

PERCEPTIONS AND STATUS OF MICHIGAN AS A HERITAGE TOURISM STATE: RESULTS OF AN ELEVEN-MONTH TELEPHONE SURVEY

Gail A. Vander Stoep

Assistant Professor, Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources, Michigan State University, 131 Natural Resources Building, East Lansing, MI 48824-1222

Cultural and heritage tourism have gained increasing attention as a type of tourism in recent years. Through a telephone survey of midwest residents (six states and one Canadian province), respondents were asked about their image of Michigan as a destination for heritage and cultural tourism experiences, about their visits to museums, halls of fame, historic and other heritage sites. Michigan, traditionally a natural resource tourism destination and maintaining a strong image as such, receives far fewer visits to heritage and cultural sites than do other states or regions. If Michigan chooses to expand its potential as a heritage/cultural tourism destination, it must engage in a variety of development, promotional, and collaborative efforts.

Introduction

In recent years, tourism industry professionals and researchers have segmented, labeled, studied and promoted various "types" of tourism. This has occurred partially in response to shifts in tourism markets and traveler preferences/demands. While much travel in the 1980s and before was heavily influenced by a desire for "escape and relaxation," travel motivations in the 1990s has begun to shift to include more interest in education and enrichment. "In the '80s cultural, historical or archaeological treasures were important to 27% of frequent travelers compared to 50% in the 1990s. Understanding culture was important to 48% in the '80s compared to 88% in the '90s" (Lord, 1996). Other reasons for identifying specific "types" or categories of tourism include 1) to better understand tourism decision making and travel behavior, and 2) to use in tourism promotion strategies. Among relatively recently labeled tourism "types" are ecotourism, nature-based tourism, agriculture or farm tourism, heritage tourism, industrial tourism, and cultural tourism. Depending on the context and who is using the terms, their meanings may vary slightly, sometimes resulting in confusion or misunderstanding, particularly for potential travelers. Additionally, tourists seldom label themselves as one type of tourist or another. In fact, more often than not, they are engaged in a variety of experiences during any given travel experience and may engage in different "types" of tourism activities across various trips. Nevertheless, it is useful--for understanding tourist destination choices and travel

patterns, for developing attractive travel packages and attractions, for designing and implementing effective promotional strategies, and developing appropriate information and interpretation for travelers--to segment markets and identify the activities, attractions and services preferred and sought by tourists, as well as to understand their perceptions of specific areas and how those perceptions influence their travel choices. It is those perceptions or images, regardless of how closely they match reality, that affect traveler destination selection (Gunn, 1988). In Michigan, as seems to be the case for most of the United States, tourism is becoming an increasingly important industry for economic development. Thus it is critical for state legislators, tourism decision makers (e.g., state travel bureau), local communities, regional tourism organizations, and tourism businesses to understand the nature of tourist behavior, decision making, existing images of the state as a travel destination, and trends in travel patterns and attractions.

Heritage and cultural tourism. "Heritage Tourism is Hot." So proclaims the title of an article in the Business Reports section of the September 1996 issue of *American Demographics*. In a 1993 issue of *History News*, Kathleen Brown identifies heritage and cultural tourism emerging as the fastest growing segment of the tourism industry. In a companion article, T. Allan Comp (1993) encourages individual historic sites to connect with other sites and activities (including historic, cultural, scenic and recreational) in their area or region to offer quality, integrated interpretive experiences for increasingly sophisticated tourists who seek such experiences.

