



EATSA
Euro-Asia Tourism
Studies Association

A PATHWAY FOR THE NEW GENERATION OF TOURISM RESEARCH

Proceedings of the EATSA Conference 2016

Lisbon, Peniche & Coimbra, Portugal



EDITED BY FRANCISCO DIAS

A PATHWAY FOR THE NEW GENERATION OF TOURISM RESEARCH

Title:

A pathway for the new generation of tourism research - Proceedings of the EATSA Conference 2016

Editor: Francisco Dias

Copyright © APTUR – Associação Portuguesa de Turismologia

ISBN: 978-989-20-7217-3

All rights reserved. Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review, no part of this book may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the publisher. Any enquiries should be directed to francisco.dias@ipleiria.pt.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
GENERAL ISSUES	11
Dream destinations and favourite destinations:	
Measuring key factors of tourism destination choice	13
Francisco Dias, Lucília Cardoso, Anne-Marie Lebrun, Che-Jen Su, Sawant Sawant, Yanki Hartijasti, Kostas Zafiroopoulos, Hirofumi Miyagi, Joanna Kosmaczewska	
Crossing frontiers between tourism and demography.	
An empirical analysis based on European travellers' behaviour	39
Jaime Serra, Filipe Ribeiro, Lídia Patrícia Tomé, Maria Filomena Mendes	
Why don't tourism firms use academic knowledge for innovation?	
A conceptual framework	53
Marcin Olszewski and Marlena A. Bednarska	
Risk management policy and its importance in the competitiveness of tourism destinations strategies	63
Marica Mazurek	
Guided tours: a performance, from script to interpretation	73
Sofia Mendonça and Cristina Barroco	
Slow cities movement: An opportunity for the city of Viseu	81
Pedro Filipe Ferreira, Cristina Barroco and Claudia Seabra	
Measurement of Infrastructure Profitability in Air Transport.	
A Review of Investment in the Project to Expanding Airport Capacity	93
Vânia Costa	
Competitiveness of Polish cities in the international meetings industry	119
Natalia Piechota and Piotr Zmyślony	

	TOURIST EXPERIENCE ISSUES	133
	Is authenticity really important? The case of archaeological festival visitors	135
	Marek Maciej Nowacki	
6	The Enhancement of the Archaeological Heritage in the qualification of the Touristic Experience: the case of Bracara Augusta (Braga)	151
	Olga Matos, Eduarda Duarte and Sandra Vasconcelos	
	Tourism Activity in Urban Space on the Example of Szczecin	167
	Beata Meyer	
	 HOTEL MANAGEMENT ISSUES	 179
	Importance bias in business hotel quality surveys: The role of travelers' heterogeneity	181
	Annalisa Stacchini and Andrea Guizzardi	
	The key factor of developing the Japanese hotel industry	193
	Shunsaku Hashimoto	
	Foreign direct investment in the accommodation sector in Portugal	205
	Cristina Barroco, Eduardo Anselmo Castro and Carlos Costa	
	The current situation and issues with accommodation legislation in Japan	217
	Yuichi Hirooka	
	 SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES	 223
	Socio-Economic impacts of Tourism development at Aurangabad District	225
	Madhuri Sawant	
	The relationship between local resident eco-consciousness and governance in the provision of ecotourism Hainan, China	239
	Zhen WEI	
	 TOURISM PRODUCTS ISSUES	 255
	Creative Tourism based on Indonesian Local Wisdom	257
	Yanki Hartijasti and Danny I. Yatim	

**Business Tourism in the Central Region of Portugal:
analyzing the results of a Delphi study** 269
Jorge Marques and Norberto Santos

The Impact of Gaming Tourism Growth On The Income Distribution In Macau 283
Luis Cunha

**Wine Culture, Territory/Landscape and Tourism, the Enotourism key Pillars.
How to get business success and territorial sustainability
inside Wine Tourism Ecosystem?** 307
Josefina Salvado

**The Comparative Study of Five Mediterranean Countries of Cruise Tourism:
Spain, Italy, Greece, Cyprus and Turkey** 331
Asli Ozge Ozgen Cigdemli, Kemal Kantarci and Murat Alper Basaran

**Diversifying adventure tourism segments: satisfaction and behaviour of international
climbers descending from the summit of Mount Fuji in summer 2015** 345
Thomas Edward JONES and Yangran ZHAO

Evaluation of tourism routes' governance – Case study: Mainland Portugal 353
Carlos Vilela da Mota and Fernando F. Gonçalves

TOURISM EDUCATION ISSUES 365

**Relationship between emotional intelligence
and entrepreneurship competencies of tourism students** 367
Kevser CINAR, Ercan YILMAZ

**The South-South Cooperation in the perspective of Education in Tourism: a report
about the experience in the School of Hospitality and Tourism of Cabo Verde** 377
Juliana Vieira de Almeida and Carlos Cabral Tavares de Lima

IS AUTHENTICITY REALLY IMPORTANT? THE CASE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL FESTIVAL VISITORS

Marek Maciej Nowacki¹

| 135

ABSTRACT

The article presents the empirical research results of the authenticity perception of archaeological festival visitors and its connections with the general assessment of the festival. The study was conducted among visitors of XV Archaeological Festival in Biskupin (Poland). Three types of authenticity were distinguished: objectivist/essentialist, constructivist/negotiated and existential. As a result of the survey conducted among visitors (N = 405) four hypotheses were verified. No association was found between socio-demographic characteristics and the perception of authenticity. The influence of authenticity importance on authenticity was found. The author also found the association of authenticity perception with the quality assessment of the festival, and association of the overall quality assessment with visitors' behavioural intentions.

KEYWORDS

Authenticity, Archaeological Festival, Quality, Visitors, Behavioural Intentions.

