24

2021

IL CAPITALE CULTURALE
Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage

Saggi

Segmenting cultural event visitors using the latent class approach: the case of "Sensational Umbria" photo exhibition by Steve McCurry

Luca Ferrucci*, Maria Cordente Rodriguez**, Silvia Sarti***, Simone Splendiani****

Abstract

Profiling event visitors has attracted increasing interest in tourism literature. However, in event visitors' segmentation, psychographic characteristics such as perceptions and satisfaction should be more emphasized by research. To fill this gap, our study aims at segmenting event visitors according to their overall perception of the exhibition, the perceived quality of the exhibition and their relationship with photography in terms of expertise. The study was based on a sample of 455 visitors of the photo exhibition "Sensational Umbria" by Steve McCurry (Perugia, Italy, 2014-2015), which was analyzed through a latent class approach. Results provide evidence of two different typologies of visitors: pragmatic and expert, who are differently affected by their level of expertise in photography and that are

* Luca Ferrucci, Full Professor, University of Perugia, Department of Economics, via Pascoli, 20, 06123 Perugia, e-mail: luca.ferrucci@unipg.it.
** Maria Cordente Rodriguez, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Faculty of Social Sciences, Av. Alfares, 44, 16071, Cuenca, e-mail: maria.cordente@uclm.es.
*** Silvia Sarti, Postdoctoral Researcher, Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Institute of Management, Piazza Martiri della Libertà, 33, 56127 Pisa, e-mail: silvia.sarti@santannapisa.it.
**** Simone Splendiani, Assistant Professor, University of Perugia, Department of Economics, via Pascoli, 20, 06123 Perugia, e-mail: simone.splendiani@unipg.it.

not convergent in evaluations about the exhibition. Theoretical and managerial implications, along with avenues for future research, are discussed.

Negli studi in ambito turistico è emerso un crescente interesse verso la profilazione dei visitatori di eventi culturali. Tra le variabili di segmentazione utilizzate comunemente, le caratteristiche psicografiche – come le percezioni e la soddisfazione dei visitatori – dovrebbero essere maggiormente analizzate, sia dal punto di vista concettuale che empirico. Per colmare questa lacuna, il presente studio si propone di segmentare i visitatori di un evento in base alla loro percezione complessiva della mostra, alla qualità percepita della mostra e al rapporto dei visitatori con la fotografia. Lo studio si è basato su un campione di 455 visitatori della mostra fotografica di Steve McCurry "Sensational Umbria" (Perugia, Italia, 2014-2015), attraverso i modelli a classe latente. I risultati evidenziano due diverse tipologie di visitatori: pragmatici ed esperti, che risentono in modo diverso del loro livello di competenza nella fotografia e che non sono convergenti nelle valutazioni sulla mostra. Infine, il lavoro discute le implicazioni teoriche e manageriali e le prospettive di ricerca future.

1. *Introduction*

Today, the tourism development strategy based on the organization of events is globally widespread. While cultural tourism originally meant only visiting a cultural site, in the nineties, as the concept of "culture" expanded, other cultural assets become crucial in the tourist decision making process, such as the consumption of traditions, customs, festivities, art, gastronomy, beliefs and values[1]. The literature presents several definitions of cultural tourism. It has been designed as the experience based on the search for and participation in new and deep cultural experiences with an aesthetic, historical, intellectual, emotional, psychological value that is charged with identity[2]. It encompasses both heritage tourism, related to artifacts from the past, and artistic tourism, related to contemporary cultural production[3]. Recently, the World Tourism Organization has defined cultural tourism as «a type of tourism activity in which the *visitor's essential motivation is to learn, discover, experience and consume the tangible and intangible cultural attractions/products in a tourism destination*»[4], and the attractions/products refer to arts and architecture, historical and cultural heritage, culinary heritage, literature, music, creative industries and the living cultures with their lifestyles, value systems, beliefs and traditions[5]. This represents an opportunity, especially for regions with an exceptional historical and cultural heritage[6]. However, the strategic planning of the event requires a

---

[1] Richards 2000. Cf. Herrero 2000.
[2] Beesley 2005; Pencarelli *et al.* 2017.
[3] Figini, Vici 2012; Lynch *et al.* 2011; Richards 2001; Torre, Scarborough 2017.
[4] UNWTO 2019, p. 30.
[5] UNWTO 2019.
[6] Pencarelli *et al.* 2017; Troitiño, Troitiño 2006.

territorial analysis of the tourist supply, a consideration of the resources and actors involved, and the analysis of the tourist demand of current and potential end-users. On the one hand, globalization and the emergence of new destinations have increased the necessity of constructing more targeted tourism strategies[7]. On the other hand, it will be increasingly necessary to be highly focused on a greater knowledge of tourist needs and the planning of event experiences[8].

With these objectives, literature is plenty of studies attempting to identify segments of tourists in order to understand tourist different characteristics and needs, and then properly respond to such requests in the planning of events. The majority of the existing studies dealing with tourist segmentation are based on socio-demographic, geographic, sociocultural, behavioral and psychographic variables. However, psychographic characteristics within tourism segmentation have been under-investigated, especially in terms of perceptions and satisfaction[9]. Deepening the knowledge on the psychographic characteristics is crucial to understand which are the main aspects to be considered in tourism planning, according to tourists' motivations and overall satisfaction. In addition, the proposed segmentation approach suggests significant implications in terms of tourist psychographic characteristics.

To fill this gap, our study aims at segmenting event visitors according to their overall perception of the exhibition, their perceived degree of quality of the exhibition and their relationship to photography in terms of the visitors' expertise.