Since the early 1990s, focused attention has been given to heritage and cultural tourism. Not only has the tourism industry recognized the important role of historic and cultural resources and events in tourism, but historical and cultural institutions increasingly are recognizing and trying to take advantage of that role. The National Trust for Historic Preservation has implemented a Heritage Tourism Initiative. As part of this initiative and in cooperation with American Express, it has produced a publication (Green, 1993), titled *Getting Started: How to Succeed in Heritage Tourism*, to help communities and historic/cultural organizations better understand travel behavior and the tourism industry, and provide guidelines or suggestions for how to engage actively in tourism. A report on cultural tourism, titled *Exploring America through its Culture* and commissioned by the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities, was prepared for the 1995 White House Conference on Travel and Tourism. Reasons for interest in heritage tourism, as identified in both publications and using citations from numerous studies, include:

- a large percent of travelers (statistics vary from area to area and among different studies) visit at least one historic site, district or building;
- visitors to historic sites tend to stay longer in an area and spend more money than those who do not visit historic sites;

- historic sites can create a "hook" to attract people to an area; tourists provide additional dollars to both the historic sites (via entrance fees and gift shop purchases) and the local area (for food, lodging, shopping, other entertainment);
- tourists who visit heritage sites tend to have higher incomes and education than other tourists;
- tourists who visit heritage sites are more likely to stay in hotels and to shop than do other tourists;
- heritage tourism provides an economic reason for communities to preserve historic resources;
- heritage tourism diversifies local economies; and
- heritage tourism provides the opportunity for visitors to gain an understanding of a previously unknown place, time or culture, hopefully broadening personal perspectives and understanding as well as contributing to development of an historic stewardship ethic.

While several characteristics of travelers who visit historic sites are different from those of non-historic site visitors, it should be remembered that not all historic site visitors have the same motivations or visitation patterns. Lord (1996) explains four degrees of consumer motivation for heritage or cultural tourism. Level one cultural tourists, those most highly motivated by cultural tourism, are those who choose a destination specifically because of its heritage sites or festivals. Level two cultural tourists are those partially motivated by historic and cultural opportunities and partly by some other factor. Level three cultural tourists are those who choose trip destinations or activities based primarily on some other characteristic but who plan, as an adjunct activity, to visit an historic site or participate in a cultural event. The final group, dubbed "accidental cultural tourists," are those people who do not plan to participate in heritage tourism, but do so for some other reason (e.g., their hosts decide to take them to a historic site; inclement weather spoils their planned outside activities so they find an alternative).

In Michigan, cultural institutions and organizations are expressing interest in collaborating and working more directly with the tourism industry. The Upper Peninsula Travel and Recreation Association sponsored conference presentations on historic preservation and the roles of interpretation and museums in tourism in October 1996. During the same month, the Midwest Museums Association requested a presentation on the tourism industry, tourist behavior, and strategies for establishing direct linkages with the tourism industry. The Michigan Museums Association currently is developing several heritage tourism initiatives, including a survey, publication and heritage tourism training. Through Michigan State University Extension, workshops in community-based tourism, which include a strong emphasis on heritage tourism opportunities, have been conducted in the past two years. The Michigan travel bureau, *Travel Michigan*, changed its slogan and logo in the spring of 1997 to "Great Lakes, Great Times," intentionally incorporating both natural and cultural resources in the image (see Figure 1.)



Figure 1. The new Michigan tourism logo and slogan reflect both the state's natural and cultural heritage.

Image and Perceptions. Travel choices are made based on a variety of factors, including individual or group preferences, expectations and motivations for a given trip, barriers and constraints (including cost, distance, time available), and image. Image, because it is such a critical component of the decision making process regarding selection of a travel destination, has been studied extensively. According to an early definition by Crompton (1979), image results from a blending of all the beliefs, perceptions, ideas, and impressions that a person has acquired about any object, place, event, or behavior. Matthieson and Wall (1982) include image as an important component of tourist decision making--that it is, in fact, a decisive factor in choosing between two or more travel opportunities. However, they caution that invalid images may create problems. "The larger the difference between image and reality, that is between expectations and experience, the more likely is the tourist to be dissatisfied" (Matthieson and Wall, 1982, 31-32).

