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Abstract
The interface between tourism and built heritage is complicated because much built heritage is located in the middle of living communities. Questions arise about how to achieve a balance between the expectations of tourists and the community. To study this question, this paper reports on tourists’ and residents’ impressions of an international heritage tourism site, the Kampong Taman Sari in Indonesia. Using a linear-numeric semantic differential as the measuring instrument and nine consensus photographs of the site as stimuli, the study investigated similarities and differences in impressions between three groups: tourists (international and domestic) and residents. Three principal dimensions were found to underlie impressions of the site: Attractiveness, Organisation, and Novelty. Significant differences were found among all three groups in their impressions of Attractiveness. In terms of impressions of the Organisation of the site, international and domestic tourists have similar impressions but these differ significantly from the impressions of residents. On the other hand, domestic tourists and residents have similar impressions of the Novelty of the site, which is evaluated differently by international tourists.
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INTRODUCTION
Many cities have districts with a sense of place and identity built around historic and cultural associations. Such districts have historical value and meaning that may be able to communicate to people something about the history of the city. No living environment is the product of a single historic period. Heritage areas are often an integral part of a city’s charm and appeal, and their functional and visual qualities are important elements of the city’s image and identity (Tiesdell, Oc, & Heath, 1996).

For areas of cities rich in history that have also become touristic sites, there is a complex relationship between tourism and cultural heritage. Tourism has played a critical role in the development of heritage tourism resources, while conversely, historical resources form a critical part of a growing tourism industry (Ashworth & Tunbridge, 1990). The symbiosis of tourism and heritage resources has become a major part of the fabric of many cities.

The combination of tourism and historic resources, what is known as heritage tourism, offers opportunities to highlight the past in the present. The past, which provides a sense of identity for the present, has made contemporary societies aware of the necessity for conservation (Lynch, 1972). The conservation of historic environment plays an important role in maintaining urban continuity. Unfortunately, a review of the literature reveals that built heritage conservation may become a stressor on the local community, especially if the heritage site is treated as a source of tourism (Ernawati, 2012).

The combination of the tourism industry and built heritage, especially in developing countries, becomes further complicated because historic places usually exist in the middle of urban living communities (Nuryanti, 1996). Therefore, questions about how to achieve a balance between the expectations of tourists and those of the community now arise in the tourism literatures (Trotter, 2001). A quality tourism product from the tourist’s point of view is only one
side of the picture. One of the major ingredients for achieving sustainable tourism is taking into account the host population’s point of view.

Local people as well as tourists play significant roles in the development and maintenance of historic sites. Urban management of the historic environment involves a thorough understanding of the place and the aspirations of the people who live in it (Orbasli, 2000), not only of the tourists. The conservation of historic precinct as a tourism object should direct to enhance local people’s quality of life and environment (Megahed, 2014). In this sense, urban built heritage as a tourist destination and as the local people’s settlement should evoke a sense of delight and pleasure for the stakeholders. The perceived quality of historic tourism areas within cities depends on the evaluation of the tourists and inhabitants of the place. However, this has not been a focus of previous studies. The importance of local people’s points of view as a valuable resource in the process of planning and management of urban heritage tourism sites has been neglected.

The aim of this research was to examine the similarities and differences in people’s impressions of heritage tourism sites that may exist between three principle groups: tourists (international and domestic) and residents. The study examines visitor as well as resident impressions for both theoretical and practical reasons. Because these two groups experience different parts of the heritage tourism site, interact with the environment differently and have different needs and expectations, they may have developed distinctly different impressions of the historic precinct. Visitors tend to experience a heritage tourism area as observers responding to first impressions, whereas residents tend to respond as participants (Brower, 1988). It is assumed that knowledge gained from visitor impressions can assist local bodies involved in management of these sites to convey a favorable impression to visitors. Meanwhile an understanding of resident impressions is important to maintain a quality living environment for the local community that is also conducive to tourism.