Introduction

The quality of services, tourist destinations and experiences as well as their authenticity attract considerable interest among theorists and practitioners of tourism recently. For many of them, those terms are even synonymous. It can, however, be noted that in many cases the attention paid to the quality of services precludes the authenticity of the tourist experience and vice versa. It is so because of commodification, standardization and staging of tourist sites and events – actions that are needed to ensure a high quality of services. The ambiguity of understanding the concept of authenticity, as well as various ways of determining the quality results in additional complications when trying to answer the question posed in the title. It should also be emphasized that, so far, in the literature in the field of tourism, there have been very few studies concerning interactions between the perception of quality and authenticity.

The notion of authenticity is a frequent subject of discussion in the literature in the field of tourism and begins to be seen as one of the main factors contributing to undertaking tourist trips (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Kim & Jamal, 2007; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; McIntosh & Prentice, 1999; Taylor, 2001) as well as one of the determinants of the quality of visitor attractions (Drummond, 2001; Moscardo & Pearce 1986; Yeoman et al. 2007). Researchers try to answer the questions about the importance of authenticity in the visitors' experiences and whether the search for authenticity is an important motive for undertaking tourist trips. Some of the researchers attempt to classify places due to their authenticity (Brida, Disegna & Scuderi, 2012; Chhabra, 2008; Cohen, 1979; Pearce & Moscardo, 1986; Salamone, 1997). Some researchers, however, question the need for an *a priori* classification of tourist sites,

¹ Economy and Social Science Institute, WSB University in Poznań, ul. Ratajczaka 5/7, 61-874 Poznań – Poland, Tel. + 48 61 655 33 33, Fax + 48 61 655 32 27, E-mail: marek.nowacki@wsb.poznan.pl

as more or less authentic, instead proposing the evaluation of accuracy or honesty of tourist representations (Silver, 1993; Taylor, 2001, Pearce 2005). Intensive development of theme parks around the world, also calls into question the need for the authenticity of mass tourists.

136 |

For visitor attractions managers the important problem is to answer the question whether interest in authenticity is important for visitors of these objects and what kind of authenticity visitors experience. Another questions are: is it possible to separate segments of visitors due to the degree of perception of various dimensions of authenticity and what is the relationship of authenticity perception with attractions and overall evaluation and behavioural intentions of the visitors? And further what is the role in that process of the perception of quality of attraction product? The purpose of this article is to attempt to answer the above questions.

The Meaning of Authenticity

The word 'authenticity' is of Greek origin - *authentikos* means 'guaranteed' (from *authéntēs* - offender or murderer) - and means: real (e.g. authentic characters, authentic difficulty), which is the original (e.g. an authentic document, authentic recordings) (Kopaliński, 2013). L. Trilling (1973) brought the concept of sincerity, which was understood as the absence of deception in social situations: sincere was man who claimed to be. In the literature in the field of tourism, authenticity was initially associated with the primitive folk art goods, not mass produced and used for traditional activities (Bamosy & Costa 2001). For example, the authentic African art was described as "... anything made of traditional materials by local artisans for use by local people, rather than to use this item by the Europeans and other foreigners" (McLeod 1976, p. 31 according to Cohen 1988). Accordingly, products made for sale to tourists were not considered as authentic. Authentic was considered to be something that is not artificial, not a copy or a forgery.

Among the authors there is a disagreement as to whether tourists are motivated by the desire to seek authenticity, as D. MacCannell (1976) convinces, or - on the contrary - the authenticity of the visited places is of no interest to them, as D. Boorstin (1964). According to MacCannell, "sightseers are motivated by a desire to see life as it is really lived, even to get in with the natives" [1976, p. 94]. Tourists are interested in real life of the foreigners, which takes place in Goffman's back regions (1964). However, they do not have access to the back regions, they are only watching the front region - the authenticity which is specially staged for them. Even the distinction between the front region from the back region is very difficult and practically impossible: "It is always possible that what is taken to be entry into a back region is really entry into a front region that has been totally set up in advance for touristic visitation" (MacCannell 1976, p. 101]. In turn, D. Boorstin (1964) argues that the authenticity of visited places is of no interest to the tourist. The modern tourist, a travel agency customer, satisfies his needs by participating in "pseudo-events". These are carefully designed, arranged and completely safe activities, providing the participants with standardized experiences. They rarely seek genuine expressions of other cultures, because they prefer their own ideas, formed on the basis of information obtained from newspapers, television and films.

Dimensions of authenticity

In the literature there have been many attempts of authenticity classification. T. Selwyn (1999) proposed two dimensions of authenticity: cold and hot, R. Wang (Wang, 1999) identified three dimensions of the understanding of authenticity: objective, constructivist and existentialist. Chhabra added another dimension of authenticity – negotiated (Chhabra, 2008) and Belhassen et al. (2008) another one, which they called ‘theoplacity’.

| 137

Objective or essentialist authenticity relates to places, objects or events which can be verified in an objective manner, using previously accepted criteria. The authenticity of the objects in the objectivist sense (their genuineness) can be determined only by professionals in the fields of art, ethnology or archaeology, usually after detailed studies. Tourists are usually not able to make the distinction. It is assumed that the artefacts that do not meet a certain criterion of authenticity cannot be regarded as authentic, even if tourists assess them as authentic. This position has been criticized by Cohen (1988) arguing that authenticity is a social construct. According to him, a tourist can even see as authentic souvenirs made for tourists or dances or rituals staged specially for tourists by local artists. The first and foremost weakness of the objectivist concept is that in many cases it is difficult to formulate clear criteria of authenticity. It is not possible, for example, to determine the authenticity of an Italian pizza or German strudel. In different regions and historical periods, these two regional dishes have evolved to form different varieties. Now all these foods, regardless of the region’s production, are true and authentic (Kolar & Žabkar 2007). Objectivist/essentialist authenticity is associated with cultural continuity, originality, genuineness (made locally by ethnic communities) and pristinity (Chhabra, 2008; Cohen, 1988; Theobald, 1998 cit. in Chhabra 2010) and is treated as the frozen heritage (Chhabra, 2010).