Exactly how the elements blend in a person's mind to form an image may not be definitively understood, but three specific components are involved in development of a destination image: cognitive, affective, and conative (Gartner, 1996). The cognitive component is based upon information or fact and includes the individual's understanding of and attitudes about those facts. Sources for the information can be numerous and varied, including both promotion and marketing efforts about the destination (termed "induced" information by Gunn, 1972) and general impressions or information about a place gained, often as background to other messages, from sources such as news media, entertainment media, and discussions with other people (termed "organic" information by Gunn, 1972). The affective component relates to how a person feels about and values a specific object or place. Individuals are different and, because their psychological make-ups, or "sets to respond," are different, they may value and react differently to the same image or set of beliefs about a travel destination (Gunn, 1988). The conative component could

be referred to as the resultant behavior, such as the act of making a specific trip based on the decision.

In the cognitive component of image development, people may have information in addition to "induced" and "organic" information--information based on personal experiences with a specific region or site. Personal experience information (termed "primary" by Phelps, 1986), when available, combines with "secondary" information from a range of induced and organic sources to create an image of a place, such as a specific travel destination. Consistency of messages and source credibility affect the extent of influence on an individual's image development of the place. This image, evolved in a person's mind about a given place, directly influences the travel decision. The tourism industry, if it hopes to attract visitors to a specific destination or region, must identify images people have about the destination and attractions, understand the match or mismatch between those images and what really exists at a site or destination, understand the match or mismatch between the image and travelers' preferences and motivations, and then work to reinforce or change those images, as needed, in ways to influence positively future travel destination decisions.

Study Context

Michigan has long been a tourist destination, with many of its early attractions based on natural resources, often water-based. In the early 1870s, the railroad opened many inland areas of Michigan, including to Grayling (middle lower peninsula) and the Au Sable River. Native grayling became a target of recreational anglers. Soon after, private individuals began introducing rainbow and brook trout; responding to this interest, the State of Michigan began stocking brook and, eventually, brown trout (Williams, 1997). Specially designed shallow draft boats were constructed to support this resource-based recreational activity. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, fishing camps, hunting camps, and resorts were developed throughout Michigan, especially in northern areas, along shorelines, and on Isle Royale. Passengers boarded excursion steamers for holidays on the Great Lakes. Despite this early emphasis on natural resource-based recreation and tourism development, cultural and historic attractions have been components of tourism in Michigan for many years. For example, Mackinac Island, designated Michigan's first state park in 1895 and always been for its quiet (motorless) natural island environment and extravagant resort amenities boasts one of Michigan's most well known attractions, Fort Mackinac, a fort founded in 1789, given to Michigan in 1895, and now portraying military life of the 1880s to visitors.

Michigan has several interesting characteristics that make it unique among other areas of the United States. First, it is comprised of two peninsulas (upper and lower peninsulas), finally linked physically in 1957 with completion of the Mackinac Bridge. As a peninsular state, Michigan has nearly 3,300 miles of Great Lakes shoreline--more than any

other state except Alaska--and almost 97,000 square miles of Great Lakes surface area within its borders. Adding to its extensive water resources are hundreds of inland lakes (totaling approximately 1,000 square miles), 36,350 miles of rivers, more than 150 waterfalls (D'Itri, 1995), and 12 existing or proposed underwater preserves (Nelson and Childs, 1996). Thus, water-based travel and recreation opportunities annually attract thousands of recreational visits by residents and visitors from across the country. Among them are thousands of boaters. For years, Michigan has been identified as one of the top two or three states for boating activity, which is supported by nearly 90 harbors with Great Lakes access (Talhelm and Vrana, 1995).

Additionally, Michigan is rich in forested land, having four national forests (more than 2.7 million acres), six state forests (3.9 million acres), 57 state game and wildlife areas (covering almost 300,000 acres), four National Park Service units, and 96 state parks (Nelson and Childs, 1996). Some of the areas (e.g., Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Isle Royale National Park) incorporate both spectacular land and water resources, providing varied opportunities for visitors.