Kampong Taman Sari, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
One of prime examples of a heritage tourism site that faces those conflicting situation of development is Kampong Taman Sari, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Yogyakarta is a well-known tourist destination city and the heart of ancient Javanese culture in the center of Java, and is the second most popular tourist destination after Bali (Adisakti, 1997). It was the center of the Mataram Kingdom, with many historic artifacts and buildings. Yogyakarta is one of the most densely populated cities in the world with an average of 1,000 people per square kilometer (Dahles, 2001). The majority of its buildings are single-story structures. Many people live in what are called “kampong” – high density, unplanned housing areas that form a large part of most Indonesian cities (World Bank Group, 1999-2001).

Taman Sari is a group of buildings that occupy 12.66 hectares of land in the inner southwest part of the old walled city in the heart of Yogyakarta. It was built in 1758 to be the pleasure gardens and rest houses of the Sultan of Yogyakarta’s family. It originally consisted of 57 buildings and 18 fruit and flower gardens. Water was the dominant feature of Taman Sari with a large artificial lake, a series of sunken bathing pools and a network of underground and underwater passageways, so people refer to it as a water kasteel or castle on the water. Taman Sari functioned as The Royal Pleasure Garden until 1867, when an earthquake damaged its buildings and infrastructure resulting in the draining of the artificial lake.

Twenty major buildings or portions of buildings of architectural and archaeological artifacts are still remaining today. However, the complex is now occupied by a very dense settlement, which is called kampong. One of the significant factors in the rapid increase in the residential density of Taman Sari has been the presence of tourism. Taman Sari has been open for tourism since 1974 after it was renovated in 1938, 1943, and 1972.
Literature on Human Impressions of The Built Environment

Cities and parts of cities have a character that can be detected easily (Rapoport, 1993). People consciously or unconsciously make evaluative judgments of that character when they visit or live in that environment (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1982). The study of environmental impressions is part of the broader domain of environmental cognition, the study of the subjective information, images, impressions, beliefs and evaluations that people have of the environment, the ways in which these conceptions arise from experience, and the ways in which they affect subsequent behavior with respect to the environment (Moore & Golledge, 1976). What people know and understand about their surroundings influences their impressions and behavior (Garling and Evans, 1991).

The physical environment provides information to observers through the various sensory modalities, especially vision (Altman & Chemers, 1980). Although the non-visual senses play a secondary role in the experience of the environment, they may account for no more than 10% of people’s sensory input (Porteous, 1996). The dominant human sense – vision – accounts for more than 80% of sensory input (Porteous, 1996). These visual inputs lead to impressions and ultimately to evaluations of that environment. The visual aspect of heritage tourism sites is, therefore, of prime importance in their planning and management.

Impressions may also be influenced by the experiences and backgrounds of the respondents (Altman & Chemers, 1980; Nasar, 1988, 1994). In the study of environmental impressions of heritage tourism sites, a given built environment may mean different things to different people who view it, experience it, or use it (Golledge, 1991). One cannot assume that the same environment means the same to all people. It can be argued that because impressions of historic environments are conditioned by cognition, which depends on experience (Zube & Pitt, 1981), there may be important group differences in people’s impressions of heritage tourism sites.

METHODS

Participants

To study the different and perhaps conflicting impressions of the Taman Sari heritage conservation area among different groups of people, and to allow statistical generalization to similar populations living in and visiting heritage tourism sites elsewhere in the developing world, three groups of respondents living in or visiting Taman Sari were chosen randomly.

A random sample of 230 tourists (115 international and 115 domestic tourists) was selected. Following the procedure of Hull and Revell (1989), the researcher went to the main gates to the site at a variety of random times. The first person of each group of international or domestic tourists in view was invited to be a participant.

A random sample of 105 residents was selected based on the map of the Taman Sari complex. Each house on the map was given a number and the sample selected using a random number table. The interviewer went to each selected house in the evening, the best time to find all members of the family at home. The respondent chosen was the first adult resident found by the interviewer when approaching the house. From the 335 people randomly selected to be in the sample, data from 17 respondents was later discarded as the majority of their questionnaires was left unanswered and 10 participants withdrew before completion. As a result, data from 308 participants were used for analysis, consisting of 100 international tourists, 106 domestic tourists and 102 residents.

