

2018

Understanding Chinese cultural tourists: typology and profile

Ganghua Chen

Songshan (Sam) Huang

Edith Cowan University, s.huang@ecu.edu.au

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013>



Part of the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

[10.1080/10548408.2017.1350253](https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/3904)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in the *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing* on 10 Jul 2017, Available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.108/10548408.2017.1350253>
Chen, G., & Huang, S. (2018). Understanding Chinese cultural tourists: typology and profile. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(2), 162-177. doi:[10.1080/10548408.2017.1350253](https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2017.1350253)

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.

<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworkspost2013/3904>

Understanding Chinese Cultural Tourists: Typology and Profile

To cite this article: Ganghua Chen & Songshan (Sam) Huang (2018) Understanding Chinese cultural tourists: typology and profile, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35:2, 162-177, DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2017.1350253

Ganghua Chen

(Associate Professor)

School of Tourism Management

Sun Yat-sen University

No.329 Building, No.135 Xingangxi Road, Haizhu District, Guangzhou

510275, P.R. China

Tel. and fax: +86-20-84113621

Email: ganghuachen0311@126.com

chengangh@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Songshan (Sam) Huang

(Professor of Tourism & Services Marketing)

School of Business and Law

Edith Cowan University

270 Joondalup Drive

Joondalup, WA 6027

Australia

Author Notes

Ganghua Chen is an Associate Professor, School of Tourism Management, Center for Tourism Planning and Research, and Center for Tourism, Leisure and Social Development, Sun Yat-sen University, 135 Xingangxi Road, Haizhu District, Guangzhou, 510275, China (ganghuachen0311@126.com; chengangh@mail.sysu.edu.cn).

Songshan (Sam) Huang is a Professor of Tourism & Services Marketing, School of Business and Law, Edith Cowan University, 270 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup, WA 6027, Australia (s.huang@ecu.edu.au).

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Professor Bob Mckercher for his constructive comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper presented at the 1st Australia and China Tourism Forum, Adelaide, South Australia, December, 2016, and the student investigators for their assistance for data collection of this paper. The authors would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions.

The work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China [grant number 41500154], the Tourism Youth Expert Training Program of the China National Tourism Administration [grant number TYETP201542].

Understanding Chinese Cultural Tourists: Typology and Profile

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to offer a clear and up-to-date typology and profile of Chinese cultural tourists in mainland China following McKercher's (2002) framework based on cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience. Using a sample of mainland Chinese tourists (n=656) at three cultural attractions in Guangzhou, China, a typology of Chinese cultural tourists (namely, casual, sightseeing, purposeful, serendipitous, and incidental) was developed and trip characteristics (e.g. prior knowledge, time spent to know the site before visit, change in knowledge, and on-site activities) and socio-demographics of each segment were also examined. In addition, slight differences are found between local day-trippers and tourists from outside Guangzhou in terms of their types and characteristics (prior knowledge, change in knowledge, and socio-demographics). Destination marketing and management implications are provided.

KEYWORDS: Chinese cultural tourists; cultural tourist typology; cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience; segmentation

Introduction

Cultural tourism, as one of the most popular forms of tourism (McKercher, 2002; Timothy, 2011), has recently witnessed remarkable development around the world. Many years ago, the World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) claimed that nearly 40% of all international trips undertaken are related to culture and heritage and the demand for both is growing at a rate of 15% annually (Boyd, 2001; McKercher, 2002). According to the European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education's 2007 cultural tourism research program, the percentage of tourists on cultural vacations grew from 17% in 1997 to over 30% in 2007 (Zbucheá, 2012). A recent study by Vong (2016) revealed that 76.2% of the surveyed tourists visiting Macao, mostly known as a gaming destination, were identified as cultural tourists by the researcher. A similar trend could also be found in China as an emerging market (WTM, 2012). Cultural tourism has become one of the most important types of tourism in China. For instance, according to the China Tourism Academy [CTA] (2016; 2017), three culture and heritage attractions were among the ten most popular domestic attractions for the National Day Holiday and the Spring Festival Holiday, respectively, in terms of online inquires and admission ticket booking. Similarly, five out of Guangzhou's ten most visited tourist attractions are culture and heritage sites (Guangzhou Tourism Bureau, 2015; 2016).

With the Chinese tourism market swiftly expanding and becoming increasingly sophisticated (CTA, 2017), the competition between cultural attractions and destinations has become fiercer. Therefore, targeting some specific segment(s) characterized by motivations and experiences that mirror the attraction's strengths will obviously bring competitive

advantages (e.g. Chen, 2016; Dolnicar, 2002). Consequently, it is vitally important to segment Chinese cultural tourists based on a full consideration of their whole cultural experiences. However, in spite of the remarkable growth and popularity of cultural tourism in China and a growing body of literature on Chinese cultural tourists' motivations (e.g. Wu & Wall, 2016), needs and evaluations of interpretation (e.g. Hong & Tao, 2006; Li & Qian, 2016), and typologies based on motivational differences (e.g. Su, Cao, Zhang, & Wu, 2005), little research has been done to segment and profile Chinese cultural tourists integrating both their cultural centrality (e.g. cultural motivation, importance of culture in the decision to visit) and depth/levels of cultural experience.

In this regard, McKercher (2002) developed a cultural tourist typology by addressing the aforementioned two dimensions. This typology considers both tourists' centrality of cultural tourism and their depth of cultural engagement and thus provides a useful and operational framework for segmenting cultural tourists. The McKercher (2002) typology has been further tested (McKercher & du Cros, 2003) and employed in subsequent empirical studies (e.g. McKercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016). In addition, prior research in the cultural tourism setting showed that local day-trippers and tourists from outside the destination exhibit differences in consumption and expenditure patterns (Caserta & Russo, 2002; Cegielski, Janeczko, Mules, & Wells, 2011; Russo, 2002), choice for attraction sites (Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998), cultural activities (Sturgis & Jackson, 2003), and satisfactions with service quality (Wan & Cheng 2011).

Therefore, the current study corresponds to the call for more empirical investigations on emerging markets, such as China in previous studies (e.g. Burgess & Steenkamp, 2006; Li,

2016; Sheth, 2011), and studies that demonstrated cross-cultural differences of cultural tourists in terms of their segmentations and profiles (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & Chow, 2001; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014). As such, the overarching purpose of the current study is to offer a clear and up-to-date typology and market profile of Chinese cultural tourists in China as an emerging market following McKercher's (2002) framework. Specifically, the research objectives are:

(1) to identify types of Chinese cultural tourists in China along the dimensions of cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience;

(2) to provide a detailed profile of Chinese cultural tourists in China by examining the characteristics of each type of cultural tourists; and,

(3) to compare local day-trippers and inter-city tourists in terms of their types and profiles.

It is believed that the findings of this study, by providing a better understanding of the Chinese cultural tourist market, will benefit marketers and managers of cultural tourism attractions and destinations, as well as future studies in the area of segmenting and profiling cultural tourists.

Literature review

Cultural tourist typologies and profiles

Cultural tourism has been broadly defined as a form of tourism concerning with a destination's culture, specifically including the lifestyles, history, arts, architecture, religions, heritages, and other related elements in the destination (McKercher & du Cros, 2002; Richards, 1996; Silberberg, 1995). Following the broadly defined concept of cultural tourism, 'cultural tourists' have been *technically* defined as travelers who visit cultural institutions or places, such as museums, archeological and heritage sites, operas, theatres, festivals, or architecture (e.g., McKercher & du Cros, 2002; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Silberberg, 1995; Stylianou-Lambert, 2011; Vong, 2016). Recently, with the growing number of segmentation and typology studies on cultural tourists (e.g. Chen, 2016; McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2002; McKercher, Ho, du Cros, & Chow, 2002; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Nyaupane, White, & Budruk, 2006; Silberberg, 1995; Vong, 2016; Yankholmes & McKercher, 2015), the heterogeneity nature of cultural tourists has been increasingly recognized. As shown in Table 1, these segmentation and typology studies can be grouped into two basic categories by segmenting variables. The first category deals with studies that used only one single segmentation variable, either focusing on tourists' pre-trip or onsite/post-trip behaviors, such as prior knowledge and information of the visited site (ICOMOS and WTO, 1993; Stebbins, 1996), travel motivations (e.g. Nyaupane, White, & Budruk, 2006; Richards, 1996; Silberberg, 1995), importance of heritage tourism in making visit decisions (Shifflet & Associates, 1999), interests of visiting cultural sites (Hughes,

2002), personal perspectives toward heritage site (Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2003), the effective behaviors of visitors (Espelt & Benito, 2006), cultural tourism activity participation (McKercher, Ho, du Cros, & Chow, 2002), and levels of heritage tourism experience (Timothy, 1997). The second category engages with multiple segmentation variables. Among these studies, McKercher (2002) developed a cultural tourist typology based on two core dimensions, namely the centrality of cultural tourism in the decision to visit a destination and the depth of cultural experience. The identified five types of cultural tourist were ‘purposeful cultural tourists’, ‘sightseeing cultural tourists’, ‘casual cultural tourists’, ‘serendipitous cultural tourists’, and ‘incidental cultural tourists’. The McKercher (2002) typology has been further tested for its applicability and employed in subsequent empirical studies, especially those focused on East Asian destinations, such as Hong Kong (e.g., McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006), Macao (Vong, 2016), and Hue City, Vietnam (Nguyen & Cheung, 2014).