According to the constructivist (symbolic) concept, authenticity is a relative construct, socially created by tourists, as a result of comparisons between their expectations and perceptions of visited sites (Cohen 1988, Wang 1999, Reisinger & Steiner 2006). Perception of constructivist authenticity depends largely on the context, situation and intersubjective conditions under which it is experienced by tourists. N. Wang (1999) quoted a number of arguments for the existence of constructivist (symbolic) authenticity only: (1) there are no absolute and unchanging originals or patterns, with which one can compare the observed objects to determine their authenticity, (2) practices of “inventing traditions” (Hobsbawn & Ranger 1992) show, that the traditions and customs are created on an ongoing basis depending on the current demand of the contemporaries, (3) a sense of authenticity is dependent on the tourist himself and his experience and understanding of authenticity (if the visitor finds something to be authentic, it is so, not what is the opinion of experts as Cohen (1988) argues, (4) authenticity is a label that is given to the tourist sites (it is influenced by both past experiences, media, travel companions and especially by a group’s tour guide), (5) often, though at a first glance something seems inauthentic, over time it becomes authentic (emerging authenticity as Cohen called). This was the case of, among others, Disneyland, which at first was regarded as a classic example of an imaginary place of amusement, and is now regarded by many as an authentic part of American heritage (Cohen 1988).

The concept of existential authenticity, which Tom Selwyn (1996) calls ‘hot’, takes the discourse away from the analysis of visited places, into the authenticity of the tourist experience. A. Wiczorkiewicz (2008) convinces, that the need for authentic experiences is cre-

ated, as a result of alienation, which the individual experiences in everyday life. In the search of them, tourists are engaged in various forms of tourist activity. An example of such form can be an active participation in dance performance organized by the natives (Daniel 1996). However, the essential precondition for the authentic experience is to take an active part in it. If such performance is viewed in a passive way, it can cause at most (though not always) a sense of authenticity in the objectivist or - even more often - in a constructivist sense. Wang (1999) also distinguished between two types of existential authenticity: intra-personal and inter-personal. The intrapersonal authenticity is caused by *bodily feelings* related to self-making. An example of the activity that provides such experiences may be practicing adventure tourism (sea sailing, paragliding, parachuting, and mountain climbing) or even sunbathing. The interpersonal authenticity takes place when a tourist is looking for authenticity in dealing with others. In this way, a tourist trip can be an opportunity to create or strengthen family ties or an opportunity for exploring exotic places in a specific group of people (Bruner 1994, Urry 1990). Visited places only serve as a medium, through which they come together and experience the authentic experience in their company.

D. Chhabra (2008) has added the fourth state to the spectrum of authenticity – negotiation. Quoting S. Pearce, she writes that “pure essentialism in its original form does not exist because nature ‘itself is a result of historical and social construction’” (Pearce, 1992, p. 6, cit. in. Chhabra, 2008, 432). So “essentialism is negotiated to address the fluidity of authenticity” (Chhabra, 2008, p. 432). She locates negotiation between essentialism and constructivism states. This is, according to Adams (1996), co-created process between suppliers and consumers. According to this line of thought authenticity can be “sustained in the re-creation process while focusing on the requirements of the market” (Chhabra 2010, p. 34). Then if it will be commoditized in the careful way, it can help to “preserve traditions by generating demand or attributing value to them” (Medina, 2003, p. 354).

Y. Belhassen, K. Caton and W. Stewart (2008), who studied Protestant pilgrims visiting the Holy Land found that the perception of authenticity is affected by three components: beliefs, visited sites and activity undertaken by visitors. This relationship was called “theoplicity” from the Greek word “theos” (God) and the Latin “placea” (place). This concept combines all three discussed earlier means of authenticity. The authenticity experienced by the pilgrims is, without a doubt, existential in nature. However, objective authenticity of the visited buildings or rather sites associated with the life of Christ is equally important. We are dealing with constructivist authenticity here, as pilgrims “bring with them preconceived understandings of the sacred spaces they visit” and we are also faced with “the notion of collective, social authoring of the meaning of these spaces” (p. 684). Then socially constructed meanings are not only places visited by pilgrims but also the importance of their own behaviour.

A sense of authenticity, quality perception of overall satisfaction

As noted by many authors a sense of authenticity in tourist settings has a strong impact on visitors’ satisfaction (Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Kolar & Zabkar, 2007; Moscardo & Pearce, 1986). This impact will be particularly strong in the case of persons for whom authenticity is one of the main determinants of attractiveness of a visited place.

The ability to trigger the need to re-participate in an activity, repeat visits to attractions and encouraging others to do so is considered to be an important factor for success in the market of visitor attractions (Bowen & Chen, 2001; Som et al. 2012; Ritchie, Mules, & Uzabeaga, 2008). Although the relationship between satisfaction with the service and loyalty to them is often taken for granted (Conlon & Murray, 1996; Yavas, 1998), some authors have questioned this relationship (Cronin & Taylor, 1992; Danaher & Arweiler, 1996). While others argue that this relationship has a certain asymmetry: loyal consumers are generally satisfied, but satisfaction does not always transform into loyalty (Wojnarowska, 2005)

This article proposes that the importance that visitors attach to the authenticity of the visitor attractions will have a significant impact on the perception of the quality of the experience gained during the visit as well as satisfaction with the sight and behavioural intentions in relation to the museum. This purpose of the paper is to answer the following questions:

1. What characteristics of visitors are related to the perception of the authenticity of the visited attraction?
2. What is the relationship between perception of the quality and the authenticity of the visited attraction?
3. What is the relationship between perception of authenticity and the overall assessment of visited attraction and visitors' behavioural intentions?

The relationships between certain tourist attractions visitors' characteristics and the perception of authenticity were pointed by some authors. For example, D. Chhabra (2010) stated, that the objective and negotiated authenticity is an inspiration for generation Y to undertake activities in the field of heritage tourism. However, in the work from 2005, Chhabra found no significant between-group differences in perception due to income, gender, education. The concept of existential authenticity (Wang 1999, Steiner and Reisinger 2006) as well as the authenticity of the hot may suggest that susceptible to this kind of authenticity will be young people looking for more exciting experiences and getting involved in events rather than older people. In turn, better educated and more experienced tourists can pay more attention to authenticity (Cohen 1998). That is, those who are more experienced and educated are more sceptical (will evaluate places and events as less authentic) than the others. The above assertions allow us to formulate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The perception of authenticity will be determined by the socio-demographic characteristics of attraction visitors.

