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ABSTRACT

This study investigated ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivational factors which influence Millennial Generation tourists’ decisions to visit heritage tourism destinations and their knowledge of Civil War and Antebellum heritage sites within the state of Arkansas. A descriptive, six-section survey was distributed to Millennial students from varying degree fields at three universities within Arkansas. Four hundred twenty-four participants completed the questionnaire with measures of demographic information, visitation and frequency to heritage tourism sites, push factors, pull factors, heritage tourism sites in Arkansas, and historic preservation participation.

The results of this study showed that although Millennial students do not visit heritage sites frequently, there are certain sets of push and pull motivational factors that influence their decisions to visit these sites, including knowledge driven factors (push) and historical factors (pull). Results also showed that many students attending universities in the state recognized heritage sites in the most densely populated areas, but did not recognize those in the less populated areas; although, many stated they would like to visit them. Lastly, the results of this study suggest that although Millennial students find historic preservation to be important, a majority of them do not participate in preservation efforts.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The National Trust for Historic Preservation defines heritage tourism as “traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past” (Heritage Tourism, 2013). It maintains that heritage tourism provides economic feasibility for historic preservation, and can improve the quality of life for residents and visitors of an area (Heritage Tourism, 2013). Historic sites are living specimens of the past and provide avenues to learn about local culture and society. These sites provide knowledge and understanding about the past, and serve as living examples of culture and legacy. In successful cases of heritage tourism development, natural and cultural inheritance is protected and quality of life is improved for both residents and visitors (Cultural Heritage Tourism, 2011). Care and preservation of these historic sites is vital and is the responsibility of present and future generations. The Millennial Generation is the current generational cohort on the rise into universities and the workforce, and will shape society in the years to come. Their inherited preservation responsibilities bring up multiple questions about Millennial Generation tourists since much remains unknown about their preferences, interests, and awareness of heritage tourism sites.

“Generation” is a term used by the researchers of population effects on society, meaning a cohort of people born in a generalized time span who therefore experience the same important historical and social events (Gursoy, Maier, & Chi, 2008; Huang & Petrick, 2010). It has also been defined as a group of people who possess certain common attitudes and behaviors that differ from the generation of people preceding them (Beirne, 2008; Huang & Petrick, 2010). The Millennial Generation, or Generation Y as they are commonly known, is a generational cohort made up of individuals born between the years of 1980 and 1994/1995, although there is some
dispute among scholars regarding the exact beginning and ending birth years for the group
(Huang & Petrick, 2010; Moscardo, Murphy, & Benckendorff, 2011; Harmon, Webster, &
Wyenberg, 1999). This generation has come of age during a time of the Internet, rapid
globalization, a rise in digital media, and overall technological evolution and dependence that
has resulted in expectation of change, technological know-how, and a group generally more
accepting of diversity (Moscardo et al., 2011). They are mostly a product of the Baby Boomer
parents, meaning they have fewer siblings than was common in previous time periods, a higher
rate of divorced parents, more working mothers, and in some ways more active parenting than
other generations resulting in a generally optimistic, confident, individualistic group who are
reported to be sheltered and indulged and require constant feedback, rewards and recognition
(Moscardo et al., 2011). It has been reported that Millennials tend to be more educated than any
other generation in history, staying in school and at home with their parents longer making them
team and group focused and more centered around learning and education (Moscardo et al.,
2011). In addition, Millennials have been raised during the rise of environmentalism, which
testifies that as a group they are generally more concerned about the state of the world, likely to
volunteer, and less interested in traditional politics (Moscardo et al., 2011).

Millennials and Tourism.

Past tourism literature states the causes of tourist motivations (relating to destination
choices) have been classified into ‘push’ and ‘pull’ factors (Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Crompton,
1979; Dann, 1977; McInTosh & Goeldner, 1990; Ryan, 1991). Push motivational factors
emphasize reasons that tourists choose one place over another, based on experiences and
activities available (Ryan, 1991) and include common themes such as ‘escape, novelty, social
interaction, and prestige’ (Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Pull motivational factors may be different for
each visitor, but include destination amenities and attributes, such as nightlife, natural and
cultural attractions, and social and physical facilities, that result in the choice of destination
(Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Thus, push factors derive from personal motivations and desires of the
tourist, whereas pull factors refer to the particular amenities each destination has to offer.

The sites chosen for this study are examples of historic tourist destinations in the North,
Central, South, and Delta regions of Arkansas. Each site was chosen based on its location within
the state of Arkansas, its classification of a tourist attraction without boarding amenities, and
each site is either historically classified as antebellum, and was affected by the American Civil
War, or exists as a direct result of the Civil War.

The northern location, Pea Ridge National Military Park, was the site of a historic Civil
War battle that proved to be the determinant that preserved the state of Missouri for the Union
and is proclaimed to be the most intact remaining Civil War battlefield in the United States
(National Park Service, 2013). The central area location of focus is the Old State House Museum
in Little Rock, Arkansas. Since construction began in 1833 and was completed in 1842, it is
declared to be the oldest standing state capitol building west of the Mississippi River (Old State
House Museum, 2013). The southern location chosen for study is Historic Washington State
Park in Washington, Arkansas. The town itself was established in 1824, and remains a preserved
historic village, containing both antebellum and post-Civil War structures, as well as being the
site of Arkansas Confederate Capital that housed the state government during part of the Civil
War (Historic Washington State Park, 2013). The fourth and final location chosen for this project
is located in the Delta region of Arkansas, specifically Chicot County in the southeastern part of
the state. Lakeport Plantation house was built in 1859, and is claimed to be the only antebellum
plantation home remaining in Arkansas along the Mississippi River (Wintory, n.d.)
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to establish tourism ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivation factors particular of Millennial Generation tourists attending universities between the ages of 18 and 33, when selecting general heritage tourist destinations and to assess the group’s knowledge of historic antebellum and Civil War tourist sites located in the state of Arkansas; specifically the North, Central, South, and Delta regions. These focal areas of the state were determined according to the regions chosen by the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (2013) to categorize Civil War sites by region. The population sample was chosen based on accessibility, Millennial Generation status, and perceived means and availability to travel.

Problem Statement

Numerous studies have been conducted concerning the Millennial Generation and tourism (Glover, 2010; Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010; Moscardo, Murphy, & Benckendorff, 2011; Hahm, J., Upchurch, R. & Wang, Y., 2008); however, there has not been significant research published regarding the Millennial Generation and their level of involvement in heritage tourism (Chhabra, 2010; Belhassen, Caton, & Stewart, 2008). The livelihood and existence of heritage tourism is dependent on the patronage of present and future residents and tourists. The Millennial Generation is the future of tourism: their travel spending along with preservation attempts will ensure that heritage tourism sites exist for generations of the future (those that have yet to be characterized). Specifically, the benefits of heritage tourism are and will be advantageous to many historic sites throughout the state of Arkansas. Therefore, tourism and heritage councils, such as Arkansas Parks and Tourism and the Department of Arkansas Heritage, as well as heritage tourist sites such as the four previously mentioned, could utilize the results of this study.
Objectives

The following objectives were developed in order to achieve the purpose of this study as previously mentioned:

1. To establish and develop a more in-depth perspective regarding the reasoning compelling Millennial Generation heritage tourism choices.
2. To ascertain the motivations driving Millennials’ preferences of heritage tourism.
3. To provide solid statistical data and results for the Arkansas Department of Tourism, Arkansas Historic Preservation Society, the Department of Arkansas Heritage, and the chosen sites of this study. This will assist the designated agencies in the form of precise budgeting, advantageous marketing, and advertising strategies designed to target the Millennial tourist.

Such data will lead to further studies and result in greater awareness and more informed Millennial tourists who will inherit preservation responsibilities.

Research Questions

Are Millennial tourists concerned about the reservation and livelihood of historic sites?

1. What specific types of heritage tourist attractions appeal to Millennial tourists?
2. What motivational tourism factors influence Millennial Generation students to travel to particular heritage tourism destinations?
3. Are Millennial students attending universities in Arkansas knowledgeable of heritage tourism sites in the state of Arkansas?
4. Are Millennial tourists concerned about the preservation and livelihood of historic sites?
Assumptions and Limitations

It is assumed that participants in this’ study will answer the questionnaire objectively and that they will be have a knowledgeable grasp of the meaning behind heritage, or historical, tourism. It is assumed that the participants will also have some sort of tourist experience on which to base their answers to questions regarding personal tourism preferences. It is assumed that the Millennial Generation is an important current and future market for heritage tourism sites and that there may be differences in this generation’s preferences for tourism experiences versus that of previous generations. It is also assumed that future preservation efforts will be dependent on the awareness, participation, and concern from members of the Millennial Generation and their progeny.

The scale of research will be limited for the following reasons:

- The participants of the study will be limited to Millennial Generation university students between the ages of 18 and 33 throughout the state of Arkansas. As such, the population will not contain a full representation of the Millennial Generation in the United States, or represent all educational levels. Therefore findings will not be able to be generalized outside of this target population.

- There is no way to determine whether all of the answers given by the respondents represent all Millennial Generation tourists between the ages of 18 and 33.

- Only historic tourist destinations will be used as examples in this study, therefore historic properties such as hotels, restaurants, schools, etc. will not have any representation; hence, the results cannot be generalized to all historic properties.
Definition of Terms

**Antebellum**: existing before the American Civil War (Merriam-Webster, n.d.).

**Heritage tourism**: “traveling to experience the places, artifacts and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past,” (Heritage Tourism, 2013).

**Historic tourist destinations**: In this study, correlates to tourist attractions that provide only learning experiences including activities, artifacts, and buildings, but do not provide housing (however, may contain some sort of food and beverage department).

**Millennial Generation (Generation Y)**: an age cohort of individuals born between the years of 1980 and 1994 or 1995, despite some dispute on the exact birth years (Huang & Petrick, 2010; Moscardo, *et al*., 2011).

**Historic Preservation**: salvation, protection, and promotion of places that contain stories of the past (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2013).

‘**Push**’ Factors: originating from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, these factors have been described as motivational needs that occur because of friction in the motivational system and contain four broad domains: “family togetherness and study, appreciating natural resources and health, escaping from everyday routine, and adventure and building friendship” (Prayag & Ryan, 2010).

‘**Pull**’ Factors: have been categorized as factors that influence when, where, and how people choose to travel and are connected to the “features, attractions, or attributes of the destination itself” (Prayag & Ryan, 2010).
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Millennial Generation

Generational Theory

The theory of generational cohorts has an extensive history in the social sciences, including sociology, psychology, and related areas, since Karl Mannheim introduced the concept in the 1920s (Moscardo et al., 2011). It has been argued that the term ‘generation’, as used by Mannheim and others, was and is meant in the sense of the term ‘cohort’, meaning people within a defined population who experience the same significant event or events during a particular period in time (Pilcher, 1994). Others have described cohorts as ‘societal subcultures’ whose value characteristics echo significant cultural, political, and economic developments that took place during their adolescent years (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Strauss & Howe, 1991). These generational terms have been popularized by Strauss and Howe (1997) who defined a generation as an “aggregate of all people born over roughly the span of a phase of life who share a common location in history and, hence, a common collective persona” (as sited by Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013). Mannheim (1952) suggested that patterns of experience and thought are created by ‘natural data’ that result from the transition from one generation to the next, and that these transitions are a continuous process as one generation disappears and another emerges. The implication is that these shared events or experiences during formative years influence factors such as world view, values, and behaviors of a given age cohort throughout the span of their lives (Moscardo et al., 2011; Mannheim, 1952; Noble & Schewe, 2003; Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013; Gursoy, et al., 2008; Huang & Petrick, 2010). It has been suggested that these shared experiences help form preferences, beliefs, psychological tendencies, feelings toward authority, work-related
According to generational theory, each generation is distinguished by specific sets of traits, values, beliefs, interests, and expectations (Strauss & Howe, 1997; Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013). A generation spans typically 20-25 years in length before fading into the background as the next cohort emerges, and is defined in terms of birth years (Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013; Schewe & Noble, 2000; Schewe & Meredith, 2004; Huang & Petrick, 2010; Gursoy et al., 2008). Each generation is thought to develop and possess a unified personality that later distinguishes them from other age brackets (Pennington-Gray, Fridgen, & Stynes, 2003; Huang & Petrick, 2010). According to Pendergast (2010), there are four main elements brought together by generational theory: repeating trends based on generational type, recognition that exposure to a wide range of factors during formative adolescent years determines fundamental values and belief systems, recognition of the presence of life-cycle stages which include generational-type characteristics evident at each stage, and a relevant generation defined by birth years containing unique attributes at any given stage (Pendergast, 2010). There are currently four generations with living members present in society that have been defined and distinguished by demographers, market researchers, the media, and the generations themselves: the Silent Generation, Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennial Generation (Generation Y) (Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013; Fields, Wilder, Bunch, & Newbold, 2008; Pendergast, 2010).

The first and eldest of the generations defined in the United States is the Silent Generation, described as those born between 1925 and 1945 (Li, Li, and Hudson, 2013; Egri & Ralston, 2004). The defining events of the Silent Generation were the Great Depression of the 1930s and World War II, which the United States entered in 1941 (Egri & Ralston, 2004). As a
result, this generation has demonstrated high concern for security and avoidance of risk and disaster that many experienced during their early years (Egri & Ralston, 2004). Some of their characteristics have been listed as hard working, dependable, and supportive of conservative values such as loyalty, duty and conformity (Egri & Ralston, 2004).

The second defined American generation is the Baby Boomer generation, with birth years between 1946 and 1964 (Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013; Egri & Ralston, 2004; U.S. Travel Association, 2011). Following World War II, the Baby Boomers were born during a time of unparalleled prosperity in the United States, and in their earlier years experienced and were active in radical social changes including the emergence of the civil rights movement, the protests of the Vietnam War, the women’s rights movement, and a time of swift technological transformation (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Strauss & Howe, 1991). As a result, this generation has been described as extremely individualistic, competitive free agents with great interest in personal growth as a way to self-fulfillment (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Parker & Chusmir, 1990). They have been labeled as persons with strong work ethic and high job involvement which, as a group, has led to success in careers and economic development, though often putting their personal lives at stake (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Kupperschmidt, 2000).

The third identified American generation is Generation X, whose birth years are defined as 1965 to 1980 (Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013; U.S. Travel Association, 2011). Members of Generation X are thought to have experienced periods of both economic prosperity and distress and family disruptions as a result of high divorce rates during their adolescent years (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Kupperschmidt, 2000). These characteristics of their upbringing have led to traits of high individualism, financial self-reliance, and entrepreneurial risk taking (Egri & Ralston, 2004). Generation Xers are more focused on finding and maintaining balance between their
personal lives and work, and therefore place less importance on job security and status and more emphasis on personal freedom and challenging work (Egri & Ralston, 2004; Kupperschmidt, 2000).

The most recent of these described generational cohorts is the Millennial Generation, otherwise known as Generation Y (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010; Moscardo et al., 2011; Gursoy et al., 2008; Hahm, Upchurch, & Wang, 2008; Noble & Schewe, 2003). The Millennial Generation is the focus population of this study and will therefore be examined in more detail than the generations before it.

Millennial Generation Characteristics

In the late 1990s, Howe and Strauss (1997) popularized the Millennial Generation as the “Next Great Generation,” making progress in an attempt to predict which direction, and with which characteristics, this newest emerging generation would enter the world on social, political, economic, and even environmental scales. They took information that had been largely publicized by American media and mixed those public messages and assumptions with polls and surveys from which to base their opinions of the then largely teenaged cohort, many times undermining the popular consensus of the media. Although their research was not purely scientific, they introduced some valid points regarding the Millennial Generation. They argued that this cohort, like the others before it, would break repeated life cycles in favor of their own individual actions, beliefs, and values; at the same time disproving predictions that their generation would be a repeat of their Baby Boomer parents or an extension of Generation X (Howe & Strauss, 1997). They suggested that the Millennial Generation would be a cohort made up of optimistic, cooperative team players that accept authority better than Generation X and
follow rules unlike the rule-breaker stereotypes much of the 1990s media suggested Generation Y would follow (Howe & Strauss, 1997).

There are varying opinions about the exact birth years encompassing the Millennial Generation; however, the majority of definitions agree that the birth years are between 1980 and 1994/1995 (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). However, the U.S. Travel Association (2011) has defined Generation Y birth years from 1981 to 1990 (Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013). This cohort is currently reaching early stages of adulthood, allowing for the evaluation of the values, beliefs, and habits they generally share (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010). They are thought to be the most educated, most well-traveled, and most technologically acclimated cohort in history (Crampton & Hodge, 2009; Josiam, Devine, Baum, Crutsinger, & Reynolds, 2008; Pendergast, 2009; Huang & Petrick, 2010). It has also been suggested that, as a group, they are confident, relaxed, and conservative (Pendergast, 2009). Although they can be impatient and self-centered, they have a reputation for being team oriented, highly collaborative, with an ability to multitask (Pendergast, 2009; Huang & Petrick, 2010). They rely on a source of networks rather than the individual, resulting in a cohort that is greatly influenced by friends and peers, even their parents (Pendergast, 2009; Howe & Strauss, 1997). They have been treated more as individuals than any other generation in history, and as a result, they tend to want immediate gratification and emphasize fun and excitement, as well as esteem personal creativity (Josiam, et al., 2008; Fountain & Charters, 2010). As a result of their want for instant gratification and joy of receiving ‘something for nothing’, it is thought that among this cohort there may be a disconnection in their understanding of effort and results (Fountain & Charters, 2010).

However, not all of the reports of Generation Y’s traits parallel each other. For example, Moscardo and Benckendorff (2010) point out that their Baby Boomer parents are often described
as vital influences to this generation, but their varying influence creates great differences in shared characteristics of the cohort. High divorce rates and single Boomer parents are thought to have created fiercely independent offspring, whereas hovering, anxious parents created indulged and spoiled children, both of which character traits are attributed to the Millennial Generation (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). Several other characteristics dubbed to this cohort contradict as well. In some cases they are described as submissive to authority, and in others as a group who questions authority; they are thought to be individualistic, yet very group and team oriented; also, they are thought to desire a work/life balance, but then described as highly ambitious and willing to sacrifice their social lives to achieve career goals, as their parents are thought to have done (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). Despite some of these contradictions in literature, there are four themes surrounding Generation Y that most generational researchers agree upon (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). According to Moscardo and Benckendorff (2010) and Donnison (2007) the Millennial Generation:

1. Uses digital media, particularly for entertainment, social networking, and creativity.
2. Has optimistic and positive attitudes toward diversity, flexibility, social issues, and its own future endeavors.
3. Is orientated toward family and social groups.
4. Spends longer in the adolescent stage of life, remaining dependent longer, and spending more time in formal education settings.