Because of its location--northern United States, water-surrounded--Michigan has a relatively short summer travel season. Even summer weather, while often hot, can be cool and rainy. Winters can be cold, long and full of snow, particularly in the upper peninsula. Thus, some might believe the climate to be a constraint to the length of the tourist season. However, fall colors, winter attractions and activities (e.g., crosscountry and some downhill skiing, snowmobiling, winter carnivals), and spring maple sugaring activities can extend the natural resource-based tourism season. It is within this heavily natural resource-based context that heritage and cultural tourism are striving to develop.

Despite, and more realistically because of, these extensive and varied natural resources, Michigan does have a long history of human habitation. Accordingly, it has numerous historic and cultural attractions and stories, reflecting both prehistoric times (e.g., Paleo Indian copper mining on Isle Royale, Native American trade routes across the southern portion of the lower peninsula and along waterways) and development since European contact. Military activity, such as at Colonial Michilimackinac, a fur-trading village and military outpost established in 1715 and at Fort Mackinac in the late 18th and 19th centuries, contributes to Michigan's colorful history. Little recognized is the extensive involvement of Michigan troops in the Civil War. In addition to military influence, much of the state's post-European contact history has resulted from economic development of the state's natural resources: copper and iron mining, fur trade, commercial fishing, lumbering, transportation along the Great Lakes...and recreation and tourism.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are to 1) describe the perceptions (or image) of Michigan as a travel destination, specifically with regard to heritage and cultural tourism, held by residents of six midwestern states and one Canadian province, 2) identify traveler visitation to historic, heritage and cultural sites, and 3) compare characteristics of heritage tourists with those of non-heritage tourists.

Methods

This study is part of a much larger, three-year household telephone survey assessing travel patterns, choices, and perceptions of residents in the midwest. Developed in cooperation between the Michigan Travel, Tourism and Recreation Resource Center (TTRRC), the Michigan Travel Bureau (now Travel Michigan), and CERTEC consulting firm, a 140-item questionnaire, structured in several blocks, was developed to assess residents' 1) awareness of tourism promotional materials (for Michigan and the other states and province), 2) image of Michigan, 3) pleasure travel patterns, in general and specifically to Michigan, for the past 12 months, 4) influence of advertising on destination choices, 5) trip expenditures, 6) future travel plans, in general and specifically to Michigan, and 7) personal and household characteristics.

The larger study, containing a core of questions to be used across all three years, was structured to incorporate a different set of special topic area questions during each of the three years. The special areas identified are 1) cultural/heritage tourism, 2) natural resource-based tourism, and 3) special attractions and festivals/event tourism. Thus, during the first year (the time frame of this study), a series of questions related to travelers' perceptions of Michigan as a heritage tourism state and about their specific travel behavior related to visits to museums, halls of fame, historic sites and buildings, and other heritage tourism attractions was asked. It should be noted that, while festivals and special events contribute significantly to heritage and cultural tourism, they are not specifically included in this study because they will be addressed along with special attractions in the focus segment during year three of the larger study.

Initially the survey contained nearly 200 items. During pilot testing it was determined that the time it took to complete a survey was too long for the telephone interview format. Therefore, numerous questions were dropped or revised, resulting in a 140-item questionnaire. In this reduction, heritage tourism-related questions dealing with motivations, satisfaction, and detailed heritage experience preferences were deleted. The remaining questions related to heritage tourism were primarily descriptive, dealing with travel behavior. A few questions in the larger survey that addressed seasonal issues (e.g., boating in the summer, snowmobiling during the winter) were changed depending on the season in which the interviews were conducted. However, those changes are not relevant to the heritage tourism part of the study.

During an 11-month period (October 1995 through August 1996), a sample of 6,073 residents was selected for participation in a household telephone survey. The study area included Michigan, five nearby midwestern states (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota), and the province of Ontario, Canada. Residents/respondents were randomly selected through random digit dialing.