The case analyzed refers to the photo exhibition "Sensational Umbria" by Steve McCurry, held in Perugia from the 29th of March 2014 to the 11th of January 2015. The Umbria region organized the event to promote the image of the destination, by exhibiting approximately 100 pictures of the region, taken by renowned photographer Steve McCurry during his stay in Umbria. The exhibition aimed to represent the Umbrian cultural identity, as seen through the lens of the famous photographer's camera and his representations of cities, villages, events and tourist attractions, in which he captures the spirit of values and traditions of Umbria. The event, which has already been the subject of a previous study by the same authors, has shown a significant impact both in terms of tourist numbers and in terms of regional image promotion[10].

In the case of the Umbria region, a tourism policy based on cultural events has been long established, having been one of the first Italian regions to mainly base its tourism development on cultural events. In these terms, the tourism policy represents a case of close link between events policy and regional tourism planning[11]. The tourism development strategies implemented in Umbria have

---

[7] Parsons, Maclaran 2009.
[8] Getz 2008.
[9] Formica, Uysal 1998.
[10] Ferrucci *et al*. 2017.
[11] Caroli, Valentino 2016; Crowther 2010; Markusen, Gadwa 2010; Stokes 2008.

found in cultural events important attractors and visitation motivations, able to improve destination competitiveness and seasonality reduction[12]. Umbria has been a pioneer in this sense, offering a range of important cultural events, such as the "Festival of the two worlds" (occurring since 1958) and "Umbria Jazz" (occurring since 1973)[13].

Based on a sample of 455 "Sensational Umbria" visitors, our study is aimed at segmenting exhibition visitors by using a latent class approach, a methodology that is applied in tourist segmentation studies and identifies out subtypes of related cases. Our results identify two different typologies of visitors: pragmatic and expert. Such segments of visitors seem to be differently affected by their level of expertise in photography and not convergent in the evaluations about the exhibition.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. First, the theoretical background is presented, and the methodology of the empirical study is then described. Next, the discussion about the main findings is provided. The main theoretical and managerial contributions along with avenues for future research are discussed in the conclusion.

2. *Literature review*

2.1 *Segmentation in cultural events*

The conceptual relationship between events and cultural tourism has been strongly debated. Some authors argue that a cultural event can be defined as a "touristic event" when it turns out to be an attractor of tourists, promoting tourist participation rather than resident participation. Events are usually considered as temporary attractions that ensure economic, social and environmental potential[14]. In contrast to permanent tourism attractions, «events are temporary occurrences, usually with a particular theme which aim to attract people (spectators, visitors, residents, guests) to a local point of short lived, organized activity in which visitors may participate, watch, view, learn from and enjoy»[15]. In addition, events represent a competitive dynamic in cities and tourist destinations, not exclusively in generating tourist supply, but in creating a new urban atmosphere in terms of companies, investments and attraction of human capital[16].

---

[12] Bellini 2004; Bracalente, Ferrucci 2009; Getz 2008; Lazzeroni *et al*. 2013; Prentice, Andersen 2003.
[13] Bracalente *et al*. 2011.
[14] McKercher, du Cros 2002; Van der Ark, Richards 2006.
[15] Getz 1991, p. 36.
[16] Della Lucia 2013; González 2010.

The importance of cultural events for the competitiveness of tourist destinations has been recognized by literature for many years[17]. Events are increasingly included in marketing and development plans for destinations since events may enhance the promotion and the image of a destination[18], by increasing tourist spending and length of stay and by attracting different segments of visitors, who would otherwise never visit the destination[19].

The existence of several typologies of cultural tourists calls for a more focused approach on the market[20], especially in the case of cities or historical places, whose limited capacity of reception makes necessary the identification of segments of consumers who can best be satisfied and whose behavior is better suited to what the city can offer[21]. In addition, it is becoming increasingly important to study the relationships between motivation, satisfaction and loyalty of the participants. Such research can help to understand how to build successful events for the benefit of the tourist attractiveness of places[22].

In general, segmentation strategies play a key role in the successful development and management of a destination and to create a positioning strategy, in addition to the characteristics of competence and the benefits asked for the consumers[23].

Thus, segmentation strategy is considered one of the most important phases in designing a marketing strategy, in terms of effectiveness and efficiency[24], and in particular for tourist development[25] and destination development[26]. It provides a huge quantity of information on tourist targets and allows to distinguish the tourists[27] for the identification of the most similar segments for the destination in terms of profitability, accessibility and consistency with local touristic products[28]. Segmentation strategy consents to identify the most attractive tourist segments for certain destinations, that are best satisfied by the tourist attractions and by the experiences provided by the local actors. Finally, segmentation techniques also support destinations in providing popular and attractive offerings[29].

---

[17] Berridge 2010; Crowther 2010; Getz 2008; Getz, Page 2016; Gregori *et al.* 2013; Richards 2000; Yeoman *et al.* 2003.

[18] Laws 1995; Monga 2006.

[19] Hernández-Mogollón *et al.* 2014.

[20] Correia *et al.* 2009.

[21] Cordente 2011.

[22] Baez-Montenegro, Devesa-Fernandez 2017; Duran, Hamarat 2014; Fruet-Cardozo *et al.* 2019.

[23] Dolničar 2008; Ugarte Otero 2007.

[24] Del Chiappa *et al.* 2020.

[25] Beh, Bruyere 2007; Dolničar 2008; Nicolau 2002.

[26] Beh, Bruyere 2007; Huang, Choi 2017.

[27] Huang, Choi 2017.

[28] Kang *et al.* 2003; Paker, Vural 2016; Park, Yoon 2009; Perdue 1996; Rid *et al.* 2014; Van Raaij 1986.

[29] Dolničar 2008; Huang, Choi 2017.