Acknowledging the commonly shared characteristics of the Millennial Generation is important for this study, as is the background that produced these shared characteristics during its formative years, which may, now and in the future, aid in the understanding of Millennials’ tourism preferences.
Just as the generations before them, the Millennial Generation’s values, beliefs, worldview, and collective habits derive from the social context of their formative adolescent years. Events such as the Columbine massacre, the Oklahoma City bombing, the death of Princess Diana, the Monica Lewinsky scandal, President Clinton’s impeachment trial, the OJ Simpson trial, and the fall of the Berlin Wall made significant impressions on Generation Y members (Howe & Strauss, 1997). They are reportedly the first generation to be born during the ‘age of terrorism’, meaning that terrorist attacks have shaped this cohort like no others before it due to the number and knowledge of the series of terrorist attacks that occurred during their formative years (Pendergast, 2010). The most influential of the terrorist activity has been traced to the attacks on the World Trade Center in the United States on September 11, 2001 (Pendergast, 2010). Such experiences have attributed to a shared concern for security issues involving crime and terrorism (Pendergast, 2010).

The Millennials were born during an era that Howe and Strauss (1997) call the era of wanted, protected, and worthy children. Parents wanted and chose to reproduce, and as a result of that choice they were more protective of these children, which is evident through laws and education reform passed during their early years, and their childhoods were no longer an example of being seen and not heard as other generations had been raised (Howe & Strauss, 1997). Perhaps as a result of this upbringing, this cohort has been accused of living in a prolonged state of adolescence, staying dependent on family far longer than generations of the past (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). Financially speaking, the Millennials have been described as ‘helicopter kids’, referring to the financial dependence they have on their parents and others until later in life than previous generations causing them to “hover” at home (Pendergast, 2010; Salt, 2006). They also are increasingly credit dependent as a result of short-
term wants and uncertain spending habits, as well as a plethora of goods to spend money on and a constant need or pressure to update technology, which is such an important part of their everyday lives (Pendergast, 2010).

Perhaps the most influential development during their formal years occurred within the context of technology. Pendergast (2009) argued that since the early 1980s, society has experienced a significant paradigm shift including an unparalleled transition from an industrial to an information-and-technology based culture and economy. When referring to values and character trait differences, she claims that a larger than usual generation gap has been created due to Generation Y’s formative year alignment with the “Information Age” (Pendergast, 2009). As the first generation to be born during this ‘age,’ they have developed a native ease with the digital world through methods of enjoyment, rather than necessity, the method by which the other generations were introduced (Pendergast, 2010). Digital networking and play has made the world an open arena for this generation, resulting in a loss of boundaries and enclosure, which in turn results in the sharing of knowledge and information (Pendergast, 2010).

Another first for this generation was their birth into a world of globalization that, in many aspects, for the first time demonstrated international interdependence and engagement among nations throughout the globe (Pendergast, 2010). The technological capability that has been such a force in their formative years, and continues to be such a constant part of their lives, along with the personal capacity to participate has made them members of a global community (Pendergast, 2010). It is with these aspects in mind that a global platform most accurately demonstrates the grounds for constructing a profile of the Millennial Generation (Pendergast, 2010). Howe (2006) attributed seven core traits to the Millennial Generation, consisting of: special, sheltered,
confident, team-oriented, conventional, pressured, and achieving. The following are brief descriptions of each of these core traits.

Howe (2006) uses ‘special’ as a core value because, he argues, that the Millennials regard themselves as special, as their parents have labeled them all their lives. A large portion of the cohort has been told from infancy of their uniqueness and special gifts that they contribute to the world (Pendergast, 2010). It is likely that the sentiments that were expressed to them stemmed from the fact that they are part of smaller families, and they were born during what Howe and Strauss (2000) refer to as ‘the era of wanted children’ (Pendergast, 2010). Howe’s second core value is ‘sheltered’, due to the amount of protection they received from their parents and the broader community, a value that is supported by the legal mandates, such as seat belts and bike helmets, which were introduced and implemented during the adolescent years of this generation (Pendergast, 2010; Howe, 2006). Perhaps because of these first two core values, the third is considered ‘confident’. Howe (2006) argued that because of a relatively strong economic base through their formative years and acclimation to uncertainty through other factors, such as terrorism, this cohort exudes confidence and a certain amount of optimism, as they recognize that uncertainty is the only thing that is certain (Pendergast, 2010).

The fourth core value is ‘team-oriented’ (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010). The Millennial Generation was born largely to the work-involved Baby Boomers who reared their children in formal childcare facilities and enrolled them in organized sports (Pendergast, 2010). This cohort was also taught in classrooms where team building and group work reinforced practices of collaboration (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010). Although there remains room for improvement in this area, they are predisposed unlike the generations before them for team-oriented organization (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010). The fifth of Howe’s core values is ‘conventional’. It is thought
that members of the Millennial Generation have more centered aspirations in life, such as work-life balance, careers, and citizenship as a response to previous generations’ tendency to place work before family (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010).

Sixth, Generation Y is thought to maintain ‘pressured’ as a core value. This pressure is mostly in reference to full days/weeks/months that were planned out for them in their formative years and included social, school, and after-school activities (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010).

The final core value Howe attributed to the Millennial Generation is ‘achieving’. Pendergast (2010) worded it this way, “this is the most education-minded generation that has lived.” For this cohort, a significant amount of emphasis has been placed on the relationship between success and education (Pendergast, 2010). With the support of their families and an extended financial dependency, Generation Y is able to meet higher education standards, making them the most educated cohort in history and validating achievement, at least in an educational sense, as a core value (Howe, 2006; Pendergast, 2010). Wolburg and Pokrywcynski (2001) validated this core value by claiming that this generation is the best educated in history (as cited by Huang & Petrick, 2010).

These values were proposed by Howe, but are not a definitive list of traits possessed by the entire cohort, nor agreed upon by all generational theorists, because it takes time and events to shape such character traits (Pendergast, 2010). Neil Howe’s work was chosen as an example of the core character traits for the Millennial Generation because his studies, several of them conducted with William Strauss, have been widely used in communication and marketing fields, higher education, and by professional development researchers to understand more about the Millennial Generation (Pendergast, 2010). A great deal of current knowledge about this cohort suggests that they are in the young adulthood phase of life, meaning they are currently in
colleges and universities, and entering or settling into the workforce (Pendergast, 2010). They have a focus on brands, their friends (which include close personal friends and those who they have connections to digitally), ways in which to have fun in most aspects of their lives, and digital culture to which they are native (Pendergast, 2010). Events in their formative years, it seems, have shaped them as a cohort to be confident, relaxed, relatively conservative, and the most well educated in history (Pendergast, 2010). Because of their number and current position in society, the Millennial Generation has become an increasing topic of academic study and media attention. It is for this reason, as well as the increased understanding of this cohort and their tourism preferences, that they were chosen for this study.

*Millennial Generation in University and the Work Force*

“Dating back to their first births in the early 1980s, you could see this Millennial Generation coming. Everywhere they’ve been, from bulging nurseries…day-care to kindergarten to high school, they have changed the face of youth – and transformed every institution they’ve touched” (Howe & Strauss, 2007). In the year 2000, the first wave of the Millennial Generation entered colleges and universities and now the latter part of the generation is currently attending (Howe & Strauss, 2007). With them, Generation Y students brought their helicopter parents and a whole new set of consequences for higher education, including new standards, data, accountability, and personalized service (Howe & Strauss, 2007). Howe and Strauss predicted that the workplace performance of university graduates would come under increased scrutiny as more of this generation than any before it have earned degrees. They have increased the pressure on available resources with a vast amount of admission to colleges and universities, leaving the administrations to catch up and make room for them (Howe & Strauss, 2007).
According to a Chartwells college student survey in 2006, Millennial collegians reported feeling pressured to have a college degree, more so than their parents’ generations: the Baby Boomers and Generation X (Howe & Strauss, 2007). Also, children of Generation X reported a stronger sense of parent involvement in their educations than children of the Baby Boomers, and these students were more likely to claim that their parents aided them in choosing their majors and individual courses, as well as reported higher expectations that their parents would intervene should any problems arise at school (Howe & Strauss, 2007). Additionally, there is more financial stress associated with higher education than ever before, and these students reported feeling the weight of pressure for their post-graduation earning capability, financial cost of attendance, and ability to avoid debt or pay off debt after graduation (Howe & Strauss, 2007).

Finally, the Chartwells college student survey reported differences in male and female Millennial collegians. The study showed that males were more social than their female counterparts, attending college to meet new people, have fun socially, and nearly three times as many males reported finding a potential spouse or life-partner as an important part of attending college (Howe & Strauss, 2007). They also showed different relationships with their parents. Males were found to rely more heavily on their parents, especially for assistance and involvement post-graduation including finding a job and aiding them financially (Howe & Strauss, 2007). Females, however, showed a greater connection with parents via personal communication, and were more likely than males to speak to their parents on the phone and receive visits from them, although they were reported as more likely to choose schools closer to home (Howe & Strauss, 2007). These reports of Millennial Generation college students reflect their characteristics as a result of their common upbringings and formative years, which they will possibly carry over into the workplace as well.
The Millennial Generation is just beginning to enter the workplace in full force (Josiam, et al., 2008). Generation Y’s entrance into the work force has caused a clash of the generations, and as a result, much has been learned about characteristics of the Millennials and their differences from previous generations.

There are several values that Millennials are thought to possess in regards to their work environments. Donna Pendergast (2009) compiled a list of Millennial values and motivators in the workplace. The following provides the traits Pendergast has described and small descriptions of them. They include flexibility, as in flexible hours, flexible ways in which to accomplish tasks, options for meetings such as virtual or in person, and opportunities for part-time commitments to individual projects. Also, they prefer networking and communicating by using the latest available communication technology and a need for quick response to communication they initiate. Along the same line, Generation Y employees value instant results, resulting in a shift from function-based work to project-based work. They value education as lifetime learners and opportunities for learning and personal growth keep them motivated. They are technologically capable and look for multiple and diverse pathways to achieve results, as they are not as inclined as previous generations to think in linear patterns. Additionally, they like to work in collaborative teams, look to establish mentor relationships, want to be provided the opportunity to make a difference, have high levels of morality and ethical standards, and want the opportunity to be creative and challenged as well as to be encouraged to advance (Pendergast, 2009; Pendergast, 2010).

It has been noted that Millennials in the workforce are unafraid to pursue other means of employment if their needs and wants are not met at their current jobs (Richardson, 2010). Members of this cohort have been observed to have very high expectations of their jobs in areas
such as compensation, promotion, and advancement, so much so that these expectations are thought to be higher than any generation to date (Oliver, 2006; Richardson, 2010). The Millennial Generation, as a group, has been described as more accepting of diversity (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The same characteristic applies in the workplace, as they value equality among all persons (Morton, 2002; Richardson, 2010). Their expectations may be high regarding pay, but in many instances they only want what they believe to be reasonable wages for the job, and they expect good training opportunities to prepare them for job demands (Morton, 2002; Richardson, 2010). Perhaps the most significant trait about Millennials in the workforce is that they are uninterested in a “job for life”, as their Baby Boomer parents have been, but rather seek flexibility and a work-life balance (Oliver, 2006; Richardson, 2010).

**Millennial Generation and Tourism**

Tourism has been described as “the activities of persons travelling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business, and other purposes” (World Tourism Organization as cited by Perrett, 2007). Most academic research regarding tourism has occurred since the 1970s, and as a result, there has not been a significant amount of longitudinal research conducted in this area (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). However, tourism practitioners within the industry have long appreciated and taken strides into generational analysis to gain insights into tourism through the lens of generational theory, which they believe could better tourism experiences and practically benefit tourism destinations (Pendergast, 2010; Li, Li, & Hudson, 2013). Tourist behavior is constantly changing based on social and personal adaptations by tourists, making prediction of this behavior difficult (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). The Baby Boomer generation has caught the attention of tourism researchers and managers because of their large size and affluence, and
although the Millennial Generation matches them in size, they are only just now starting to gain similar research attention in the tourism sector due to their rise as consumers into society (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010). It is thought that this cohort has gained prominence in the tourism industry as it has recently reached an impressionable stage in life in which it is able to develop its own spending decisions and habits (Chhabra, 2010).

Several claims have been made regarding the Millennial Generation and tourism, but with little statistical evidence to support them; however, two theories have surfaced that describe the cohort as tourists – those who claim to want to travel and actually do travel more than other generations, and those who would rather and do travel less (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). The majority of the studies conducted on Millennial travel were produced by organizations dealing with student and youth travel, in which the survey responses were not generalizable outside of the respondents who already showed some interest in travel (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). It is suggested that the broader range of the generation travels no more than generations of the past, but those who do travel are inclined to do so more frequently and go to a wider range of destinations than members of the preceding generations (Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). Strides are being taken to learn more about the changes that Generation Y is bringing to tourist behavior, and there is evidence to support that change. For example, there has been growth in the volunteer tourism in recent years, which has been attributed to the interest put forth by tourist members of this cohort (Clemmons, 2008, as cited by Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). Studies have also found that there is an increased interest in local culture participation and extended stays in one country, rather than short vacations on a more frequent basis (Contiki, 2008, as cited by Moscardo & Benkendorff, 2010).
Generation Y have certain expectations of their consumer experiences, which can have an effect on their travel choices. For example, they are thought to expect punctual and dependable service with visually appealing facilities, aesthetically pleasing features, incorporated technology, and visible prices and brands (Huang & Petrick, 2010; Kueh & Voon, 2007; Stevens, Lathrop, & Brandish, 2005).

In a study conducted by Huang and Petrick (2010) regarding travel behaviors of three generations, they found that there were statistical difference in travel preferences among Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennial Generation. Generation Y was found to be less likely to visit museums, participate in sports such as golf, tennis, hunting, and fishing, and less likely to go sightseeing and visit historical places than the Baby Boomer generation (Huang & Petrick, 2010). They were more likely to visit amusement or theme parks as well as participate in nightclub and dancing activities than the older generations (Huang & Petrick, 2010). Also in this study, upon rating the importance of destination’s elements in drawing tourists, the majority of the Millennial participants regarded beaches, amusement parks, spectator sports and big cities more important attributes than the Baby Boomers, although Generation X shared their sentiments regarding all except for large cities (Huang & Petrick, 2010). The Millennials also were found to consider shopping opportunities more important than the older generations (Huang & Petrick, 2010). In contrast, the Millennials and Generation X were not as concerned with historical sites, museums, and beautiful scenery, as the Baby Boomers (Huang & Petrick, 2010). None of these results maintain that any of these attributes are not enjoyed or sought after by all of the generations, but rather these are the top qualities they look for when choosing a destination. It is also possible that Generation Y travelers’ preferences may change as they age and as their disposable income grows in the future.
In a six-year study conducted by Benckendorff and Moscardo (2010) with the purpose of understanding the Generation Y tourist market in relation to other generations, findings related differences in age groups within each year of the study which suggested effects of maturation, as well as differences between age groups across the years of study, supporting the theory of changes from cohort to cohort. Within this study, the researchers determined that even accounting for difference in life stages and evidence of maturation, the Millennial Generation tourists of the Great Barrier Reef in Australia still showed significant differences among several variables with the other generational cohorts (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010). For example, they were more likely to travel with a family group (supporting evidence of a tendency to stay at home longer than previous generations), were more interested in attractions of escape, novelty, and excitement which the researchers attributed to their early exposure to a plethora of leisure and entertainment encounters during their formative years (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010).

As the participants in the this study were visitors to the Great Barrier Reef, the researchers inquired about the Millennial participants’ interests in nature education and found that they were far less interested in this sustainability amenity than in finding ways to maximize the value of the experience for the amount of money they were paying for it (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010). The researchers concluded that the overall results suggested that Millennial Generation tourists are emerging with a unique set of travel characteristics, motivations, and expectations (Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010).

In 2008, it was reported that the Millennial Generation only made up nine percent of business travel, but suggested that the group is likely to become more involved with age and career progression (Van Dyck, 2008, as cited by Moscardo & Benckendorff, 2010). It has been concluded that there has been very little research conducted, and therefore minimal statistical
evidence, to suggest decisive trends between the Millennial Generation and tourism (Moscardo and Benckdorff, 2010; Benckendorff & Moscardo, 2010).

**Push and Pull Tourism Motivation**

_Tourism Motivation_

Travel motivation has been considered to be a significant subject among tourism researchers as a means to better improve tourist behavior and for the analysis of tourism (Bashar & Abdelnaser, 2011; Pearce, 1996; Guha, 2009). There are several working definitions of the concept of motivation. For example, motivation has been described as an individual’s driving force that pushes them to act to satisfy their needs (Bashar & Abdelnaser, 2011). Motivation also has been described as the needs or desires that encourage certain behaviors in order to accomplish a goal (Bashar & Abdelnaser, 2011). In addition, motivation has been described as the needs or desires that push an individual to act and to find a way to obtain satisfaction (Beerli & Martin, 2004; Bashar & Abdelnaser, 2011). Crompton (1979) divided the travel market into four segments consisting of business travel, government or corporate business travel, visitation of friends and relatives, and pleasure vacation travel (Guha, 2009).