Administration of the survey was conducted in the TTRRC's CATI (computer-assisted telephone interview) lab via a bank of computer-supported telephone stations, from which trained interviewers contacted and interviewed respondents. Some of the respondents (if they had not traveled in the previous 12 months) received an abbreviated form of the survey, providing only household demographics, while others (if they had traveled in the previous 12 months) were asked to participate in an extensive version (approximately 140 items) of the survey. In completing a full interview, responses to specific questions might direct the interview to designated blocks of questions, resulting in skipping of irrelevant questions for respondents. When the same questions were incorporated in alternative blocks, responses from both were included in the analysis. The mean time required to complete an interview was 12 minutes, with a maximum interview length of about 20 minutes. Outright refusals by residents to participate in the survey are not indicated here. In some cases, respondents chose to terminate the interview prior to completion. Also, on occasion, respondents may have chosen not to answer specific questions. Therefore, the sample size for any specific question may not be 6,073. For this reason, results are presented as valid percents based on those who responded to the given question rather than actual percents of the entire sample (the "n" for individual questions will be indicated when other than 6,073). Additionally, the data are weighted proportionally based on the relative total household numbers in each state and Ontario to account for uneven sampling across the sampling areas. The number of respondents from each state is indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample sizes by state or province.

State or Province	Original Sample Size	Weighted Sample Size
Michigan	1,292	979
Ohio	904	1,174
Indiana	702	599
Illinois	765	1,205
Wisconsin	828	528
Minnesota	782	478
Ontario, Canada	800	1,110
TOTAL	6,073	6,073

Questions dealing with image allowed respondents to rate places based on a 10-point Likert scale, with 10 being the most positive rating. In open-ended questions, respondents were allowed a maximum of three responses each about their positive and negative impressions of Michigan. For questions describing travel destinations and activities, lists were provided, but in most cases an "other" category was

provided. Due to the lengthiness of the survey, the majority of questions were close-ended. However, respondents were able to provide open-ended responses for some questions (e.g., "What did you enjoy most [or least] about this trip?").

Results

General travel patterns. Of the total 6,073 respondents, 69.5% had taken a trip of some kind in the previous 12 months. Of the 3,852 respondents who answered the question about having taken a pleasure trip anywhere in the previous 12 month, 93% responded positively. Thirty-nine percent (of 4,125 responding) indicated they had taken a pleasure trip to Michigan in the previous three years. (Notes: The smaller percent of travelers to Michigan will affect the overall "n" used in describing destination choices and activities related to heritage tourism in Michigan. Detailed questions about activities during a specific trip are restricted to a pleasure trip within the previous 12 months.)

Image of Michigan as travel destination. Thirty-seven percent of respondents rated Michigan high (8, 9 or 10 of 10 points possible) as a popular pleasure trip destination, which places Michigan in a first place ranking when compared with the other states in the study. Only Ontario received a higher percent (47%) of 8, 9 and 10 ratings. For comparison, this places Michigan and the other midwest states lower than states generally perceived to be major tourism destinations: Colorado and Florida, each receiving an 8, 9 or 10 rating by 60% of the respondents. (See Table 2.)

Table 2. Percent of respondents rating each state/province 8,9, or 10 as a desirable tourism destination

State or Province	Valid Percent	# Respondents Answering Q
Florida	60	3,015
Colorado	60	2,703
Ontario, Canada	47	2,714
Michigan	37	2,927
Wisconsin	32	2,692
Minnesota	26	2,593
Illinois	24	2,923
Ohio	22	2,667
Indiana	15	2,728

When asked about their image of Michigan as having interesting museums, 36% (n=2619) gave Michigan a rating of 8, 9 or 10, which is comparable to the percent of respondents indicating Michigan as a popular destination. However, far more respondents gave Michigan a rating of 8, 9 or 10 for recreation or travel opportunities related to natural resources: 69% for "great scenic appeal" (n=3524), 68% for "great summer outdoor recreation" (n=3480), and 66% for "great winter outdoor recreation" (n=3177). Michigan residents (63%), more than residents of other areas (ranging from 33% to 48%), were more likely to rate Michigan high (8, 9 or 10) as having interesting historic sites. They also were more likely than residents of other areas to rate Michigan high (8, 9 or 10) as having many

interesting museums (52% of Michigan residents, 46% of Ohio residents, 37% of Indiana residents, and 19-30% of respondents from other states/province in the survey).