Please insert Table 1 about here

In addition to the aforementioned two categories of studies (Table 1), tourism researchers have also conducted some other cultural tourist typology studies. For instance, Prentice (1993) segmented tourists to heritage attractions by socio-demographics. Pietro, Mugion, Mattia, and Renzi (2015) classified potential tourists to visit Italian cultural resources by four variables, namely, guiding elements, experiential elements, substantial elements, and practical aspects.

Chinese cultural tourist studies

With the remarkable growth and popularity of cultural tourism in China, tourism researchers have recently investigated a variety of topics related to Chinese cultural tourists. Major topic areas include tourist motivations (e.g. Cui, He, & Xu, 2016; Wu & Wall, 2016), tourist needs and expectations toward and evaluations of heritage interpretation (e.g. Deng & Qin, 2010; Li & Qian, 2016), and motivation-based tourist typologies (e.g. Luo & Zhao, 2015; Su et al., 2005). First, tourist motivations in the context of heritage tourism have recently become a popular research theme. For instance, tourism researchers have examined the core-periphery structure (Cui, He, & Xu, 2016) and types (Song, 2013) of heritage tourists' motivations, and the motivations of tourists to intangible cultural attractions (Sun & Shi, 2012). In addition, focusing on a special market, Wu and Wall (2016) explored the motivations of Chinese parents who take their children to heritage museums. In another line of research, some researchers have investigated the impacts of motivations on tourist perceived value and destination loyalty (e.g. Wang, Liu, & He, 2015), their experiences at a dark tourism site (Yan, Zhang, Zhang, Lu, & Guo, 2016), and satisfaction (Nguyen & Cheung, 2016).

Second, as interpretation is an important factor that influences cultural visitors' depth of learning and experience (Io, 2013; Tao & Du, 2009), the topic of interpretation in museums and other cultural attractions have been increasingly researched by tourism scholars. Major research areas included tourist needs for interpretation media in museums (e.g. Hong & Tao, 2006; Li & Qian, 2016) and heritage-based mountain destinations (e.g. Deng & Qin, 2010), tourist expectations and evaluations of the interpretation system in museums (Gan & Lu, 2012), as well as the impacts of interpretation on tourist learning, knowledge, and behavioral

intentions (Tao & Du, 2009).

Third, a number of typology studies have been conducted on Chinese tourists to cultural and religious sites. For example, Su et al. (2005) developed a motivation-based typology of tourists to Xidi, a World Heritage Site in China. They identified four segments, namely, professional research tourists, exploration tourists, developmental tourists, and recreational tourists. Similarly, Luo and Zhao (2015) conducted a motivation-based segmentation study on visitors to religious sites (e.g. prayers, cultural experiencers, spiritual experiencers, and recreational hang-outers). Using both motivations and socio-demographics as the criteria of typology, Sun and Shi (2012) identified economical knowledge-seekers, well-off culture-seekers, and stable aesthetic visitors out of those visitors to the intangible cultural heritage attractions.

As discussed above, most studies on Chinese tourist typology and profiles has used motivations to classify tourists. These studies largely neglect the level/depth of tourists' cultural experiences. However, as demonstrated by many studies (Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998; McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher, Ho, du Cros, & Chow, 2002; Stebbins, 1996, Timothy, 1997), different tourists engage with cultural attractions at different levels, depending on various factors, such as their own interests, prior knowledge, and time availability. Therefore, it is important to involve the depth of cultural experience together with cultural centrality in segmenting and profiling cultural tourists for a better understanding of the cultural tourist market. As such, this study aims to profile Chinese cultural tourists in China following McKercher's (2002) framework.

Research methods

In order to answer the research questions as stated earlier, following previous studies on cultural tourist typology (e.g. Chen, 2016; McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016), a quantitative approach was employed in the study. Specifically, a questionnaire survey was conducted, which is elaborated below.

Questionnaire design

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. The first part was designed with choice questions to screen qualified respondents and record eligible respondents' trip characteristics. Following previous studies (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014), the second part consisted of questions relating to the respondents' prior knowledge about the attraction, motivations, factors influencing their decision to visit the attraction, depth of experience of the culture and history. Following previous studies (e.g. McKercher, 2002; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014), the questions are measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale. The third part was designed to collect the respondents' socio-demographic information.

Data collection

Sites for data collection

A total of 30 college students who are fluent in both Mandarin and Cantonese were recruited

as field interviewers and specially trained for the study. During October to November, 2015, field interviewers were divided into nine groups and allocated to three cultural attractions in Guangzhou, a historical and cultural city with a history of more than 2000 years and thus remarkably rich in cultural heritage. The three sites, namely the Guangdong Museum, the Chen Clan Ancestral Hall (the Guangdong Folk Arts Museum), and the Mausoleum of the Nanyue King, were elaborately chosen for data collection. They are all very popular cultural tourist attractions, as all of them are National First-class Museums designated by the State Administration of Cultural Heritage, PRC, and each attracted hundreds of thousands of visitors each year (Guangdong Museum, 2016; Guangzhou Tourism Bureau, 2015; Peng, 2013).

Data collection process

Potential eligible respondents were approached and asked by the field interviewers to fill in a questionnaire in Chinese. Then the field interviewers stayed nearby for any possible queries while participants were filling in the questionnaires. Two approaches were used to select qualified respondents. First, field interviewers asked potential eligible respondents whether they have just finished visiting the cultural site. If yes, field interviewers would further ask them to fill in a questionnaire. Second, a yes/no question “I have just finished visiting the (surveyed cultural site)” was placed at the very beginning of the questionnaire for further screening.

Respondents

As shown in Table 2, a total of 667 questionnaires were distributed and collected through

convenience sampling by the study; 656 copies were deemed usable. Regarding the distribution of the sample across the three sites, 265 questionnaires (40.4%) were collected in the Guangdong Museum, 216 (32.9%) in the Chen Clan Ancestral Hall, and 175 (26.7%) in the Museum of the Mausoleum of the Nanyue King. Among the respondents, 163 were local day-trippers who reported their normal places of residence are Guangzhou, while the other 493 respondents are tourists outside Guangzhou. The day-trippers are included in the analysis because they also form a significant market for cultural attractions (e.g. Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998; Laing, Wheeler, Reeves, & Frost, 2014; Sturgis & Jackson, 2003). Therefore, it would be interesting to examine whether there are differences between these two groups of cultural visitors (day-trippers and external tourists) in terms of their types and profiles, which will be of great marketing and management value for cultural destinations.

As shown in Table 2, male participants slightly outnumbered female (51.9% vs. 48.1%). More than half of the respondents were in the age group of 21 to 35 (53.7%), followed by the ≤ 20 group (34.1%) and the 36-50 group (9.3%), which is similar to some previous studies on both Chinese cultural tourists (e.g. Gan & Lu, 2012; Peng, 2013) and Western cultural tourists (e.g. Adie & Hall, 2016; Huh, Uysal, & McCleary, 2006) demonstrating that cultural tourists tended to be younger. Regarding education background, 42.5% the respondents reported an education level of undergraduate degree, and 31.4% were junior college graduates. In addition, 40.9% of the respondents reported a monthly personal income of less than 1500 RMB, followed by the 3001-4500 RMB (16.5%) and the 4501-6000 RMB (11.2%). Accordingly, when completing the survey questionnaire, 48.0% of the respondents were students (e.g. high school student, college and university student, and graduate student),

10.1% were government staff/civil servants, and 4.9% were private business owners. It is also worth noting that the large percentage of students in the sample resembles those in some previous studies on Chinese cultural tourists (e.g. Hong & Tao, 2006; Sun & Shi, 2012; Tao & Du, 2009).