Much of motivational theory is born from the work of Abraham Maslow and his defined hierarchy of needs, which he classified into higher and lower categories (Maslow, 1954; Guha, 2009; Mohammad & Som, 2010). This theory was modeled as a pyramid of needs with a base of physiological needs, followed by higher levels of needs, ending in the need for self-actualization (Mohammad & Som, 2010). The lower needs are needs of deficiency, beginning with physiological needs such as hunger, thirst, shelter, and sexuality (Maslow, 1954; Guha, 2009). The next step in the pyramid is safety needs, which include security, protection from pain, fear, and anxiety and need for sheltering dependency, order, and lawfulness (Maslow, 1954; Guha,
After the most basic needs are met, the middle of Maslow’s pyramid involves needs for belongingness, involving love, affection, emotional security, social acceptance, and a sense of identity (Guha, 2009). Moving into the higher needs categories Maslow described esteem needs, which include the need to achieve goals and gain approval and recognition from peers (Guha, 2009). At the top of the needs pyramid are self-actualization needs such as self-fulfillment through the realization of potential and ability, and the need for comprehension and insight into society and the world (Maslow, 1954; Guha, 2009).

Crompton (1979) stated that all segments of the tourism industry spend money in an attempt to produce an image; which can be defined as a sum of the beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of a destination. It is thought that the images perceived by tourists in the travel market could be a significant factor in the development of a tourism location, which is directly related to the limited personal experience of the consumer with the destination (Crompton, 1979). Crompton (1979) classified tourist motivations into push and pull tourism factors, although Dann (1977) was the first to use these terms (Guha, 2009). Through his research, Crompton identified two distinct types of socio-psychological motivation. The first drives the initial decision to travel, and the second aids in the decision to choose a particular destination, location, or event (Crompton, 1979; Guha, 2009). Among tourist motivation theories, the theory of push and pull motivational factors has been widely accepted among researchers (Bashar & Abdelnaser, 2011; Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Mohammad & Som, 2010; Guha, 2009; Klenosky, 2002; Dann, 1977). The concept behind this theory is that people travel based on a push by internal forces and a pull of the external forces made up of a destination’s attributes (Mohammad & Som, 2010).
**Definition of ‘Push’ Motivational Factors**

Push motivational factors originate from Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and are considered intrinsic motivations (Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Guha, 2009). According to Maslow (1954), there are fundamental goals and needs that provide the basis of behavior motivation. These push factors directly correlate to a tourist’s home environment and the resulting needs and pressures for travel that motivate the tourist to leave his or her current situation (Perrett, 2007; Guha, 2009). These needs and pressures originate from an individual’s unique psychological traits and drives that inspire them to act (Guha, 2009). It has been suggested that these motivational factors arise due to a state of tension in the emotional system, the causes of which usually involve an escape of mundane life (Dann, 1977; Crompton, 1979; Iso-Ahola, 1982; Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Bashar & Abelnaser, 2011). In other words, these factors refer to specific forces in a potential tourist’s life that prompt a decision to travel outside of his or her normal environment (Klenosky, 2002). Kim et al. (2003) identified four broad domains of push factors including family togetherness and study, appreciating natural resources and health, escaping from everyday routine, and adventure and building friendship (as cited by Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Consequently, existing studies propose common push factors such as escape, novelty, social interaction, and esteem (Prayag & Ryan, 2010).

Push factors relate to the needs of the tourist and include examples such as the desire for escape, rest and relaxation, adventure, prestige, health and fitness, and social interaction (Klenosky, 2002). Guha (2009) identified eight motivational push factors based on the research of Crompton (1979). Brief descriptions of each type are as follows:
The first factor is the escape from a perceived routine environment. One motive for travel is a temporary change of everyday surroundings, which involves a physically and socially different context than the traveler’s ordinary life.

Second is the exploration and evaluation of self. The freshness of physical and social context is an essential part of the transformations process undergone by travelers upon visiting a destination. A vacation may be view by travelers as an opportunity to reevaluate and discover more about themselves, modify themselves, or act out self-images.

The third factor is relaxation. Crompton argued that during the rhythm of ordinary routine life, people are not focused on hobbies or self-fulfilling interests, and that vacation is a way of taking time to pursue these things. Although, according to Moscardo and Benckendorff (2010), the Millennial Generation is very oriented toward a work/life balance and socially inclined, which could indicate that relaxation could be a factor of their everyday lives.

The fourth push factor is regression. Travel provides the opportunity to do things that are unimaginable in the context of usual life styles. Tourists get to experience different times and places as well as engage in behavior that varies from their traditional role obligations. This motive has been identified as regressive because it allows the tourist to revert to a simpler way of life.

Fifth is the enhancement of kinship relationships. Traveling provides a way for people to be brought closer together; and is therefore, a means by which familial relationships can be enhanced and enriched.

Sixth is the facilitation of social interaction. This motive for visiting various destinations consists of the opportunity to meet new people and engage in socializing with the possibility to enhance social status.
Novelty is the seventh push factor. Tourists’ curiosity influences their decisions to travel. In many cases, they tend to travel to destination they have previously never visited so that they can experience new activities.

The eighth and final push factor identified by Crompton and defined by Guha is education. Tourism destination selection is sometimes based on the potential for educational experiences. In this category, destinations and activities such as museums, tours, and workshops are appealing attraction choices. For example, tourists are sometimes interested in the exploration of a destination for its historical or scientific significance. It is probable that this is the push factor that many times influences potential tourists to visit cultural heritage tourist sites.

*Definition of ‘Pull’ Motivational Factors*

Pull motivational factors have been described as influencing when, where, and how people travel (Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Mill & Morrison, 1985). These factors are normally specific to the destination, meaning that the destination itself has characteristics that attract visitors, consisting of its features, attractions, or attributes (Klenosky, 2002; Perrett, 2007; Guha, 2009; Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Mohammad & Som, 2010). These qualities of a given location promote an image presented to potential tourists. Images are arguably the “currency of cultures” and as such, they reflect and reinforce shared meanings, beliefs, and value systems relating to their destinations (Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Visitors may evaluate their vacation experiences based on the cultural construction of these destination images based on tourist characteristics (Prayag & Ryan, 2010).

The chosen destination is expected to meet the needs and pressures of the visitor that pushed them to travel in the first place (Guha, 2009). Several researchers of these motivational factors have established that ‘push’ factors precede ‘pull’ (Guha, 2009; Prayag & Ryan, 2010;
Perrett, 2007; Dann, 1977). Push and pull factors have usually been characterized as two distinct and separate decisions made at two separate points in time; one focused on whether to go and the other one where to visit (Klenosky, 2002). This is perceivably based on the context of push factors as the initial motivators directly related to the potential tourist, after which the destination is chosen by the same tourist to meet the needs of the push via a series of pull factors offered by the destination. Pull factors respond to and reinforce motivational push factors, and tourists consider various pull factors (which correspond to push factors) upon deciding on a particular destination (Dann, 1981; Klenosky, 2002).

Each destination has a discernable set of pull factors (Guha, 2009). Some would argue that pull factors are more identifiable because they are external and using them destinations can be visibly compared (Guha, 2009). The particular pull factors that attract one visitor to a destination could significantly vary from the pull factors that attract another visitor to the same destination (Guha, 2009, Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Destination choice originates from tourists’ assessments of a location’s qualities and includes factors such as natural and cultural attractions, social opportunities, physical amenities and facilities, nightlife, and ambiance (Prayag & Ryan, 2010; Kim, Lee, & Klenosky, 2003). Bashar and Abdelnasar (2011) listed culture link, accessibility, products, quality, advantage, events, ecological attributes, shopping, and natural amenities as examples of pull motivations.

The measurement of a destination’s image has been the dominant way of assessing pull factors as a result of the general agreement that these factors are assessed based on a list of the destination’s attributes which represent perceptions of the location (Prayag & Ryan, 2010). Berrli and Martin (2004) explained that the fulfillment of motives along with the alignment of a
destination’s image with the visitor’s self-concept of the location may explain a visitor’s choice and may also prompt repeat visitation.

*Marketing to the Millennial Generation*

It has been suggested that age is the most important demographic characteristic for consumer marketers and researchers to consider, and that not only chronological age is important, but also age cohorts and time periods (Roberts & Manolis, 2000, as cited by Huang & Petrick, 2010; Stevens et al., 2005). In the environment and culture that the Millennial Generation was raised and acclimated to, there have been more opportunities and reasons to shop and purchase than ever before (Huang & Petrick, 2010). It is in this context that they have been predicted to have the biggest spending potential of all the generations to date, especially since Generation Y teenagers, as of the year 2000, had spent an estimated 153 billion US dollars on items including electronics, cars, and clothing (Brand, 2000, as cited by Huang & Petrick, 2010). Belleau, Summers, Xu, and Pinel (2007) claimed that the central feature of this cohort’s life is consumerism. Because of their buying capability and potential to become lifetime consumers (Wolburg & Pokrywcynski, 2001), researchers have come to believe that shopping is a key activity for this group when choosing a destination (Martin and Turley, 2004, as cited by Huang & Petrick, 2010).

The Millennial Generation has been regarded as showing little loyalty to brands (Pendergast, 2010). The Baby Boomers required mass marketing and communication, followed by a shift to direct marketing efforts required by Generation X, but the Millennial Generation has required marketing that is viral, participative, interactive, and networked (Pendergast, 2010). Now more than ever, the Millennials value the opinions of their peers, in particular, their friends
To the Millennial member, a friend is often not comprised of someone known personally to them, but rather a person in the same network (Pendergast, 2010).

In a marketing context, the Millennial Generation has been found to be highly individualistic, anti-corporate, and resistant to advertising efforts (Huang & Petrick, 2010; Wolburg & Pokrywcynski, 2001; Belleau et al., 2007). Additionally, word of mouth, in various forms, is thought to be the best form of marketing used to target Millennial cohort members, since they highly value the opinions of their friends and peers, and purposive relationships developed by promoters goes rewarded (Huang & Petrick, 2010; Morton, 2002). Huang and Petrick (2010) stated that due to their frequently and consistently changing tastes, it might prove difficult among this group to generate repeat patronage. In a study of travel behaviors conducted by Huang and Petrick (2010), the findings suggested that targeting Generation Y more efficiently would depend on promotional messages centered around events, central reservations for booking flights, hotels, and car rentals, word of mouth promotion, as well as electronic and digital promotions of related to nightlife, large cities, and shopping opportunities.

**Cultural Heritage Tourism**

**Definition of Tourism**

Tourism is massive and global, and became a legitimized and recognized industry in the twentieth century; since then it has been classified by some as America’s largest industry; however, few destinations attract enough constant and continuous tourist spending to sustain and promote economic stability and growth for local economies (Souther & Bloom, 2012; Baram & Rowan, 2004). Tourism is thought of as an economic endeavor and commercial activity, and as a result is a force for social, cultural, and environmental change (Robinson, 2001; McKercher & du Cros, 2002). It has been argued that a growing proportion of leisure time and financial
resources of American households are being spent on pursuits of tourism, which creates social and cultural patterns for destinations and society (Souther & Bloom, 2012). Factors such as leadership, choices, design, and historical context influence success for a destination’s appeal and draw of visitors, and repetition of the joining of these factors can be witnessed at many tourist destinations throughout the United States (Souther & Bloom, 2012). With these dynamics in mind, it stands to reason that tourism could be considered an integral part of America’s political, social, and cultural development (Souther & Bloom, 2012).

Travelers are becoming more sophisticated as a result of sociological changes involving growing economies, changing demographics, and advances in technology, all of which have contributed to a shift away from traditional tourism such as inclusive tours (Weiler & Hall (1992) as sited by Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011). The modern tourist is interested in being included in the everyday life of the destination through experiences, discovery, and participation (Robinson & Novelli, 2005; Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011). Tourism can be divided into multiple categories, and is categorized by researchers and marketers alike for the purpose of facilitating research and developing knowledge as well as marketing, planning, and managing the impacts tourism has on the environments in which it occurs (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). A few of these tourism categories include: nature-based, sport, health, adventure, volunteer, and cultural heritage tourism, among others (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Although there are multiple segments and sub-segments of tourism, this study focuses on cultural heritage tourism.

**Definition of Cultural Heritage Tourism**

The definition of cultural heritage tourism is many times shaped by its participants in order to suit their own needs (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). According to the World Tourism Organization (WTO), cultural tourism is defined as “movements of persons essentially for
cultural motivations such as study tours, performing arts and cultural tours, travel to festivals and other events, visit to sites and monuments, travel to study nature, folklore or art, and pilgrimages” (World Tourism Organization, 1985; McKercher & du Cros, 2002). In addition, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization has developed a definition of cultural heritage which includes: monuments and groups of buildings that are of “outstanding universal value from the point of view of history, art, or science” and sites that are the works of man or a combination of man and nature that are of outstanding value from historical, aesthetic, ethnological, or anthropological points of view (UNESCO, 1972). Heritage tourism includes tangible elements such as natural and cultural environments, landscapes, historic places, sites, and man-made environments as well as intangible elements such as collections, past and current cultural practices, passed down knowledge, and living experiences (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). A cultural or heritage asset is identified as one that is valued for its inherent values (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). Cultural heritage tourism, according to the National Trust for Historic Preservation (2011), is “traveling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past and present.” This includes attractions that are historic, cultural, and natural in character.

McKercher and du Cros (2002) separate definitions of cultural tourism into four categories: tourism-derived, motivational, experiential, and operational definitions. Tourism definitions recognize cultural tourism within the broader scope of tourism, and are classified as a form of special interest tourism in which culture and heritage is the basis of attraction for tourists and tourist motivation. The motivational definition of cultural tourism considers motivation as a key aspect to tourist participation in cultural heritage sites. The experiential definition claims that motivation alone does not account for the full force behind cultural tourism, rather that it is an
experiential activity with a quality of aspiration for many of its participants. This definition suggests that cultural tourism involves experiencing unique social heritage and special character of places visited, as well as an expectation to be educated as well as entertained as a result of experiencing the culture. The operational definition of cultural tourism is perhaps the most common and broadest, since it describes cultural tourism as the participation in any one of an array of activities including but not limited to archaeological sites, museums, castles, palaces, historical buildings, famous buildings, ruins, art, galleries, festivals, events, music and dance performances, folk arts, theater, ethnic communities, churches, cathedrals, and anything else than represents people and their cultures, and on a large or small scale.

In the late 1970s, cultural tourism began to be recognized as a distinct tourism product category after tourism marketers and researchers realized that some people travel for the sole purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the culture or heritage of a destination (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). Culture is a broad concept because it includes all aspects that define a community, with both tangible and intangible elements (Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011). Cultural tourism takes many forms, and one of the ways it can be segmented further is historical or cultural heritage tourism (Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011). Just like culture, heritage is also a broad and complex notion, which involves not only the past but also contemporary social understandings of sites, and the current active construction of the past (Baram & Rowan, 2004). More specifically, heritage is a form of the past that belongs to a particular group (Baram & Rowan, 2004). Heritage tourism consists of consumption of the past, which includes people knowing and visiting places with historic content (Baram & Rowan, 2004).
According to Timothy and Nyaupane (2009), heritage tourism is currently one of the fastest growing sectors of tourism, which consists of people visiting cultural and historical resources. By definition, this form of tourism relies on both living and manmade elements of culture, using both the tangible and intangible past as tourism resources (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Cultural heritage tourism has increasingly matured in the tourism market (Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011). According to Kneofsey (1994), “Culture is being seen as a resource and history has become a saleable commodity” (as cited by Simone-Charteris & Boyd, 2011).

Variations of Cultural Heritage Tourism

Varying types of heritage tourism are identified by the places, events, and artifacts being observed or visited as well as by the motives and activities of the tourists who visit them (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Although it has been suggested that all tourism includes a cultural element, visiting historic sites and cultural landmarks, attending festivals and other special events, or visiting museums are some of the most prominent forms of cultural tourism in which the art of traveling removes tourists from their home culture to experience the culture and heritage of a new one (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). Previous research suggests that in many cases, tourists are drawn to heritage sites in order to enhance learning, satisfy curiosity and nostalgic feelings, for spiritual growth, relaxation, self-discovery, time away from home, and valued time with loved ones (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009; Confer & Kerstetter, 2000; Krakover & Cohen, 2001; Poria, Butler, & Airey, 2004; Prentice, Davies, & Beecho, 1997; Timothy, 1997; Timothy & Boyd; 2003). The heritage sites themselves are considered the product of archaeological excavations and historical investigations that are in turn promoted as commodities in the tourism market (Baram & Rowan, 2004).
Cultural heritage tourism has been classified into subcategories based on specific activities and events including: arts tourism, which includes visits to places such as the theater, concerts, or literary sites; creative tourism in which the visitor participates in activities such as painting, cooking, pottery making, etc.; urban tourism which involves partaking in shopping, nightlife, and visits to historic sites within an urban location; rural tourism which includes visits to farms, villages, and National Parks; indigenous tourism involving visits to cultural centers and participation in or observance of performances and festivals; industrial heritage tourism an example of which would be a visit to a regenerated waterfront development; sport tourism consisting of attendance to or participation in sporting events; gastronomy tourism which involves partaking of local food, food festivals, and wine trails; political tourism which accounts for visits to sites such as national monuments, war memorials and cemeteries; and religious tourism which consists of visits to churches, temples, and other religious sites, festivals, and ceremonies for viewing or participation (Simone-Charterise & Boyd, 2011; Timothy & Boyd, 2003).

One study (Nyaupane, White, & Budruk, 2006) categorized heritage tourists into three types based on motivation: culture-focused, culture-attentive, and culture-appreciative (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). There are several different attractions encompassed by the heritage tourism classification, including cultures and folklore, music, dance, language, food, religion, artistic tradition, festivals, and remaining extant man-made edifices such as public buildings, homes, castles, cathedrals, farms, monuments, museums, ruins, and relics (Timothy and Nyaupane, 2009). In first world areas of the globe such as North America, Western Europe, and Australia, industrial heritage has become a routine occurrence due to a cultural move to post-industrial
service economies, making industrialism a thing of the past, and therefore a heritage attraction (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009).

**Benefits and Disadvantages of Cultural Heritage Tourism**

"Conserving cultural heritage is as important as conserving the natural environment" (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Most tourism scholars focus sustainability conversation on natural environments, but while some natural realms can organically recover from the negative impacts of tourism and development, damaged cultural heritage cannot (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Timothy and Nyaupane contend that cultural heritage sites are non-renewable resources that, once gone, cannot be recovered. The growth of cultural tourism coincided with an emergence of a broader societal appreciation of the necessity for protection and conservation of declining cultural and heritage resources (McKercher & de Cros, 2002). There are several observed reasons for the preservation of human heritage including: countering effects of modernization such as the destruction of historic structures, building nationalism, preserving community nostalgia, improving education and scientific fields, protecting the values of art and an esthetic environment, upholding diversity in a common environment, and spawning economic value (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009; Timothy & Boyd, 2003). In many places throughout the world, tourism is based on cultural heritage and is seen as an economic liberator, suggesting that in parts of the world, cultural heritage sites take on a very important role economically (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009).