Stimuli

Rather than have participants wander the site and therefore have different, uncontrolled experiences, a pilot study was conducted to standardize the stimuli by using photographs that were agreed on by participants ahead of time as being familiar and meaningful aspects of the heritage complex. To select pictures as stimuli, a participant photography method (see Chenoweth, 1984; Hull & Revell, 1989) was employed. This method leads to the selection of
scenes that was meaningful to participants rather than meaningful to the researcher. Sixty people (20 from each of the three types of respondents) were given inexpensive cameras and asked to photograph scenes in the area that were the most “impressive” to them according to their own values and perceptions. This resulted in 480 photographs of 20 different scenes. The photographs were sorted by the researcher to identify those scenes and angles of photographs most frequently photographed by all three groups. The consensus scenes taken by at least 10% of the participants were then re-photographed by the researcher using a high-quality camera.

This process produced nine consensus scenes (shown in Figure 1): (1) Umbul Binangun Tower, (2) the ventilation buildings of the Underground Passageways, Cemeti Island and Indigenous Settlement, (3) Stage Gate, (4) the gate to Umbul Muncar Bathing Pool, (5) the gate to the Lopak-Lopak Building and Indigenous Settlement, (6) Umbul Muncar Bathing Pool, (7) the Great Gate, (8) Batik Painting Art Gallery, and (9) Sumur Gumuling Underground Mosque.

Figure 1: Stimuli for the independent variables (Source: Authors).
However, it was found from a second pilot study that the most reasonable number of stimuli that met participant's time limitation was six pictures. Therefore, replicating the Hull and Revell (1989) procedure, but to shorten the respondent completion time, the nine stimuli were divided into two questionnaires of six pictures each. Each questionnaire contained the three most preferred scenes (pictures 1-3) plus three of the remaining six pictures. One questionnaire, therefore, consisted of pictures 1-6 and the other consisted of pictures 1-3 and 7-9.

With this arrangement, 308 people responded to pictures 1-3, 153 responded to pictures 4-6, and 155 responded to pictures 7-9. This corresponds to accepted statistical techniques (see Alreck & Settle, 2004; Stamps, 2000). Moreover, since respondents rated the stimuli on the same rating scale, the number of stimuli increased the number of cases for statistical purposes (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998).

Dependent Variables
To measure the dependent variable of people's impressions, a linear-numeric semantic differential scale was developed. Based on previous research, 25 items were selected to measure the underlying dimensions of people's impressions of the heritage tourism site, including items representing the three constructs of attractiveness, order, and novelty.

Eight of the 25-items were chosen to reflect people's impressions of the attractiveness or unattractiveness of the site. These were derived from studies of the experience of West Berlin conducted by Franke (1969) and Franke and Bortz (1972; both in German; cited in Krampen, 1979). The items were unattractive-attractive, subdued-colorful, strange-familiar, restricted-free space, ugly-beautiful, dull-varied, unpleasant-pleasant, and monotonous-diverse.

As has been done in a number of previous studies, preference was measured using Nasar's (1998) single item like-dislike scale. Interestingness of places is also considered as an important variable that may enhance the attractiveness of the precinct; therefore interesting-uninteresting was chosen from Bortz (1972).

Beside these qualities of the precinct, an ordering dimension might play an important role in people's impressions. It has been suggested in architectural theory, based on empirical studies (e.g., Rapoport, 1993), that people usually like areas that have visual order and do not like areas with disorder or chaos. This notion is supported by other research that order and related variables such as organization and coherence enhance people's preferences (Nasar, 1998). It should be noted, however, that in heritage sites, visitors might not be put off by the chaos of the precinct caused by the combination of old and new, historic buildings and local settlement. To measure people's impressions of the ordering dimension of the area, three adjective pairs – orderly-chaotic, exciting-calming, and complex-simple – were derived from Hershberger (1972) and disorganized-organized, impressive-unimpressive, and neat-messy were chosen from Kasmar's (1970) study of the lexicon of environmental descriptors.