Please insert Table 2 about here

Among the 650 respondents who have indicated their normal places of residence, as shown in Table 2, 25.1% of them were residing in Guangzhou, 74.9% of them were residing outside Guangzhou. Specifically, as shown in Table 2, 25.2% of the respondents were residing outside the Pearl River Delta (PRD) region but within Guangdong; 22.3% of them were from Guangzhou's neighboring cities in the PRD region, for instance, Foshan, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Dongguan, and Huizhou; 9.7% of them were from Guangdong's neighboring provinces, namely, Guangxi, Hunan, Fujian, Jiangxi, and Hainan; 17.7% of them from other mainland Chinese provinces. When asked about their travel styles, 70.4% of the respondents reported that they were visiting the respective cultural site 'together with relatives and/or friends.' Similarly, regarding their travel itineraries, 71.9% of them treated the respective cultural site as 'one site of the planned itinerary in Guangzhou.'

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS 17.0 for descriptive analysis, cross-tabulation analysis, *t*-tests, and Chi-square tests. The cultural centrality of tourists visiting the respective

site was measured by two items, namely, the importance of the motivation of learning the history/culture/heritage/arts as displayed in the respective site and the importance of learning the history/culture/heritage/arts when deciding to visit the site. The mean values of the scores of the two items were used to present cultural centrality. Considering the nature of the item measurement, a mean value of 1 or 1.5 or 2 was categorized as low, 2.5 or 3 or 3.5 as medium, and 4 or 4.5 or 5 as high. Following previous studies (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014), the depth of cultural experience of tourists visiting the respective survey site was measured by one single item which asked respondents to indicate the level of their understanding of the history/culture/heritage/arts as displayed in the attraction site. A score of 1 or 2 or 3 was categorized as low, and 4 or 5 as high. Therefore, as shown in Table 3, in the current study, ‘purposeful cultural tourists’ were technically operationalized as those who reported that culture played a strong role in their decisions/motivations to visit (the cultural centrality is high) and who also had a deep cultural experience (the depth of cultural experience is high). In a similar way, ‘sightseeing cultural tourists’ were those who indicated that culture played an important role in their decisions/motivations to visit, but who indicated that their experiences were fairly low. ‘Casual cultural tourists’ were those whose cultural centrality is moderate and the experience is low. ‘Serendipitous cultural tourists’ stated that their cultural centrality was limited (moderate or low), but they ended up visiting cultural attractions and having a fairly deep experience. ‘Incidental cultural tourists’ were those people whose cultural centrality was very limited and whose experience was very shallow.

Results and discussions

The Chinese cultural tourist typology

As exhibited in Table 3, five segments of Chinese cultural tourists are identified. Specifically, casual cultural tourists account for the largest proportion (46.0%), indicating that tourists whose cultural centrality is moderate (a score of 2.5 or 3 or 3.5) and whose experience is low (a score of 1 or 2 or 3) form the dominant niche market. In addition, sightseeing cultural tourists represent a segment of 30.5% of the whole market, followed by purposeful (14.5%), serendipitous (5.0%), and incidental (4.0%) cultural tourists. A closer look at the results suggests that Chinese cultural tourists with a low cultural experience (casual, sightseeing, and incidental tourists) account for more than 80% of all the respondents.

Please insert Table 3 about here

As shown in Table 4, despite the potential behavioral differences between the mainland Chinese tourists visiting Hong Kong in McKercher (2002) and domestic tourists in mainland China in the current study, comparisons could still be made between the two studies, since no other studies, to the knowledge of the authors, have typologized Chinese cultural tourists along the dimensions of cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience. With only mainland Chinese tourists included, it could be interpreted from the differences identified in Table 4 that mainland China has recently seen a remarkable growth of its ‘sightseeing cultural tourists’ (26.9%), a moderate growth of its ‘purposeful cultural tourists’ (5.6%), as

well as a very slight increase of its ‘serendipitous cultural tourists’ (1.4%). Additionally, if ‘incidental’ and ‘casual’ were lumped into ‘casual’, as practiced in Vong (2016), a dramatic decrease (33.9%, from 83.9% in McKercher [2002] to 50% in the current study) of mainland Chinese ‘casual’ cultural tourists could be further identified. These changes are not difficult to understand. As many recent studies (e.g., Gan & Lu, 2012; Li & Qian, 2016; Nguyen & Cheung, 2016; Vong, 2016; Wu & Wall 2016) have observed, with the rapid and tremendous social, economic, and educational development in China, more and more Chinese tourists are culturally motivated to visit heritage and cultural sites and gain an increasingly deep understanding of the culture and heritage as displayed by those cultural sites.

Please insert Table 4 about here

If we neglect the longitudinal changes of outbound Chinese cultural tourists’ behaviors, the abovementioned variances could also be interpreted as between outbound cultural tourists and domestic cultural tourists. Specifically, when mainland Chinese tourists visit a domestic destination, they are seemingly much more likely to have a relatively higher cultural experience (purposeful and serendipitous tourists altogether account for 19.5%, see Table 4) than when visiting an outbound destination, in this case, Hong Kong (purposeful and serendipitous tourists altogether account for 12.5%, see Table 4). These differences are not difficult to comprehend either, since it would be much easier for Chinese tourists to understand the dominant Chinese culture and heritage in mainland China than those combinations of Chinese and Western cultures in Hong Kong (McKercher & Chow, 2001;

McKercher, Ho, du Cros, & Chow, 2002).

If we compare the findings of the previous studies (McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher, Mei, & Tse, 2006; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016) that followed McKercher's (2002) framework as shown in Table 4 with the current study, it would be interesting to note that the commonly low percentage of serendipitous tourists suggest that it is not likely for a tourist with low cultural centrality to end up having a fairly deep cultural experience. Furthermore, if we compare the findings of the most recent two studies (Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016) with those of the current study, it is found that, from a destination perspective, the Hue city in Vietnam seems to have attracted a larger proportion of purposeful and sightseeing cultural tourists, both international and domestic, but the lowest proportion of 'casual' cultural tourists ('incidental' and 'casual' lumped into 'casual' for the convenience of comparison). A possible explanation could be the source market structure and cultural distance. As McKercher and Chow (2001) demonstrated, the greater the difference between the tourists' own culture and that of the destination, the greater the likelihood that tourists are culturally motivated and that in-depth learning occurs. According to Nguyen and Cheung (2014), the majority of the international respondents were Westerners (more than 93%), which was reported by the researchers to be corresponding to the statistics of international visitor arrivals in Hue. Contrarily, in Vong's (2016) study, most of respondents were ethnically Chinese (88%) from mainland China (56.6%), Hong Kong SAR (20.6%), and Taiwan (10.8%), which, as reported by the researcher, showed a good reflection of the composition of tourists to Macao. In the current study, all respondents are mainland Chinese. Therefore, due to the respective source market structure, the Hue city in Vietnam appealed to

more purposeful and sightseeing cultural tourists. A more direct demonstration could be found in the comparison between mainland Chinese tourists and Western tourists in Hong Kong as displayed in Mckercher (2002) (see Table 4). Specifically, compared to the Chinese tourist market in the current study, there were more purposeful and sightseeing cultural tourists among Western tourists visiting Hong Kong in McKercher's (2002) study but less 'casual' cultural tourists ('incidental' and 'casual' lumped into 'casual' for the convenience of comparison). This can also be explained by cultural distances (McKercher & Chow, 2001).

In addition, another possible explanation that should not be ignored is the travel accessibility (i.e. ease, price, and transportation). Chinese domestic tourists may be more likely to be 'casual' as it is often easier and cheaper for them to visit a domestic cultural destination compared to a foreign/outbound destination.

Profiles of Chinese cultural tourists

As shown in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7, a profile of Chinese cultural tourists is developed by examining the characteristics of each type of cultural tourists in China. It is indicated that the five segments of cultural tourists identified in the current study did not show significant differences in socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age group, education level, personal monthly income, and occupation) (see Table 6), which is consistent with Espelt and Benito (2006) and Vong (2016). The above finding is not difficult to comprehend. Since all the respondents in the current study are within the same Chinese cultural context and visiting dominant Chinese cultural and heritage sites, understandably, there would be no differences of gender, age, education level, personal monthly income, and occupation across various

types of cultural tourists based on cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience.

However, there were significant differences in terms of prior knowledge, time spent to know the site before visit, and perception of change in knowledge (see Table 5). Specifically, the purposeful segment has more cultural tourists who had a high level of knowledge prior to visiting the respective site, followed by the serendipitous and sightseeing segments. Not surprisingly, the casual and incidental segments have more cultural tourists who had a low level of knowledge prior to visiting the respective site. Similarly, tourists in the purposeful segment spent much time to learn about the cultural attraction before the trip, followed by tourists in the serendipitous and sightseeing segments. Regarding change in knowledge, all the purposeful and serendipitous tourists and most sightseeing tourists (96%) reported that they had acquired more knowledge after the visit; however, 13.2% of casual tourists and 23.1% of incidental tourists reported ‘no change’ in their knowledge level about the visited site. This finding is consistent with McKercher and du Cros (2003) and shows that those who had high cultural centrality tend to possess a higher level of prior knowledge and tend to have more active learning during the visit.