According to Timothy and Nyaupane (2009), “heritage is a source and symbol of identity.” It has been noted that public funding for the conservation and preservation of historic sites are in short supply in the developed world, and even more so in less-developed regions (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). However, when tourism sites are properly managed, heritage
conservation empowers local communities and provides many opportunities including improved income and living standards for local people, particularly in less-developed areas (Engelhardt, 2005; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Heritage tourism and conservation stimulates economies in rural and isolated regions by creating demand for other amenities (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Maintenance and preservation of cultural heritage can assist in creating awareness of and pride in local history and civilization (Prentice, 2005; Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). This local pride in turn can provide increased local efforts to protect the cultural past of an area (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009).

Heritage tourism has many impacts in physical, socio-cultural, and economic arenas of the regions in which it occurs (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). In the community of cultural heritage management, cultural tourism has been described as a double-edged sword (McKercher & de Cros, 2002). For example, increased tourist demand has provided a growing political and economic justification to increase conservation activities (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). The reverse argument suggests that increased visitation, overuse, inappropriate use, and the commoditization of these assets without regard for their cultural values strips them of their integrity (and in extreme cases is a threat to the survival) of cultural heritage assets (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). Despite the negative side to cultural heritage tourism, many in the conservation sector accept that a partnership between heritage management and tourism is beneficial and necessary (McKercher & du Cros, 2002). In the physical realm, an abundance of tourists in an area can cause damage such as wear and tear of structures and landscaping, litter and air pollution, vandalism, and the very presence of an abundance of tourists can make the attraction less appealing for themselves (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). These negative physical impacts are not beyond improvement, as the tourist sector is becoming more educated about
damages through interpretation, which encourages visitors to refrain from touching and climbing on historical artifacts (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009; Moscardo, 1996).

Socio-culturally impacts result from tourist interaction with local populations (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Tensions between these two groups can derive from several different sources, including local dependence on tourist activity, local displacement because of tourist activity, friction at religious sites, and cultural change as a result of interaction with tourist populations (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Although these negative impacts are noted, there are positive socio-cultural effects as well. Lost or declining elements of culture have been revived because of increased tourism interests, self-esteem and cultural pride are often revived through tourism, and an expansion of knowledge, innovation, and increased employment of local artisans are all positive results of increased tourist traffic (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009).

Economic impacts are often more positive than other effects of heritage tourism. Increased regional revenue and tax bases are the result of tourism activity, and largely aid in the conservation, maintenance, and interpretation of cultural heritage sites (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). Baram and Rawan (2004) defined preservation as an umbrella term that includes restoration, reconstruction, and rehabilitation. These three tasks are large undertakings to ensure the upkeep of cultural heritage sites, and funds are required in order to accomplish preservation, and success in this area can come from the marketing of heritage (Baram & Rowan, 2004). Although entrance fees for these sites have been criticized as unjust, they provide a viable source of funding for the site and the local economy and generally do not dissuade visitation by tourists (Timothy & Nyaupane, 2009). In all, both positive and negative impacts are made on cultural heritage sites as a result of tourism; however, it is possible that additional preservation as a result
of the economic benefits, as well as an increase in education regarding heritage maintenance outweigh the negative results.

*Cultural Heritage Tourism and the Millennial Generation*

There has not been extensive research conducted specifically regarding the Millennial Generation and their involvement in cultural heritage tourism (Chhabra, 2010; Belhassen, Caton, & Stewart, 2008; Chhabra, Healy, & Sills, 2003). Deepak Chhabra is one of the first to approach the subject. He used a four-part questionnaire to survey a group of two hundred students from universities in the southwest, Midwest, and northeast regions of the United States to determine trends and patterns among Generation Y tourists, their participation in cultural heritage tourism, and their perceptions and needs in the area of authenticity. According to Chhabra (2010), regardless of generational categorization, most tourists are seeking authenticity in heritage settings. In addition, it has been argued that authenticity is the most important factor for the development of heritage tourism (Chhabra, 2010; Xie & Wall, 2003).

It is important to consider that tourists in general, no matter which cohort they were born into, are not a homogenous group and they seek differing types of authentic cultural heritage experiences (Chhabra, 2010). Age has been found to be an indicator of defining authenticity in a tourism experience, and the younger generations were discovered to desire uniqueness and originality in their experiences, whereas the older cohorts sought cultural and historical integrity (Chhabra, 2010). However, there are specifics that have been found about the Millennial Generation. For example, according to Chhabra’s research, objective forms of authentic tourist experiences were dominant factors among the Generation Y respondents of his study. He found that the likelihood for the Generation Y cohort to be heritage tourists increases with party size as the cohort is liable to adapt to other members of a group. He also suggested that they are
enthusiastic about “time travel” experiences, meaning that they seek authenticity and reality in tourism; for example, they want to feel present in the past when visiting heritage tourism sites. Chhabra (2010) predicted that the search for true and original authentic historical experiences, as well as the inclination to spend on genuine historical encounters would grow as this cohort matures. He insists that their desire for authenticity could transform into a powerful force for conservation and preservation opportunities in the future, and advises cultural heritage management to take advantage of this cohort in order to reinforce support cultural heritage causes.

Cultural Heritage Tourism in Arkansas

Heritage tourism has been named one of the top motivations for pleasure travel and as it has become more important to travelers it has generated significant benefits for the communities that house historic sites, helping to stimulate preservation efforts and develop the unique character and identity of community (Arkansas Historic Preservation Program: Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation, 2013). Additionally, heritage tourism aids locations through economic gains in areas such as job growth, income, and tax revenues (Arkansas Historic Preservation Program: Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation, 2013). Great variations of buildings have been converted into tourist destinations over the past century, and tourists have come to accept almost any building type as appropriate for a full tourist experience (Souther & Bloom, 2012). Such sites are sometimes the main destination of traveling tourists, can be one part of their travel itinerary, may be something they discover while in the area, or perhaps a location that locals are more interested in than visitors, signifying that not all sites are attractive to visitors (National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2011). Heritage tourism has been named one of the top reasons for pleasure travel in the United States, and has become gradually more
important to visitors and the communities that house heritage attractions (Arkansas Historic Preservation Program: Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation, 2013).

Four cultural heritage locations in the state of Arkansas have been selected for examples in this study. They are located in four regions within the state: north, central, south, and the Arkansas Delta. All sites listed are on the National Register of Historic Places.

The first of these locations is Pea Ridge National Military Park, located in the northern region of the state. The park is part of the National Park Service, and this organization provides a great deal of information about the battle and the condition of the battlefield today. According to the National Park Service (2013), “Pea Ridge was one of the most pivotal Civil War battles and is the most intact Civil War battlefield in the United States.” The battle that made Pea Ridge famous occurred on March 7 and 8, 1862, on a battlefield of 4,300 acres. Together, the Union and Confederate armies present consisted of 26,000 soldiers who fought to determine the destiny of Missouri and the largely untamed western territories. In the end, the battle preserved Missouri for the Union. In the years to follow, before the site was preserved as a park, many Union and Confederate veterans attended a series of reunions at the site, the first of which occurred in 1887, twenty-five years after the battle (Warren, 2011). As a result of these remembrance gatherings, the first monuments were dedicated on the battlefield to the Union and Confederate dead, and remain in the park today (Warren, 2011).

The battlefield was also significant in other ways. For example, on it took place the only major Civil War battle in which Native American troops participated (National Park Service, 2013). Two Confederate regiments were made up of almost 1,000 Cherokee natives, led by Cherokee Colonel Stand Watie. The park also contains an estimated two and a half miles of the
Trail of Tears as followed by some members of the Cherokee Nation in the 1830s (Warren, 2011).

The preservation of Pea Ridge battlefield was the result of the efforts of several Arkansas congressmen (Warren, 2011). In 1939, Representative Clyde T. Ellis began corresponding with the National Park Service in order to revive a proposal attempt to preserve the battlefield (Warren, 2011). However, no steps were taken toward preservation until 1956 when the Arkansas congressional delegation proposed legislation to turn the battlefield into a 5,000-acre national military park. This legislation was a historic breakthrough for Civil War battlefield preservation at the time, since the National Park Service classification system only allowed one acre to be preserved, along with a monument. On July 20, 1956, Congress enacted legislation to accept the battlefield land donation from the state of Arkansas (Warren, 2011). Mrs. W.W. Vaught proposed the Pea Ridge Memorial Association in 1958, and it was approved in 1961 with the goal to hold annual memorial services on the anniversary of the battle as well as install historic markers identifying maneuvers of both armies before, during, and after the battle, (Warren, 2011). This preceded the list of the park on the National Register of Historic Places on October 15, 1966 (Warren, 2011).

The National Park Service, Department of the Interior, currently manages the park. In February 2010, the museum was reopened to the public after a $1 million renovation including expansion of the facility with new interactive exhibits (Warren, 2011). The Pea Ridge National Military Park is part of the Civil War Discovery Trail, the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail, and the Lower Missouri Civil War Heritage Trail (Warren, 2011). It is located in Pea Ridge, Arkansas, part of Benton County. It is such a well-preserved specimen of the Civil War, that it provides a prime location of cultural heritage tourism in the State of Arkansas.
The second cultural heritage location is the Old State House Museum located in the central region of Arkansas. “The Old State House Museum is the oldest standing state capitol building west of the Mississippi River” (Old State House Museum, 2012). The Old State House Museum website provides a vast amount of history and current information regarding the museum. Located in Little Rock, Arkansas, construction began on the building in 1833 and was competed in 1842, making it an antebellum structure. Territorial Governor John Pope commissioned the building and selected Kentucky architect Gideon Shryock to draw up plans for the capitol, as he had previously done for the Kentucky state capitol building. The building was drawn up in the Greek Revival style, one of the most popular designs for public buildings at the time. It was built from local materials, and there is even evidence to support that bricks for building may have been made on site with slave labor (Old State House Museum, 2012).

When Arkansas became a state in 1836, government officials moved into the building, although it was still under construction. It served as the state capitol building until 1911, when the current capitol building was completed. After the relocation of the state government, the edifice was put through a variety of uses including as a meeting place for statewide patriotic organizations, and for a brief period of time, its name was changed to the Arkansas War Memorial and prepared for use by federal and state agencies. In 1947, the Old State House became a museum as the result of acts passed by the Arkansas legislature, a process that was overseen by the newly established Arkansas Commemorative Commission (Old State House Museum, 2012).

The Old State House was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1969. In 1993, it received accreditation by the American Association of Museums (which was renewed in 2003) and became a National Historic landmark in 1997. For a brief period of time, from 1996
through 1999, the museum was closed to the public to undergo serious foundation work updates in order to preserve the building for years to come. Many exceptional events in Arkansas history took place in and around this building. One example of these events involved a knife fight between state Representative Anthony and Speaker of the House Wilson in 1837 over a bad joke that sent Wilson into a fury of anger and resulted in Anthony’s death. During the Civil War, the building served first as the Confederate State Capitol, and then the Union State Capitol after the Confederate loss at Pea Ridge and the Confederate government fled south after it appeared that Little Rock would fall to the Union. Other significant events such as the Brooks-Baxter War, which was a struggle for power between opposing Republican factions after a party split in the 1870s, and President Bill Clinton’s campaign efforts took place in the building (Old State House Museum, 2012). This museum holds significant amounts of Arkansas history and is also an exemplary specimen of an Arkansas cultural heritage tourism location.

The third chosen heritage site is Washington Historic State Park located in the southern region of the state. It is currently one of fifty-two state parks in operation by the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism, and it primarily exists to provide a living history experience of life in the town during the nineteenth century (McDade, 2012). The town of Washington, Arkansas, was founded in 1824 as part of the legendary Southwest Trail, one of the eight major trails traveled by pioneers on their way to Texas and the Southwest (Historic Washington State Park, 2013). During the nineteenth century, Washington served as the cultural, political, and economic center for the southwest region of Arkansas as a result of its location (McDade, 2012; Historic Washington State Park, 2013). Some of the more famous visitors to the town included Sam Houston, Davy Crockett, and Jim Bowie, all of who visited Washington separately before fighting for Texas and Southwest independence at the Alamo (McDade, 2012; Historic
Washington State Park, 2013). In fact, it was in Washington where Bowie commissioned a local blacksmith to make the first of what became known as the Bowie Knife (McDade, 2012).

In 1863, during the Civil War, the Confederate government of Arkansas fled from Union invasion of Little Rock to eventually set up government headquarters in Washington at the 1836 Hempstead County Courthouse, which served as the Confederate state capitol until the end of the war in 1865. During this period, Washington fell under threat only once in the spring of 1864 when Union and Confederate troops engaged in battle on April 10, 1864, fourteen miles north of town (McDade, 2012). Many of the soldiers from the battle were taken to Washington for treatment after the battle and several buildings were converted to hospitals to accommodate them. The Washington Presbyterian Cemetery became the site of a mass grave in which seventy-four unknown Confederate soldiers were buried (McDade, 2012).

In the 1870s, the Cairo and Fulton Railroad was built through southwest Arkansas and a depot was set up in a neighboring town nine miles away. This, along with two serious fires that swept through the town between 1875 and 1883, initiated the decline of Washington as a central location in southwest Arkansas (McDade, 2012). After a sixty-year long feud with Hope, Arkansas, for control of the Hempstead County seat, Washington lost the title in May of 1939 (McDade, 2012).

In 1928, the United Daughters of the Confederacy made the first inroads into preservation of the town by acquiring funds to restore the 1836 Hempstead County courthouse (McDade, 2012; Kesterson, 2011). In 1958, several locals formed the Pioneer Washington Restoration Foundation in order to preserve and interpret the history of the town by operating tours of some of the historic homes (McDade, 2012). In 1973, the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism joined the effort, and the town was officially made a state park on July 1 (McDade, 2012). The
town’s name was officially changed to Historic Washington State Park following a vote from the Arkansas State Parks, Recreation, and Travel Commission in 2006 with the goal of better promoting and marketing the park to potential visitors. Today, the park includes fifty-four buildings on a total of 101 acres (McDade, 2012). Thirty of the buildings hold historic significance, and selected historic buildings are open for tours seven days a week, including: The 1836 Hempstead County Courthouse, the Works Progress Administration gymnasium, Washington Post Office, the American Bladesmith Society’s Bill Moan School of Bladesmithing, and the Southwest Arkansas Regional Archives, among others (McDade, 2012). The park contains living history figures, demonstrations, and special events all year round to keep the history of the town alive. The offerings of experience at Washington Historic State Park make it a primary heritage tourism destination in the state of Arkansas.

Finally, the fourth Arkansas cultural heritage location of this study is Lakeport Plantation, located in Chicot County along the Mississippi River in the Delta region of Arkansas. The Lakeport Plantation house was built in 1859 and is the sole antebellum plantation home remaining in Arkansas along the Mississippi River (Lakeport Plantation, 2013). It was built in the Greek Revival style and remains one of the finest historic examples of its kind in the state of Arkansas (DeBlack, 2011; Wintory & ASU, 2013). The property was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1974, gifted to Arkansas State University in 2001, and after a five-year restoration period it was opened to the public as an Arkansas heritage attraction (Lakeport Plantation, 2013).

Thomas DeBlack, a professor of history at Arkansas State University, is one of the top published researchers of Lakeport Plantation and like farms in the Arkansas Delta region. The history of Lakeport plantation comes from his published articles. The plantation itself was
established in 1831 by Joel Johnson of a prestigious Kentucky family, who sold a house and grist mill in his home state and took up residence in Chicot County, Arkansas, which at the time was vast delta wilderness with a total population of only 1,165 people. In this region, the percentage of slaves was higher than in the state as a whole, as the area was comprised of rich, delta farmland and a prime area for growing cotton. Census records in 1831 indicated that only two men in the county at the time owned more than twenty slaves, which was the minimum number necessary to be considered a planter. Joel Johnson purchased land and developed a plantation (called Lakeport after a nearby steamboat landing) with his twenty-three slaves, making him the largest slave-owner in the county. Over the next fifteen years, Johnson developed and expanded his estate and cultivated more land so that, by the time of his death in 1846, he owned over 3,700 acres of land and ninety-five slaves. His assets were divided among his six children, with his eldest son, Lycurgus Leonidas Johnson, inheriting the largest share (DeBlack, 2011).

At the time Lycurgus inherited Lakeport plantation, Chicot County, although seemingly still wilderness, was making strides to become a more civilized area, such as plans for building a road to the state capitol in Little Rock. According to the census, by 1850, Lycurgus owned 2,850 acres and ninety-five slaves which he rapidly built upon as the price of cotton soared through the mid-1850s. By the end of the decade, he had accumulated a total of 4,400 acres of land and 155 slaves. It was in 1858 that Lycurgus started construction of the plantation house that stands today. The house, built in a Greek Revival style out of cypress from the surrounding region, is a two story, L-shaped dwelling with seventeen rooms and tapered white columns on both levels. At the time it was built, it was a “showplace of the state’s ‘cotton aristocracy’” (DeBlack, 2011). Johnson’s prosperity that initiated the building of the house reflected that of the surrounding county until the emergence of the Civil War.
The life force of the delta, the Mississippi River, became the way by which the Union soldiers arrived in Chicot County. During the early stages of the war, Lycurgus continued to grow his holdings and served as a purchasing agent for the Confederate government. However, by 1863 or 1864, Union soldiers raided Lakeport, taking all of the mules, horses, and cattle from the property for their use. By the time of the Confederate surrender in 1865, Chicot County was thoroughly devastated and had lost their way of life, including Lakeport, which was severely impacted. Lycurgus lost well over $100,000 in slaves, not to mention livestock, crops, and household items. Racial strife abounded in the surrounding areas, among other problems, but Lycurgus managed to prosper despite those difficulties. Cotton prices remained high, he was able to settle part of his debt through the federal bankruptcy law of 1867, he negotiated for the services of many of the freedmen who had been his slaves before the war, and he developed a reputation for being a fair and honest employer, even supported by the Freedmen’s Bureau. By 1870, he was the largest cotton producer in the county with six hundred bales to his name (DeBlack, 2011).