Novelty has also emerged as a prominent dimension of historic settings. Robins (1991) emphasized the importance of distinctive qualities and place-specific differences in historic areas to gain advantage in an increasingly competitive market. He argued that in a world where differences are being erased, the commodification of place, historic areas in particular, is about creating distinct place-identities in the eyes of global tourists. This can create a sense of place, an environment that possesses a distinctive and desirable character. Therefore, two adjective pairs – ordinary-distinctive and desirable-undesirable – were chosen from Green's (1999) study of town character and Kasmar's (1970) lexicon of environmental descriptors.

Another important quality of historic precincts is the uniqueness of the place. This was measured using the adjective pair common-unique (Hershberger, 1972; Kasmar, 1970). An adjective pair for the meaningfulness of place was taken from Ertel's (1964) study of visual impressions of facades of different styles, namely meaningless-meaningful (cited in Krampen, 1979).
Another important aspect of place is whether it is memorable, for which forgettable-memorable was selected from the research of Prentice (1993), who pointed out that the only things tourists take home are photographs, purchased souvenirs, and memories. Memorable places will make people's minds contain special and powerful images that contribute to a special sense of place in particular settings (Steele, 1981). Four additional items – incoherent-coherent, disturbing-restful, worthless-valuable, and expected-unexpected – were added by the researcher based on their relevance to the research questions and context of the present study. The 25 items were organized on a 7-point linear-numeric bi-polar semantic differential scale, each item ranging from one adjective (e.g., very unattractive=1) to its opposite (e.g., very attractive=7) with number four as the neutral point.

**Procedure**

After being selected and agreeing to participate in the study, each tourist respondent was invited to explore the Taman Sari heritage area on their own, as they would have had they not been invited to be a part of the study, and to return to the researcher stationed at the rest area near the exit gate after they completed their visit. Resident respondents were contacted at their homes as described above. Each respondent received a set of research instrument consisted of an album of six photographs of the Taman Sari complex and 25 semantic-differential items questionnaire for each photograph. Each participant was asked to rate each photograph by circling the number of a 7-point bi-polar semantic differential scale that best described their impression of each photograph.

**Data Analysis**

To identify the dimensions underlying tourists' and residents' impressions of the heritage tourism site, this study employed principal factor analysis to the 25 semantic differential items. Since there were 106 domestic tourists, 100 international tourists, and 102 residents who rated their responses to nine stimuli, the number of cases in the data set for analysis was 1848 (each of the stimuli numbers 1-3 were rated by all respondents, n=308; stimuli 4-6 were rated by 153 respondents and stimuli 7-9 were rated by 155 respondents). After preliminary tests, three variables – strange, complex, and coherent – were dropped from further analysis because those variables could have redundancy problems with other variables and should therefore be eliminated before proceeding to factor analysis (see Field, 2009). Factor analysis was then conducted on the remaining 22 variables with oblique rotation (direct Oblimin).

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine the similarities and differences in impressions of the heritage tourism site among international and domestic tourists and residents. The ANOVA was based on factor scores (see Field, 2009; Hair, et al., 1998). Three one-way ANOVAs were conducted. Each analysis was followed by post-hoc tests to examine differences between groups. Since the group sample sizes were slightly different, the post-hoc analysis used Gabriel's procedure, which has greater power to deal with slightly unequal sample sizes (see Field, 2009).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Dimensions Underlying People’s Impressions: The Attractiveness, Organization, and Novelty of Heritage Tourism Sites**

Principal axis factoring with oblique rotation (direct Oblimin) was employed on the remaining 22 semantic differential items. Results indicated there are three principle dimensions underlying tourists' and residents' impressions of the Taman Sari heritage area with Eigen values exceeding 1, explaining 87.9% of the total variance.
Table 1: Factor pattern matrix of the semantic differential scale of impressions of the Taman Sari heritage tourism site with Oblimin rotation (n=308).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Attractiveness</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Novelty</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uninteresting-Interesting</td>
<td>.614*</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant-Pleasant</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly-Beautiful</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unattractive-Attractive</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull-Varied</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monotonous-Diverse</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimpressive-Impressive</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike-Like</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdued-Colorful</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaotic-Orderly</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.871</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messy-Neat</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.867</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized-Organized</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.797</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing-Restful</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted-Free</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.511</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-Unique</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary-Distinctive</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected-Unexpected</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningless-Meaningful</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless-Valuable</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.153</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgettable-Memorable</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable-Desirable</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calming-Exciting</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of Variance             | 32.88          | 30.01        | 25.02   | -             |