Please insert Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7 about here

Understandably, as shown in Table 7, the five segments of Chinese cultural tourists identified in the current study showed significant differences in on-site activities. Specifically, purposeful and serendipitous cultural tourists had taken more activities to gain a deeper understanding of the culture/history/arts/folklores in (and as displayed in) the surveyed

cultural sites, followed by sightseeing cultural tourists. On the contrary, casual and incidental cultural tourists had participated slightly more in such activities as ‘hang out and walk around’ and ‘enjoy my leisure time.’

Differences between local day-trippers and external tourists

Day-trippers form a significant market for cultural attractions (e.g. Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998; Laing et al., 2014; Sturgis & Jackson, 2003). As indicated in Table 8, there exist slight differences of cultural tourist types between day-trippers and outside tourists. Specifically, more purposeful and serendipitous cultural tourists were found among day-trippers from Guangzhou than tourists from outside Guangzhou. In contrast, less sightseeing and ‘casual’ (combining casual and incidental) cultural tourists were found among day-trippers from Guangzhou than those from outside Guangzhou. However, there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of their cultural centrality ($M_{Tourists\ in\ Guangzhou}=3.6150$; $M_{Day-trippers}=3.5859$; $p>0.01$) and depth of cultural experience ($M_{Tourists\ in\ Guangzhou}=3.0144$; $M_{Day-trippers}=3.0245$; $p>0.01$), respectively.

According to Table 9, only purposeful, casual, and sightseeing cultural tourists have minor differences of trip characteristics and socio-demographics across the two groups. Particularly, among purposeful cultural tourists, day-trippers have more prior knowledge than tourists visiting the city (high level of prior knowledge: 71.0% v.s. 42.9%) and have spent more time to know the respective site before visit (much time spent: 38.7% v.s. 19.0%). Compared to day-trippers, tourists from outside Guangzhou have gained more knowledge of culture and heritage, among both purposeful cultural tourists (89.8% v.s. 78.1%) and

sightseeing cultural tourists (98.8% v.s. 84.2%). Besides, among purposeful cultural tourists, more students are found in tourists from outside Guangzhou than in local day-trippers (54.9% v.s. 35.2%). A reasonable postulation for the above findings could be that, day-trippers who regularly reside in Guangzhou would have more knowledge about and spent much more time to know the respective cultural site via various local information channels, and as such would perceive a smaller change of knowledge than tourists from outside Guangzhou.

Please insert Table 8 and Table 9 about here

Conclusion and implications

The objectives of the current study are to: (1) offer a clear and up-to-date typology of Chinese cultural tourists in China along the dimensions of cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience; (2) provide a detailed profile of Chinese cultural tourists by examining the characteristics of each type of cultural tourists; and (3) compare local day-trippers and external tourists in terms of their types and profiles. This study collected a sample of mainland Chinese tourists (n=656) at three cultural tourist attractions in Guangzhou, China. Following previous studies (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014), a typology of Chinese cultural tourists was identified. Among the five cultural tourist segments (i.e. casual, sightseeing, purposeful, serendipitous, and incidental cultural tourists), casual tourists appear to be dominant in terms of market size. In addition, the trip characteristics and socio-demographics of each segment were also provided and interpreted with the extant literature. As an important cultural niche market (e.g. Kerstetter, Confer, & Bricker, 1998; Sturgis & Jackson, 2003), day-trippers present a slightly different typology profile and show marginally different trip characteristics and socio-demographics from those external tourists. As mentioned above, this current study contributes to the growing body of typology studies of cultural tourists along the dimensions of cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience (McKercher, 2002) and a better understanding of the quickly expanding Chinese cultural tourist market.

Specifically, it should be noted that, following McKercher's (2002) typology approach, both previous studies (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; McKercher, Mei,

& Tse, 2006; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016) and the current study disclosed an imbalanced distribution of cultural tourists. Especially, in the Chinese context, a predominant proportion of ‘casual’ cultural tourists and marginal proportion of serendipitous and purposeful cultural tourists have been identified in previous studies (i.e. McKercher, 2002; Vong, 2016) and the current study. In this regard, in addition to the abovementioned explanations from perspectives of cultural distance and travel accessibility, a rethinking of McKercher’s (2002) typology approach may be needed. That is, the disproportion of different segments of cultural tourists by using McKercher’s (2002) typology approach may suggest a need for improvement. Such a disproportion may have been caused by the potential determination effect of cultural centrality on the depth of cultural experience, which has been suggested by previous studies confirming that tourists’ cultural motives/centrality predicts and determines their trip satisfaction (e.g. Lee & Hsu, 2013; Savinovic, Kim, & Long, 2012) and cultural knowledge acquisition (Hou, Lin, & Morais, 2005). Undoubtedly, the potential determination effect of cultural centrality on the depth of cultural experience is in need of further investigations in future studies.

Findings of the market shares and characteristics (i.e. cultural centrality, depth of cultural experience, and on-site activities) of various segments of Chinese cultural tourists could be utilized by cultural attractions to offer tourists a better cultural and heritage experience. For instance, for the dominant ‘casual’ segment (50%; Table 4), at least two aspects of measures could be taken into consideration. First, to those who expressed a temporary interest upon arrival in knowing more about the culture and history of the attraction, it is vitally important for cultural attractions to take effective measures to deepen

their cultural understanding and thus to make them end up having a surprisingly high cultural experience. In this regard, though it is impossible for attraction management to ‘modify’ or ‘improve’ the historical and cultural aspects of the heritage, the facilities and services within the attraction, especially those used for effective interpretation, can be deliberately designed and improved. All these measures could make specialized and somewhat sophisticated knowledge of history, culture, and arts more popular and easier for tourists to understand and thus form an in-depth experience. Particularly, for attractions with a specific cultural/historical theme or specialization, for example, the Chen Clan Ancestral Hall featuring Cantonese folk arts, a variety of creative, innovative and interactive ways of display should be taken into consideration. Such ways of display can be those utilizing multimedia, virtual reality, and computer games, among others. Second, for those who still show no further cultural interest upon arrival, according to Table 7, facilities and amenities such as book stores, coffee shops, movie centers, and recreational areas could be in place for them to just ‘hang out and walk around’ and ‘enjoy my leisure time.’

Furthermore, in order to increase potential tourists’ prior knowledge and enhance their willingness/motivation to pay a visit to a cultural attraction, popular social media widely used in China (e.g., Wechat, Weibo, mobile phone applications, and websites) could be fully utilized to display an attraction’s cultural and heritage prior to their actual visits.

Limitations and future research directions

Several limitations of the present study should be acknowledged and some future research directions be specified. First, the present study and some previous ones (e.g. McKercher, 2002; McKercher & du Cros, 2003; Nguyen & Cheung, 2014; Vong, 2016) only used one or two items to present cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience, respectively, which made the framework simple and convenient to follow but at the same time neglected some other important aspects of cultural tourists' experience, for instance, needs and expectations for cultural understanding, perceived value, and satisfaction. Fellow researchers are therefore encouraged to use more related constructs and items to present and measure tourists' cultural centrality and depth of cultural experience, respectively. Second, the three cultural attractions for data collection in this study are museums. Although museums are important cultural attractions and widely researched in the tourism literature (e.g., McKercher, Ho, & du Cros, 2004; Huh & Uysal, 2004; Stylianou-Lambert, 2011), future studies may further verify the findings in settings of other types of cultural attractions, for instance, cultural festivals and cultural live performances.