There is little research on the relationship between perception of quality and authenticity. For example, Moscardo and Pearce (1986) found, that the majority of people visiting the historic theme park believe, that it should be the most true and consistent with the history even at the expense of some facilities for visitors. Also, the vast majority of the public does not agree that it should improve the comfort and convenience of visitors at the expense of losing some historical details. Similar results were obtained by Nowacki (2011) in studies carried out among visitors at XV Archaeological Festival in Biskupin in 2009. In these studies, up to 74% of visitors agreed that the authenticity of the visited sites is very important, even at the expense of higher fees for sightseeing. Furthermore 83% of respondents stated that such attractions as Biskupin should be the most authentic, even at the expense of the convenience for visitors. Then, it can be concluded that:

Hypothesis 2: Visitors who attach high importance to authenticity will highly evaluate the authenticity of the festival.

Relationships between perception of authenticity and assessment of visitor attraction quality have not previously been the subject of discussion in the literature. However, some findings suggest that a positive evaluation of the authenticity may affect the positive assessment of the quality of the attraction product. Moscardo and Pearce (1986), who studied the perception of historical theme park authenticity found that 95% of the visitors believed that the park should be as true and consistent with the story even at the expense of some facilities for visitors, and 88% disagreed that it should improve the comfort and convenience of visitors at the expense of losing some historical details. Similar results were obtained by Nowacki of people visiting the Archaeological Festival in Biskupin (Nowacki, 2011). When asked “Rate how important it is for you the authenticity of the places visited” 74% of respondents agreed that the authenticity of the visited sites is very important to them, even at the expense of higher fees for sightseeing. And 83% of respondents stated that such places as Biskupin should be the most authentic, even at the expense of the public convenience. This allows us to formulate hypothesis no. 3:

Hypothesis 3: High perception of authenticity is associated with high assessment of quality elements which are connected with authenticity.

The influence of authenticity perception on the visitors’ satisfaction already has been confirmed by a number of authors (Moscardo & Pearce, 1986, Kolar & Zabkar 2007, 2010, Nowacki 2011). For people who attach great importance to the authenticity of visited sites, the impact of a sense of authenticity on the satisfaction will be even stronger. In other words, the impact of authenticity perception on the quality of experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions will be moderated by the individual importance of authenticity. The larger the importance of site authenticity, the greater the satisfaction will be induced by his perception.

Hypothesis 4: High assessment of authenticity will have a positive impact on the overall quality assessment and on the behavioural intentions of Festival visitors.

Archaeological Festival in Biskupin

Archaeological Festival in Biskupin is the largest such event in Central and Eastern Europe. It takes place on the territory of the Museum and the archaeological reserve which protect the ancient defensive settlement of Lusatian culture. The leading theme of the Festival is different every year. In 2013, the main theme was “Archaeology - profession or adventure?” Within nine days of the Festival, from 14th to 22th September 2013, it was visited by 30,110 people. The Festival is full of presentations of craft techniques, fights, music and dance performances. Visitors have the opportunity to taste regional and historical cuisine, and to purchase a variety of souvenirs. Dance and music ensembles perform on the festival’s scene, and historical re-enactment groups present the fights of the early Middle Ages’ warriors. In addition, visitors have the opportunity to participate in dance workshops, competitions of pot modelling, art and ceramic painting contests. In addition, in 2013, visitors could learn about methods of excavation and documentation of their results, as well as the ways of conservation of artefacts. Aviation and submarine archaeology shows, archeozoology, anthropology, geophysics and others took place on a daily basis. Moreover, in the building of

the museum where the permanent exhibition of the history of the settlement and the archaeological excavations was displayed, a temporary exhibition titled “The phenomenon of Nidajna” was opened. It presented the results of archaeological research conducted at the site of the former lake in north-eastern Poland, where a remarkable discovery was made. The plated fittings and applications richly decorated with unusual representations of mythical animals, which were prepared in the best workshops of the ancient world on the Black Sea and the Mediterranean were presented in the exhibition in a very realistic way.

Methods

The survey was conducted among the visitors to 19th Archaeological Festival at Biskupin, Poland. The estimated size of the survey sample was based on attendance at previous festivals. Observing the decreasing attendance at the festival in the last ten years it was assumed that attendance in 2013 would not exceed 40,000 visitors. So for a confidence level of 0.95 and the maximum error $p = 0.05$ the minimum sample size of $N = 381$ respondents was considered. Interviews were conducted by two trained interviewers among visitors leaving the festival in the reception area and museum exhibition. Four hundred and five completed questionnaires were collected ($N = 400$), with 35 refusals, giving a very high rate of return of 91%.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire included scales to measure the perception of authenticity, attraction product quality, the importance of authenticity, overall attraction evaluation, behavioural intentions and socio-demographic characteristics. Authenticity was operationalized using the typology proposed by Wang (1999) with modifications suggested by Chhabra (2010). Accordingly, it was decided to use a three-dimensional structure of authenticity: object-based (essentialist), negotiated and existential. Measurement scales were developed based on previously conducted qualitative and quantitative research on the perception of authenticity at the Festival in Biskupin carried out in 2009 (Nowacki, 2011) and analysis of the literature. As a result, three sentences were chosen regarding the object-based authenticity, three sentences concerning the existential authenticity and three sentences concerning negotiated authenticity (Tab. 3). The importance of authenticity was assessed using three statements taken from Pearce and Moscardo (1986) and Nowacki (2011). The scale to assess the attraction product quality consisted of 17 statements adapted from McDowall (2011), Baker & Crompton (2000), Crompton & Love (1995) and Yoon, Lee & Lee (2010).

