tennessee State University. For my dissertation, I am currently conducting an online survey. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among tourists' place attachment, destination image, and their intention to visit or revisit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area. Your participation is very important to the success of this study and will contribute to our current understanding of heritage tourists' behaviors.

All participants need to be 18 years or older. I would really appreciate your participation in the study by completing the brief survey which can be found at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/CZPPNL5

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose to stop participation at any time with no consequences, and there are no risks to your participation. The survey will only take about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. When you have completed the survey, simply click on the submit button on the final page. By completing and submitting the survey, you are giving your consent to participate. If you do not wish to participate, simply disregard this message. Please make sure you submit your response only once.

Please be assured that your response will be anonymous and confidential. There will be no way for me to determine the origin of your response. You will not be contacted for any further information. Additionally, no individual information will be shared with a third party; only aggregate results will be reported. If you have any questions regarding this survey, I may be contacted at jl2v@mtmail.mtsu.edu; 615-898-2901.

Best regards,

Jin Lin

1.

    ___ I agree to participate in this study

Appendix K

The Survey

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

1. Informed Consent Form

To participate in the survey, you must read and agree to this consent page.

1. Informed Consent

Hello, everyone! My name is Jin Lin, a doctoral student in the Leisure Studies specialization in the Department of Health and Human Performance at Middle Tennessee State University. For my dissertation, I am currently conducting an online survey. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships among tourists' place attachment, destination image, and their intention to visit or revisit Civil War heritage sites in the Middle Tennessee region of the Tennessee Civil War National Heritage Area. Your participation is very important to the success of this study and will contribute to our current understanding of heritage tourists' behaviors.

All participants need to be 18 years or older. I would really appreciate your participation in the study by completing the brief survey which can be found at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/CZPPNL5

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose to stop participation at any time with no consequences, and there are no risks to your participation. The survey will only take about 20 to 25 minutes to complete. When you have completed the survey, simply click on the submit button on the final page. By completing and submitting the survey, you are giving your consent to participate. If you do not wish to participate, simply disregard this message. Please make sure you submit your response only once!

Please be assured that your response will be anonymous and confidential. There will be no way for me to determine the origin of your response. You will not be contacted for any further information. Additionally, no individual

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

**information will be shared with a third party; only aggregate
results will be reported. If you have any questions regarding
this survey, I may be contacted at jl2v@mtmail.mtsu.edu;
615-898-2901.**

Best regards,
Jin Lin

◯ I agree to participate in this study

2. Past travel experiences

We are interested in your travel experiences to Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee within the past three years. For the purpose of this study, Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee include sites such as battlefields, historic houses, heritage trails, museums, and cemeteries that have been designated as National landmarks by Congress.

**2. How many times have you visited National Civil War Heritage Sites
in Middle Tennessee within the past three years?**

◯ 0   ◯ 6

◯ 1   ◯ 7

◯ 2   ◯ 8

◯ 3   ◯ 9

◯ 4   ◯ 10 or more

◯ 5

3.

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

The Civil War National Heritage Area in Middle Tennessee is composed of three regions: east, middle, and western Tennessee. The dividing line of west and east TN is the Tennessee River. The major sizable cities include Nashville, Clarksville, and Murfreesboro. Below is the list of the Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee.

Tennessee Department of Tourist Development (2010). Retrieved http://www.tnvacation.com/civil-war/trails/listing/?
type=154&city_id=0&region_id=2&per_page=60

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

3. Please check the specific Civil War National Heritage Area sites you have visited in the past years in the Middle Tennessee area