References

- Adie, B. A., & Hall, C. M. (2017). Who visits World Heritage? A comparative analysis of three cultural sites. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 12(1), 67–80. doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2016.1151429
- Biran, A., Poria, Y. & Oren, G. (2011). Sought experiences at (dark) heritage sites. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38 (3), 820–841. doi:10.1016/j.annals.2010.12.001
- Boyd, S. (2001). Cultural and heritage tourism in Canada: Opportunities, principles and challenges. In D. J. Timothy (Ed.), *The heritage tourist experience: Critical essays* (Vol. 2, pp.9–31). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Burgess, S. M., & Steenkamp, J.-B. E. M. (2006). Marketing renaissance: how research in emerging markets advance marketing science and practice. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 23, 337–56. doi:10.1016/j.ijresmar.2006.08.001
- Caserta, S., & Russo, A. P. (2002). More means worse: asymmetric information, spatial displacement and sustainable heritage tourism. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 26, 245–260. doi:10.1023/A:1019905923457
- Cegielski, M., Janeczko, B., Mules, T., & Wells, J. (2011). Economic value of tourism to places of cultural heritage significance: a case study of three towns with mining heritage. Retrieved February 14, 2017, from <http://www.environment.gov.au/system/files/resources/0375dcba-a6e5-4036-85a7-59cbabd69df/files/economic-value-heritage-tourism.pdf>
- China Tourism Academy [CTA]. (2016). 589 million trips of vacation and almost 6 million outbound trips: The China Tourism Academy and the Ctrip jointly released the tourism trend report and attractions popularity ranking during the 2016 National Day Holiday (in Chinese). Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.ctaweb.org/html/2016-9/2016-9-30-16-55-97444.html>
- China Tourism Academy [CTA]. (2017). The China Tourism Academy and the Ctrip jointly released the tourism trend report and attractions popularity ranking during the 2017 Spring Festival Holiday (in Chinese). Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.ctaweb.org/html/2017-1/2017-1-25-14-25-49629.html>.
- Chen, G. (2016). Typology, tourist. In J. Jafari, & H. Xiao (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Tourism* (pp. 979–981). Switzerland: Springer.
- Cui, Q., He, L., & Xu, H. (2016). The Core-Periphery Structure of Heritage Tourism Motivation in Lijiang. *Tourism Tribune*, 31(10), 84–93. (in Chinese). doi:

- Deng, M., & Qin, Y. (2010). An optimization of tourist interpretation system in heritage scenic areas based on demand analysis– Taking Mount Emei Scenic Area as an example. *Tourism Tribune*, 25(7), 35–40. (in Chinese).
- Dolnicar, S. (2002). A review of data-driven market segmentation in tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(1), 1–22. doi: 10.1300/J073v12n01_01
- Espelt, N. G., & Benito, J. A. D. (2006). Visitors' behavior in heritage cities: The case of Girona. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(2), 442–448. doi: 10.1177/0047287505282956
- Gan, L., & Lu, T. (2012). Study on visitors' expectations, use and evaluation to museum interpretation system: An analysis based on knowledge needs. *Tourism Tribune*, 27 (9), 56–64. (in Chinese).
- Guangdong Museum (2016). Guangdong Museum Development Plan in the 13th Five-Year (in Chinese). Retrieved February 5, 2017, from http://www.gdmuseum.com/tech/anli_detail.php?classid=1&id=14
- Guangzhou Tourism Bureau (2015). Statistical analysis report of Guangzhou Tourism 2014 (in Chinese). Retrieved February 5, 2017, from <http://www.imxdata.com/archives/8897>
- Guangzhou Tourism Bureau (2016). Statistical analysis report of Guangzhou Tourism in the First Half of 2016(in Chinese). Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.gzly.gov.cn/a/ydndtj/2077.html>
- Hong, Y., & Tao, W. (2006). Tourists' demands for interpretative media: A case study of the Museum of the Mausoleum of the Nanyue King. *Tourism Tribune*, 21(11), 43–48. (in Chinese)
- Hou, J. S., Lin, C. H., & Morais, D. B. (2005). Antecedents of attachment to a cultural tourism destination: The case of Hakka and non-Hakka Taiwanese visitors to Pei-Pu, Taiwan. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44(2), 221-233. doi: 10.1177/0047287505278988
- Hughes, H. (2002). Culture and tourism: A framework for further analysis. *Managing Leisure*, 7(3), 164–175. doi: 10.1080/1360671022000013701
- Huh, J., & Uysal, M. (2004). Satisfaction with cultural/heritage sites. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 4(3-4), 177–194. doi: 10.1300/J162v04n03_12
- Huh, J., Uysal, M., & McCleary, K. (2006). Cultural/heritage destinations: Tourist satisfaction and market segmentation. *Journal of Hospitality & Leisure Marketing*, 14(3), 81–99. doi: 10.1300/J150v14n03_07

- Hu, G. (2010). A report on the interpretation and reception work in the Guangdong Folk Arts Museum. *Journal of Guangzhou Culture and Museum*, 4, 208–228. (in Chinese)
- ICOMOS, & WTO. (1993). *Cultural tourism—tourism at world heritage sites: The site manager's handbook (2nd ed.)*. Madrid: UN.
- Io, M.-U. (2013). Testing a model of effective interpretation to boost the heritage tourism experience: a case study in Macao. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 21(6), 900–914. doi: 10.1080/09669582.2012.750328.
- Kerstetter, D., Confer, J., & Bricker, K. (1998). Industrial heritage attractions: Types and tourists. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(2), 91–104. doi:10.1300/J073v07n02_05
- Laing, J., Wheeler, F., Reeves, K., & Frost, W. (2014). Assessing the experiential value of heritage assets: A case study of a Chinese heritage precinct, Bendigo, Australia. *Tourism Management*, 40, 180–192. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2013.06.004
- Lee, T. H., & Hsu, F. Y. (2013). Examining how attending motivation and satisfaction affects the loyalty for attendees at aboriginal festivals. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(1), 18–34. doi: 10.1002/jtr.867
- Li, H., & Zhu, Q. (2016): Archaeological heritage tourism in China: the case of the Daming Palace from the tourists' perspective. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. Published online. doi:10.1080/1743873X.2016.1208205.
- Li, X. (2016). Emerging-market research: new bottles and new wine?. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(4), 419–426. doi: 10.1177/0047287515625132
- Luo, J., & Zhao, Y. (2015). Research on Chinese religious tourism-market segmentation based on tourism motivation. *Chinese Management Journal*, 12(8), 1118–1123. (in Chinese). doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-884x.2015.08.003
- McKercher, B. (2002). Towards a classification of cultural tourists. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4 (1), 29–38. doi:10.1080/1743873X.2016.1208205
- McKercher, B., & Chow, B. S. M. (2001). Cultural distance and participation in cultural tourism. *Pacific Tourism Review*, 5(1), 23–32.
- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2002). *Cultural tourism: Partnership between tourism and cultural heritage management*. Binghamton, New York: Haworth Press.
- McKercher, B., Ho, P. S. Y., du Cros, H., & Chow, B. S. M. (2002). Activities-based segmentation of the cultural tourism market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*,

12(1), 23–46. doi: 10.1300/J073v12n01_02

- McKercher, B. & du Cros, H. (2003) Testing a cultural tourism typology. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5(1), 45–58. doi: 10.1002/jtr.417
- McKercher, B., Ho, P. & du Cros, H. (2004) Attributes of popular cultural tourism attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31 (2), 393–407. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2003.12.008
- McKercher, B., Mei, W. S., & Tse, T. S. M. (2006). Are short duration cultural festivals tourist attractions? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (1), 55–66. doi: 10.1080/09669580608668591
- Nguyen, T. H. H., & Cheung, C. (2014). The classification of heritage tourists: a case of Hue City, Vietnam. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(1), 35–50. doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2013.818677
- Nguyen, T. H. H., & Cheung, C. (2016). Chinese heritage tourists to heritage sites: what are the effects of heritage motivation and perceived authenticity on satisfaction?. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(11), 1155–1168. doi: 10.1080/10941665.2015.1125377
- Nyaupane, G. P., White, D. D., & Budruk, M. (2006). Motive-based tourist market segmentation: An application to Native American cultural heritage sites in Arizona, USA. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 1 (2), 81–99. doi: 10.2167/jht010.0
- Peng, Q. (2013). Museum positioning and operation: A case study of Museum of the Mausoleum of the Nanyue King. *Journal of Guangzhou Culture and Museum*, 7, 311–321. (in Chinese)
- Pietro, L.D., Mugion, R. G, Mattia, G., & Renzi, Mattia M. F. (2015). Cultural heritage and consumer behaviour: A survey on Italian cultural visitors. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development*, 51 (1), 61–81. doi: 10.1108/JCHMSD-03-2013-0009
- Poria, Y., Butler, R., & Airey, D. (2003). The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 238–254. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00064-6
- Prentice, R. (1993). *Tourism and heritage attraction*. London: Routledge.
- Richards, G. (1996). Production and consumption of European cultural tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 261–283. doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(95)00063-1
- Russo, A. P. (2002). The “vicious circle” of tourism development in heritage cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29(1), 165–182. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00029-9