The importance of authenticity for the visitors of Biskupin was evaluated based on the answers to the question: *Rate how important for you is the authenticity (genuineness) of the visited places.* Respondents evaluated sequentially, using a five-point Likert scale (from *definitely yes* to *definitely not*), the three statements: *The authenticity of the visited places is very important to me even at the expense of higher charges for entrance. Such places as Biskupin should be as authentic, even as the convenience of visitors could be lost, and I do not pay attention to the authenticity of visited places and objects.* These statements were evaluated using a five-point Likert scale (from *definitely yes* to *definitely not*). The α -Cronbach coefficient

of the scale - 0.33 was insufficient. However, after the removal of the last statement from the scale *I do not pay attention to the authenticity of visited places and objects*, the value of α -Cronbach's coefficient was 0.708 and proved to be satisfactory (Hair et al. 2007).

142 | The overall satisfaction with the visit at the Festival was assessed with three statements concerning behavioural intentions, recommendation of visiting the festival to others and quality of the festival compared with similar events. Behavioural intentions were assessed using a statement: *Do you intend to visit the Festival again?* Recommendations of visiting the festival were assessed with: *Will you recommend visiting the Festival to your friends or family?* and quality of performance was assessed using a question: *In general, how would you rate the Festival compared to the other attractions of this type?* All claims were evaluated using a five-point Likert scale (α -Cronbach = 0.708). The questionnaire also contained questions about socio-demographic characteristics, features of the trip and tour group. Data analysis was performed using the statistical software STATISTICA 8.0.

Research results

The profile of respondents. In the study group there were 58.2% female respondents and 41.8% males (N = 405). The most numerous age group was the youngest group (15–18 years old) - 29.8% and people aged 35–44 years (17.5%). The smallest age groups represented in the study consisted of the oldest persons: over 64 years old – 5.1%, 45–54 years – 7,6 and 55–64 years – 9.4%. Most numerous were those with college education (29.1%), secondary education (28.8%), with college education (25.0%) and students (26.4%). Only 16.3% of the respondents were tourists (during the overnight trip). The remaining 83.7% of those were people living in the area or on one-day excursions. Only 18.0% of respondents had a guide in the Festival area. Most of them, 37.7% of respondents, came to the Festival with family groups (with children) (37.8%) and with a group (35.8%).

Authenticity perception

In order to verify the three-dimensional concept of authenticity the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out. Latent variables (authenticity factors) were defined in such a way that each was loaded by at least one item. The analysis confirmed the existence of three factors of authenticity: essentialist-objectivist, existentialist and negotiated (Tab. 1). The values of Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the measurement scales ranged from 0.61 to 0.71 and therefore were within the required minimum of 0.60-0.70 (Hair at al. 2010). The obtained factors from 0.527 to 0.558 of the average variance explained (AVE) and confirmed sufficient consistency and reliability of the tested model. Factor loadings obtained factors ranged from 0.597 to 0.798. The chi-square ratio to the degrees of freedom (χ^2 / df) was 2.32, and with the other indicators, which were: RMSEA = 0.055; CFI = 0.945; NFI = 0.951; GFI = 0.971 allows to accept the proposed measurement model.

Table 1: Confirmatory factor analysis of authenticity items.

Factors/ items	α	AVE	CR	λ	t
Essentialists-objectivist	0.61	0.52	0.76		
<i>Iron Age settlement on the peninsula looks authentic</i>				0.69	11.0
<i>Exhibits on display in the museum pavilion look authentic</i>				0.72	11.4
<i>I really liked the exhibits on display at the museum</i>				0.74	11.0
Existential authenticity	0.71	0.57	0.79		
<i>Festival allowed me to empathize with the period of the Iron Age</i>				0.85	12.5
<i>Festival really revived the past</i>				0.79	11.9
<i>I was able to feel the real atmosphere of this place</i>				0.59	7.91
Constructivist authenticity /negotiated	0.64	0.55	0.78		
<i>I really like places where history can be almost touched</i>				0.77	11.0
<i>Information about the history and archaeology was very interesting</i>				0.78	10.5
<i>Reconstruction of the settlement from the Iron Age and early medieval settlement really inspired me</i>				0.66	8.25

Note: $\chi^2 = 55.88$; $\chi^2/df = 2.32$; RMSEA = 0.055; CFI = 0.945; NFI = 0.951; GFI = 0.971;

Clustered segments of authenticity perception

In order to obtain clusters of people perceiving authenticity of the Festival in Biskupin in a similar way two subsequent cluster analyses were performed. The first analysis with a tree clustering algorithm was performed. The purpose of this algorithm is to join together objects (visitors) into successively larger clusters, using some measure of similarity or distance. A typical result of this type of clustering is the hierarchical tree (StatSoft, Inc. 2007). Nine items of authenticity as variables in analysis perception were taken. The tree clustering analysis revealed the existence of three clusters of people clearly differentiated due to perception of authenticity. In the next step K-means grouping procedure was performed, where as a criterion for the segmentation were nine authenticity items. Clustering cases, sorting of distances and taking observations at a fixed interval algorithm was selected. The aim was to achieve three clusters of cases (visitors of the festival), to the greatest extent differ from each other in terms of the perception of authenticity. The significance of differences in the perception of authenticity between segments was tested with non-parametric H Kruskal-Wallis test. Analysis showed that the obtained clusters are significantly different between each other due to all items of authenticity (Table 2, next page).

Cluster I is the largest segment of Festival visitors ($n = 237$, 58.5%). This group has a high perception of all three dimensions of authenticity: all items of authenticity were rated highest (the highest mean in the sample). Therefore we can call them "highly authentic". Cluster II (58 persons, 14.3%), is a small group which highly evaluated the existential authenticity (highest in the sample), average evaluated constructivist authenticity and quite low essentialist. Than we can call them "really existentialists". Cluster III which included 110 persons (27.2%) comprises people with lowest perception of authenticity in the sample. All items of authenticity were rated lowest by them - significantly lower than in the other two segments. Mem-

Table 2: Mean scores of authenticity items by and differences between clustered authenticity groups.