* Loadings in excess of .4 are shown in bold (per Stevens, 1992)

As seen in Table 1, there are three major common dimensions in people’s impressions of the heritage tourism site. Factor 1 consists of the variables interestingness, pleasantness, beauty, attractiveness, variety, diversity, impressiveness, liking, and colorfulness. All of these variables relate to the visual attractiveness of the site; the factor can therefore be named Attractiveness. The second factor consists of the variables chaotic, messy, disorganized, disturbing, and restricted, all with negative loadings. If these items are interpreted in reverse, the factor brings together the ideas of orderly, neat, organized, restful, and free. This factor is related to the organization of the environment, and is named Organization. The third factor consists of the variables uniqueness, distinctiveness, unexpectedness, meaningfulness, valuableness, memorability, desirability, and excitingness. Although desirability and excitingness are included in this factor, overall the factor is best characterized by this area being different from others, and is therefore named Novelty. The reliability test for assessing the internal consistency of the three
factors yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .89 for Attractiveness (nine items), .88 for organization (five items), and .85 for Novelty (eight items), indicating that all three factors were internally consistent.

The result that Attractiveness as a major common dimension in people’s impressions is consistent with other research on environmental aesthetics. For example, the study of Lowenthal and Riel (1972) found that places that are regularly described as beautiful are also regularly described as pleasant and vice versa (Canter, 1977).

A variety of studies examining subjective response to environments (e.g., Canter, 1969; Hershberger & Cass, 1988; Lowenthal & Riel, 1972; Oostendorp & Berlyne, 1978; Russell & Ward, 1981) have indicated the importance of the aesthetic dimension in people’s responses to the environment. Canter (1969), for example, using factor analysis, found that for both architects and lay people, the major factor in response to simulated environments was pleasantness. Lowenthal and Riel (1972) found that aesthetic variables such as beautiful-ugly and pleasant-unpleasant account for most of the variance in people’s response to the aesthetic dimension of an environment.

The attractiveness dimension of the heritage tourism site reflects the overall feelings the people have about the aesthetic appreciation of the ideal place. It shows how bad or good the historic tourism site is in people’s minds. Heritage tourism sites, therefore, should aim to generate positive, attractive settings to provide positive impressions of a good tourist destination while maintaining it as an attractive living environment.

In terms of the scale, the findings of Attractiveness in this study are also consistent with the findings of Franke (1969) and Franke and Bortz (1972; cited in Krampen, 1979). In their study of people’s experience of city districts in West Berlin, Attractiveness, which consisted of the variables pleasant, beautiful, attractive, varied, diverse, colorful, familiar, and free, was found to be a major common dimension underlying people’s impressions. In the present study, these affective qualities were found to coalesce. However, in this research, interesting and liking, the likeability of the place, replaced the two variables, familiar and free. This is probably because of the differences in environmental features between the districts evaluated in Germany and Indonesia.

In the studies of Franke (1969) and Franke and Bortz (1972), the Attractiveness dimension was influenced by the impressions of subjects living in districts with a great deal of greenery and little traffic (Krampen, 1979). Perhaps familiarity and freeness of the area played a significant role in the attractiveness of the site. In the present study, interestingness and liking seemed to be more significant. This implies that peripheral attributes of districts may play a significant role in forming the dimension underlying people’s impressions. However, the six variables of Attractiveness, i.e., pleasant, beautiful, attractive, varied, diverse, and colorful, which remain stable in both studies may have strength as a scale of attractiveness of heritage areas and can be tested further in subsequent research.