☐ 1. 1860s Living History Celebration	☐ 45. Greenwood Cemetery
☐ 2. Affair at Travisville	☐ 46. Gravel Hill Community
☐ 3. Arts Center of Cannon County	☐ 47. Harrison Barracks
☐ 4. Battery Knob Earthworks	☐ 48. Hartsville
☐ 5. Battle of Hartsville Memorial Park	☐ 49. Historic Chockley Tavern
☐ 6. Battle of Nashville Driving Tour at Shys Hill	☐ 50. Historic Lairdland Farm House and Civil War Museum
☐ 7. Battle of Nashville Monument	☐ 51. Historic Lebanon Square
☐ 8. Battle of Statesville	☐ 52. Humphreys County Museum & Civil War Fort
☐ 9. Beech Grove Confederate Cemetery & Park	☐ 53. Iron Furnaces
☐ 10. Bell Buckle	☐ 54. John Hunt Morgans Raid to Ohio
☐ 11. Belmont Mansion	☐ 55. Johnsonville State Historic Park
☐ 12. Bicentennial Capitol Mall State Park	☐ 56. Lewis County
☐ 13. Carnton Plantation	☐ 57. Lewis County Courthouse Square, Hohenwald
☐ 14. Castalian Springs	☐ 58. Liberty Gap
☐ 15. Cedar Creek Iron Furnace	☐ 59. Livingston Historic Courthouse & Square
☐ 16. Cheatham County	☐ 60. Macon County Courthouse Square
☐ 17. Civil War Railroad Gateway Marker, Kingston Springs	☐ 61. Manchester
☐ 18. Coffee County	☐ 62. Marshall County
☐ 19. Coffee County Courthouse, Manchester	☐ 63. Marshall County Courthouse Square, Lewisburg
☐ 20. Confederate Camp at Seawell	☐ 64. McGavock Confederate Cemetery
☐ 21. Confederate Enlistment Center at Red Boiling Springs	☐ 65. Mount Pleasant
☐ 22. Cookeville Depot Museum	☐ 66. Nashville National Cemetery
☐ 23. Courthouse Burning in Livingston	☐ 67. Nashville Old City Cemetery
☐ 24. Cowan	☐ 68. Old Graveyard Memorial Park
☐ 25. Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Chapel Hill	☐ 69. Pickett's Chapel Methodist Church
☐ 26. Cumberland County Driving Tour	☐ 70. Portland Historic Business District
☐ 27. Cumberland University	☐ 71. Puryears Ferry
☐ 28. Davidson County	☐ 72. Putnam County

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

☐ 29. Duval-Groves House and camp Trousdale

☐ 30. Elk River Bridge, Elkton

☐ 31. Farmington Confederate Cemetery

☐ 32. Fiddlers' Grove Park, Lebanon

☐ 33. First Presbyterian Church in Nashville

☐ 34. First Presbyterian Church in Gallatin

☐ 35. Fisk University & Fisk Jubilee Singers (TM)

☐ 36. Fite-Ligon House

☐ 37. Forrest Boyhood Home, Caney Creek

☐ 38. Fort Donelson National Battlefield

☐ 39. Fort Grainger

☐ 40. Fort Granger

☐ 41 Fort Hill and Museum

☐ 42. Fort Redmond

☐ 43. Franklin County

☐ 44. Giles County

☐ 73. Rest Hill Cemetery

☐ 74. Robert L. Caruthers House

☐ 75. Robertson County Courthouse Square

☐ 76. Rutherford County Courthouse & East Main Street Historic District

☐ 77. Sam Davis Trail

☐ 78. Shelbyville

☐ 79. Smith County Courthouse Square

☐ 80. South Tunnel Site

☐ 81. Stones River National Battlefield

☐ 82. Surrender House/Dover Hotel

☐ 83. Tennessee Antebellum Trail

☐ 84. Tennessee Civil War Railroad Driving Tour

☐ 85. Tennessee State Capitol, Nashville

☐ 86. Wilson County

☐ 87. Winchester City Hall, Winchester

☐ 88. Other (please specify below)

please specify

[_____]

4. During the past three years have you visited other Civil War National Heritage Area sites outside the Middle Tennessee area?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

5. With whom did you most often travel to Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (Please check all that apply)

☐ Family

☐ Friends

☐ Both family and friends

☐ Alone

☐ Organized group (Please specify below)

☐ Other (Please specify below)

Please specify

[   ]

6. On average, how long did you stay in the Middle Tennessee area during your visit(s) to Civil War National Heritage Area sites?

○ Half day

○ One day

○ More than one day

○ Other (Please specify below)

Please specify

[   ]

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

7. From where did you obtain information about Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee to plan your trip? (Please check all that apply)

☐ Brochure/Travel guides

☐ Tour Operator

☐ Travel agents

☐ Friends/Family members

☐ Book/Movies

☐ Articles/News

☐ Advertisements

☐ Internet (Please specify below)

☐ Other (Please specify below)

Please indicate internet site or other sources

_____

4.