Lycurgus Johnson died on August 1, 1876, and was seen as an “irreparable loss” to the county and community. The house and land remained part of the Johnson family until 1930 when it was sold to Sam Epstein, a native of Russia and an Eastern European Jewish immigrant, for $30,000. Epstein also found success at Lakeport, becoming a highly esteemed and valued citizen of Chicot County before his death in 1944. Neither Epstein nor any of his family members ever lived in the plantation house. It did not house another family until 1950, when a man by the name of Alvin Ford and his family moved into it to take over farming operations. They moved out in 1972, leaving the house unoccupied. However, the house still stands as a monument and testament to the trials and successes of the delta frontiersmen, antebellum planters, post-war
farmers, and modern day history. Cotton is still grown on the farm, and the house has been largely restored to its original grandeur, thanks to the efforts of Arkansas State University who took control of the property in 2001 and later opened it as a museum (DeBlack, 2011). It is a fine example of Arkansas history that remains open to the public and welcomes visitors.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Planning and development for the research design began in the spring 2013. An extensive literature review in combination with the objectives of this study was used as the guideline to build the questionnaire. A quantitative approach was used in this study in order to develop a non-experimental research design for the purpose of determining Millennial Generation student tourists’ push and pull motivational factors relating to cultural heritage tourism sites. The research design utilized for this study consisted of a non-experimental descriptive survey, for the purpose of assessing the perceptions and preferences of Millennial tourists regarding heritage tourist destinations, particularly four sites in the state of Arkansas. Because typical survey studies are used to assess attitudes, preferences, opinions, practices, procedures, and demographics (Gay & Airasian, 2003), a descriptive survey research design was deemed appropriate for this study. An approval form for research involving human subjects was submitted to the Institutional Review Board. The approval form was accepted and approved in September 2013 (See Appendix A). A descriptive questionnaire survey was designed and distributed to the members of a focus group. The results of the focus group yielded small changes which were made and a letter of consent was developed to accompany the surveys (See Appendix B & C). The members consisted of three hospitality faculty members, two hospitality graduate students, and six undergraduate students of varying degree fields, for a total of eleven focus group participants. Changes and modifications were made to the questionnaire based on the results of the focus group.
Population and Sample Selection

The target population selected for analysis consists of Millennial Generation university students between the ages of 18 and 33 who attend a four year university in Arkansas and who have presumed means and ability to participate in the tourism market. It would be impossible to survey every student within the state between the ages of 18 and 33; therefore, a convenience sample of students from varying degree fields at the University of Arkansas (Fayetteville, AR), the University of Central Arkansas (Conway, AR), Southern Arkansas University (Magnolia, AR), and Arkansas State University (Jonesboro, AR) was utilized to collect data. The researcher felt that by sampling students from these universities there would be representation from each region of the state in which the chosen tourist destinations are located. Specific cultural heritage tourism destinations were included in the survey instrument to further knowledge pertaining to Millennials’ capacity to visit these types of sites, and in order to gain information that would benefit these particular sites regarding tourism motivations. In order to represent the entire state of Arkansas, four heritage tourism sites were chosen in four different regions of the state: north, central, south, and the Delta. The chosen sites and their regionally correlating universities were as follows:

**North:** Pea Ridge National Military Park/ University of Arkansas

**Central:** Old State House Museum/ University of Central Arkansas

**South:** Washington Historic State Park/ Southern Arkansas University

**Delta:** Lakeport Plantation/ Arkansas State University

The selection of the sites was based on Antebellum and/or Civil War period status, common listing on the National Register of Historic Places, regional representation in the State of Arkansas, and because each is perceived as a tourist destination without lodging amenities.
**Instrumentation**

The instrument design consisted of a descriptive, in-person survey. A self-administered questionnaire was developed for this study based on the review of literature and the results of a focus group consisting of two hospitality graduate students, and six undergraduate students of varying degree fields, and three hospitality program educators. The focus group was used to test the content validity and clarity of the questionnaire as well as the estimate of time to take the survey and the ease of use. As a result of the focus group, there were three changes made to the questionnaire. Rather than asking which region the respondent was from, which may have been confusing to him/her, it was determined that the survey would include an open-ended question asking for the respondent’s hometown. Secondly, multiple-choice responses for frequency of visiting heritage sites were changed to encompass “less than once a year” since the focus group stated they needed this option. Lastly, detailed descriptions before each table were removed and only the most basic instructions remained to prevent any confusion among respondents and shorten the length of the survey.

**Measures**

The study engaged an in-person survey with six major sections. The first section asked demographic questions related to the respondent, which consisted of age, college classification, gender, hometown, and race/ethnicity. Descriptive statistics were run to determine the mean, standard deviation, and numbers and percentages of each item. The mean age was 20.01, with a standard deviation of 2.248.

The second section involved visitation and frequency of visits to heritage tourism attractions. The first part of this section asked if the respondent had visited historical attractions and if so how frequently. The second part of this section consisted of a table dealing with the
likeliness of the respondent to visit a variety of types of heritage tourism sites. Descriptive statistics were also used in this section to determine numbers and percentages of respondents who had visited historic sites and, among those, how frequently they visit. The second part of this section included a table with five response options ranging on a five-point Likert type scale from “not likely” to “highly likely.” There were varying means and standard deviations found for each type of site listed, which can be viewed in Table 4.3.

Section three dealt with ‘push’ motivational factors, or factors that push one to act based on one’s personal motivational system. A list of factors was presented in a table to which the respondent would be able to choose how low or high the factor applied to him/her. The Crombach’s alpha of the overall ‘push’ motivational table was .90, and had a mean of 3.86 with a standard deviation of .20.

The fourth section was very similar to the third except that this table dealt with ‘pull’ motivational factors, or elements of a destination that draw the respondent to travel. A list of factors was presented in a table to which the respondent would be able to choose how low or high the factor applied to him/her. The Crombach’s alpha of the overall ‘pull’ motivational table was .89, and had a mean of 3.59 with a standard deviation of .34.

Both the push and pull sections of the survey were based on the work of Mohammad and Som (2010), who used similar scales in their study regarding travel motivations of foreigners to Jordan. These push and pull sections were analyzed with factor analysis in order to combine individual variables into sets to be more easily understood as units. Four sets were found within each table. These factor sets were then analyzed using standard multiple regression, controlling for age and gender, and using the table of heritage sites as the dependent variable. Correlations,
unstandardized and standardized coefficients, and levels of significance were found for each factor set against the dependent variable.

The fifth section was compiled of two parts, both dealing with four specific historical/cultural heritage tourist sites in Arkansas. The first part consisted of a table which listed each site and then asked a series of six questions to which the respondent could either check if applicable, or leave blank if not. The second part consisted of four yes-or-no questions that inquired of respondents whether or not they were aware of specific details about each of the chosen heritage tourism sites. Both parts of this section were analyzed using descriptive statistics to find numbers and percentages of respondents who had heard of, visited, attend an event or festival at the site, knew the Civil War era or antebellum historical status of the site, or would like to visit or revisit. The sixth and final section dealt with historic preservation. There were five questions relating to the respondent’s efforts to assist in historic preservation and whether or not historic preservation was of importance to the respondent. This section was also analyzed with descriptive statistics.

Data Collection Techniques

The planned method of data collection for this study consisted of university instructors administering the surveys in Tuesday, Wednesday, and/or Thursday classes to maximize in-class attendance and participation. Some professors chose to offer extra credit as an incentive for taking the survey, but others did not. The classes were informed that participation was voluntary and all information gathered as a result of the survey was confidential. No names or identifying information of any kind was obtained.

The researcher had a contact/colleague at each university where the surveys were sent. These surveys were sent via FedEx. Southern Arkansas University opted not to participate in
data collection. Each colleague administered the surveys to the university students then return the completed surveys in a prepaid FedEx envelope to the researcher. After the data collection and the data input procedures were completed, the data was destroyed.

*Data Analysis*

The data collected was analyze using descriptive statistics, percentages, frequencies, factor analysis, and multiple linear regression analysis. Data was coded and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Inc. 2013). The first part of data analysis involved a demographic profile of respondents. Demographic data from the questionnaires was tabulated using percentages and frequencies.

Second, data produced from research question one was also analyzed using descriptive statistics to describe which types of heritage tourist attractions appeal most to Millennial students.

Third, data produced from research question two, asking what motivational tourism factors influence Millennial Generation students to travel to particular heritage tourism destinations, were subjected to exploratory factor analysis to identify underlying subscales of push and pull factors. Kim and Mueller (1978) stated that factor analysis is based on the basic assumption that certain underlying factors, which are more condensed in number than the total number of observed variables, are responsible for covariation among the observed variables. In addition, standard multiple regression analysis was used to predict the significance of Millennial students’ choices among push and pull factor subscales in relation to types of heritage tourism and predict the variance among them.

Lastly, descriptive statistics were used in response to data produced from research questions three and four. These descriptive statistics were used to describe how knowledgeable
Millennial Generation university students in Arkansas were about four specific heritage tourism destinations within the state and the historical significance of each site. These statistics were also used to describe Millennial students’ involvement in preservation of historic sites and whether or not historic preservation was important to them.

The previous chapter discussed the research methodologies that were used to investigate four research questions. By utilizing methods of statistical analysis, this chapter presents the results of the survey developed to answer these research questions. Several of these questions involve descriptive statistics, including demographic profiles. Descriptive statistics were also explored regarding Millennials knowledge of four specific heritage sites in the state of Arkansas as well as their interests and participation in historic preservation. The inferential statistics undergone in this study are further extended to Millennial Generation university students from three universities within the state of Arkansas, regarding their perceptions of different types of heritage sites and “push” and “pull” motivational factors for traveling to heritage tourist destinations.

The objective of this study was to establish tourism ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivation factors particular of Millennial Generation tourists attending universities between the ages of 18 and 33, when selecting general heritage tourist destinations. In addition, sub-segments of the study were to determine the sample’s level of concern and participation in historic preservation and to assess the group’s knowledge of historic antebellum and Civil War tourist sites located in the state of Arkansas; specifically the North, Central, South, and Delta regions.

Response Rate

Four hundred twenty nine surveys were distributed to students at three universities in Arkansas: the University of Arkansas, the University of Central Arkansas, and Arkansas State
University. Attempts were made to send surveys to Southern Arkansas University in Magnolia, Arkansas, for a more solid representation of the Southern region of Arkansas, but there was no cooperation for distribution at this location. The number of responses from each of the other three universities was as follows: University of Arkansas, 347; University of Central Arkansas, 76; Arkansas State University, 6.

All of the surveys distributed at the University of Arkansas were distributed in person in a variety of classroom settings among students with varying educational backgrounds and classifications. Surveys were collected on three campuses from October 25, 2013, through November 12, 2013. Surveys were sent to the University of Central Arkansas and Arkansas State University to be distributed by faculty in their classes. The surveys were sent out on October 20, 2013 to be returned by October 31, 2013. Table 3.1 shows the raw and adjusted response rates. Of the 429 surveys distributed, all were deliverable and returned. Of the surveys returned, 5 (1.00%) were unusable, mostly due to age of the respondent, which was set at 18 to 33 in order to be considered a member of the Millennial Generation. Therefore, 424 surveys were usable, which produced a 99.07% response rate. The 424 surveys deemed usable were coded and analyzed.
TABLE 3.1
RESPONSE RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Person Surveys</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Not Deliverable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Sample Size</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Returned</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Unusable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Number Usable</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>98.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent Profile**

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are described for male and female Millennial Generation students from the University of Arkansas, the University of Central Arkansas, and Arkansas State University. There were 73 (17.20%) male respondents and 351 (82.60%) female respondents.

The majority of male respondents were between the ages of 20 and 21 while the majority of female respondents ranged between the ages of 19 and 23. Two hundred forty two (57.76%) of the respondents were between the ages 20 and 21, making this age group the majority of respondents. The next highest percentage of respondents was between the ages of 18 and 19 with 75 (17.90%) surveys. In the 20 to 21 age group, 35 (8.35%) were males and 207 (49.40%) were females. In the 18 to 19 age group, 8 (1.91%) were males and 67 (15.99%) were females. The remaining 102 (23.34%) respondents fell between the ages of 23 and 33. Of these, 30 (7.16%) were male and 72 (17.18%) were female.
In terms of college classification, the majority of survey respondents, 173 (40.80%), were juniors, with the next highest number, 128 (30.19%), as seniors. Twenty-four (13.87%) of juniors were male, while 149 (86.13%) were female. Among seniors, 28 (21.88%) were male while 100 (78.13%) were female. Sophomores made up the third largest category with 15 (15.15%) males and 84 (84.85%) females, for a total of 99 (23.34%) respondents. Fourteen (3.30%) respondents were freshman, with 2 (14.28%) males and 12 (85.71%) females. Only 7 (1.65%) respondents were graduate students, made up of 4 (57.14%) males and 3 (42.86%) females. The smallest category was other, meaning someone not enrolled on a degree seeking track, with a total of 2 (0.47%) respondents, both of whom were female.

Respondents were asked to identify the race or ethnic background with which they most closely associated. White or Caucasian was response most chosen with 352 (84.62%) respondents. Of those, 50 (14.20%) were male and 302 (85.80%) were female. Twenty four (5.77%) respondents chose Black/African American as their race or ethnicity, made up of 8 (33.33%) males and 16 (66.67%) females. Hispanic/Latino was the option with the next highest number, 22 (5.29%) respondents made up of 9 (40.90%) males and 13 (59.91%) females. There were 5 (1.20%) respondents who identified most closely with Native American ethnic status, all female. Eleven (2.64%) respondents chose Asia Pacific, made up of 3 (30.30%) males and 8 (72.73%) females. Only 2 (0.71%) respondents considered themselves to fall into the “other” category, one male and one female.

In order to gain a better understanding of the respondents’ familiarity with heritage tourism, they were asked whether or not they had ever visited historic attractions such as monuments, history museums, battlefields, past homes of historic figures, etc. Of 420 respondents, 398 (94.76%) stated that they had visited historic sites in the past while 22 (5.24%)
stated that they had not. Of those who have visited historic sites, 64 (16.08%) were male and 334 (83.92%) were female. Of those who have not visited historic sites in the past, 7 (31.82%) were male and 15 (68.18%) were female.

TABLE 3.2

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>57.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Classification</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>30.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>*424</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>*416</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Heritage Tourism

Research Question 1: What specific types of heritage tourist attractions appeal to Millennial tourists?

In order to further understand how often Millennial students’ frequent heritage tourism destinations, they were asked to identify how often they visit historic sites. The majority of respondents, 175 (42.07%), stated that they visit historic destinations less than once per year. Of these respondents, 31 (17.71%) were males and 144 (82.29%) were females. One hundred forty two (34.13%) respondents said that they visit historic sites once per year. This number included 25 (17.61%) males and 117 (82.39%) females. Sixty one (14.66%) respondents said that they visited historic sites every six months, of whom 9 (14.75%) were males and 52 (85.25%) were females. Thirty six (8.65%) respondents said they visited historic sites 3 to 4 times per year, including 4 (11.11%) males and 32 (88.89%) females. Finally, 2 (0.48%) respondents, one male and one female, said that they visited historic sites once per month.

TABLE 4.1
VISITATION TO HISTORIC SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visited Historic Sites</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>94.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>*420</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4.2
FREQUENCY OF VISITATION TO HISTORIC SITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Visitation to Historic Sites</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than Once/Year</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>42.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Year</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>34.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 6 Months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 Times/Year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/Month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>*416</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=424
*=Totals differ based on the fact that respondents did not respond to every question.

A table of types of heritage tourism sites was presented to respondents of the survey in order to rank each type of site by how likely or unlikely they were to visit. This exercise was an attempt to discover which specific types of heritage tourist attractions appeal to Millennial students/tourists. Table 4.3 presents each type of heritage tourism site and the number of respondents who chose each response on a Likert type scale from Not Likely to Highly Likely.

Of the sites surveyed in this table, National Parks had the highest mean of 4.07 with the lowest standard deviation of 1.058. In contrast, reenactments had the lowest mean score of 2.14, and a standard deviation of 1.273. There were four sites that received notable scores of “Not Likely to Visit.” One hundred twenty-two (29.26%) respondents stated that they were not likely to visit sites of folklore and craftsmanship. One hundred thirty-six (32.38%) respondents stated they were not likely to visit cemeteries. Regarding living history demonstrations, 143 (34.38%)
respondents stated that they were not likely to attend. And perhaps the most notable, 182 (43.96%) of respondents stated they were not likely to attend reenactments.

On the opposite end of the scale, there were also four sites that received notable scores of “Highly Likely to Visit.” One hundred fifty-one (36.04%) respondents stated they were highly likely to visit events and/or festivals. One hundred sixty-one (38.61%) respondents stated they were highly likely to visit State Parks. In regards to ethnic restaurants, 168 (40.1%) respondents stated that they were highly likely to visit. National Parks obtained the peak number of respondents with 169 (41.22%) stating that they were highly likely to visit these sites.

There were a few sites with notable scores within the three central response choices of the table. For example, 113 (27.23%) respondents stated they were somewhat likely to visit archaeological sites, and 116 (27.95%) respondents stated they were neutral to the idea of visiting archaeological sites. Four notable scores were found in the “Likely to Visit” category of the table. One hundred sixty-eight (40.19%) respondents stated they were likely to visit monuments. One hundred seventy-one (40.91%) respondents stated they were likely to visit historical buildings and 181 (43.30%) stated they were likely to visit historical towns. The highest and most notable number of respondents fell in the “Likely to Visit” category when asked if they would be willing to visit museums. One hundred ninety (45.35%) respondents stated they would be likely to visit them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Heritage Tourism</th>
<th>Not Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Highly Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>*418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>*419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlefields</td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>*415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>159</td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>*417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>158</td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>*410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reenactments</td>
<td><strong>182</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>*414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Festivals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>*419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore/Craftsmanship</td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>*417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97</td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>*419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Restaurants</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>132</td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>*419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Centers</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>*415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Sites</td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>*417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Neighborhoods</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>70</td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>*416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Buildings</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>*418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Towns</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>*418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living History Demonstrations</td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>*416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Properties</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>*418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Vistas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78</td>
<td><strong>137</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>*416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Countries</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>128</td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>*418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>*420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=424

* Totals differ based on the fact that respondents did not respond to every question.