At the same time, a segmentation strategy allows optimization of marketing resources by controlling promotional communication toward segments of interest[30], by using the most appropriate means of communication to reach targets and guide promotional and marketing strategies[31], in order to increase visitors' presence in a specific location[32]. It may be possible since consumers tend to choose products that are consistent with their self-concepts[33], namely their individual opinions, feelings, perceptions or attitudes[34].

In addition, the segmentation process can support tourist destinations in meeting the conditions of a competitive market, and the ability of adapting to the heterogeneity of demand, in order to focus on the most appropriate segment for the destination and, finally, the process facilitates the selection and attraction of individuals who would most likely be satisfied with what the destination may offer[35]. Additionally, segmentation strategy allows specializing a destination in providing a much more professional, complex, and differentiated service[36].

With regards to event management, profiling cultural event tourists is a fundamental part of event planning in order to segment the market and develop strategies to satisfy the needs of the participants[37]. Performing an event visitor segmentation appears relevant in order to understand the preferences of different market segments and design effective promotion strategies. To this aim, several studies on event visitor segmentation have been proposed on visitors of different types of events, such as festivals[38], sport events[39], culinary events[40], and special events[41].

Formica and Uysal[42] studied the Spoleto Festival (Italy), and identified two segments, called enthusiasts and moderates, based on preferences and motivations.

Gomez-Casero et al.[43] – analyzing the Almagro International Classical Theatre Festival – indicated the existence of "cultural viewers" and "alternative viewers", the former with higher degree of cultural interest compared to the second ones.

Prentice and Andersen[44] identified seven clusters of visitors to Edinburgh festival according to consumption styles: serious consumers of international culture, British drama-going socializers, Scots performing arts attenders,

---

[30] Lee *et al.* 2004; Ugarte Otero 2007.
[31] Dolničar 2008; Kang *et al.* 2003.
[32] Beh, Bruyere 2007.
[33] Grubb, Grathwohl 1967.
[34] Sirgy 1982.
[35] Cordente *et al.* 2014; Dolničar 2004.
[36] Pulido, Sánchez 2010.
[37] Brida *et al.* 2012; Getz 1997; Molera, Albaladejo 2007.
[38] Formica, Uysal 1995; Lee *et al.* 2004; Li *et al.* 2009; Scott 1995.
[39] Chalip, McGuirty 2004; Preuss *et al.* 2007; Snelgrove *et al.* 2008; Wood *et al.* 2010.
[40] Ignatov, Smith 2006; Smith, Costello 2009.
[41] Carmichael 2002; Hede *et al.* 2005; Scott, Thigpen 2003.
[42] Formica, Uysal 1998.
[43] Gomez-Casero *et al.* 2020.
[44] Prentice, Andersen 2003.

Scottish experience tourists, gallery-goers, incidental festival-goers, and accidental festival-goers.

Using different levels of satisfaction, another research based in Faro (Portugal) identified three segments of cultural events visitors, namely generally more satisfied respondents, less satisfied respondents, especially in terms of promotion and organization, and globally less satisfied respondents[45]. A study about segmentation in Christmas markets identified three segments based on motivation variables for visiting the event: business people, Christmas fans and general tourists[46].

2.2 *Segmentation criteria in cultural tourism studies*

Segmentation techniques are widely applied in tourism research, and generally in consumer studies[47] as well as in event management[48].

According to Dolničar[49], classification criteria may be grouped into four main typologies: socio-demographic (as for instance, age, gender, education, income), geographic (country of origin), behavioral (as for instance, vacation activities, vacation habits, behavior, expenditure, items of information), and psychographic (as for instance, motivations, satisfaction or lifestyle). The selection of the variable of analysis depends on the study aim and the managerial demands[50] as well as on the destination's characteristics.

The variables used in tourism segmentation studies may be related to extrinsic aspects, such as age, marital status, employment and income level or to intrinsic aspects, including psychological and material needs, aspirations and desires[51]. As confirmed by previous studies, visitor motivation is a reliable segmentation variable[52].

Differently, Cervantes *et al.*[53] affirm that tourism segmentation may be based on multiple criteria, named social structure criteria (referring to the socio-demographic variables), tourist action criteria (referring to the tourism consumer behavior variables, including characteristics of the trip, expenditure and activities), sociocultural structure criteria (referring to the general characteristics of visitors, its values, cultural consumption patterns, lifestyles

[45] Oom do Valle *et al.* 2010.

[46] Brida *et al.* 2013.

[47] Bimonte 2008; Calantone, Johar 1984; Díaz-Pérez *et al.* 2005; Dolničar 2002; Frochot 2005; Frochot, Morrison 2000; Legohérel *et al.* 2015; Li *et al.* 2009; López-Sánchez, Pulido-Fernández 2016; Palacio 1997; Woodside, Jacobs 1985.

[48] Lee *et al.* 2004; Tkaczynski, Rundle-Thiele 2011.

[49] Dolničar 2005.

[50] Wedel, Kamakura 2000.

[51] Freire 2011.

[52] Formica, Uysal 1995, 1998; Gomez-Casero *et al.* 2020; Lee *et al.* 2004.

[53] Cervantes *et al.* 1999.

and stereotypes) and tourist culture criteria (referring to subjective variables such as motivations, perceptions or satisfaction).

Loyalty and opinion have been identified as two of the most commonly used variables for segmentation[54]. Furthermore, attributes of the destination[55], the score of the attributes[56], satisfaction[57], perceived quality[58], motivation[59] and previous experience[60] have been widely used in the literature.