The next set of questions focus on your travel experiences to "a" specific Civil War National Heritage Area site within Middle Tennessee To best answer the following questions, please identify the MOST RECENTLY VISITED site (i e, battlefield, historic house, heritage trail, museum, or cemetery) You will base your responses in the following sections on this identified site

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

8. Identify the Civil War National Heritage Area site in Middle Tennessee you most recently visited. (Only check one site)

☐ 1. 1860s Living History Celebration	☐ 45. Greenwood Cemetery
☐ 2. Affair at Travisville	☐ 46. Gravel Hill Community
☐ 3. Arts Center of Cannon County	☐ 47. Harrison Barracks
☐ 4. Battery Knob Earthworks	☐ 48. Hartsville
☐ 5. Battle of Hartsville Memorial Park	☐ 49. Historic Chockley Tavern
☐ 6. Battle of Nashville Driving Tour at Shys Hill	☐ 50. Historic Lairdland Farm House and Civil War Museum
☐ 7. Battle of Nashville Monument	☐ 51. Historic Lebanon Square
☐ 8. Battle of Statesville	☐ 52. Humphreys County Museum & Civil War Fort
☐ 9. Beech Grove Confederate Cemetery & Park	☐ 53. Iron Furnaces
☐ 10. Bell Buckle	☐ 54. John Hunt Morgans Raid to Ohio
☐ 11. Belmont Mansion	☐ 55. Johnsonville State Historic Park
☐ 12. Bicentennial Capitol Mall State Park	☐ 56. Lewis County
☐ 13 Carnton Plantation	☐ 57. Lewis County Courthouse Square, Hohenwald
☐ 14. Castalian Springs	☐ 58. Liberty Gap
☐ 15. Cedar Creek Iron Furnace	☐ 59. Livingston Historic Courthouse & Square
☐ 16. Cheatham County	☐ 60. Macon County Courthouse Square
☐ 17 Civil War Railroad Gateway Marker, Kingston Springs	☐ 61. Manchester
☐ 18. Coffee County	☐ 62. Marshall County
☐ 19. Coffee County Courthouse, Manchester	☐ 63. Marshall County Courthouse Square, Lewisburg
☐ 20. Confederate Camp at Seawell	☐ 64. McGavock Confederate Cemetery
☐ 21. Confederate Enlistment Center at Red Boiling Springs	☐ 65. Mount Pleasant
☐ 22. Cookeville Depot Museum	☐ 66. Nashville National Cemetery
☐ 23. Courthouse Burning in Livingston	☐ 67. Nashville Old City Cemetery
☐ 24. Cowan	☐ 68. Old Graveyard Memorial Park
☐ 25. Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Chapel Hill	☐ 69. Pickett's Chapel Methodist Church
☐ 26. Cumberland County Driving Tour	☐ 70. Portland Historic Business District
☐ 27. Cumberland University	☐ 71. Puryears Ferry
☐ 28. Davidson County	☐ 72. Putnam County

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

☐ 29. Duval-Groves House and camp Trousdale

☐ 30. Elk River Bridge, Elkton

☐ 31. Farmington Confederate Cemetery

☐ 32. Fiddlers' Grove Park, Lebanon

☐ 33. First Presbyterian Church in Nashville

☐ 34. First Presbyterian Church in Gallatin

☐ 35. Fisk University & Fisk Jubilee Singers (TM)

☐ 36. Fite-Ligon House

☐ 37. Forrest Boyhood Home, Caney Creek

☐ 38. Fort Donelson National Battlefield

☐ 39. Fort Grainger

☐ 40. Fort Granger

☐ 41. Fort Hill and Museum

☐ 42. Fort Redmond

☐ 43. Franklin County

☐ 44. Giles County

☐ 73. Rest Hill Cemetery

☐ 74. Robert L. Caruthers House

☐ 75. Robertson County Courthouse Square

☐ 76. Rutherford County Courthouse & East Main Street Historic District

☐ 77. Sam Davis Trail

☐ 78. Shelbyville

☐ 79. Smith County Courthouse Square

☐ 80. South Tunnel Site

☐ 81. Stones River National Battlefield

☐ 82. Surrender House/Dover Hotel

☐ 83. Tennessee Antebellum Trail

☐ 84. Tennessee Civil War Railroad Driving Tour

☐ 85. Tennessee State Capitol, Nashville

☐ 86. Wilson County

☐ 87. Winchester City Hall, Winchester

☐ 88. Other (please specify below)

Please specify

[   ]

9. Date of most recent visit?____ Month_____Year (Please specify below)

○ None

○ January

○ Febury

○ March

○ April

○ May

○ June

○ July

○ August

○ September

○ October

○ November

○ December

"Year"

[   ]

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

10. How many times have you visited this site within the past three years?

- ○ 0
- ○ 1
- ○ 2
- ○ 3
- ○ 4
- ○ 5

- ○ 6
- ○ 7
- ○ 8
- ○ 9
- ○ 10 or more

5. Tourists' travel motivation

This section focuses on your reasons for visiting the site you identified

Modified from "Image Formation Process and Future Intentions through Tourists Functional Motivation and Perceived value in Cultural Heritage Tourism (Doctoral dissertation) " by J. Pan, 2008. Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (UMI Number: 3390931).