Factors/ items	Custers			P
	I 237, 58.5%	II 58, 14.3%	III 110, 27.2%	
Essentialists-objectivist				
<i>Iron Age settlement on the peninsula looks authentic</i>	4.67	4.56	4.07	0.001
<i>Exhibits on display in the museum pavilion look authentic</i>	4.69	2.79	3.88	0.001
<i>I really liked the exhibits on display at the museum</i>	4.55	2.86	3.70	0.001
Existential authenticity				
<i>Festival allowed me to empathize with the period of the Iron Age</i>	4.41	4.25	2.93	0.001
<i>Festival really revived the past</i>	4.52	4.62	3.64	0.001
<i>I was able to feel the real atmosphere of this place</i>	4.55	4.67	3.98	0.001
Constructivist authenticity /negotiated				
<i>I really like places where history can be almost touched</i>	4.46	4.27	3.34	0.001
<i>Information about the history and archaeology was very interesting</i>	4.48	4.31	3.51	0.001
<i>Reconstruction of the settlement from the Iron Age and early medieval settlement really inspired me</i>	4.37	4.22	3.60	0.001

Note: values above mean are bolded

144 |

bers of that cluster are therefore people who see the festival as an event artificially fabricated for tourists, in a staged environment and were in the slightest felt genuinely and inspired by the authenticity of the festival. We can call them “inauthentic”.

Socio-demographic characteristics versus authenticity perception

The analysis of intergroup differences between segments obtained due to socio-demographic characteristics and features of the trips did not show any significant differences.

The importance of authenticity

The importance of authenticity for visitors of Festival in Biskupin were tested using three items. All of them significantly differentiate the identified visitors segments (Tab. 3). The first two items: *the importance of authenticity even at the expense of higher fees for sightseeing* and *importance of authenticity even some facilities for visitors are lacking* were rated much higher by people with clusters of high and medium perception of authenticity than by people with low perception of authenticity. The third assertion concerning importance of *authenticity instead of comfortable connection with attractions* substantially differentiates the segment of high authenticity of the low segment of authenticity that confirms the 2nd hypothesis (high perception of authenticity is connected with high importance to authenticity).

Table 3: Importance of authenticity and authenticity segments.

Importance of authenticity items	Custers			p
	I	II	III	
<i>Authenticity of the visited sites is very important even due to higher entrance fees</i>	4.21 ^a	4.26 ^a	3.66 ^b	0.001
<i>Such sites as Biskupin should be very authentic even at the expense of facilities for visitors</i>	4.12 ^a	4.05 ^a	3.53 ^b	0.001
<i>Authenticity of the visited sites is very important even at the expense of the more difficult directions to them</i>	4.40 ^a	4.29	4.08 ^b	0.010

Note: a, b, c – indicates differences between two groups tested with U Mann-Whitney test.

145

Quality of the Festival

Respondents from three clusters significantly differ due to assessment of 8 out of 17 quality attributes of the festival: three attributes of the aesthetics of the festival (appearance of the objects, shows and performances as well as exhibitions in the museum pavilion) and the single attributes of other factors: atmosphere during the Festival, sites for rest, food & beverages and stands (souvenirs and level of congestion) (Table 4).

Table 4: Quality of festival attributes and authenticity segments.

Quality of Festival attributes	Custers			p
	I	II	III	
<i>Aesthetics of the Festival</i>				
The general appearance of the reconstructed buildings and settlements	4.66	4.70	4.45	0.003
Shows and performances	4.46	4.32	4.18	0.02
The exhibition in the museum pavilion	4.36	4.17	3.95	0.001
<i>The organization of the festival</i>				
Information concerning the program of the Festival	4.53	4.67	4.41	0.18
Safety in the Festival area	4.20	4.27	4.03	0.17
The program of the Festival	3.83	3.75	3.68	0.16
The atmosphere during the Festival	4.37	4.44	4.15	0.01
<i>Cleanliness and tidiness</i>				
Cleanliness in the Festival area	3.83	3.72	3.70	0.40
Sites for rest	4.33	4.39	4.10	0.009
Stands in the Festival area	4.43	4.37	4.24	0.11
<i>Gastronomy, orientation and staff</i>				
Food & beverage	4.05	4.13	3.79	0.03
Orientation in the Festival area/ directional signs	4.57	4.51	4.39	0.11
The attitude of the staff in the Festival area	4.24	4.22	4.17	0.88
<i>Stands</i>				
Souvenirs	3.26	3.01	2.84	0.01
The level of congestion and queues to the stands	4.34	3.10	3.79	0.001
<i>Parking and toilets</i>				
Toilets	3.94	3.55	3.96	0.14
Parking	3.69	3.72	3.64	0.77

Individuals with a strong perception of authenticity rate significantly higher attributes which can affect the assessment of the quality, that is: objects, shows and exhibitions (intensity of these differences is significant and ranges from $p = 0.001$ to $p = 0.02$), that allows to accept hypothesis no. 3, that high perception of authenticity is positively associated with high assessment of quality elements. In addition, people with the strongest perception of authenticity perceived significantly higher the atmosphere of the festival, the quality of the sites for rest, food & beverage and stands (souvenirs and the level of congestion and queues to the stands).

Satisfaction and behavioral intentions

There were no significant differences between the clusters due to desire of recommending to friends and family visiting the festival (Tab. 5). However, the segment with strong perception of authenticity (really authentic) has a significantly higher willingness to re-visit the festival than people with the lowest perception of authenticity ($H = 11.62$, $p = 0.003$). Similarly, the segment of the high and the average perception authenticity rate higher the festival in their overall assessment in comparison with other similar attractions than those with low perception of authenticity ($H = 41.87$, $p < 0.001$). That allows to accept the 4th hypothesis, that high assessment of authenticity has a positive impact on the overall quality assessment.

Table 5: Satisfaction and behavioral intentions by authenticity segments.