The following table summarizes the use of different variables in segmentation (tab. 1):

Socio-demographic variables	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Age	Dolničar (2005), Freire (2011)
Gender	Dolničar (2005)
Education	Dolničar (2005)
Marital status	Freire (2011)
Employment	Freire (2011)
Income	Dolničar (2005), Freire (2011)
Country of origin	Dolničar (2005)
Vacation activities	Cervantes *et al.* (1999), Dolničar (2005)
Vacation habits	Dolničar (2005)
Characteristics of the trip	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Expenditure	Cervantes *et al.* (1999), Dolničar (2005)
Items of information	Dolničar (2005)
Motivations	Formica and Uysal (1995, 1998), Cervantes *et al.* (1999), Lee *et al.* (2004), Dolničar (2005), Devesa *et al.* (2010)
Satisfaction	Cervantes *et al.* (1999), Dolničar (2005), Tsiotsou and Vasioti (2006), Getz (2016)
Perceptions	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Opinion	Ugarte Otero (2007), Akhoondnejad (2016)
Perceived quality	Laguna and Palacios (2009), Wu and Chan (2011), Barić *et al.* (2016)
Previous experience	Diaz-Martin *et al.* (2000), Grande *et al.* (2002), Getz (2016)
Lifestyle	Dolničar (2005)
Values	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Cultural consumption patterns	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)

---

[54] Akhoondnejad 2016; Ugarte Otero 2007.
[55] Goodall, Cooper 1991; Kim *et al.* 2003.
[56] Crask 1981.
[57] Getz 2016; Tsiotsou, Vasioti 2006.
[58] Barić *et al.* 2016; Laguna, Palacios 2009; Wu, Chan 2011.
[59] Devesa *et al.* 2010; Rittichainuwat, Mair 2012.
[60] Diaz-Martin *et al.* 2000; Getz, Page 2016; Grande *et al.* 2002.

Lifestyles	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Stereotypes	Cervantes *et al.* (1999)
Psychological and material needs	Freire (2011)
Aspirations	Freire (2011)
Desires	Freire (2011)
Loyalty	Ugarte Otero (2007), Akhoondnejad (2016)
Attributes of the destination	Crask (1981), Goodall and Cooper (1991), Kim *et al.* (2003)

Tab. 1. Segmentation criteria (source: authors' elaboration)

In the case of event segmentation, age, gender, place of origin, education, income, motivations and experience are the most frequently used[61]. Together with common socio-demographic information, some authors recommend that psychographic characteristics, such as perceptions and satisfaction, are emphasized in research[62].

In particular, satisfaction is considered as a measure of the fulfillment of expectations and, together with the selected alternative[63], a measure of the effectiveness of the developed experience, with clear advantages in explaining behavior[64]. In the case of festivals, satisfaction refers to the overall evaluation of an attendee about his or her experience in a festival[65].

Furthermore, festival quality refers to the characteristics of products, as for instance design of the event, entertainment, activity, performance, and services, as for instance facilities, catering and merchandising, that are provided at the festival[66]. Moreover, satisfaction about the festival and festival quality are predictors of attendee loyalty, a part of other variables. Such loyalty is widely recognized to provide successful tourist experience[67], and to influence behavioral intentions[68] in terms of recommendations or new visits.

Finally, considering the choice of criteria, there are two segmentation approaches: a-priori and post hoc or data-driven[69]. In the first – the most adopted one – the researchers use the common-sense and criteria that are known. In this case, researchers choose variables of interest to develop the segmentation and the potential grouping is undertaken in advance and it is expected to cause heterogeneity among the customers. Some authors argue that a-priori approach does not reflect the differences among individuals.

---

[61] Tkaczynski, Rundle-Thiele 2011.
[62] Formica, Uysal 1998.
[63] Oom do Valle *et al.* 2010.
[64] Pulido-Fernández, Sánchez-Rivero 2010.
[65] Akhoondnejad 2016.
[66] Savinovic *et al.* 2012.
[67] Akhoondnejad 2016.
[68] Lee *et al.* 2007.
[69] Dolničar 2004; Mazanec 2000.

Therefore, it is necessary more than one characteristic to segment[70] in order to produce in-depth outcomes[71]. In post hoc or data-driven approach, there are no prior insights, and researchers choose a set of variables to develop multivariate analyses. The analysis classifies individuals by considering their degree of similarity in terms of that set of variables and, after that, they decide which segmentation is the most suitable one. Within this approach, latent class analysis is a methodology for finding subtypes of related cases, which are called latent classes, from multivariate categorical data, where membership cannot be observed directly[72].

3. *Methodology*

In this paper a quantitative analysis is developed, a self-administered questionnaire was distributed, to allow the respondents to answer the questions when most convenient for them and without pressure.

The close-ended structured questionnaire consisted of three main sections. The first part of the questionnaire contained information about the exhibition "Sensational Umbria", and questions with statements relating to the visitors' familiarity with the photographer based on Cordell[73], overall evaluations, satisfaction (based on the attributes identified by Echtner and Ritchie[74]), motivation for the visit (based on the main groups of motivation identified by Kozak[75]: physical, cultural, social or prestigious, and relaxing), and future behavior (based on the scale of Davis[76]) with regards to the visit. The statements were rated by respondents on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly disagree (1)" to "strongly agree (5)."

The second section requested information about the visitor typology and composition, such as socio-demographic characteristics and cultural habits (following the scale of Khodadady and Natanzi[77]). The last section gathered information about the non-resident domestic and international visitors' stays in Perugia, such as their length of stay and accommodation.

The questionnaire also included open questions, to collect further comments about the exhibition or the respondents' visitation plan in Umbria region.