When asked in an open-ended question to identify specific things contributing to Michigan as a popular tourism destination, respondents were allowed to identify a maximum of three things. A total of 3,769 individuals responded to this question, providing a total of 6,277 responses. Thirty-four percent of the respondents indicated, as one of their top three "positive impressions," lakes, lakeshores or other water-related elements" (including marinas, boating, swimming). Nearly 14% indicated general scenery, 11% indicated woodland-based nature (trees, woods, forests), 10% indicated Upper Peninsula/north country, 7% towns and cities, and nearly 7% indicated elements of the Mackinac Straits area. Fishing and seasonal climate were the only other elements identified by at least 5% of those responding to this question. By far, the strongest "positive impression" elements are related to Michigan's water and other natural resources, including associated outdoor activities. On the other hand, when asked about elements contributing to a negative image of Michigan (3,734 people responding with 4,243 items), respondents most often identified "Detroit," "violence in Detroit," or "crime and violence" in general (combined, identified by 23% of the respondents). Nearly 13% identified climate as a negative element and 4% identified infrastructure problems, most notably poor road conditions. (Forty-six percent of respondents said they had no negative impressions of Michigan.)

Travel related to heritage tourism. Respondents' actual travel behavior showed less support of Michigan heritage sites than did their image ratings. While 59% of travelers stated they had visited a heritage site during any recent pleasure trip, only 15% had visited heritage sites in Michigan. Nevertheless, travelers did visit heritage sites in Michigan. Of those who had visited Michigan in the past 12 months (n=941), 27% (n=256) had visited some kind of museum or historic site. However, the types of heritage and cultural sites visited most often were a bit different from sites visited elsewhere. Visits to historical museums (35%), art museums (30%), science museums (14%), and natural history museums (11%) were identified most often when they visited locations outside of Michigan. Between five and 10% of those visiting some type of heritage site also visited historic homes, halls of fame, historic towns and battlefields. Those who visited heritage and cultural sites in Michigan (n=256) also visited historical museums (39%) and art museums (16%) most often, but they were much more likely to visit forts (13%), historic towns (9% in Michigan vs. 6% elsewhere), lighthouses (8%) and maritime museums (5%) in Michigan than elsewhere. Ships (3%) also were visited slightly, though not significantly, more often in Michigan than elsewhere.

Demographics. Information requested in the personal/household characteristics block included: city,

state, county and zip code of residence; total number of persons living in the household; inclusion of pre-school child, school-age child less than 18 years old, senior citizen or handicapped person in the household; number of full-time wage earners in the household; employment category; racial/ethnic group; and household income. Some characteristics of groups that visited heritage sites were similar to those of other travelers. However, two group characteristics of those who visited heritage sites were different than for other travelers, using $\alpha=.05$, and another if less rigorous significance level ($\alpha=.1$) is used. Visitation to heritage sites increases as income increases (of those who visited museums, 38% had annual household incomes of more than \$50,000, 33% had incomes between \$31,000 and \$50,000, and 29% had incomes of \$31,000 or less). This annual income is significantly higher ($P=.000$) than for those not visiting museums or historic sites. Groups or families with preschool children were significantly less likely to visit heritage sites than those without preschool children ($P=.001$). Groups including a senior citizen were slightly less likely to visit a heritage site than groups without a senior citizen ($P=.07$). While households including a person with disabilities were no more or no less likely to visit a museum or historic site, very few respondents (3.7%) indicated having a person with disabilities in the household. It is not possible to make any comparisons of visitation to heritage sites based on race and ethnicity. This is in part due to difficulties in clearly identifying race (as the open-ended question was worded) because responses included a mix of race, ethnic background and nationality. Even with this variety of responses, an overwhelming majority of respondents (80%) identified themselves as white, Caucasian or Anglo.