The most notable types of heritage tourism sites in regards to how likely or unlikely Millennial students are to visit them can be derived from this table. Specific types of sites or experiences seemed to be rather unpopular with respondents. These included folklore/craftsmanship, living history demonstrations, and reenactments, all of which involve the acting out of historical practices and happenings. Visiting cemeteries was also relatively unpopular among Millennial students.

National Parks, State Parks, ethnic restaurants, and events/festivals all received notable responses in the “Highly Likely to Visit” category, suggesting that these types of heritage sites and experiences may be more widely known and visited among Millennial university students in Arkansas. It is also arguable that these types of sites and experiences, although many times historical, are more cultural in nature of focus. The most notable scores were in the category of “Likely to Visit” and included monuments, museums, historical buildings, and historical towns. This suggests that in terms of historical heritage tourism sites, physical artifacts from the past or markers and testimonials of the past are likely to be visited by Millennial university students in Arkansas.

**Factor Analysis: Push & Pull Motivational Factors**

*Research Question 2*: What motivational tourism factors influence Millennial Generation students to travel to particular heritage tourism destinations?

In an attempt to determine which personal motivational factors aid in Millennial university students’ decisions to travel to heritage tourism destinations, a table of ‘push’ motivational factors and a table of ‘pull’ motivational factors were included in the survey, asking
respondents to label each factor according to how low or high it would personally motivate them to travel. There were twenty-one “push” motivational factors listed in the table and twenty-two “pull” motivational factors listed in a separate table. Exploratory factor analysis was initiated to identify the underlying dimensions of these motivational factors and condense the information. The factor analysis used a Promax rotation method with Kaiser Normalization, which converged in six iterations.

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the factor structure underlying the Push and Pull Motivational factors in this data set. Factor analysis has as its key objective reducing a larger set of variables to a smaller set of factors, fewer in number than the original variable set, but capable of accounting for a large portion of the total variability in the items. The identity of each factor is determined after a review of which items correlate the highest with that factor. Items that correlate the highest with a factor define the meaning of the factor as judged by what conceptually ties the items together. A successful result is one in which a few factors can explain a large portion of the total variability and those factors can be given a meaningful name using the assortment of items that correlate the highest with it. In the context of this study, it can be said that there is validity evidence supporting the conclusion that the scores from the push and pull motivational factors are a valid assessment of a person’s motivation to visit heritage sites. Based on Eigenvalues and Scree Plot, there were four factors determined for each Push and Pull Motivational factors. Cronbach’s alpha was used to assess the internal consistency reliability of the each of the scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Motivational Scale</strong></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Push Factors $\alpha=.91$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Knowledge Driven</strong></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Factor 1 $\alpha=.84$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit new place</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.259</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience new lifestyles</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore cultural resources</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange customs/ traditions</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about the past</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Knowledge</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Sightseeing</strong></td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Factor 2 $\alpha=.83$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek Novelty</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be away from home</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a place friends have been</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in new activities</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to be somewhere else</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightsee tourist spots</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightsee scenic attractions</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Social Interaction</strong></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>Factor 3 $\alpha=.77$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with locals</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet new people</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase social status</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit a place friends have NOT been</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impress friends and family</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 4: Enjoyment/Relaxation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable time with companions</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relax physically</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit friends and relatives</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4 $\alpha = .77$
TABLE 4.5

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR PULL MOTIVATIONAL SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pull Motivational Scale</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull Factors α=.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Historical</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>-.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antebellum history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War Battlefields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical reenactments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.150</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Local Activities</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, arts, traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>-.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.154</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>-.346</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/State Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling local/nearest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Amenities</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable weather/climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Push Factors Explained

Push variables are based on personal motivators that influence a person to travel. Table 4.4 states the results from the “push” factor analysis. Based on this analysis, four factors were determined that grouped the push variables together based on similarity. Items with factor loadings of .30 or higher were clustered together to form constructs. The results of the factor analysis produced four factors with eigenvalues greater than one, and explained 59.75% of the variance. The first factor consisted of “knowledge driven” components which included visiting a new place, experiencing new lifestyles, exploring cultural resources, exchanging customs and traditions, learning about the past, and improving knowledge. This factor explained 35.03% of the variance and had a Cronbach’s alpha of .91.

The second subscale was labeled “sightseeing” as seven variables loaded on this factor. Sightseeing variables include: seeking novelty, being away from home, visiting a place friends have been participating in new activities, the desire to be somewhere else, sightseeing tourist...
spots, and sightseeing scenic attractions. This factor explained 10.84% of the variance and had a Cronbach’s alpha of .83.

The third factor had an alpha of .77 and consisted of five “social interaction” components including communication with locals, meeting new people, increasing social status, visiting a place friends have not been to, and impressing friends and family. This factor explained 8.26% of the variance.

The fourth factor labeled “enjoyment/relaxation” had an alpha of .77 and was made up of three variables including: enjoyable time with companions, relax physically, and visit friends and relatives. It explained 5.63% of the variance.

**Pull Factors Explained**

Pull variables are based on destination motivators that influence a person to travel. Table 4.5 states the results from the “pull” factor analysis. Based on this analysis, four factors were determined that grouped the pull variables together based on similarity. Items with factor loadings of .30 or higher were clustered together to form constructs. The results of the factor analysis produced four factors with eigenvalues greater than one, and explained 56.09% of the variance. The first factor consisted of “historical” components which included heritage sites, historical locations, antebellum history, Civil War battlefields, and historical reenactments. This factor explained 30.95% of the variance and had a Cronbach’s alpha of .88.

The second subscale was labeled “local activities” and six variables loaded on this factor. Local activities variables included Culture, arts, and traditions; scenic attractions, festivals and events, outdoor activities, National and State Parks, and traveling local or nearby. This factor explained 12.36% of the variance and had a Cronbach’s alpha of .77.
The third factor had an alpha of .74 and consisted of six “amenities” components including safety, affordable, reliable weather or climate, value for money, available tourist information, and standards of hygiene and cleanliness. This factor explained 7.15% of the variance.

The fourth factor, labeled “variety” had an alpha of .77 and was made up of five variables including souvenirs, activities for families, variety of short tours, warm welcome for tourists, and traveling to places people appreciate. This factor explained 5.63% of the variance.

**Standard Multiple Regression of Heritage Tourism and Push/Pull Factors**

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to develop a model for predicting the significance of Millennial students’ choices among push and pull factor sets and predicting the variance among them. Model 1 consists of the control variables, gender and age. Model 2 relates push and pull factor sets, four of each. Both models were set against the table of heritage tourism sites as the dependent variable. Table 4.6 shows the descriptive statistics of the variables of each model. Table 4.7 shows the Pearson Correlation statistic, which was used as a descriptive measure. All of the independent variables showed some relationship to the dependent variable, with the pull factor set labeled “historical” having the strongest correlation at .680. The weakest correlation was found between the dependent variable and the push factor set labeled “enjoy” with .125. The strongest correlation among push factor sets was “knowledge driven,” which correlated at .625. The weakest correlation among the pull factor sets was amenities, which correlated at .213.

Regression analysis was used to estimate relationships among the push and pull factor sets (independent variables) and the tourism model (dependent variable) while controlling for gender and age. The R Square (.030) of Model 1 (age, gender as control variables) suggests that
the control variables explained 3% of the dependent variable (tourism). Model 2 (in inclusion of the push and pull factor sets) increased the R Square to .59, suggesting that the push and pull factors were significantly associated with tourism and increased the R2 significantly.

As shown in Table 4.8, the pull factor set labeled “historical” was significantly associated with tourism, $b = .64$, $p < .xx$, suggesting that this variable made the strongest contribution to explaining the dependent variable of types of heritage tourism. The historical pull factor was also statistically significantly associated with tourism. This suggests that the historical pull factor, which includes heritage sites, historical locations, antebellum history, Civil War battlefields, and historical reenactments, is strongly associated with being an important factor for Millennial university students in Arkansas when choosing types of heritage tourism destinations.

Although other factor sets were not as significant, several were approaching significance. Age was significantly associated with these tourism sites, with significance of .001. The older the respondent, the more likely he or she became to visit heritage tourism destinations. The knowledge driven factor set was approaching significance at .060, and the local activities pull factor set was approaching significance at .070. The remaining factor sets, sight seeing, social interaction, enjoyment/relaxation, amenities, and variety were not found to be significant, nor was gender.
TABLE 4.6
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF REGRESSION MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Push Factor Sets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Driven</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Interaction</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment/Relaxation</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pull Factor Sets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Activities</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.7
CORRELATION OF TOURISM AND FACTOR SETS WITH CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Tourism</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Push**

| Knowdriven          | .625    | .107   | .142 |
| Sightsee            | .405    | .121   | -.064|
| SocialInter         | .306    | .027   | -.050|
| Enjoy               | .125    | .094   | -.062|

**Pull**

| Historical          | .680    | -.071  | .135 |
| Localactiv          | .591    | .133   | .078 |
| Amenities           | .213    | .125   | .045 |
| Variety             | .371    | .117   | -.027|
### TABLE 4.8

STANDARD MULTIPLE REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS AND SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Knowdriven (push)</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sightsee (push)</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SocialInterc (push)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoy (push)</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical (pull)</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Localactiv (pull)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities (pull)</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety (pull)</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Heritage Tourism in Arkansas**

*Research Question 3:* Are Millennial students attending universities in Arkansas knowledgeable of heritage tourism sites in the state of Arkansas?

A table of statements regarding four specific heritage tourism locations in the state of Arkansas was presented to respondents of this survey. The purpose of this table was to assess Arkansas Millennial university students/tourists’ knowledge and experience with heritage
tourism sites in the state. The table presented six statements, one set for each of the four sites: Pea Ridge National Military Park, Old State House Museum, Washington Historic State Park, and Lakeport Plantation. Respondents were asked to check any box that was applicable. The six statements were written as follows:

1. I have heard of this site.
2. I have visited this site.
3. I attended and event or festival at this site.
4. I am aware that this is a historic Civil War or Antebellum site.
5. I would like to visit this site.
6. I would like to revisit this site.

Every box that was checked within the table was considered a “yes” and every box left empty suggested that the statement was not applicable to the respondent. Table 4.9 shows the results of this exercise.

The first set of statements were directed toward Pea Ridge National Military Park in Garfield, Arkansas. Of the respondents, 232 (54.72%) stated they had heard of the site, while there were 192 (45.28%) to which the statement was not applicable. Next, the participants were asked to state whether or not they have visited Pea Ridge National Military Park. Eighty-three (19.58%) stated that they have been to the site, while 341 (80.42%) were not applicable.

When asked to state whether or not they have attended an event or festival at this site, 15 (3.54%) stated “yes”, and the statement did not apply to 408 (96.23%). Respondents were also asked to state whether or not they were aware that this site is historically classified in the Civil War Era. One hundred one (23.82%) participants stated that they were aware of this, and there were 323 (76.18%) to which the statement was not applicable.
Respondents were lastly asked to state if they would like to visit this site (for those who had not previously visited), or to revisit this site (for those who had already been). Ninety-nine (23.35%) respondents stated that they would like to visit this site, while there were 325 (76.65%) to which this statement was not applicable. Thirty-two (7.55%) respondents stated that they would like to revisit this site, while the statement was not applicable to 392 (92.45%) participants.

The second set of statements were directed toward the Old State House Museum in Little Rock, Arkansas. Of the respondents, 180 (42.45%) stated they had heard of the site, while there were 244 (57.55%) to which the statement was not applicable. Next, the participants were asked to state whether or not they have visited the Old State House Museum. Eighty-three (19.58%) stated that they have been to the site, while 340 (80.19%) were not applicable.

When asked to state whether or not they have attended an event or festival at this site, 20 (4.72%) stated “yes”, and the statement did not apply to 404 (95.28%). Respondents were also asked to state whether or not they were aware that this site is historically classified as Antebellum. Forty-seven (11.08%) participants stated that they were aware of this, and there were 377 (88.92%) to which the statement was not applicable.

Respondents were lastly asked to state if they would like to visit this site (for those who had not previously visited), or to revisit this site (for those who had already been). Ninety-five (22.41%) respondents stated that they would like to visit this site, while there were 329 (77.59%) to which this statement was not applicable. Thirty-four (8.02%) respondents stated that they would like to revisit this site, while the statement was not applicable to 390 (91.98%) participants.
The third set of statements were directed toward the Historic Washington State Park in Washington, Arkansas. Of the respondents, 163 (38.44%) stated they had heard of the site, while there were 260 (61.32%) to which the statement was not applicable. Next, the participants were asked to state whether or not they have visited Historic Washington State Park. Twenty-three (5.42%) stated that they have been to the site, while 401 (94.58%) suggested that the statement was not applicable.

When asked to state whether or not they have attended an event or festival at this site, 13 (3.07%) stated “yes”, and the statement did not apply to 410 (96.70%). Respondents were also asked to state whether or not they were aware that this site is historically classified as Antebellum and Civil War Era. Thirty-nine (9.2%) participants stated that they were aware of this, and there were 384 (90.57%) to which the statement was not applicable. Respondents were lastly asked to state if they would like to visit this site (for those who had not previously visited), or to revisit this site (for those who had already been). One hundred thirty-two (31.13%) respondents stated that they would like to visit this site, while there were 292 (68.87%) to which this statement was not applicable. Sixteen (3.77%) respondents stated that they would like to revisit this site, while the statement was not applicable to 408 (96.23%) participants.

The final set of statements were directed toward Lakeport Plantation and grounds in Chicot County, Arkansas. Of the respondents, 159 (37.5%) stated they had heard of the site, while there were 265 (62.5%) to which the statement was not applicable. Next, the participants were asked to state whether or not they have visited Historic Washington State Park. Seven (1.65%) stated that they have been to the site, while 417 (98.35%) suggested that the statement was not applicable.
When asked to state whether or not they have attended an event or festival at this site, 3 (0.71%) stated “yes”, and the statement did not apply to 421 (99.29%). Respondents were also asked to state whether or not they were aware that this site is historically classified as Antebellum and Civil War Era. Thirty-one (7.31%) participants stated that they were aware of this, and there were 393 (92.69%) to which the statement was not applicable. Respondents were lastly asked to state if they would like to visit this site (for those who had not previously visited), or to revisit this site (for those who had already been). One hundred thirty-eight (32.55%) respondents stated that they would like to visit this site, while there were 286 (67.45%) to which this statement was not applicable. Five (1.18%) respondents stated that they would like to revisit this site, while the statement was not applicable to 419 (98.82%) participants.

TABLE 4.9
FOUR CULTURAL HERITAGE TOURISM SITES IN ARKANSAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pea Ridge National Military Park</th>
<th>Total N/A</th>
<th>Percentage of N/A</th>
<th>Total “Yes”</th>
<th>Percentage of “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard of site</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>45.28%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>54.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Site</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>80.42%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Event or Festival at site</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>96.23%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware that site is historically Civil War/ Antebellum</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>76.18%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to visit site</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>76.65%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to revisit site</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>92.45%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old State House Museum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage of N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total “Yes”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage of “Yes”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of site</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>57.55%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>42.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Site</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>80.19%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Event or Festival at site</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>95.28%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware that site is historically Civil War/ Antebellum</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>88.92%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to visit site</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>77.59%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to revisit site</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>91.98%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Historic Washington State Park</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percentage of N/A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Total “Yes”</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percentage of “Yes”</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heard of site</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>61.32%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>38.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Site</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>94.58%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Event or Festival at site</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>96.70%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware that site is historically Civil War/ Antebellum</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>90.57%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to visit site</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>68.87%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>31.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to revisit site</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>96.23%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeport Plantation</td>
<td>Total N/A</td>
<td>Percentage of N/A</td>
<td>Total “Yes”</td>
<td>Percentage of “Yes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard of site</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visited Site</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>98.35%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Event or Festival at site</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>99.29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware that site is historically Civil War/ Antebellum</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>92.69%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to visit site</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>67.45%</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>32.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to revisit site</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>98.82%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 breaks down the totals of Millennial students and their knowledge and experience with four heritage tourism sites in Arkansas. Each site was strong in different areas. More Millennial students in Arkansas have heard of Pea Ridge National Military Park than any other of the four sites with 232 (54.72%) stating that they have heard of the location. This could be due to the fact that of the four sites, Pea Ridge National Military Park has the strongest ties to the nation as a whole since a significant battle of the Civil War was fought there. It is also reasonable to deduce that because a majority of the surveys collected came from the University of Arkansas, which is only about forty miles away from the Park, more students who participated in the survey would have heard of the Park.

Respondents were also asked if they had ever visited any of the four sites. In this category, there was a tie between Pea Ridge National Military Park and the Old State House
Museum, both with 83 (19.58%) respondents who stated they had visited these sites previously. Of the four sites, the Military Park and the Old State House are located in two of the most densely populated areas of the state, and in turn, two of the most well-traveled. It is reasonable to deduce that for this reason, these two locations were the most visited among the four sites.

Respondents were asked if they had ever attended an event or festival at any of the four sites, in order to better understand their reasoning for visiting the site. In response to this statement, 20 (4.72%) respondents stated that they had attended an event or festival at the Old State House Museum, more than any of the other four sites. The Old State House Museum is attached to the State House Convention Center in downtown Little Rock, and is a significant outlet for events in the state. It is feasible that this site has had more event attendants among Millennial students in Arkansas because it is the only site of the four that adjoins to a convention and meeting center.

Respondents were asked if they recognized each of the four heritage sites as either historically Antebellum or Civil War Era. The site that was most widely recognized as such was Pea Ridge Historic Military Park with 101 (23.82%) respondents stating that they recognized the Civil War battlefield as a Civil War Era historic location. This location was made a historic landmark because of the Civil War, and it was also the most recognized site in this survey, standing to reason that more students would recognize it for the time period in which it became of importance to the state.