The survey was conducted in Perugia, among the visitors of the exhibition "Sensational Umbria", in the two places where the exhibition took place (namely the former "Fatebenefratelli" spaces and the Museum of the "Palazzo della

---

[70] Dolničar 2008.
[71] Mazanec 2000.
[72] Pulido-Fernández, Sánchez-Rivero 2010.
[73] Cordell 1997.
[74] Echtner, Ritchie 1991.
[75] Kozak 2002.
[76] Davis 1989.
[77] Khodadady, Natanzi 2012.

Penna"), from August 2014 until January 2015. The total number of visitors of the exhibition was 42,304. The selection of respondents was conducted randomly, in order to cover the widest possible range of visitors; after the visit, in the exit of both locations, the visitors were asked by the exhibition's employees about their willingness to complete the questionnaire. Once the questionnaires were reviewed and the invalid ones were discarded, a total of 455 questionnaires were collected. Finally, the response rate was 1.08%.

Latent class segmentation was used to answer the research questions and to carry out the visitor segmentation. This technique allows the identification of the optimal number of segments in which individuals are assigned based on the highest probability of belonging to a particular segment. Moreover, they are classified considering their degree of similarity; this classification reflects the differences among individuals using more than one characteristic.

Compared to other traditional segmentation techniques, latent class segmentation provides several advantages that endorse its application[78], such as rigorous statistical process and use of statistical indicators to check the fit of the model (BIC, R2, misclassification, number of parameters); use of latent variables or unobservable variables as segmentation criteria; use of exogenous variables to describe the segments in detail.

The variables used to carry out the segmentation of visitors to the "Sensational Umbria" photo exhibition are the following:
  – overall perception of the exhibition;
  – perceived quality of the exhibition based on: perceived quality of photographs, setting, spaces, cleaning, staff, bookshop, opening hours, quality-price ratio, relaxation areas and toilet;
  – relationship to photography in terms of expertise.

These three variables were used to develop the segmentation in accordance with Tkaczynski and Rundle-Thiele[79] with regards to the use of multiple segmentation bases. The two first variables are psychographic criteria, and the third behavioral.

In addition, a series of covariates are included in order to refine and describe the identified segments. The covariates included identifying the exhibition information source, time and duration of the exhibition, means of transportation to the exhibition, type of accommodation chosen by tourists, type of visitors accompanying the respondent (e.g. family, friends, tour group members), length of visitation, length of stay in Perugia, motivation for visiting the exhibition, motivation for visiting the city of Perugia, future intention to revisit, experience with previous Steve McCurry exhibitions, type of respondent's hobbies and free-time activities, and socio-demographic variables (gender, age, education level, monthly income).

---

[78] Picón *et al.* 2006; Sánchez 2001.
[79] Tkaczynski, Rundle-Thiele 2011.

4. *Data analysis*

4.1 *Segmentation process*

The software used to carry out the segmentation was Latent Gold®4.5.

The segmentation results provide information about a series of estimated models and indicators (tab. 2). They are interpreted to choose the most appropriate model, and to determine the optimal number of segments in which to divide the sample of visitors.

Number of clusters	LL	BIC (LL)	Npar	L2	P-value	Class. Err	Es	R2
1 cluster	-5860.8800	12015.5343	48	11721.7600	1.0 e-2163	0.0000	1.0000	1.0000
2 cluster	-5252.8136	11484.8747	160	10505.6271	4.3 e-1992	0.0356	0.8754	0.8961
3 cluster	-4967.9948	11600.7105	272	9935.9896	6.1 e-1963	0.0256	0.9297	0.9340
4 cluster	-4829.3233	12008.8407	384	9658.6465	3.2 e-2010	0.0080	0.9793	0.9810
5 cluster	-4689.9106	12415.4887	496	9379.8212	*	0.0204	0.9595	0.9568
6 cluster	-4588.5825	12898.3059	608	9177.1651	*	0.0084	0.9830	0.9825
7 cluster	-4505.1942	13417.0025	720	9010.3884	*	0.0049	0.9906	0.9907
8 cluster	-4458.2637	14008.6148	832	8916.5274	*	0.0029	0.9939	0.9940
9 cluster	-4376.1721	14529.9051	944	8752.3443	*	0.0024	0.9954	0.9952
10 cluster	-4273.3653	15009.7648	1056	8546.7307	*	0.0015	0.9968	0.9969

Note: LL=log-likelihood; BIC=Bayesian information criterion; Npar=number of parameters; L2=likelihood ratio; P-value=significance of the model; Class.Err.=misclassification; Es=statistical entropy (entropy R-squared); R2=R squared (Standard R-squared).
*p-value not calculated by negative degrees of freedom (df).
Tab. 2. Estimation of latent class models (source: authors' elaboration)

The main criterion to determine the most suitable model is the Bayesian information criterion (BIC). It determines the model that best fits the data with the minimum value of BIC[80]. According to this approach, the model with the best fit is the second one that identifies two segments in the sample.

To evaluate the adjustment, it is also necessary to consider other indicators that can confirm a good fit (tab. 2):
– p-value is a contrast for the hypothesis "model fitted the data"; if the ratio is less than 0.05, as in our case, the model has a good fit to the data;
– error in the estimation (Class. Err) is low (3.56%);
– number of parameters (Npar) is not very high (160);
– the indicators Es (0.87) and R2 (0.90) are the lowest, even if they are close to 1.

---

[80] Vermunt, Magidson 2002.

The next step that was carried out to validate the segmentation was to analyze the p-value associated with the Wald statistic (tab. 3). Values lower than 0.05 confirm that the chosen indicators significantly discriminate between identified latent classes[81]. This situation is verified for all the indicators of our segmentation.