Discussion and Recommendations

Michigan has a wealth of existing and potential heritage and cultural resources, attractions and stories. Yet, though over one third of all respondents who had traveled anywhere in the past 12 months rated Michigan highly as having many interesting museums and historic sites, a much smaller percent of people who have visited Michigan in the past 12 months included a visit to a historic site or museum. Comparing this with national data collected by the Travel Industry Association of America (TIAA) from adults planning to take a pleasure trip in 1996, Michigan receives considerably fewer visits to historic or cultural sites. In the TIAA study, 45% planned to visit a historic destination and 41% planned to visit a cultural destination (Dickinson, 1996). Michigan heritage site visitation also is less than that indicated by respondents in a study of inbound international travelers to the United States in 1994. Results of that study indicated that 30% of those travelers planned to visit historical places and 23% planned to visit museums and art galleries, thus ranking historic site visits fifth and museum visits seventh of all planned activities, including shopping and dining (Moskin and Guettler, 1996).

Despite its abundance of historic stories, Michigan falls behind national travel patterns with regard to visits to heritage and cultural sites. Perhaps this is due partly to strong perceptions of Michigan as a natural resource-based tourism destination as well as the traditional travel to Michigan being for outdoor activities and other natural resource-based experiences. Perhaps Michigan is lacking (or perceived to be lacking) in accessible, quality historic and cultural resources in some parts of the state. Perhaps the cultural and heritage sites are not well connected with other local or regional tourism businesses and attractions. Whatever the reasons, if Michigan wants to expand its tourism development efforts with heritage and cultural tourism, and if it hopes to compete with other states and international tourism regions for tourists interested in heritage and cultural tourism, it must actively work to change the image and promote its heritage and cultural attractions. Some recommendations include:

- Heritage and cultural attractions must be identified and assessed for their potential (e.g., location, quality, proximity to tourism infrastructure and amenities) as tourist attractions.
- Individual heritage and cultural attractions, as well as the communities within which they exist, must decide if and to what extent they choose to be involved with tourism development.
- Professionals in museums, historic sites, and other heritage and cultural resources must work closely with local, regional and state organizations (e.g., convention and visitors bureaus, public officials, travel organizations, other tourism businesses, and other destination marketing organizations) involved with tourism development.
- Tourism training should be provided for professionals in museums, historic sites, and other heritage and cultural resources. Likewise, tourism professionals should become more familiar with the role museums and heritage sites can play in tourism.
- The image of Michigan as a tourism destination must change or expand to include heritage and cultural sites. This includes an effort to actively promote these sites in ways to make them attractive to potential visitors. (To avoid dissatisfaction based on differences between image/expectations and experience reality, the promotions must be accurate.)
- Heritage and cultural sites should be integrated with various tourism packages: bus tours, community walking tours, highway or waterway heritage routes, promotional packages, discounted multiple site/single fee ticket sales.
- Communities might become involved in integrated heritage tourism development by creating historic districts or cultural landscapes, making efforts (through publicity, collaborative efforts, tax incentives, grant opportunities, etc.) to encourage preservation of the historic and natural settings of the community.
- The state's travel promotion efforts should more actively incorporate heritage and cultural images, including through its logo and slogan.

- ° If groups with young children and senior citizens are to feel welcome at heritage and cultural sites, there must be changes in programs (to entice and engage children), facilities (structural modifications and communication systems to accommodate senior citizens), organizational culture and promotion of those sites (to overtly welcome and encourage visitation by *all* people, regardless of age or physical capabilities).