Respondents who presumably have not visited the given sites were asked if they would like to visit any of them now that each site has been brought to their attention. The site with the highest number of “yes” responses to this statement was Lakeport Plantation, with 138 (32.55%) respondents stating that they would like to visit this site. Also notable were the number of
respondents who stated they would like to visit Historic Washington State Park. One hundred thirty-two (31.13%) students expressed that they would like to visit this site as well, making this site a close second to Lakeport Plantation. Even though these two sites were not the most recognized either on their own or as Civil War or Antebellum locations in Arkansas, they were the most popular to be visited. Perhaps because these sites were not as well known, they had a certain level of appeal or their names were more appealing than the other two sites in the study.

Finally, respondents were asked to identify whether or not they would like to revisit any of the sites, assuming they had been to them before. Thirty-four (8.02%) respondents stated that they would like to revisit the Old State House Museum in Little Rock, Arkansas, making it the most notable revisit location among the four.

Knowledge about the History of Four Heritage Tourism Sites

Following the table regarding four heritage tourism sites in Arkansas, there were four questions regarding specific information about each of the four sites which required “yes” or “no” answers. The questions were asked as follows:

1. Are you aware of the Civil War battle that as fought at Pea Ridge?
2. Are you aware that the Old State House was formerly the Arkansas State Capitol building?
3. Are you aware that Washington, Arkansas, (currently Historic Washington State Park) was the Confederate State Capitol during the last half of the Civil War?
4. Are you aware that Lakeport Plantation is the only Antebellum (pre-Civil War) plantation home remaining in Arkansas along the Mississippi River?

These questions were designed to better understand the respondents’ knowledge regarding the particular historical significance of each heritage tourism site.
Table 4.10 shows the results of these questions. Two hundred forty (57.01%) respondents stated that they were aware of the Civil War battle that took place at Pea Ridge, while 181 (42.99%) stated that they did not. One hundred fifty (35.63%) respondents stated that they recognized that the Old State House Museum was formerly the Arkansas State Capital building, while 271 (64.37%) responded “no”. Sixty-eight (16.15%) respondents stated that they were aware that Washington, Arkansas, housed the Confederate State Capital during the latter half of the Civil War, and 353 (83.85%) of respondents were not aware. Lastly, 44 (10.45%) respondents stated that they recognized Lakeport Plantation as the only remaining Antebellum plantation home in the state along the Mississippi River, and 377 (89.55%) stated they were not aware of the site’s historical context.

**TABLE 4.10**

**KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Site</th>
<th>Total “Yes”</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total “No”</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pea Ridge National Military Park</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>57.01%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>*42.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old State House Museum</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35.63%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>*64.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Historic State Park</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.15%</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>*83.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeport Plantation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>*89.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=424
*Percentages were based out of 421 respondents; not all respondents answered every question.

Table 4.10 demonstrated the varying numbers of Millennial university students in Arkansas who recognized or had never heard of these four heritage tourism sites in the state.
Table Y follows the preceding table in that the most heard of sites were the most well known in terms of historical context as well, beginning with Pea Ridge National Military Park, and followed by the Old State House Museum, Washington Historic State Park, and Lakeport Plantation, sequentially. It is reasonable to deduce that the most heard of sites would also result in more respondents knowing the historical context of the site.

**Historic Preservation**

*Research Question 4:* Are Millennial tourists concerned about the reservation and livelihood of historic sites?

Heritage tourism sites, such as the ones mentioned in the previous section, rely on various preservation efforts in order to be maintained for the education and enjoyment of future generations. In order to grasp the level of participation in and importance of historic preservation to Millennial Generation university students in Arkansas, a section of four statements and one question regarding historic preservation efforts was included in the survey instrument for this study. The statements and question were written as follows:

“Have you done any of the following to assist in historic preservation? Please choose *Yes* or *No.*”

1. Volunteered your time at a historic location.
2. Provided donations to a historic location.
3. Participated in educational activities regarding preservation of a historic location.
4. Visited historic sites that require a fee to enter and experience.
5. Is historic preservation of cultural heritage resources important to you?

Table 4.11 represents the responses to this set of statements/question. Of 424 respondents, 51 (12.03%) stated that they have volunteered their time at a historic location, while 371 (87.5%) stated they had not. Seventy-three (17.22%) respondents stated that they have
provided donations to a historic location, while 349 (82.31%) stated they have not. Those who have participated in educational activities regarding preservation of a historic location consisted of 171 (40.33%) respondents, while 249 (58.73%) stated they have not participated in educational activities of this nature. Three hundred eight (72.64%) respondents stated that they have visited historic locations that required a fee to enter and experience, while 114 (26.89%) state they have not. Finally, respondents were asked if historic preservation of cultural heritage resources was important to them. A majority of respondents, 325 (76.65%), stated that historic preservation was important to them, and 92 respondents stated that it was not. Rather than answering yes or no to this question, four respondents left a comment beside the question stating that they were neutral to the subject of historic preservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preservation Statement/Question</th>
<th>Total “Yes”</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total “No”</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered Time</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.03%</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided Donations</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17.22%</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>82.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Activities</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>40.33%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid a Fee to Enter</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>72.64%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Historic Preservation Important?</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>76.65%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=424
Percentages may not add up to 100 because not all respondents responded to each question.

A majority of respondents stated that historic preservation is of importance to them, suggesting that these Millennial university students in Arkansas care about preservation of historic sites for future generations. However, it is evident, based on the responses to
participation in various preservation activities, that these same students are not particularly involved in the preservation attempts that include volunteering time or providing donations. A larger percentage stated they have engaged in educational activities regarding historic preservation of a historic location, but this number did not include the majority of respondents.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to establish tourism ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivational factors particular of Millennial Generation student tourists, between the ages of 18 and 33 when selecting general heritage tourism destinations. Additionally, the study sought to find whether Millennial university students in Arkansas visited, would like to visit, or in general were knowledgeable about historic antebellum and Civil War sites within the state and the extent to which these participants have participated in historic preservation as well as whether or not it is important to them. The benefits of heritage tourism are and will be advantageous to many historic sites throughout the state of Arkansas. Therefore, tourism and heritage councils, such as Arkansas Parks and Tourism and the Department of Arkansas Heritage, as well as heritage tourist sites, such as the four discussed in this study, could utilize these results.

The previous chapter elaborated on the research methodologies and statistical analyses that were used to discuss the test results. The first part of this chapter provides a summary of the study and conclusions related to the four research questions, followed by discussions of specific findings. The second part of this chapter concludes by identifying implications for heritage tourism sites and tourism boards and councils as well as suggestions for future research.

The research was conducted in the summer and fall of 2013. An in depth literature review along with the objectives of this study were used as a guide to build a questionnaire for Millennial university students in Arkansas. A descriptive in-person questionnaire survey was developed and distributed to a focus group to test for validity and reliability, consisting of three hospitality educators, two hospitality graduate students, and four undergraduate students of varying educational backgrounds. As a result of the focus group, there were three changes made
to the questionnaire. Rather than asking which region the respondent was from, which may have been confusing to him/her, it was determined that the survey would include an open-ended question asking for the respondent’s hometown. Secondly, multiple-choice responses for frequency of visiting heritage sites were changed to encompass “less than once a year” since the focus group stated they needed this option. Lastly, detailed descriptions before each table were removed and only the most basic instructions remained to prevent any confusion among respondents and shorten the length of the survey.

The population used in this study consisted of Millennial students attending four-year universities in the state of Arkansas, with the presumed means and ability to partake in the tourism market. It would have been impossible to survey every Generation Y university student in the state; therefore, the sample was chosen of students from four universities including: the University of Arkansas, the University of Central Arkansas, Arkansas State University, and Southern Arkansas University. The total sample of Millennial students for this study was 420.

Conclusions

Research Questions:

**Research Question 1:** What specific types of heritage tourist attractions appeal to Millennial tourists?

The results of this study showed that 94.76% of respondents have visited historic sites in their lifetimes. In terms of frequency, 42.07% of respondents stated that they visit heritage sites less than once a year, while 34.13% stated they visit them at least once a year. Additionally, 14.66% claimed to visit every six months, while only 8.65% stated that they visit three to four times per year. These results suggest that although the majority of Millennial university students (as represented by this study’s respondents) are not frequenting heritage tourism sites multiple
times per year, they do visit them or have visited them at some point in their lives. Awareness levels of heritage sites are, in general terms, significantly high among this set of respondents.

In order to better understand which types of heritage attractions these Millennial students found most appealing, they were asked to rank a series of heritage tourism sites from not likely to visit to highly likely to visit. The following numerical reports were considered significant in the category “not likely to visit” because the highest number of respondents stated they were not likely to visit each of these types of sites. The results showed that 43.96% of respondents were not likely to visit reenactments, 29.26% were not likely to visit sites based on folklore and/or craftsmanship, and 34.38% were not likely to attend living history demonstrations. These three particular types of heritage attractions involve modern people reinventing or reenacting moments or practices from the past, and were some of the least appealing to the Millennial students of this study. Additionally, 32.38% of respondents stated they were not likely to visit cemeteries, 26.86% were not likely to visit archaeological sites, and 23.61% were not likely to visit battlefields.

Cemeteries are very common, although some, such as Saint Louis Cemetery Number 1 (purported burial ground of Voodoo Queen Marie Laveau) in New Orleans, Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, Virginia, or even Mark’s Mill Civil War Cemetery in Cleveland County, Arkansas, hold particular historical significance. Despite those with particular significance, cemeteries do not seem to be popular destination for Millennial students, which could be a result of the nature of these sites, the representation of death all around versus the liveliness and youth of the Millennial Generation at this stage in their lives.

Archaeological sites are sites in which there has been an investigation to retrieve artifacts from the past and can range from locations were there are no artifacts to be found above ground
to historical buildings, towns, and cities that remain from past civilizations. Although there are artifacts present at these sites, there is very little to interact with for those who are spectators and not actively working at the site. For this reason, it can be concluded that the active and social Millennial students are not interested in going to view artifacts and remains in their natural environments with little activity and interaction to take place.

Battlefields as lone entities are simply plots of land where a significant historical event took place, but there is very little left to imply what actually happened there unless there is an adjoining visitor center containing more details. Perhaps the lack of physical evidence of the battle remaining leaves Millennial Generation students wanting more from these sites.

The results of the tourism site likeliness-to-visit table showed that 45.34% of respondents were likely to visit museums, 43.30% were likely to visit historical towns, 40.91% were likely to visit historical buildings, 40.19% were likely to visit monuments, and 38.66% were likely to attend events or festivals.

These five types of heritage tourism attraction involve historic artifacts with a certain amount of interaction. For example, museums contain artifacts with interactive exhibits, and there are many varieties of museums to choose from including, but not limited to, art, history, collections, and scientific themes, which can all be part of cultural heritage tourism as they preserve items from the past for future generations, but provide variety of choice. Historical towns and buildings come in many varieties as well, and usually allow for exploration and tours of facilities so that visitors get hands on experience with edifices of the past. Monuments can be classified as historic artifacts, and are also many times more representative of historical people or events. There usually is not the same amount of interaction with these sites, but rather a marker indicating that an event took place there. The marker can then be photographed and shared with
friends and family. There are many historical monuments that are famously in photographs such as the statue of Andrew Jackson in Jackson Square in the French Quarter of New Orleans or the Lincoln Memorial in Washington D.C. As Millennials have been found to be fond of sharing photos via social media, these types of sites would understandable be popular among this group. Events and festivals were the fifth highest number in the “likely to visit” category and like the other sites, can vary in type, size, and amount of interaction. It is likely that Millennial students attend events and festivals to participate, they can interact with others as they are a social group, and experience new things, while exploring a variety of interests and activities.

Additionally, 41.22% of respondents stated they were highly likely to visit National Parks, 40.1% were highly likely to visit ethnic restaurants, and 38.61% were highly likely to visit State Parks. National and State Parks could be popular among this group for several reasons. They are relatively well known since the United States and each individual state has public lists of these locations, and usually National and State Parks exist locally making them easily accessible. Again, generally speaking, there is a high range of interaction at these sites, many times the appeal of enjoying the outdoors, and senses of adventure can be fulfilled since there are many times trails and other things to explore and discover at these locations. Such amenities have the capability to fulfill the Millennial Generation’s sense of adventure. At parks, the Millennials can explore without being tied to the historic or heritage aspects of the location if that is not their primary reason for visiting.

The goal of this section was to determine what types of heritage tourism appeal to Millennial tourists. In this case, we were able to attempt to answer that question. Although the majority of respondents have visited historic sites, they are not frequenting them, to which it might be concluded that this type of tourism is not the first choice among this generation.
However, when choosing heritage tourism options, it appears that Generation Y prefers locations such as monuments, museums, historic buildings and towns, and events or festivals. These types of locations can be varied and many times include much more than history and an air of historical significance. Reenactments, living history, cemeteries, and battlefields which are all directly related to history or the reliving of history rank among the least popular, suggesting that there may have to be another draw to a location besides historical significance to attract Millennials.

**Research Question 2:** What motivational tourism factors influence Millennial Generation students to travel to particular heritage tourism destinations?

*Push Subscales*

Exploratory analysis examined the reliability and validity of push and pull motivational factors that were grouped together. Factor analysis of push motivational factors revealed four factor subscales: knowledge driven, sightseeing, social interaction, and enjoyment/relaxation. Finding that the knowledge driven pull factor set was significant is important because it shows that the seeking of knowledge is important to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. They seek to visit places they have not been before, to experience new things, to explore cultural resources, exchange customs and traditions, learn about the past, and enhance or improve knowledge at cultural heritage sites. In a way, these descriptions would be the primary reasons for people of any generation to visit these sites, since knowledge and experience is in the nature of each type of site.

The sightseeing push factor set was also found to be meaningful and included seven variables including seeking novelty, being away from home, visiting a place friends have been, participating in new activities, the desire to be somewhere else, sightseeing tourist spots, and
sightseeing scenic attractions This finding is important because it shows that sightseeing is of importance to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. These variables were grouped together because they mostly fulfill the need to be in a new and different environment than one’s everyday surroundings. Even being to a place where friends have been has ties to a change in environment since it can be assumed that the friend who previously visited would have described the location or site in order to entice the visitor to go. It has been argued that the Millennial Generation bores easily and this factor subscale could alleviate boredom with one’s normal and repetitive environment.

The social interaction subscale included variables such as communication with locals, meeting new people, increasing social status, visiting a place friends have not been to, and impressing friends and family. This finding is important because it shows that social interaction is important to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. It has also been argued that members of Generation Y are perhaps the most social generation that has ever lived. They are constantly connected to other people via social media and have more friends, both virtual and real, than other generations have. Social interaction might be considered a need for this group. Through this subscale, they seek to find this interaction in the places they visit, including heritage tourism sites.

The enjoyment/relaxation subscale included factors such as an enjoyable time with companions, relax physically, and visit friends and relatives. This finding is important because it shows that the enjoyment and/or relaxation is of importance to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. Although the Millennial Generation might not always be relaxed, they have a reputation for being laid back and, perhaps sometimes, too informal. It is plausible that this characteristic and the want to be comfortable in their
surroundings made the subscale significant. Being around friends and family, having a good time in an enjoyable and relaxing environment would fulfill the laid back character described of this generation.

*Pull Subscales*

Factor analysis of pull motivational factors revealed four factor subscales: historical, local activities, amenities, and variety. This finding is important because it shows that historical components are important to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. These components include heritage sites, historical locations, antebellum history, Civil War battlefields, and historical reenactments. Since participants were being questioned about heritage tourism and the knowledge driven subscale loaded highest in the push factor analysis, it stands to reason that historical components would load highest on the push scale. Millennials look for opportunities to enhance knowledge and learning by visiting heritage sites and the history of the site is likely the most significant piece of knowledge to be gained at these sites.

Local activity factors included six variables including culture, arts, and traditions; scenic attractions, festivals and events, outdoor activities, National and State Parks, and traveling locally or nearby. This finding is important because it shows that local activities are of importance to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. These variables were grouped together because they describe aspects of the local environment to be explored. According to the section of the survey regarding types of heritage tourism destinations, locations such as National and State Parks scored highly likely to visit among the Millennial participants of this study. Referring to Millennials becoming bored easily, these local
and well-known sites could provide a chance to explore the local but different environment and fulfill the desire to learn something new.

The amenities subscale included variables such as safety, affordable, reliable weather or climate, value for money, available tourist information, and standards of hygiene and cleanliness. This finding is important because it shows that amenities of a location are of value to Millennial students when being motivated to visit heritage tourist destinations. In some ways, all of these variables are related to personal comfort. Despite the fact that Generation Y has been described as adventure seeking, they are also said to enjoy comfort and laid back atmosphere. The variables of this subscale fulfill those Millennial needs. Additionally, although the Millennial Generation is thought to be the most marketed to and the biggest spenders in the economy, it can be concluded that they are in a life cycle that requires value for money and affordability, since many of them are still in the university setting or just starting careers.

The variety subscale included factors such as souvenirs, activities for families, variety of short tours, warm welcome for tourists, and traveling to places people appreciate. As established by their top choices in types of heritage tourism sites to visit, variety is important in Millennials’ choice of heritage tourism site.

It would appear that the importance of both the push and pull subscales play off of the characteristics attributed to the Millennial Generation in that they fulfill desires of comfort, alleviating boredom, and a sense of adventure and exploration.

*Standard Multiple Regression Analysis: Heritage Tourism and Push/Pull Factors*

Regression analysis was conducted in order to estimate the relationship between types of heritage tourism sites and the push and pull factor subscales to better understand which of these subscales earned the highest level of importance to Millennial university students when choosing
heritage tourism destinations. In this instance, the types of heritage tourism served as the dependent variable while the push and pull subscales made up eight independent variables.