Satisfaction and behavioral intentions items	Clusters			p
	I	II	III	
<i>Do you recommend visiting the Festival to your friends or family?</i>	4.32	4.26	4.35	0.52
<i>Do you want to visit the festival again?</i>	4.48	4.48	4.22	0.003
<i>In general, how would you rate the Festival in Biskupin compared to the other attractions of this type?</i>	4.27	4.09	3.73	0.001

Conclusions

The study's aim was to empirically examine the multidimensional concept of authenticity and to identify the determinants of the perception of authenticity by the attraction visitors as well as the relationship between the perception of authenticity and visitors' satisfaction and their behavioural intentions. Based on a literature review a three factorial structure of authenticity was identified, which was verified and empirically confirmed in the study performed during the Archaeological Festival in Biskupin among 405 visitors. The study confirmed the high internal reliability of the scales used for measuring the perception of authenticity.

Research showed that the tested group of people visiting the archaeological festival is significantly diverse in terms of the perception of authenticity. However, the results forced to reject the first hypothesis: there were no significant differences in the perception of authenticity among groups of people of different ages, different backgrounds, as well as among groups with different characteristics excursion group (tourists / visitors), experience (first / next), etc. Lack of linkages between socio-demographic characteristics and the perception

of authenticity, also identified by Kolar and Zabkar (2007) indicates the need to incorporate into the model the authenticity conditions and other variables such as psychometric characteristics, motivations and perhaps expectations of attractions that better explain variation in the perception of authenticity.

The study confirmed that the importance of authenticity significantly differentiates visitors due to perception of authenticity (second hypothesis). Individuals with high perception of authenticity are much more interested in the authenticity of tourist attraction: they are able to pay more for admission, they are able to tolerate the lack of facilities for visiting such places and spend more effort reaching them. In practice, it means that managers need to ensure a high degree of authenticity or at least provide a gradation accuracy or authenticity of such zones (for example according to the model proposed by C. Gunn in 1988). Accordingly, “nucleus” of attraction could remain totally authentic. Access to it would be restricted e.g. by a buffer zone, available only for those visitors who need authenticity mostly. This impairment may have to rely both on having to incur additional costs and take a longer walk in order to reach the nucleus. Such zoning would ensure better protection of historic and sensitive nucleus and improve the quality of visitors’ experiences.

It was found also, that perception of authenticity has a significant relationship with the assessment of the archaeological festival quality (third hypothesis was confirmed). However, that applies not only to all attributes of the festival, but especially those whose quality is related to their authenticity, namely: reconstructed elements of the settlement, shows and performances (interpreters dressed in authentic costumes and presenting authentic dances, songs and art handicraft), the exhibition in the museum pavilion, stalls with souvenirs (looking very authentic). Although several studies have shown that authenticity is important even at the expense of quality (Moscardo & Pearce 1986, Nowacki 2011, 2013), the present study shows that a positive perception of authenticity is conducive to the high assessment of the quality of services provided.

The perception of authenticity is also linked with a sense of loyalty to the Festival. It was found that there is a significantly higher willingness to re-visit the Festival expressed by people from groups highly authentic (segment I) and really existentialists (segment II) - that is, with higher perception of authenticity - than inauthentic. This is perhaps the most important observation of this study because repeat visits, as claimed by many authors (Swarbrooke 2002, Um et al. 2006) are the key to the success of visitor attractions. That relationship indicates the need for attraction managers to care not only about adequate display of original artefacts, create atmosphere corresponding to the interpreted historical periods but also revitalize exposure and zooming inspiring story almost at the doorstep.

As other studies show (e.g. Nowacki, 2011), the impact of existential authenticity on behavioural intentions also runs through the quality of experience and satisfaction, but most affected - directly, which confirms earlier findings by Boulding et al. (1993) and Baker and Crompton (2000). Active participation of the visitors in the festival is the strongest factor influencing the willingness to revisit. Only later that affects satisfaction. This relationship should prompt managers of attractions, testifying the need to engage visitors in a variety of forms of activity and perhaps even to stimulate creativity through the organization of various workshops in the attractions area.

The above-mentioned research showed, that people who strongly perceive existential, hot, actively constructed by them authenticity - depended greatly on the visitors themselves (Cohen, 1988, Wang 1999, Reisinger and Steiner 2006), rate significantly higher the festival and show greater loyalty to it. This is probably due to the fact that the festival is an event created artificially, especially for guests. Although the festival takes place at the authentic Lusatian culture settlement and shows revitalized times of settlement existence, the interpreted themes often differ from historical and geographical realities. For a variety of festivals different foreign cultures such as Native Americans, Japanese or Egyptian Pharaonic culture period in the settlement are interpreted. Although those themes very far from the place of its presentation, authentic costumes used by interpreters, props and their behaviours affect authenticity of these representations in the perception of the visitors.

Although the above-mentioned study was conducted among the participants of the archaeological festival, further research should be carried out in other tourist attractions such as museums, theme parks and historical places, even in areas of natural heritage to verify the hypotheses wider.

References

- Adams, V. (1996). *Tigers of the Snow and Other Virtual Sherpas: An Ethnography of Himalayan Encounters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Baker, D., & Crompton, J. (2000). Quality, Satisfaction and Behavioral Intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), pp. 785-804.
- Bamossy, G., & Costa A. (2001). Le parc Disney: Creating an “authentic” American experience”. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 28, pp. 398-402.
- Belhassen, Y., Caton, K., & Stewart, W.P. (2008). The search for authenticity in the pilgrim experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(3), pp. 668-689.
- Boorstin, D. (1964). *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Boulding, W., Kalra, A., Staeling, R., & Zeithaml, V. A. (1993). A dynamic process model of service quality: from expectations to behavioural intentions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30, pp. 7-27.
- Bowen, J. T., & Chen, S. (2001). The Relationship Between Customer Loyalty and Customer Satisfaction. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 5, pp. 213-217.
- Brida, J. G., Disegna, M., & Scuderi, R. (2012). The visitors’ perception of authenticity at the museum: archaeology versus modern art. *Current Issues in Tourism*, iFirst article, pp. 1-21.
- Bruner, E. M. (1994). Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism. *American Anthropologist*, 96, pp. 397–415.
- Chhabra, D. (2005). Understanding authenticity and its determinants. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(1), pp. 64-73.
- Chhabra, D. (2008). Positioning museums on an authenticity continuum. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), pp. 427-447.
- Chhabra, D. (2010). *Sustainable Marketing of Cultural and Heritage Tourism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, E. (1988). Authenticity and Commodification in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, pp. 371-386.
- Cohen, E., & Cohen S. (2012). Authentication: Hot and cool. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(3), pp. 1295-1314.
- Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the Sociology of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 6(1), pp. 18-35.
- Conlon, D. E., & Murray, N.M. (1996). Customer Perceptions of Corporate Responses to Product Complaints: The Role of Explanations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 4, pp. 1040-1056.
- Crompton, J., & Love, J. L. (1995). The Predictive Validity of Alternative Approaches to Evaluating Quality of a Festival. *Journal of Travel Research*, 34(1), pp. 11-24.
- Cronin, J., & Taylor, S. (1992). Measuring service quality: a re-examination and extension. *Journal of Marketing*, 56(3), pp. 55-68.