Results of this study further support those of numerous other studies which note that visitors to heritage and cultural sites tend to have higher incomes and education, tend to take longer trips, are more likely to stay in hotels (a source of "bed" or other taxes that often support local tourism efforts), and have more interest in shopping than visitors who do not visit these sites (Moskin and Guettler, 1996). While a goal of cultural and heritage institutions may be to become more accessible *all* people, including those not traditionally visitors of such places, the tendency for more educated, more wealthy visitors to participate in heritage tourism makes them attractive to tourism developers. Thus, it is in the interest of tourism developers, communities and the state to support development and promotion of heritage and cultural sites. Suggestions provided above offer considerations for further development of heritage and cultural tourism, both in Michigan and elsewhere. It should be noted that Michigan already has begun these efforts, as is evident by its new logo (containing a lighthouse and water scene), new slogan (Great Lakes, Great Times), and identification of cultural tourism as one of four tourism product categories for which it believes the state has a distinct competitive advantage (Travel Michigan, 1997). Additionally, as indicated in the introduction of this paper, cultural institutions and professional organizations within Michigan already have begun a series of initiatives to further the cooperation between cultural/heritage institutions and the tourism industry. To determine the impact of these efforts, consistent and regular monitoring should be implemented.

Literature Cited

- Brown, Kathleen. 1993. *Tourism trends for the '90s*. History News 48(3):4-8.
- Comp, T. Allan. 1993. *Heritage tourism comes of age*. History News 48(3):9-12.
- Crompton, John. 1979. *An assessment of the image of Mexico as a vacation destination and the influence of geographical location upon that image*. Journal of Travel Research 17(4):18-23.
- Dickinson, Rachel. 1996. *Heritage tourism is hot*. American Demographics 18(9):13-14.
- D'Itri, Frank M. 1995. Water Resources. Special Report 79, Status and Potential of Michigan Natural Resources. East Lansing, MI: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan State University.
- Gartner, William. 1996. *Image development (ch. 11)*. Tourism Development. New York, NY: VanNostrand Reinhold.
- Green, Joslyn. 1993. *Getting Started: How To Succeed in Heritage Tourism*. Washington, D.C., National Trust for Historic Preservation.
- Gunn, Clare. 1972. *Vacationscape: Designing Tourist Regions*. Austin, TX: Bureau of Business Research, University of Texas Press.
- Gunn, Clare. 1988. *Tourism Planning (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Lord, Gail D. 1996. *Cultural tourism: The success story*. Visions in Leisure and Business 14(4):25-29.
- Matthieson, Alister and Wall, Geoffrey. 1992. *Tourism: Economic, Physical and Social Impacts*. London, England: Longman.
- Moskin, Bill and Guettler, Sandy. n.d. *Exploring America through its Culture*. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.
- Nelson, Charles and Childs, Sally. 1996. *State and federal recreation areas in Michigan*. In: van der Smissen, Betty and Haskell, Theodore (eds.), *Recreation in Michigan: Great Professional Opportunities*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.
- Phelps, A. 1986. *Holiday destination image: The problem of assessment; an example developed in Menorca*. Tourism Management 7(3):168-180.
- Talhelm, Dan R. and Vrana, Ken J. 1995. *Boating and Underwater Recreation. Special Report 77, Status and Potential of Michigan Natural Resources*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan State University.
- Travel Michigan. 1997. *Travel Michigan: Strategic Plan (internal report)*. Lansing, MI: Travel Michigan (travel bureau).
- Williams, Erin. 1997. *Sports Fishing Along the National Wild and Scenic Au Sable River Corridor*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, unpublished paper.

Acknowledgments

This study was funded by state and Michigan State University dollars as part of a SAPMINR (Status and Potential of Michigan Natural Resources) grant. The funds were administered by the Michigan State University College of Agriculture and Natural Resources. This study is a specialized one-year portion of a larger three-year study.

Sincere thanks are given to Dae Kwan Kim, doctoral student at Michigan State University, Department of Park, Recreation and Tourism Resources, who provided extensive work with data analysis for this paper.