Organization, another common dimension of impressions of a heritage tourism site, is concerned with the formal quality of the scenes, the orderliness, neatness, organization, freeness, and restfulness of the site. Organization or coherence has been found to be one of predictors of environmental preference (Kaplan & Kaplan, 1982). People tend to prefer scenes that are well organized, orderly, and neat. This notion is also applied to the heritage tourism site.

Results also indicated that the Novelty dimension is a significant factor in people’s impressions. The power of heritage tourism places lies in their distinctive quality and uniqueness, their value as heritage, and the meaning that attaches to them. Although the concept of Novelty is often difficult to express or define clearly, places which people categorize as unique and distinctive can bring forth strong mental images of a remembered or imagined character (Garnham, 1985). A memorable place triggers memories for residents, who have shared a common past, and at the same time it can represent shared pasts to visitors who might be interested in knowing about them in the present (Hayden, 1995). A large body of heritage
literature also stresses the importance of the Novelty quality of historic places (e.g. Boniface, 1995; Orbasli, 2000; Tiesdell et al., 1996).

Results further suggest that the Novelty dimension is likely to involve a cognitive response to the impressions of a heritage tourism site. The factor includes variables of unique, distinctive, unexpected, meaningful, valuable, memorable, desirable and exciting. It can be argued that one needs to collect and process information from images to make a judgment on items such as the degree of meaningfulness, valuableness and uniqueness.

Concerning the relationship among those three factors, the factor correlation matrix produced from the factor scores as seen in Table 2 shows that Attractiveness and Organization of the site are highly negatively correlated ($r=-.627$). However, it should be noted that Organization, as shown in Table 1, had negative loading for its items. This means that Organization and Attractiveness of the site are actually positively correlated. With regards to the Novelty of the site, it is moderately correlated to the Attractiveness of the site ($r=.480$), while Novelty has a negative low correlation with the Organization of the site ($r=-.340$). However, Organization has negative loading for its items as shown on Table 1. This means Organization and Novelty are positively correlated.

Table 2: Factor correlation matrix of people’s impressions of the heritage tourism site (n=308).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1 (Attractiveness)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (Organization)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (Novelty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results that show a highly inter-correlated that exist between Attractiveness and Organization of the site is consistent with previous studies. The literature indicates that coherence (organisedness and orderliness) should influence pleasantness, the dimension of Attractiveness, in predictable ways (Nasar, 1988). The literature also suggests that pleasantness should be highest for high coherence or organisedness of the elements in the scene (Nasar, 1988).

Table 2 also shows that the Attractiveness is moderately correlated to the Novelty of the site ($r = .480$). This finding suggests that the Novelty factor is somewhat associated with the affection quality of the place. As Lynch (1976) suggested, the specific quality of place such as its distinctive quality is often recalled with affection. Places that provide a distinctive and desirable character experience have been suggested as one way of mitigating some of the negative psychological effects of town growth on communities (Green, Barclay & McCarthy, 1985; Lynch, 1976). The concept of placelessness, the weakening of a distinct experience and of identities of places, was also found as being associated with a variety of negative perceptual and affective responses (in this case the Attractiveness of the site) to the environment (Garnham, 1985; Giuliani & Feldman, 1993; Altman & Low, 1992; Relph, 1976).

These findings suggest that a heritage tourism site should have a strong distinctive quality to make it attractive. The ideal in developing an appealing attraction would be to reveal the unique aspect of a place (Boniface, 1995). Novelty, ‘otherness’, as long as it is not frightening, is customarily quite attractive (Boniface, 1995). Fundamentally, what a visitor seeks in a heritage tourism site is a quality of difference from that which constitutes everyday life.

The results shown in Table 2 further indicated that although the Organization of the site correlated relatively highly with Attractiveness ($r =-.627$, interpreted inversely as explained in the previous section), it correlated relatively low with the Novelty dimension ($r =-.340$, interpreted inversely). This indicates that the Novelty of the precinct seems unlikely to be affected by the
Organization of the site. This finding indicates that although some urban tourism destinations in developing countries may not be well-organized, global tourists may still find them unique, distinctive, and desirable.