		Pragmatic Segment 1	Expert Segment 2	Wald	p-value
Size (%)		54.75	45.25		
Indicators					
Overall perception	Not at all	0.0406	0.0006	48.3072	3.6e-12*
	2	0.0630	0.0033		
	3	0.1810	0.0345		
	4	**0.4546**	0.3129		
	Highly	0.2607	**0.6487**		
Relationship to photography	Professional photographer	0.0307	0.0496	4.7124	0.030*
	Passionate about photography	0.3221	**0.4005**		
	Occasional hobby	**0.3787**	0.3629		
	No particular interest	0.2019	0.1492		
	Other	0.0665	0.0379		
Quality of photographs	Very poor	0.0322	0.0008	27.5748	1.5e-7*
	Poor	0.0310	0.0021		
	Acceptable	0.0953	0.0185		
	Good	0.3184	0.1741		
	Excellent	**0.5230**	**0.8045**		
Quality of setting	Very poor	0.0324	0.0001	62.8339	2.2e-15*
	Poor	0.0799	0.0016		
	Acceptable	0.2015	0.0218		
	Good	**0.4406**	0.2492		
	Excellent	0.2455	**0.7272**		
Quality of spaces	Very poor	0.0449	0.0001	59.3149	1.3e-14*
	Poor	0.1368	0.0028		
	Acceptable	0.3244	0.0484		
	Good	**0.4331**	**0.4694**		
	Excellent	0.0609	**0.4793**		

[81] Vermunt, Magidson 2005.

Quality of cleaning	Very poor	0.0124	0.0000	67.6475	2.0e-16*
	Poor	0.0123	0.0001		
	Acceptable	0.1317	0.0053		
	Good	**0.5637**	0.1909		
	Excellent	0.2800	**0.8038**		
Quality of staff	Very poor	0.0083	0.0000	78.4039	8.4e-19*
	Poor	0.0082	0.0000		
	Acceptable	0.1295	0.0032		
	Good	**0.5098**	0.1279		
	Excellent	0.3443	**0.8688**		
Quality of relaxation areas	Very poor	0.0170	0.0000	59.2559	1.4e-14*
	Poor	0.0672	0.0012		
	Acceptable	0.3798	0.0509		
	Good	**0.4817**	**0.5041**		
	Excellent	0.0543	0.4438		
Quality of toilet	Very poor	0.0249	0.0001	50.2282	1.4e-12*
	Poor	0.0196	0.0004		
	Acceptable	0.3006	0.0411		
	Good	**0.5701**	**0.4938**		
	Excellent	0.0848	0.4646		
Quality of bookshop	Very poor	0.0173	0.0000	68.7198	1.1e-16*
	Poor	0.0386	0.0003		
	Acceptable	0.3226	0.0272		
	Good	**0.5518**	0.4420		
	Excellent	0.0697	**0.5304**		
Quality of opening hours	Very poor	0.0087	0.0000	50.0626	1.5e-12*
	Poor	0.0639	0.0016		
	Acceptable	0.2344	0.0323		
	Good	**0.5593**	0.4199		
	Excellent	0.1337	**0.5461**		
Quality-price ratio	Very poor	0.0376	0.0000	78.2340	9.2e-19*
	Poor	0.0708	0.0003		
	Acceptable	0.2690	0.0134		
	Good	**0.4759**	0.2396		
	Excellent	0.1467	**0.7466**		

Note: *p<0.05

Tab. 3. Visitor profiles through indicators (source: authors' elaboration)

According to the covariate variables (tab. 4), from the variables used to characterize the segments, the chi-square statistic was found to be significant only in six cases: in two items of the variable "motivation for visiting the exhibition" (Follow the artist; Live an experience), two items in "motivation for visiting the city of Perugia" (Visit the historical, cultural, natural and gastronomic heritage; Relax, leisure, shopping), one item in "future behavior" (Recommend this exhibition) and one item in "hobbies and free-time activities" (Sport and fitness). This means that only these six items discriminate well between the individuals of our sample, and thus the values taken for each segment are different. For all other items, there were no significant differences among the identified segments.

		Pragmatic Segment 1	Expert Segment 2	λ^2	Sig.
Size (%)		54.75	45.25		
Covariates					
Gender	Male	0.5977	0.4023	1.2673	0.26
	Female	0.5158	0.4842		
Age	18-25	0.4480	0.5520	0.8142	0.37
	26-45	0.6565	0.3435		
	46-65	0.5291	0.4709		
	> 65	0.3106	0.6894		
Education level	Compulsory education	0.5185	0.4815	0.0027	0.96
	Diploma	**0.5136**	0.4864		
	Degree	**0.5761**	0.4239		
Monthly income	Less than 1.000 €	0.4783	**0.5217**	0.0368	0.85
	1.001-1.500 €	**0.6773**	0.3227		
	1.501-2.000 €	0.4311	**0.5689**		
	More than 2.000 €	**0.5805**	0.4195		
Previous experience	I do not know the artist	**0.5625**	0.4375	1.1067	0.29
	I already know the artist	**0.5419**	0.4581		
	I have attended previously	**0.5407**	0.4593		
Length of stay in Perugia	One day (no overnight stay)	**0.5656**	0.4344	0.9036	0.34
	2 days	0.4795	**0.5205**		
	3 days	0.3930	**0.6070**		
	4 or more days	**0.5897**	0.4103		