- Savinovic, A., Kim, S., & Long, P. (2012). Audience members' motivation, satisfaction, and intention to re-visit an ethnic minority cultural festival. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 29(7), 682–694. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00064-6
- Sheth, J. N. (2011). Impact of emerging markets on marketing: rethinking existing perspectives and practices. *Journal of Marketing*, 75(4), 166–82. doi: 10.2307/41228618
- Shifflet, D. K., & Associates. (1999). Pennsylvania heritage tourism study. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from <http://www.china-up.com:8080/memberbook/information/6/Pennsylvania%20Heritage%20TourismStudyfinalreport.pdf>
- Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 16(5), 361–365. doi: 10.1016/0261-5177(95)00039-Q
- Song, J. (2013). On domestic tourists' tourism motivation of Sichuan World Heritage Sites: Taking Qingcheng Mountain for example. *Journal of Hexi College*, 29(4), 83–88. (in Chinese). doi: 10.13874/j.cnki.62-1171/g4.2013.04.020
- Stebbins, R. A. (1996). Cultural tourism as serious leisure. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(4), 948–950. doi: 10.1016/0160-7383(96)00028-X
- Sturgis, P., & Jackson, J. (2003). Examining participation in sporting and cultural activities: analysis of the UK 2000 Time Use Survey Phase 2. Retrieved February 14, 2017, from <http://www.authorstream.com/Presentation/Sibilla-44904-PatrickSturgis-Examining-Participation-Sporting-Cultural-Activities-Study-Education-ppt-powerpoint/>
- Stylianou-Lambert, T. (2011). Gazing from home—cultural tourism and art museums. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(2), 403–421. doi: [10.1016/j.annals.2010.09.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.09.001)
- Su, Q., Cao, Y., Zhang, H., & Wu, P. (2005). A study on the patterns of tourists' motivations and their behaviours: a case study of Xidi world Heritage sites. *Human Geography*, 20(4), 82–86. doi:10.13959/j.issn.1003-2398.2005.04.020
- Sun, M., & Shi, M. (2012). Study on the motivation of intangible cultural heritage recreational visitors and its market segmentation. *Tourism Tribune*, 27(12), 95–102. (in Chinese). doi: 10.3969 /j.issn.1002–5006.2012.12.013
- Tao, W., & Du, X. (2012). Study on the impact of tourism interpretation to tourists in the garden heritage site: a case study of Yuyin Garden in Guangdong Province. *Tropical Geography*, 29(4), 384–388. (in Chinese).
- Tao, W., Du, X., & Hong, Y. (2009). Interpretation: an important tactics for heritage conservation. *Tropical Geography*, 24(8), 47–52. (in Chinese).

- Timothy, D. J. (1997). Tourism and the personal heritage experience. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 751–54. doi: 10.1016/S0160-7383(97)00006-6
- Timothy, D. J. (2011). *Cultural heritage and tourism: An introduction*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Vong, F. (2016). Application of cultural tourist typology in a gaming destination—Macao. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19 (9), 949–965. doi: 10.1080/13683500.2013.842543
- Wan, P. Y. K., & Cheng, E. I. M. (2011). Service quality of Macao’s world heritage site. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 5 (1), 57–68. doi: 10.1108/175061811111111762
- Wang, X., Liu, J., & He, W. (2015). The relationship of tourism motivation, perceived value and destination loyalty—a case of Macao cultural heritage. *Modern Hong Kong and Macao Research*, 2, 20–34. (in Chinese). doi: 10.13521/b.cnki.ddgayj.2015.0002
- WTM (World Travel Market). (2012). *World Travel Market 2012 Industry Report*. London: World Travel Market.
- Wu, M.-Y., & Wall, G. (2016). Visiting heritage museums with children: Chinese parents’ motivations. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*. Published Online. doi: 10.1080/1743873X.2016.1201085.
- Yan, B.-J., Zhang, J., Zhang, H.-L., Lu, S.-J., & Guo, Y.-R. (2015). Investigating the motivation–experience relationship in a dark tourism space: A case study of the Beichuan earthquake relics, China. *Tourism Management*, 53, 108–121. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.09.014
- Yankholmes, A., & McKercher, B. (2015). Understanding visitors to slavery heritage sites in Ghana. *Tourism Management*, 51, 22–32. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2015.04.003
- Zbucea, A. (2012). Cultural interests while on holidays. An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Tourism Challenges and Trends*, V(2), 53–70.

Table 1. Main studies related to cultural tourists segmentations and profiles

Author(s) (Year)*	Research objective(s)	Research method(s)/data source(s)	Segmentation variable(s)	Types of tourists
Ashworth and Tunbridge (1990)	Segmentation of tourist in a historic city	N. A. **	Intention to visit a historic city	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidental • Intentional
ICOMOS and WTO (1993)	Categorizing visitors to heritage sites for the purpose of interpretation and education	N. A.	Prior knowledge, experience and information they seek for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholar visitor • General visitor • Student • Reluctant visitor
Prentice (1993)	Segmenting tourists to heritage attractions	N. A.	Socio-demographics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nostalgia seekers • Schoolchildren • Families or Groups • Professionals • Educated visitors
Silberberg (1995)	Segmenting tourists to museums and heritage sites	N. A.	Visitors' motivations for cultural tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatly motivated tourists • In part motivated tourists • Adjunct tourists • Accidental tourists
Richards (1996)	Understanding the production and consumption of European cultural tourism	Survey data from the European Cultural Tourism Project	Motivations to visit cultural sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General cultural tourists • Specific cultural tourists
Stebbins(1996)	Categorizing hobbyist cultural tourists	N. A.	General/deep knowledge of the visited site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generalized cultural tourist • Specialized cultural tourist
Timothy (1997)	Understanding heritage tourism experiences	N. A.	Levels of heritage tourism experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World heritage tourism experience • National • Local • Private
Shifflet and Associates (1999)	Studying Pennsylvania heritage tourists	N. A.	The importance of heritage tourism in their choice of visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Core heritage traveler • Moderate heritage traveler • Low heritage traveler

Continued

Author(s) (Year)	Research objective(s)	Research method(s)/data source(s)	Segmentation variable(s)	Types of tourists
Poria, Butler, and Airey (2001).	Clarifying heritage tourism	N. A.	Personal perspective toward heritage site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered as heritage site/unconnected • Not categorized as a heritage site/their own heritage • Classified as a heritage site/unaware
Hughes (2002)	Establishing a framework for further analysis of culture and tourism	Based on existing studies and surveys	Interests of visiting cultural sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accidental tourists • Incidental tourists • Multi-primary cultural tourists • Primary cultural tourists
McKercher (2002)	Towards a general typology of cultural tourists	Questionnaire survey (tourists, including mainland Chinese tourists, visiting cultural attractions in Hong Kong; n=675)	Importance (centrality) of cultural tourism in the decision to visit Hong Kong and depth of cultural experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful cultural tourists • Sightseeing cultural tourists • Casual cultural tourists • Serendipitous cultural tourists • Incidental cultural tourists
McKercher, Ho, du Cros, & Chow (2002)	Activities-based segmentation of the cultural tourism market	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting cultural attractions in Hong Kong; n=760)	Cultural tourism activities that tourists have participated in Hong Kong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural generalists • Icon culturalist • Chinese heritage culturalist • Tsim Sha Tsui nodal culturalist • Colonial culturalist • Sino-colonial culturalist
McKercher and du Cros (2003)	Testing the typology of cultural tourists by McKercher (2002)	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting cultural attractions in Hong Kong; n=760)	Importance (centrality) of cultural tourism in the decision to visit Hong Kong and depth of cultural experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful cultural tourists • Sightseeing cultural tourists • Casual cultural tourists • Serendipitous cultural tourists • Incidental cultural tourists

Continued

Author(s) (Year)	Research objective(s)	Research method(s)/data source(s)	Segmentation variable(s)	Types of tourists
Espelt and Benito (2006)	Understanding visitors' behavior in a heritage city in Girona, Spain	Direct observation of visitors' behavior and questionnaire survey (n=532)	Various behavioral criteria (e.g., number of accessible nodes, number of visited nodes, total time of the visit, length of the itinerary, and number of edges walked) when visiting the Old Quarter of Girona, Spain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noncultural tourists • Ritual tourists • Interested tourists • Erudite tourists
McKercher, Mei, and Tse (2006)	Examining the value of short duration cultural festivals in Hong Kong as tourist attractions	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting three cultural festivals in Hong Kong; n=314)	Importance (centrality) of cultural tourism in the decision to visit cultural festivals in Hong Kong and depth of cultural experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful cultural tourists • Sightseeing cultural tourists • Casual cultural tourists • Serendipitous cultural tourists • Incidental cultural tourists
Nyaupane, White, and Budruk (2006)	Segmenting and profiling heritage tourists in the USA	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting three Native American cultural heritage sites in Arizona, USA; n=307)	Motives for cultural history learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture-focused tourists • Culture-attentive tourists • Culture-appreciative tourists
Biran, Poria, and Oren (2011)	Understanding the sought experiences of visitors at dark heritage sites (Auschwitz-Birkenau death camp)	The exploratory stage: semi-structured interviews (n=30) The second stage: structured questionnaire survey (n=25) The third stage: questionnaire survey (n=198)	Visitors' perception of the site and motivation for the visit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group one: do not perceive the site as part of their personal heritage; • Group two: ambivalent in their perception of the site as part of their personal heritage; • Group three: perceive the site as part of their personal heritage
Stylianou-Lambert (2011)	Explaining the subtle differences between different cultural tourists in art museums	Interviews with 60 participants in their home in Cyprus	Museum Perceptual Filters (MPFs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional visitor • Art-loving visitor • Self-exploration visitor • Cultural tourism visitor • Social visitation visitor