**Similarities And Differences in Impressions Among Groups**

Using the three factors, the second analysis involved three composite variables as the dependent variables (i.e., the three factors of impressions) and the three groups of participants as the independent variables (i.e., international and domestic tourists and local residents).

The results of the ANOVA shown in Table 3 demonstrated that there are significance differences between international and domestic tourists and resident groups in their impressions of the heritage tourism site. Lack of significant differences were only found between domestic tourists and international tourists in terms of the Organisation of the site, and between domestic tourists and the local people in terms of the Novelty of the site. All other comparisons among the three groups showed significant differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (Attractiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.820</td>
<td>27.910</td>
<td>28.748***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1791.180</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (Organisation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.505</td>
<td>13.753</td>
<td>13.945***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1819.495</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (Novelty)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141.161</td>
<td>70.581</td>
<td>76.339***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>1705.839</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are potential reasons for this situation. The aesthetic response depends on association, memory, and knowledge (Tuan, 1989). These might change continuously because of changes in people’s experience and learning. People have somewhat different aesthetic criteria and differ in the aesthetic quality they ascribe to a heritage tourism site. Preferences regarding heritage conservation sites are something learned or developed over time, dependent upon a person’s experiences and current purposes. Environmental cognition theory suggests that people build an image of their environment using information from their experiences (e.g., Moore & Golledge, 1976). This image is used as a template to form expectations, structure incoming information and evaluate environments. People also evaluate the precinct with a particular purpose in mind (see Ittelson, Proshansky, Rivlin, & Winkel, 1974; Russell & Snodgrass, 1987). A person’s immediate purpose in an environment influences the type of information sought and the criteria used to evaluate the environment. Therefore, local residents looking at the historic environment with the purpose of living there evaluate it differently from a tourist visiting it for three to four hours.

Based on these rationales, each group – residents, international and domestic tourists – from different backgrounds have different experiences and purposes, and thus different impressions of the heritage tourism site.
Furthermore, a post-hoc comparison of means of the three factor scores using Gabriel’s procedure indicated that there are significant differences in Attractiveness of the site between all groups, i.e., between international tourists and domestic tourists (p < .001), between international tourists and local residents (p < .05), and between domestic tourists and local residents (p < .001). Local residents rated the Attractiveness of the district higher than tourists did, while international tourist rated the Attractiveness of the precinct higher than domestic tourists did. Overall, all three groups of respondents evaluated the area as having an attractive quality.

The potential reason local people rated the Attractiveness of the site higher than tourists did is because residents are often people with a somewhat egocentric orientation to the environment, with all nearby places considered as being ‘good’. Research has reasonably well documented this idea (Altman & Chemers, 1980). Local people may be influenced by their egocentric attitude so they evaluated the Attractiveness quality higher than the two other groups of users. However, international tourists rated Attractiveness of the precinct higher than domestic tourists did. This implies that difference perceptions emerge between these two groups. This may be caused because international tourists that come from other cultures may have experienced visiting similar places in other cultures. Therefore, they unconsciously compare the precinct to other places. This may enrich their evaluations of the Attractiveness dimension. The local tourists, on the other hand, may only have visited similar districts of the same culture. This experience may make them evaluate the precinct in comparison to other places from the same culture that may have the same features. This, in turn, may influence the fact that local tourists rated the Attractiveness quality lower than the global tourists did.

There is, however, a similarity existing between international tourists and domestic tourists in their evaluation of the Organization of the historic precinct. Post-hoc tests found no significant difference between the two groups of tourists. International and domestic tourists were similar in their impressions of the Organization of the site (p < .05), while local residents’ impressions of Organization of the site were significantly different from those of both domestic tourists (p < .001) and international tourists (p < .001). Although all respondent groups had positive impressions of the Organization of the site, tourists evaluated the Organization of the precinct lower than the local residents did.