11. DIRECTIONS: Following is a list of reasons or motivations people may have for visiting Civil War Heritage sites. For each of the listed reasons, please choose the number that best represents how much you agree that the reason was a motivating factor for you prior to your most recent visit to the site.

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 Strongly Agree
1. Learning	○	○	○	○	○
2. Novel-seeking	○	○	○	○	○
3. Pleasure	○	○	○	○	○
4 Escape	○	○	○	○	○
5. Socialization	○	○	○	○	○
6 Opportunity to express personal values	○	○	○	○	○

6. Tourists' place attachment

This section focuses on your attachment to the site you identified.

Modified from "The measurement of Place Attachment: Validity and generalizability of a psychometric approach, " by D. Williams and J., Vaske, 2002, Forest Science, 49(6), p. 830-839 and "Testing the Dimensionality of Place Attachment in Recreational Settings, "by A. Kyle, A. Graefe, and R., Manning, 2005, Environment and Behaviors, 37, p. 153-177.

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

12. DIRECTIONS: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

Place attachment

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 Strongly Agree
1 This site means a lot to me	O	O	O	O	O
2 I am very attached to this site	O	O	O	O	O
3 I identify strongly with this site	O	O	O	O	O
4 I feel like this site is part of me	O	O	O	O	O
5 This site is very special to me	O	O	O	O	O
6 Visiting this site says a lot about who I am	O	O	O	O	O
7 Visiting this site is more important than Visiting any other place	O	O	O	O	O
8 Doing what I do here is more important to me than doing it in any other place	O	O	O	O	O
9 I wouldn't substitute any other site for doing the types of things I do here	O	O	O	O	O
10 This site is the best place for what I like to do	O	O	O	O	O
11 No other place can compare to this site	O	O	O	O	O
12 I get more satisfaction out of visiting this site than from visiting any other area	O	O	O	O	O
13 I have a lot of fond memories about this site	O	O	O	O	O
14 I have a special connection to the site and the people who visit here	O	O	O	O	O
15 I do not tell many people about this site	O	O	O	O	O
16 I will bring people whom I care about to this site	O	O	O	O	O

7. Tourists' destination image A:

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

13. This section focuses on your perception or image of the site you identified. Your perception/image includes how you think and feel about the site.

DIRECTIONS: Please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

The site you most recently visited provides...

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 Strongly Agree
1 A variety of festivals and events	○	○	○	○	○
2 A variety of tours and programs	○	○	○	○	○
3 Plentiful historic houses and homes.	○	○	○	○	○
4 Plentiful museums	○	○	○	○	○
5 A living history, customs and culture	○	○	○	○	○
6 Attractive scenery and landscapes	○	○	○	○	○
7 Historical railroads related to the Civil War era.	○	○	○	○	○
8 Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods	○	○	○	○	○
9 Good accessibility in terms of transportation cost and time	○	○	○	○	○
10 Walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era	○	○	○	○	○
11 Souvenir shops	○	○	○	○	○
12 A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions	○	○	○	○	○
13 Ample local information	○	○	○	○	○
14 A variety of accommodations	○	○	○	○	○
15 A variety of restaurants	○	○	○	○	○
16 Good opportunities for local tours	○	○	○	○	○
17 Historical buildings, churches and courthouses	○	○	○	○	○
18 Affordable price	○	○	○	○	○
19 Walking tour programs related to Civil War era	○	○	○	○	○
20 Well preserved historic structures and landscapes	○	○	○	○	○
21 Many interpretive sites	○	○	○	○	○
22 Public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era	○	○	○	○	○
23 Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere	○	○	○	○	○
24 Opportunities for learning	○	○	○	○	○
25 Fame/ Reputation	○	○	○	○	○

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

26 A variety of reenactments and demonstrations	○	○	○	○	○
27 Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts, and cemeteries	○	○	○	○	○
28 Friendly people	○	○	○	○	○
29 A variety of family-oriented activities	○	○	○	○	○

8. Tourists' destination image B:

This section focuses on your destination image regarding the site you identified

Adopted from 'A Model of Destination Image" by S Baloglu and K McCleary 1999b Annals of Tourism Research 26 (4), p 868-897

14. DIRECTIONS: Please indicate which words below best describe how you felt about this site before you visited.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Relaxing vs Distressing (1=relaxing, 7=distressing)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Pleasant vs Unpleasant (1=pleasant, 7=Unpleasant)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Exciting vs Gloomy (1=exciting, 7=gloomy)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Arousing vs Sleepy (1=arousing, 7=sleepy)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Interesting vs Dull (1=interesting, 7=dull)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

15. DIRECTIONS: Please rate your overall feeling toward the site you identified.

Adopted from "A Model of Destination Image," by S. Baloglu and K., McCleary, 1999b, Annals of Tourism Research, 26 (4), p. 868-897.