- Danaher, P. J., & Arweiler, N. (1996). Customer satisfaction in the tourist industry: a case study of visitors to New Zealand. *Journal of Travel Research*, 35(1), pp. 89-93.
- Daniel, Y. P. (1996). Tourism Dance Performances: Authenticity And Creativity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), pp. 780-797.
- Drummond, S. (2001). Critical success factors for the organization. In S. Drummond, & J. Yeomann, (Eds.), *Quality Issues in Heritage Visitor Attractions* (pp. 16-27). Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gunn, C. (1988). *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B., Anderson, R.L., & Tatham, R.L. (2007). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hobsbawm, E, & Ranger, T. (1992). *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, H., & Jamal, T. (2007). Touristic Quest for Existential Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), pp. 181-201.
- Kolar, T., & Žabkar, V. (2007). The meaning of tourists' authentic experiences for the marketing of cultural heritage sites. *Economic and business review*, 9(3), pp. 235-256.
- Kolar, T., & Žabkar, V. (2010). A consumer-based model of authenticity: An oxymoron or the foundation of cultural heritage marketing? *Tourism Management*, 31, pp. 652-664.
- Kopaliński, W. (2013). „Słownik wyrazów obcych i zwrotów obcojęzycznych”. <http://www.slownik-online.pl>. (access 15.08.2013)
- MacCannell, D. (1976). *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Schocken Books Inc.
- McDowal, S. (2011). The Festival in My Hometown: The Relationships Among Performance Quality, Satisfaction, and Behavioral Intentions. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 12(4), pp. 269-288.
- McIntosh, A., & Prentice, R. (1999). Affirming Authenticity: Consuming Cultural Heritage. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), pp. 589-612.
- McLeod, M. D. (1976). Limitations of the Genuine. *African Art*, 9(3), pp. 48-51.
- Medina, L. (2003). Commoditizing Culture: Tourism and Maya Identity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30, pp. 353-368.
- Moscardo, G., & Pearce, P. (1986). Historic Theme Parks. An Australian Experience in Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, pp. 467-479.
- Nowacki, M. (2011). The Authenticity of Perception of the Visitors to the Archaeological Festival at Biskupin. *Journal of Tourism and Services*, 3, pp. 23-39.
- Nowacki, M. (2013). *The determinants of satisfaction of tourist attractions' visitors*. Poznań: Active.
- Pearce, S. (1992). *Museums, Objects and Collections*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Pearce, P. (2005). *Tourist Behaviour. Themes and Conceptual Schemes. Aspects of Tourism*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Pearce, P., & Moscardo, G. (1986). The Concept of Authenticity in Tourist Experiences. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 22, pp. 121-132.
- Reisinger, Y., & Steiner, C. (2006). Reconceptualising Object Authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(1), pp. 65-86.
- Ritchie, B., Mules, T., & Uzabeaga, S. (2008). *Visitor attraction satisfaction benchmarking project*. Gold Coast: Sustainable Tourism Pty Ltd.
- Salamone, F.A. (1997). Authenticity in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), pp. 305-321.
- Selwyn, T. (1996). *The Tourist Image: Myths and myth making in tourism*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Silver, A. (1992). Marketing authenticity in Third World countries. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20(2), pp. 302-318.
- Som, A. P. M., Marzuki, A., Yousefi, M., & AbuKhalifeh, A.N. (2012). Factors influencing visitors' revisit behavioral Intentions: A case study of Sabah, Malaysia. *International Journal of Marketing Studies* 4(4), pp. 39-50.
- StatSoft, Inc. (2007). STATISTICA (data analysis software system), version 8.0. www.statsoft.com.
- Swarbrooke, J. (2002). *The Development and Management of Visitor Attractions*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, J. P. (2001). Authenticity and Sincerity in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28(1), pp. 7-26.
- Theobald, W. (1988). *Global Tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Trilling, L. (1973). *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Um, S., Chon, K., Ro, Y. (2006). Antecedents of Revisit Intention. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(4), pp. 1141-1158.
- Urry, J. (1990). The Consumption of Tourism. *Sociology*, 24(1), pp. 23-35.

- Wang, N. (1999). Rethinking Authenticity in Tourism Experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), pp. 349-370.
- Wieczorkiewicz, A. (2008). *Apetyt turysty. O doświadczeniu świata w podróży*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Wojnarowska, H. (2005). Wyznaczniki lojalności klientów indywidualnych. *Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie*, 677, pp. 85-101.
- Yavas, U. (1998). Service Quality Sentiments as Correlates of Behavioral Intentions and Satisfaction: A Study of Turkish Consumers. *Journal of Customer Service in Marketing and Management*, 1, pp. 31-45.
- Yeoman, I., Brass, D., McMahon-Beattie, U. (2007). Current issue in tourism: The authentic tourist. *Tourism Management*, 28(4), pp. 1128-1138.
- Yoon, Y.-S, Lee J.-K., & Lee C.-K. (2010). Measuring festival quality and value affecting visitors' satisfaction and loyalty using a structural approach. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), pp. 335-342.