This similarity in group’s impressions is possibly because the subjects evaluated the Organization of the precinct having the idea of recreation in mind. Possibly the level of similarities or agreement is a result of tourists all having the same overriding purpose, i.e. tourism. Tourists, being foreigners, the Organization of scenes emerges in their mind; various sections are put in relation to one another and the district begins to take on a semblance of organization (Altman & Chemers, 1980). As tourists may have some experience in visiting heritage tourism site in other places, they may also unconsciously compare the orderliness of the area to other places elsewhere. This situation may mean tourists have higher criteria when judging the Organization pattern compared to a similar heritage tourism area. Residents, on the other hand, may be influenced by their egocentric attitude so they evaluated Organization dimension higher than tourists did. Different purposes between visitors and residents resulted in different responses to the Organization of the heritage tourism site.

As regards the Novelty dimension, results indicated significant differences in scores on Novelty between international tourists and local residents (p < .001) and between international and domestic tourists (p < .001), while there is no significant difference between domestic tourists and residents. Domestic tourists and local residents were similar in their impressions of the Novelty of the site (p < .05). Local people and domestic tourists evaluated the Novelty of the district higher than international tourists did. However, all groups of respondents rated the historic precinct as having the quality of Novelty. For the local community as well as domestic tourists, the heritage tourism site creates an atmosphere that serves as a symbol of their national culture. Locals, in order to reflect and reinforce their identity with the community, often use these symbols. Such symbols help give a
sense of unity to the community, something that both its members (the local residents) and related outsiders (the domestic tourists) use to label and identify the historic precinct. Taken together, all activities, symbols and features of the historic precinct suggest that people often have a sense of identity, imageability and feelings of bonding with their historic environment. These represent forces of togetherness and community identity. By a sense of belonging of the property, both groups reinforce and demonstrate its internal unity as a subculture and simultaneously display distinctiveness and separateness from others, i.e. the international tourists. Thus, local people and domestic tourists because of community familiarity and close ties with the history of the nation have similar interpretations of the Novelty dimension of the heritage tourism site and hence different evaluations from international tourists.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The research findings have implications for the management and development of heritage tourism sites. As this research found, similarities and differences in people’s impressions is a key component in the planning, design and management of historic environments for future development. The impressions of the places may be different between the experts and lay people, especially people who experience and use the historic environment such as tourists and residents. Therefore, urban design in such areas, being both a tourism object as well as a living environment, should aim to generate good impressions in people who experience it.

The findings suggest that the Attractiveness, Organization and Novelty of place are the most dominant factors that evoke impressions of those experiencing the place. This stresses the need for environmental planning and design that accommodates those qualities. Furthermore, the nature of the relationship among the three factors contributes to an understanding of how to deal with environmental features in the juxtaposition between historic precinct and urban living environments.

Findings suggest a moderate correlation between Novelty and Attractiveness. This has implications for the management of the visitors, which in planning terms means making and keeping a place attractive. For this purpose, the unique character and distinctiveness of the place need to be maintained and enhanced. Findings further indicate the importance of conferring a sense of place. Although Organization has a relatively low correlation with Novelty, it has a high correlation with Attractiveness. This suggests that environmental designers should take careful note of the nature of the relationship among those factors. This also suggests a need for creative thinking by environmental designers to produce a novel quality within these particular settings.

In sum, the visual quality of historic environments should be maintained and managing carefully because of its obvious importance to the aesthetic experience. In this sense, the visual quality of historic tourism sites must satisfy both tourists who experience it for a short period of time and the local inhabitants who experience it daily. However, it should be noted that this study does not reveal the specific historic environmental features that lead to the emergence of these impressions. Therefore, further research needs to be done to uncover the environmental features of heritage tourism sites that gave rise to these impressions. As Nasar (1988) pointed out, knowledge of the relationship between properties of the visual environment and human affect will better assist environmental designers to plan, design, and manage setting to fit the preferences and activities of the variety of users.

Future research regarding people’s impressions in a wider range of developing countries is also necessary to contribute to the development of knowledge in heritage tourism. The characteristics of urban heritage tourism environments in western countries and non-western countries may be different. To explore this, studies like the above should be replicated in historic precincts existing in other developing countries.
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