Type of accommodation	Hotel	**0.7405**	0.2595	2.7029	0.10
	Residence	0.3333	**0.6667**		
	B&B	**0.5677**	0.4323		
	Camping	**0.5233**	0.4767		
	Second home	**0.6105**	0.3895		
	Rent	0.4914	**0.5086**		
	Home of friends/relatives	0.4780	**0.5220**		
	Other	**0.8613**	0.1387		
Sources of information	Printed media	**0.5454**	0.4546	0.0117	0.91
	TV	**0.7821**	0.2179	2.4375	0.12
	Radio	**0.7617**	0.2383	0.0063	0.94
	Web	**0.5299**	0.4701	0.0043	0.95
	Social network	**0.5339**	0.4661	0.3601	0.55
	Billboards	**0.5447**	0.4553	1.4447	0.23
	Recommendations from family/friends	**0.6090**	0.3910	1.0083	0.32
	Advertising in magazines	0.4989	**0.5011**	1.9988	0.16
	Other	**0.5471**	0.4529	4.3001	0.96
Motivation for visiting the exhibition	Technique used by the artist	**0.5081**	0.4919	0.1820	0.67
	Follow the artist	0.4874	**0.5126**	4.8829	0.027*
	Discover Umbria	**0.5431**	0.4569	0.1900	0.66
	Live an experience	**0.5086**	0.4914	6.2161	0.013*
Motivation for visiting the city of Perugia	Visit the exhibition of McCurry	**0.5017**	0.4983	1.1875	0.28
	Visit the historical, cultural, natural and gastronomic heritage	0.4343	**0.5657**	5.8459	0.016*
	Relax, leisure, shopping	0.4099	**0.5901**	4.3689	0.037*
	Religion/pilgrimages	0.4682	**0.5318**	0.0000	1.00
	Business trip	**0.5959**	0.4041	1.3810	0.24
	Visit friends/relatives	**0.5979**	0.4021	0.2657	0.61
	Education and training	0.3929	**0.6071**	3.4908	0.062
	Health and medical care	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	1.00
Length of exhibition visit	Less than 30 minutes	**0.7172**	0.2828	0.0296	0.86
	From 30-60 minutes	**0.5431**	0.4569		
	From 1-2 hours	0.4215	**0.5785**		
	More than 2 hours	0.3429	**0.6571**		

People: with whom visiting the exhibition	Alone	0.4708	**0.5292**	0.1524	0.70
	Family/relatives	**0.6321**	0.3679		
	Friends	**0.5245**	0.4755		
	Organized group	**0.7272**	0.2728		
	Partner	**0.5244**	0.4756		
	Other	**1.0000**	0.0000		
Means of transport	Car/motorbike	**0.5513**	0.4487	0.1127	0.74
	Train	0.4332	**0.5668**		
	Bus	**0.6527**	0.3473		
	Airplane	0.3836	**0.6164**		
	Other	**0.5697**	0.4303		
Timing: decision for exhibition visit	Today	**0.5960**	0.4040	0.0737	0.79
	During the last week	**0.5316**	0.4684		
	I planned the visit in advance	**0.5373**	0.4627		
Future behavior	Recommend this exhibition	0.4503	**0.5497**	18.8412	1.4e-5*
	Visit a new exhibition of McCurry	**0.5010**	0.4990	0.0666	0.80
	Visit other exhibitions in Perugia	0.4175	**0.5825**	0.6380	0.42
Hobbies and free-time activities	Music	**0.5551**	0.4449	0.3391	0.56
	Theatre	**0.5752**	0.4248	0.1271	0.72
	Cinema	**0.5027**	0.4973	0.2272	0.63
	Sport and fitness	**0.6049**	0.3951	4.0475	0.044*
	Reading	**0.5281**	0.4719	0.0208	0.89
	Travel	**0.5276**	0.4724	0.0003	0.99
	Arts	0.4948	**0.5052**	0.6973	0.40
	Volunteering and social commitment	**0.5220**	0.4780	0.0001	0.99
	Shopping	**0.5661**	0.4339	0.7352	0.39
	Other	**0.5471**	0.4529	0.5631	1.00

Note: *p<0.05
Tab. 4. Visitor profiles characterized by objective variables (source: authors' elaboration)

4.2 Convergence analysis

In order to analyze the convergence of the judgments in the identified segments, we performed the variance analysis (ANOVA). This technique allows us to verify the average differences of specific variables for different groups. At the same time,

it shows the standard deviation as a measure of convergence for elements of the same group. ANOVA results (tab. 5) highlight significant differences, which indicate that the average of each aspect to each segment is significantly different.

		Average		Standard deviation		F Snedecor (sig.)
		Pragmatic Segment 1	Expert Segment 2	Pragmatic Segment 1	Expert Segment 2	
Overall perception		3.81	**4.67**	1.018	0.71	117.026 (0.000*)
Quality of the exhibition	Quality of photographs	4.29	**4.78**	0.992	0.415	40.703 (0.000*)
	Setting	3.84	**4.69**	1.037	0.465	112.424 (0.000*)
	Spaces	3.44	**4.34**	0.996	0.647	119.323 (0.000*)
	Cleaning	4.22	**4.66**	0.798	0.484	46.027 (0.000*)
	Competence and courtesy of the staff	4.28	**4.76**	0.774	0.428	58.248 (0.000*)
	Relaxation areas	3.55	**4.38**	0.838	0.519	137.825 (0.000*)
	Toilet	3.72	**4.41**	0.813	0.507	88.585 (0.000*)
	Bookshop	3.69	**4.48**	0.805	0.512	136.703 (0.000*)
	Opening hours	3.83	**4.45**	0.872	0.510	70.701 (0.000*)
	Adequacy of quality/price ratio	3.74	**4.65**	1.023	0.480	126.203 (0.000*)
Satisfaction	This is one of the best exhibitions I could have visited	2.78	**3.85**	1.039	0.734	143.323 (0.000*)
	I am satisfied with this experience	3.77	**4.51**	0.956	0.501	95.596 (0.000*)
	The photos were good but the quality of services was not adequate	**2.29**	1.96	0.922	1.057	11.983 (0.001*)
	The photos are too few to justify an exhibition	**2.50**	2.02	1.030	1.008	23.758 (0.000*)