	1 Strongly Negative	2	3	4	5	6	7 Strongly Positive
Overall	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

9. Tourists' visitation intention

This section focuses on your future intentions to re-visit Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee

Questions modified from 'How Destination Image and Evaluative Factors Affect Behavior Intentions?" by C Chen and D Tsai, 2006, Tourism Management,28, p 1115-1122

Note: "Interesting vs. Dull" is an example

162

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

16. DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following questions, using the rating scale provided.

Questions

	1 Not likely	2	3	4	5 Very likely
1 How likely are you to visit Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee in the next 12 months?	○	○	○	○	○
2 How likely are you to recommend to others that they visit Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee area?	○	○	○	○	○

10. Socio-demographic information

DIRECTIONS for Questions 18 - 25 Please check or type in the appropriate response

17. What is your gender?

○ Female

○ Male

18. In what year were you born?

○ 19_____

please type in

19. Where do you live? Please type in Zip code

20. What is your current marital status?

○ Single (never married)

○ Married

○ Divorced/separated/single

○ Widowed

○ Single (committed relationship)

○ Other (Please specify below)

Please specify

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

21. What is your highest education level?

◯ Middle/Jr. High School

◯ High school graduate or GED

◯ Technical school, 2 year college

◯ Four year college/university

◯ Graduate school/professional degree

Please indicate graduate degree (Masters doctorate etc)

```
[                                    ]
```

22. What is your current occupational status?

◯ Employed part-time

◯ Employed full-time

◯ Unemployed

◯ Retired

◯ Other (Please specify below)

Please specify

```
[                              ]
```

23. What is your annual household income?

◯ Less than $25,000

◯ $25,000 to $ 49,999

◯ $50, 000- 74,999

◯ $75,000 or more

◯ Other (Please specify below)

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

24. Which of the following best describes your race and ethnic origin? (please check one category)

◯ African American

◯ Asian/Pacific Islander

◯ American Indian/Alaskan Native

◯ Caucasian

◯ Hispanic

◯ Multi-racial

◯ Unknown

◯ Other(Please specify below)

Please Specify

[   ]

25. Additional comments:

Do you have any additional thoughts or comments about Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee?

[   ]

11. Importance of destination characteristics

The following section focuses on how much you value destination characteristics when visiting Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee. Please indicate how important each attribute is to you when visiting a destination site

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

26. DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following questions, using the rating scale provided.

The site you most recently visited provides...

	1 Not very important	2 Not important	3 Neutral	4 Important	5 Very important
1 A variety of festivals and events	O	O	O	O	O
2 A variety of tours and programs	O	O	O	O	O
3 Plentiful historic houses and homes	O	O	O	O	O
4 Plentiful museums	O	O	O	O	O
5 A living history, customs, and culture	O	O	O	O	O
6 Attractive scenery and landscapes	O	O	O	O	O
7 Historical railroads related to the Civil War era	O	O	O	O	O
8 Natural attractions such as farmlands and woods	O	O	O	O	O
9 Good accessibility in terms of transportation cost, and time	O	O	O	O	O
10 Walking trails and trails with signage related to Civil War era	O	O	O	O	O
11 Souvenir shops	O	O	O	O	O
12 A variety of handicrafts/local crafts and handcrafted reproductions	O	O	O	O	O
13. Ample local information	O	O	O	O	O
14 A variety of accommodations	O	O	O	O	O
15 A variety of restaurants	O	O	O	O	O
16 Good opportunities for local tours	O	O	O	O	O
17 Historical buildings, churches, and courthouses.	O	O	O	O	O
18 Affordable price	O	O	O	O	O
19 Walking tour programs related to Civil War era	O	O	O	O	O
20 Well preserved historic structures and landscapes	O	O	O	O	O
21 Many interpretive sites	O	O	O	O	O
22 Public and private preserved spaces related to Civil War era	O	O	O	O	O
23 Peaceful/tranquil atmosphere	O	O	O	O	O
24 Opportunities for learning	O	O	O	O	O
25 Fame/ Reputation	O	O	O	O	O
26 A variety of reenactments and demonstrations	O	O	O	O	O
27 Plentiful historical sites such as battlefields, forts and cemeteries	O	O	O	O	O

Civil War National Heritage Area sites in Middle Tennessee (A)

28 Friendly people. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

29 A variety of family-oriented activities ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey Your response is very important for the success of this study