Continued

Author(s) (Year)	Research objective(s)	Research method(s)/data source (s)	Segmentation variable(s)	Types of tourists
Nguyen and Cheung (2014)	Classifying heritage tourists in Hue City, Vietnam	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting heritage sites in Hue City; n=307)	Importance (centrality) of cultural tourism in the decision to visit Hue City and depth of cultural experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful cultural tourists • Sightseeing cultural tourists • Casual cultural tourists • Serendipitous cultural tourists • Incidental cultural tourists
Pietro, Mugion, Mattia, and Renzi (2015)	Segmenting tourists choosing to visit a museum	Online questionnaire survey (n=555)	Various criteria (e.g., ticket price, opening time, tourist guide, path organization) used when choosing to visit a museum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The connoisseurs (or experts) • The demanding tourists • The practical tourists • The inattentive tourists
Yankholmes and McKercher (2015)	Understanding visitors to slavery heritage sites in Ghana	Questionnaire survey (visitors to slavery heritage sites in Ghana; n=550)	Tourists' connection to slavery and their trip purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connected slavery heritage tourists • Connected vacationers • Not connected bicultural tourists • Not connected Caucasian tourists
Vong (2016)	Examining the cultural tourist typologies in an urban gaming destination (Macau)	Questionnaire survey (tourists visiting Macau; n=500)	Main purpose of visit (heritage or others); time spent visiting heritage sites and museums	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful cultural tourists • Sightseeing cultural tourists • Casual cultural tourists • Serendipitous cultural tourists

Note: *Related studies are displayed following the order of year of publication. ** N.A. suggests that it is a conceptual paper or the research method(s)/data source (s) were not specified or not available.

Table 2. Socio-demographical profiles and trip characteristics of respondents

Variable	Category	Valid n=606-656	
		Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	340	51.9
	Female	315	48.1
Age Group	≤20	223	34.1
	21-35	351	53.7
	36-50	61	9.3
	51-64	16	2.4
	≥65	3	0.5
Education Level	Junior high school and below	25	3.8
	Senior high school	90	13.7
	Junior college	206	31.4
	Undergraduate	279	42.5
	Graduate and above	56	8.5
Personal Monthly Income(RMB)	<1500	248	40.9
	1500-3000	65	10.7
	3001-4500	100	16.5
	4501-6000	68	11.2
	6001-7500	37	6.1
	7501-10000	37	6.1
	10001-15000	28	4.6
Occupation	>15001	23	3.8
	Enterprise staff	181	27.8
	Private business owner	29	4.4
	Student (e.g., high school student, college and university student, and graduate student)	313	48.0
	Government staff/civil servant	66	10.1
	Teacher	26	4.0
	Others	37	5.7
Normal place of residence (Place of origin)	Guangzhou	163	25.1
	Neighboring cities in the Pearl River Delta (PRD) region, for instance, Foshan, Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Dongguan, and Huizhou	145	22.3
	Outside the PRD region and within Guangdong	164	25.2
	Neighboring Provinces, namely Guangxi, Hunan, Fujian, Jiangxi, and Hainan	63	9.7
	Other mainland Chinese provinces	115	17.7
Travel style	An package tour by travel agency	6	0.9
	Together with relatives and/or friends	462	70.4
	An organized tour by my affiliation (e.g., school, company)	55	8.4
	Travelling alone	133	20.3
Travel itinerary	One site of the planned itinerary in Guangzhou	469	71.9
	By-the-way visit when visiting friends/relatives and/or on a business travel	183	28.1

Note: The percentages were rounded up to one decimal point. Therefore, the percentage may not add to 100.0 because of rounding errors.

Table 3. Typology of Chinese cultural tourists (n=656)

Cultural tourist typology	Cultural centrality		Depth of cultural experience		Number in sample	Percentage of sample (%)
	Score scope	Mean value of the (sub)sample	Score scope	Mean value of the (sub)sample		
Casual	Medium (a score of 2.5 or 3 or 3.5)	3.1540	Low (a score of 1 or 2 or 3)	2.7318	302	46.0
Incidental	Low (a score of 1 or 1.5 or 2)	1.8654	Low (a score of 1 or 2 or 3)	2.4615	26	4.0
Purposeful	High (a score of 4 or 4.5 or 5)	4.3947	High (a score of 4 or 5)	4.0737	95	14.5
Serendipitous	Low (a score of 1 or 1.5 or 2) or Medium (a score of 2.5 or 3 or 3.5)	3.1061	High (a score of 4 or 5)	4.0909	33	5.0
Sightseeing	High (a score of 4 or 4.5 or 5)	4.2175	Low (a score of 1 or 2 or 3)	2.8500	200	30.5
The whole sample		3.6044		3.0198		

Table 4. Typology studies of cultural tourists using Mckercher's (2002) framework

Studies	Sample	Segmenting Variables	Percentage of sample of each group (%)				
			Casual	Incidental	Purposeful	Serendipitous	Sightseeing
Mckercher (2002)	Tourists in Hong Kong (n= 687)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	23.5	27.9	11.8	6.2	30.7
	Mainland Chinese tourists in Hong Kong ^(a) (n= 60)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	35.7	48.2	8.9	3.6	3.6
	Western tourists in Hong Kong (n= 486) ^(b)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	21.8	20.0	14.8	4.7	38.8
Mckercher & du Cros (2003)	Tourists in Hong Kong ^(c) (n= 760)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	26.7	20.9	13.4	7.0	32.0
McKercher, Mei, & Tse (2006)	Festival visitors in Hong Kong (n=314)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	17.6	13.1	31.9	7.3	30.0
Nguyen & Cheung, (2014)	Tourists in Hue, Vietnam (n=307)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	4.7 (4.6) ^(d)	5.2 (1.5)	22.5 (47.7)	4.2 (6.2)	63.4 (40.0)
Vong (2016)	Tourists in Macau ^(e) (n= 381)	Main purpose of visit (heritage or others); time spent visiting heritage sites and museums	70.3 ^(f)	N. A. ^(g)	7.3	5.2	17.1
The current study	Mainland Chinese tourists (n= 656)	Cultural centrality; depth of cultural experience	46.0	4.0	14.5	5.0	30.5

Note: (a) Other subsamples include tourists from Australia, Chinese Taipei, Singapore, the UK and the USA.

(b) The percentages of each group of this sample (USA, UK, and Australia) were calculated by the authors based on figures displayed in Mckercher (2002). The percentages were rounded up to one decimal point. Therefore, the percentage may not add to 100.0 because of rounding errors.

(c) A total sample of tourists from Australia, Canada, Chinese Taipei, Europe, Malaysia, mainland China, New Zealand, Singapore, the UK and the USA. No specific typology pertaining to mainland Chinese tourists was provided.

(d) The percentage in brackets is of Vietnam's domestic visitors, while the other is of international visitors.

(e) A total sample of 500 tourists from mainland China, Hong Kong SAR, Taiwan China, Malaysia, Thailand, and other countries/regions. No specific typology pertaining to mainland Chinese tourists was provided. Among them, 381 (76.2%) tourists were identified as cultural tourists and were further segmented.

(f) The percentages of each of the segments are recalculated by the authors using the data provided in Vong (2016, p.959).

(g) 'Casual' and 'incidental' cultural tourists were lumped into 'casual' (Vong, 2016).