Upon examining the Pearson Correlation statistic of the analysis, it was found that among the push scale “knowledge driven” maintained the highest correlation to the types of heritage sites, and the pull scale “historical” held the strongest among those variables. Overall, the historical subscale had the strongest correlation to types of heritage sites. This finding is very practical since the attraction of heritage tourism sites would presumably be the historical aspects relating to the site; since these aspects are primarily the reason a site becomes an attraction.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, the enjoyment/relaxation subscale had the weakest correlation with types of heritage tourism sites, suggesting that experiences such as physical relaxation and quality time with friends and family are not primary factors when choosing heritage sites to visit. Additionally, the amenities subscale held the weakest correlation among pull factors suggesting that variables such as safety, affordability, reliable weather or climate, value for money, available tourist information, and standards of hygiene and cleanliness are not significant components among Millennial Generation students when choosing heritage destinations. Perhaps that is because heritage tourism destinations are not reputed to be in poor weather or hygienic conditions, and are typically safe, affordable, and have a relatively positive reputation of value for money. The popularity of State and National Parks could be the reason for this as they advertise affordability, variety, and local activity.

The regression analysis concluded that the pull factor subscale “historical” was significantly associated with the tourism scale, which suggested that this factor most strongly contributed to explaining types of heritage tourism. Historical elements are perhaps most closely associated with heritage tourism sites; therefore, finding that the historical subscale was the most
significant in relation to types of heritage tourism is no surprise. When seeking a heritage
destination, it would be important to be interested in its historical context.

In contrast, the push factor subscale “social interaction” was not significantly associated
with the types of heritage tourism scale. This finding was somewhat surprising based on the
social characteristics of Generation Y. They are perhaps the most socially inclined generation in
history with the most advanced methods of communication and the results suggest that social
interaction is not a sought after element among Millennial students when seeking a heritage
tourism attraction.

The goal of this section was to ascertain which motivational tourism factors influence
Millennials to travel to heritage sites. It can be determined that, based on both correlation
analysis and regression analysis, historical pull factors are highly correlated and significant to
Millennials as they are choosing heritage tourism destinations. This finding may seem obvious,
since historical attributes are the major contributing attractions of heritage sites, but many times
these sites broaden across other forms of tourism, which could have been reasoning behind
choosing to visit them. It was interesting for the researcher to find that enjoyment and relaxation
and social interaction were not factors that Millennials are particularly concerned with when
choosing heritage tourism destinations. However, it could be assumed that these factors would be
generally popular among this generation based on their defined characteristics. It may therefore
be concluded that Millennial Generation tourists are not frequenting heritage sites, because they
do not associate these sites with social interaction and enjoyment types of factors.
**Research Question 3**: Are Millennial students attending universities in Arkansas knowledgeable of heritage tourism sites in the state of Arkansas?

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze a series of questions regarding four heritage tourism sites in the state of Arkansas: Pea Ridge National Military Park, the Old State House Museum, Washington Historic State Park, and Lakeport Plantation. The only one of these locations that a majority of the respondents had previously heard of was Pea Ridge National Military Park. This could be because most of the respondents were students of the University of Arkansas located relatively closely to this location compared to the others in the study. However, when asked which if they had ever visited these locations, Pea Ridge National Military Park and the Old State House Museum had an equal number of respondents with 19.58% of respondents stating that they had visited both of these sites. These two sites are located in the most densely populated regions of the state, which could account for having received the most visits out of the four locations.

The Old State House Museum had the most respondents who claimed to have attended an event or festival, with only 4.72% of respondents answering affirmatively. It could be determined that this location had the most event/festival attendees because it is directly connected to a city convention center, a specific event venue. Although the other locations have festivals or events from time to time, The Old State House is the only one attached to a convention/event venue.

For those who had not visited any of these four sites, the question was posed whether or not they would like to visit. Lakeport Plantation, the least visited, had the highest number of respondents, 32.55%, who stated they would like to visit. There could be several reasons for this: it could be that of the four, the type of site is most recognizable from the name. It is easy to see
that this is a plantation home based on the name of the location, whereas the other sites are not as self-explanatory. It is also possible that the recent increase in popularity of Southern culture could make the idea of seeing a Southern plantation home more appealing than other types of sights in the state.

Those who had previously visited the sights were asked to state whether or not they would like to visit again. Even though more people had visited Pea Ridge National Military Park, more respondents, 8.02%, stated that they would like to revisit the Old State House Museum in Little Rock, Arkansas. There is significantly more variety associated with the town in which this site is located versus that of other sites, which could possibly correlate to the number of respondents who stated they would like to revisit this site.

After questioning the respondents about their awareness and visitation experiences with these four sites, one “yes-or-no” question was asked about each site’s historical significance in order to better understand the respondents’ knowledge about this subject. As predictable by the previous numbers of respondents who had heard of or visited these sites, the historical significance of Pea Ridge National Military Park was the most well-known with 57.01%, followed by the Old State House Museum with 35.63%. The historic significance of Washington Historic State Park was recognized by 16.15% of respondents, and 10.45% were aware of the significance of Lakeport Plantation.

The purpose of this section was to gauge how aware and knowledgeable Millennial students in Arkansas were of four heritage sites in the state. Although significant numbers of students recognized these sites, there were fewer who had visited them, and even fewer who actually recognized specific historical significance of each of these sites. From this, it can be
concluded that these Millennial university students in Arkansas are not becoming familiarized with such locations as these, either through educational introduction or from being from the state.

**Research Question 4**: Are Millennial tourists concerned about the reservation and livelihood of historic sites?

A series of four questions regarding Millennial university students’ participation in historic preservation efforts followed by one question asking if historic preservation was important to the respondents, were asked and descriptively analyzed for this study.

Based on responses regarding Millennial student involvement in historic preservation activities, it was concluded that a majority of respondents have not volunteered their time, provided donations, or attended educational activities regarding historic preservation. However, the majority of respondents, 72.64%, stated that they have paid a fee to enter a historic site, and 76.65% of respondents stated that historic preservation is important to them. As a majority of respondents had visited heritage sites in their lifetimes and many sites require a fee to enter, it is statistically supported that the majority of respondents would have paid a fee to enter a heritage tourism site. Characteristically speaking, the Millennial Generation is a cohort very aware of social and environmental issues and a cohort that is technologically active in spreading awareness. It is not surprising, therefore, that the majority of this study’s respondents stated the preservation of cultural heritage was important, but there is very little activity among the group to back up the level of importance of historical preservation.

The purpose of this section was to determine whether or not historic preservation is an important issue to Millennial students and whether or not they participate in preservation activities of their accord. Based on the results of the study, Millennial students in Arkansas are concerned about historic preservation, or stated that it is important to them. However, few of
them actually participate in preservation activities unless they are education based or they have to pay a fee to enter a location.

Implications

How does history catch up with the Millennial Generation? This cohort has been characterized as impatient, dependent on technology or technological natives, one that desires comfort and convenience, seeking instant gratification, and highly social. Based on these characteristics, it is safe to conclude that Millennials are looking for opportunities in tourism that provide social interaction, the use and promotion of technology, fast paced movement, levels of comfort and convenience, variety, ease of experience, and a sense adventure. However, the Millennial respondents of this study indicated that they have visited heritage sites throughout their lives, but do not frequent them. Could this be a reflection of their Baby Boomer, and in some cases Generation X, parents taking them to these types of sites rather than independent visitation?

The findings suggest that although seeking knowledge and historical aspects are important to Millennial students when seeking heritage destinations, they are not often seeking these destinations. After all, a majority of respondents stated that they visit heritage sites once per year or less. Although heritage sites such as museums, monuments, and State and National Parks were popularly chosen sites among this group, perhaps this is out of an obligation to education. One of the characteristics of the Millennial Generation is that they are the most educated in history. It is reasonable to believe that many of these heritage sites, for example monuments such as the Lincoln Memorial, they visit out of obligation to being educated about their own culture and history.
Perhaps one of the most interesting findings of this study was the lack of significant association between the social interaction and types of heritage tourism sites. As a characteristically social cohort, one would assume that this group would look for social interaction in almost every endeavor. Therefore, it is plausible to conclude that although social interaction in general is of major importance to the Millennial cohort, that heritage tourism destinations in general do not offer this type of interaction. Are interactions with elements of heritage sites as well as opportunities for social interaction vital missing parts of many heritage destinations today?

A majority of respondents stated they were aware of two Arkansas heritage sites, the two in the most densely populated areas of the state, Pea Ridge Military Park and the Old State House Museum in the northwest and central regions of the state. However, the heritage sites in the south and Delta regions, Washington Historic State Park and Lakeport Plantation, were not as well known. Interestingly, these were ranked higher on sites respondents would like to visit. Perhaps there is something enticing about this unknown, but relatively local, locations among Millennial university students. Is it possible that increased advertising for these state historic sites among universities could increase awareness and visitation among this cohort? Perhaps Millennial university students do not frequent these sites because they are not aware of their existence or their historical significance to the state and culture.

Regarding historic preservation, it can be concluded that although Millennial university students claim that it is important, they are not particularly active in preservation efforts. Is historic preservation an issue for these sites? Is awareness an important step in making sure that these sites are preserved for following generations?
Recommendations for Future Research

This study was largely descriptive because very little has previously been published regarding the Millennial Generation and their relationship to cultural heritage tourism. It is recommended that, based on the results of this study, more studies be conducted to find the importance or rank of historical tourism among Millennials in relation to other types of tourism.

Other studies could be conducted based on elements Generation Y would like to experience in heritage tourism destinations to make suggestions to heritage sites, tourism councils, and preservation groups so that more of the Millennial Generation could be drawn in and marketed to in this area.

Tourism and heritage councils, such as Arkansas Parks and Tourism and the Department of Arkansas Heritage, as well as heritage tourist sites such as the four previously mentioned, could benefit by extending the findings of this study. Particular types of sites and push and pull factors have been established; however, the question still remains, how can heritage tourism be made appealing to the Millennial Generation? Will their interest grow with age, or do changes have to be made to draw them? Although factors and types of heritage tourism have been established, the level of commitment to heritage tourism by the Millennial respondents of this survey was not significant. Further studies should explore how to pique the interest of Generation Y and how to capitalize on the findings that historic preservation is important to them.

There are several aspects of this study that could be studied further. For example, the results could be broken into subgroups of varying types. Respondents were asked to identify their hometown, so the push and pull motivational factors, as well as knowledge of the Arkansas heritage sites could be analyzed by region of association. Also, there is plenty of information to
conduct a factor analysis on the types of heritage tourism sites to more fully understand which types of sites group together and in turn hold significance among the Millennial Generation.

Age is a factor that could be furthered studied in this context. Although the researcher found that the visitation to historic sites was more significant with age, there was no control for differing age groups among this generation to discover just how different or similar the age groups might be regarding motivational factors, types of heritage sites, knowledge of Arkansas heritage sites, or importance and participation in historic preservation.

A more in-depth study could also be conducted regarding factors, such as social interaction, that seem to compliment Millennial characteristics. In this way, future research could produce statistical support for attributes this generation is looking for in heritage sites that are not currently present, or that they do not see as present at these sites. Further studies regarding marketing heritage tourism to Generation Y might provide answers to why they are not currently frequenting heritage sites and ways to encourage them to do so.

There are multiple reasons to study the Millennial Generation, two of which are their purchasing power and economic longevity. They are the youngest generation with a significant amount of purchasing power and will be participating in the market for years to come, presumably longer than Generation X, the Baby Boomers, and the remaining Silent Generation, because they are younger. Therefore, investing in the Millennial Generation could be a long term and beneficial investment, just as the Baby Boomers have been. It is therefore safe to presume that heritage tourism should make investments in this group since they are will provide future patronage and preservation for cultural heritage tourism sites.
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LETTER OF CONSENT

Written Consent Form

Project Title: Tourism Motivational Factors, Historic Preservation, and the Millennial Generation

Investigators: Kayla Kesterson, Principal Investigator, responsible for contact with participants.
Dr. Kelly Way, Committee Chair.

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to establish tourism ‘push’ and ‘pull’ motivation factors particular of Millennial Generation student tourists between the ages of 18 and 33 when selecting general heritage tourist destinations and to assess the group’s knowledge of historic antebellum and Civil War tourist sites located in the state of Arkansas; specifically the North, Central, South, and Delta regions. This study will benefit our knowledge of the Millennial Generation’s ideas and preferences regarding heritage tourism and will be advantageous to tourism and heritage councils and historic sites throughout the state of Arkansas.

Procedures: An in-person questionnaire will be used to gather data from Millennial Generation students between the ages of 18 and 33 in varying degree fields. This survey will take approximately between 5-10 minutes for completion. Your responses and opinions are very important to understanding more about Millennial Generation’s relationship to heritage tourism and historic preservation.

Risks of Participation: There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

Benefits: There are no personal direct benefits to you for participating in this study. However, your valuable input will provide important insight for the results of this study.

Confidentiality: The participants’ name will not appear on the questionnaire. The data collected will be reported in aggregate by groups and will be archived in a retrieval system until December 31, 2013, then subsequently destroyed. Only the researcher and the committee chair will have access to the data. There are no foreseeable risks related to participating in this study.

Compensation: There is no compensation other than personal satisfaction from participation associated with this study.

Contacts: For information about your rights as a subject, please contact Dr. Douglas James Adams, Institutional Review Board Chair, at djadams@uark.edu, telephone (479) 575-7440. Also, please feel free to contact me with any other questions you might have at: kdkester@uark.edu, telephone, 870-845-8839.

Participant Rights: Your participation is completely voluntary and can be discontinued by you at any time without reprisal or penalty.

I have read and fully understand the consent form. By completing the in-person questionnaire that follows, I hereby consent to participate in this study.
1. **Demographic Information:**

*Thank you for your interest in completing this survey. Your answers will remain confidential and will be destroyed after completion of the study. Please answer the following questions by choosing only ONE answer for each question.*

1. What is your age? (Fill in blank.) __________

2. What is your college classification?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate
   f. Other

3. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female

4. What is your hometown (city/state)? ______________________________

5. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a. White/Caucasian
   b. Black/African American
   c. Hispanic/Latino
   d. American Indian/Native American
   e. Asia Pacific
   f. Other (please print) ____________________
2. **Visitation and Frequency of Heritage Tourism Attractions:**

1. Have you ever visited historical attractions? (i.e. historical monuments, history museums, battlefields, past homes of historic figures, etc.)
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. How frequently do you visit historical attractions?
   a. Less than once a year
   b. Once a year
   c. Once every 6 months
   d. 3 to 4 times a year
   e. Once a month

*Heritage Tourism Sites are defined by The National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States as “travelling to experience the places and activities that authentically represent the stories and people of the past”.

Please check your degree of likeliness to visit the following examples of Heritage Tourism Sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Heritage Tourism Sites</th>
<th>Not Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Somewhat Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely to Visit</th>
<th>Highly Likely to Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monuments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlefields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reenactments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Festivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folklore/Craftsmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Restaurants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living History Demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic Vistas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Personal Motivation Travel Factors:**

When responding to the following factors, please mark the box that best represents how low or high you believe the factor would personally motivate you to travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Push Factors: Factors that push you to act based on your personal motivational system.</th>
<th>1 Low</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Low</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Somewhat High</th>
<th>5 High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To visit a place you have not visited before</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To experience new and different lifestyles or traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To explore cultural resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To exchange customs and traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn about the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To seek novelty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be away from home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit a place that friends have been to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To participate in new activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To satisfy the desire to be somewhere else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sightsee touristic spots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sightsee scenic attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance communication with local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To meet new people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have an enjoyable time with travel companion(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To relax physically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit friends and relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit a place friends have NOT been to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To visit a destination that would impress my friends and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance or improve knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Destination Motivation Travel Factors:**

When responding to the following factors, please mark the box that best represents how low or high you believe the factor would motivate you to travel to a particular destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pull Factors:</th>
<th>1 Low</th>
<th>2 Somewhat Low</th>
<th>3 Neutral</th>
<th>4 Somewhat High</th>
<th>5 High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe destination/Personal safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable tourist destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture, arts, and traditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding scenic attractions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable weather/climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals and Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities for entire family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antebellum (pre-Civil War) history</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil War battlefields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical reenactments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National/State Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling to a local or nearby destination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of short tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm welcome for tourists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of pre-trip tourist info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling to a place people appreciate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards of hygiene and cleanliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Four Historic (Cultural Heritage) Tourist Sites in Arkansas:**

The following sections refer to your knowledge and perceptions of four historic tourist attractions selected for this study within the state of Arkansas.

Please check any box that applies to each of the four historic sites in Arkansas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Site</th>
<th>I have heard of this site.</th>
<th>I have visited this site.</th>
<th>I attended an event or festival at this site.</th>
<th>I am aware that this is a Historic Civil War or Antebellum Site.</th>
<th>I would like to visit this site.</th>
<th>I would like to revisit this site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pea Ridge National Military Park (North Arkansas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old State House Museum (Central Arkansas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Washington State Park (South Arkansas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeport Plantation (Delta Region Arkansas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the following questions pertains to one of the historic sites mentioned in the previous table. Please answer Yes or No.

1. Are you aware of the Civil War battle that was fought at Pea Ridge?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. Are you aware that the Old State House was formerly the Arkansas State Capitol building?
   a. Yes
   b. No

3. Are you aware that Washington, Arkansas (currently Historic Washington State Park) was the Confederate State Capitol during the last half of the Civil War?
   a. Yes
   b. No

4. Are you aware that Lakeport Plantation is the only Antebellum (pre-Civil War) plantation home remaining in Arkansas along the Mississippi River?
   a. Yes
   b. No
6. **Historical Preservation:**

*The following are questions regarding your efforts to aid in historic preservation of cultural heritage sites.*

Have you done any of the following to assist in historic preservation? Please choose *Yes* or *No*.

1. Volunteered your time at a historic location.
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

2. Provided donations to a historic location.
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

3. Participated in educational activities regarding preservation of a historic location.
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

4. Visited historic sites that require a fee to enter and experience.
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

5. Is historic preservation of cultural heritage resources important to you?
   - a. Yes
   - b. No

---

**Tourism Motivational Factors, Historic Preservation, and Generation Y**

Thank you for your participation in this survey and the future of historic tourism and preservation.

If you would like a summary of this study, please email a request to: kdkester@uark.edu