Table 5. Cross-tabulation results for the five groups of Chinese cultural tourists (knowledge and travel characteristics)

Variable	Category	Casual (%/rank) <i>N=302</i>	Incidental (%/rank) <i>N=26</i>	Purposeful (%/rank) <i>N=95</i>	Serendipitous (%/rank) <i>N=33</i>	Sightseeing (%/rank) <i>N=200</i>	Chi-square test (<i>N=652~656</i>)
Prior knowledge ^{(a)*}	Low ^(b)	79.5(2)	80.8(1)	47.4(5)	57.6(4)	69.0(3)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 40.372$; <i>df</i> =4; sig.= 0.000; valid n=656
	High ^(b)	20.5(4)	19.2(5)	52.6(1)	42.4(2)	31.0(3)	
Time spent to know the site before visit*	Little ^(c)	96.3(1)	96.2(2)	73.7(5)	78.8(4)	91.0(3)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 9.658$; <i>df</i> =4; sig.= 0.000; valid n=655
	Much ^(c)	3.7(5)	3.8(4)	26.3(1)	21.2(2)	9.0(3)	
Travel styles	Travelling in group (e.g. an package tour by travel agency, together with relatives and/or friends, and an organized tour by my affiliation, i.e. school, company)	81.5(1)	73.1(4)	77.9(3)	72.7(5)	80.0(2)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 2.477$; <i>df</i> =4; sig.= 0.649; valid n=656
	Travelling alone	18.5(5)	26.9(2)	22.1(3)	27.3(1)	20.0(4)	
Travel itinerary	One site of the planned itinerary in Guangzhou	72.1(3)	56.0(5)	74.7(1)	71.9(4)	72.4(2)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 3.535$; <i>df</i> =4; sig.= 0.473; valid n=652
	A by-the-way site when visiting friends/relatives/on business	27.9(3)	44.0(1)	25.3(5)	28.1(2)	27.6(4)	
Change in knowledge ^{(d)*}	No change	13.2(2)	23.1(1)	0.0(4)	0.0(4)	4.0(3)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 33.740$; <i>df</i> =4; sig.= 0.000; valid n=655
	More before visit	86.8(4)	76.9(5)	100.0(1)	100.0(1)	96.0(3)	

Note: (a) Knowledge about the culture/history/arts of and as displayed in the site before visit.

(b) 'Do not know at all,' 'Do not know too much,' and 'Nothing more nor less' were lumped into 'Low' while 'Know a little' and 'Know very much' into 'High'.

(c) 'Very little,' 'Little,' and 'Nothing more nor less' were lumped into 'Little' while 'Much' and 'Very much' into 'Much.'

(d) Perception of changes in knowledge about the culture/history/arts of and as displayed in the site visited.

* $p < 0.05$.

Table 6. Cross-tabulation results for the five groups of Chinese cultural tourists (socio-demographics)

Variable	Category	Casual (%/rank) N=302	Incidental (%/rank) N=26	Purposeful (%/rank) N=95	Serendipitous (%/rank) N=33	Sightseeing (%/rank) N=200	Chi-square test (N=606~656)
Gender	Male	50.0(5)	69.2(1)	53.7(3)	60.6(2)	50.3(4)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 4.905$; df=4; sig.= 0.297; valid n=655
	Female	50.0(1)	30.8(5)	46.3(3)	39.4(4)	49.7(2)	
Age groups	≤20	37.5(1)	34.6(2)	32.6(3)	27.3(5)	30.7(4)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 22.578$; df=16; sig.= 0.125; valid n=654
	21-35	53.2(3)	46.2(5)	54.7(2)	48.5(4)	55.8(1)	
	36-50	8.0(4)	15.4(2)	11.6(3)	18.2(1)	8.0(4)	
	51-64	1.0(5)	3.8(2)	1.1(4)	3.0(3)	5.0(1)	
	≥65	0.3(3)	0.0(4)	0.0(4)	3.0(1)	0.5(2)	
Education level	Junior high school and below	4.0(2)	3.8(4)	2.1(5)	6.1(1)	4.0(2)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 16.296$; df=16; sig.= 0.433; valid n=656
	Senior high school	13.9(4)	15.4(1)	11.6(5)	15.2(2)	14.0(3)	
	Junior college	33.8(2)	23.1(4)	25.3(3)	15.2(5)	34.5(1)	
	Undergraduate	42.4(4)	46.2(3)	46.3(2)	51.5(1)	39.0(5)	
	Graduate and above	6.0(5)	11.5(3)	14.7(1)	12.1(2)	8.5(4)	
Occupation	Enterprise staff	30.4(1)	26.9(3)	22.1(5)	27.3(2)	26.6(4)	Pearson $\chi^2 = 20.555$; df=20; sig.= 0.424; valid n=652
	Private business owner	3.0(5)	15.4(1)	5.3(3)	6.1(2)	4.5(4)	
	Student (e.g., high school student, college and university student, and graduate student)	50.5(1)	46.2(4)	48.4(3)	48.5(2)	44.2(5)	
	Government staff/civil servant	8.0(4)	3.8(5)	14.7(1)	12.1(2)	11.6(3)	
	Teacher	3.0(4)	3.8(3)	4.2(2)	3.0(4)	5.5(1)	
	Others	5.0(3)	3.8(4)	5.3(2)	3.0(5)	7.5(1)	
	Personal monthly income (RMB)	<1500	42.7(1)	37.5(5)	39.8(3)	40.0(2)	
	1500-3000	12.1(1)	8.3(4)	7.2(5)	10.0(3)	10.6(2)	
	3001-4500	18.1(1)	8.3(5)	10.8(4)	13.3(3)	18.1(1)	
	4501-6000	9.6(5)	20.8(1)	12.0(3)	10.0(4)	12.2(2)	
	6001-7500	6.4(3)	4.2(5)	7.2(1)	6.7(2)	5.3(4)	
	7501-10000	5.0(3)	4.2(4)	10.8(1)	3.3(5)	6.4(2)	
	10001-15000	3.6(4)	8.3(3)	9.6(2)	13.3(1)	2.1(5)	
	>15001	2.5(4)	8.3(1)	2.4(5)	3.3(3)	5.9(2)	

Table 7. Cross-tabulation results of activity participation differences between the five groups of Chinese cultural tourists (N=652)

Activities	Casual N=299		Incidental N=26		Purposeful N=95		Serendipitous N=32		Sightseeing N=200	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Hang out and walk around	159	53.2	15	57.7	25	26.3	11	34.4	77	38.5
Take a picture and prove that I have been here	153	51.2	7	26.9	31	32.6	15	46.9	84	42.0
Buy souvenirs (for my friends/relatives and myself)	15	5.0	0	0	4	4.2	3	9.4	5	2.5
View the cultural and sports activities/performances	44	14.7	4	15.4	15	15.8	11	34.4	46	23.0
Take part in the cultural and sports activities/performances	23	7.7	3	11.5	12	12.6	1	3.1	19	9.5
Visit my friends/relatives	16	5.4	3	11.5	5	5.3	2	6.3	13	6.5
On a business trip	7	2.3	3	11.5	7	7.4	0	0	9	4.5
Enjoy my leisure time	151	50.5	13	50.0	42	44.2	11	34.4	85	42.5
Visit a special exhibition	59	19.7	7	26.9	36	37.9	14	43.8	63	31.5
To have a little bit understanding of the culture/history/arts/folklores as displayed here	164	54.8	11	42.3	26	27.4	14	43.8	115	57.5
To have a relatively deeper understanding of the culture/history/arts/folklores as displayed here	22	7.4	1	3.8	42	44.2	15	46.9	45	22.5
To have very deep understanding of the culture/history/arts/folklores as displayed here	3	1.0	1	3.8	8	8.4	3	9.4	4	2.0

Note: Pearson $\chi^2=230$; $df=188$; Sig.= 0.020.

Table 8. Typology differences between tourists and day-trippers

Cultural tourist typology	Tourists in Guangzhou (N=487)		Guangzhou day-trippers (N=163)	
	Number in sample	Percentage of sample (%)	Number in sample	Percentage of sample (%)
Casual	225	46.2	73	44.8
Incidental	15	3.1	11	6.7
Purposeful	63	12.9	31	19.0
Serendipitous	22	4.5	10	6.1
Sightseeing	162	33.3	38	23.3

Note: Pearson $\chi^2 = 11.866$; $df = 4$; $p < 0.05$.

Table 9. Trip characteristics and socio-demographic differences between tourists and day-trippers

Variable	Category	Tourists visiting Guangzhou (%)	Guangzhou day-trippers (%)
<i>Casual cultural tourists (N=295~298)</i>			
Change in knowledge ^(a)	No change	10.2	21.9
	More before visit	89.8	78.1
<i>Purposeful cultural tourists (N=94)</i>			
Prior knowledge ^(b)	Low	57.1	29.0
	High	42.9	71.0
Time spent to know the site before visit ^(c)	Little	81.0	61.3
	Much	19.0	38.7
Occupation ^(d)	Enterprise staff	24.1	50.7
	Private business owner	3.6	1.4
	Student (e.g. high school student, college and university student, and graduate student)	54.9	35.2
	Government staff/civil servant	8.0	8.5
	Teacher	3.6	1.4
	Others	5.8	2.8
<i>Sightseeing cultural tourists (N=188~200)</i>			
Change in knowledge ^(e)	No change	1.2	15.8
	More before visit	98.8	84.2

Note: (a) Pearson $\chi^2 = 6.628$; $df=1$; $p<0.05$; (b) Pearson $\chi^2 = 6.579$; $df=1$; $p<0.05$; (c) Pearson $\chi^2 = 4.225$; $df=1$; $p<0.05$; (d) Pearson $\chi^2 = 19.281$; $df=5$; $p<0.005$; (e) Pearson $\chi^2 = 16.862$; $df=1$; $p<0.001$.