Note: *p<0.05
Tab. 5. ANOVA results (source: authors' elaboration)

5. *Results and discussion*

As a result of the segmentation based on the overall visitors' perception of the exhibition, their relationship with photography, and the perceived quality of the exhibition, two segments were identified: Pragmatics and Experts. As shown in table 2, the two clusters were quite similar in segments, size. The Pragmatics represented 54.75% of our sample, whereas the Experts were 45.25%. The Pragmatics group included visitors aged between 26 and 65 years old and the Experts cluster was composed of younger and older visitors. Considering generation profiles, the Experts include Generation Z and Baby Boomers. The first one refers to the demographic of people born after the Millennials, technically proficient and computer literate. The second ones regard the populace born during the boom of post-war in the mid-century. The Pragmatics mainly comprise Millennials, the first generation to come of age in the new millennium and with a relevant exposure to modern technology, and Generation X, born between the early-to-mid 1960s to the early 1980s.

The Experts had the highest overall perception regarding the exhibition; in average, they rated it with 4.61 points out of 5, in contrast with 3.83 in the case of Pragmatics. In fact, 96.16% of Experts expressed their appreciation, and highly rated the exhibition. The majority of Experts (64.87%) evaluated the exhibition very highly (5 points out of 5). In contrast, only 26.07% of the Pragmatics rated the exhibition with 5, and the majority of the Pragmatics (45.46%) evaluated the exhibition with 4 points out of 5. The Pragmatics were found to have a more distributed opinion compared to the Experts.

Regarding the respondents' relationship to photography, Experts had a stronger relationship than the Pragmatics. Most of the Experts are passionate about photography (40.05%), 36.29% considered photography as an occasional hobby, 14.92% had no particular interest in photography, and 4.96% were professional photographers. In contrast, most of the Pragmatics consider photography as an occasional hobby (37.87%), 32.21% were passionate about photography, 20.19% had no particular interest in photography, and only 3.07% were professional photographers. As such, the identification of Experts and Pragmatics could be considered similar to the dated differentiation of cultural events' visitors by Spielberg[82], in "culturally attached to another main motivation" and "culturally attracted tourist".

In line with the above, the Experts spent more time than the Pragmatics visiting the exhibition (tab. 3), so the familiarity with the event increased the engagement of visitors. Furthermore, the Experts provided less indications than the Pragmatics with regards to the different free time activities, except for art.

In general, as highlighted in table 4, the Experts perceived more positively (higher evaluation) the quality of the exhibition compared to Pragmatics, based

---

[82] Spielberg 1995.

on the perceived quality of the photographs, setting, spaces, cleaning, staff, relaxation areas, toilet, bookshop, opening hours and quality-price ratio.

In general, the Pragmatics evaluated the quality of the exhibition based on the aforementioned specific aspects as good, whereas the Experts rated it as excellent. Both visitor segments expressed their appreciation for the quality of the photographs as excellent, and for the relaxation and toilet areas as good.

In addition to these variables used for the segmentation, the two segments were analyzed considering other variables, as shown in table 3. However, most of these characteristics do not significantly differentiate the two segments.

Among the significant results, one of the motivations for visiting the exhibition was following the artist, which was the most important for the Experts' cluster. In contrast, Pragmatics attributed more importance to other motivations, such as discovering Umbria, living the experience and observing the photography techniques used by the artist.

Furthermore, the Experts who do not live in the province of Perugia mostly attributed their visit to the city of Perugia to the following motivations: education and training, relaxation, leisure and shopping, visiting the historical, cultural, natural and gastronomic heritage and religion/pilgrimages. In contrast, the Pragmatics declared visiting friends and relatives and business trips as their main primary and secondary motivations.

Based on their relationship with photography, Pragmatics included visitors who were more willing to visit a new McCurry exhibition. On the other hand, Experts included visitors who were more willing to recommend the exhibition and to visit other exhibitions in Perugia.

Moreover, it was found that Pragmatics use more sources of information than Experts, especially with regard to printed media, TV, radio, web, social networks, billboards, recommendations from family/friends and others. With regard to magazines advertisement as information source, the difference between the two clusters was not found to be high, even though it was slightly higher for the Experts.

The majority of Experts visited the exhibition alone, whereas Pragmatics were generally accompanied by other visitors, especially tour group members or family members. In particular, it seems that the Experts arrived in Perugia by airplane and train, while the Pragmatics mainly arrived by car, motorbike and bus.

Experts include visitors who had an average length of stay in Perugia (52.05% of those who choose 2 days and 60.70% of those who choose 3 days are Experts), while the Pragmatics had the shortest and the longest stays in Perugia (56.56% of those who choose 1 day and 58.97% of those who choose 4 or more days are Pragmatics). In general, Experts preferred types of accommodation with fewer services (e.g., residences, rental homes, staying at relatives and friends). Pragmatics preferred types of accommodation that offer more services, such as hotels and B&B, or alternative types of accommodation such as camping or second homes.

As a result of the convergence analysis, the Pragmatics segment presents the lowest appreciation and lowest convergence regarding overall perception.

In terms of perceived quality of the exhibition, Pragmatics had the lowest appreciation for all the aspects (quality of photographs, setting, spaces, cleaning, staff, relaxation areas, toilet, bookshop, opening hours and adequacy of quality/price ratio) and the lowest convergence.

The satisfaction with the experience was higher among Experts, and Experts also had a more convergent opinion. Experts agreed that the exhibition "Sensational Umbria" was one of the best exhibitions they had ever visited. This judgement is more convergent with the opinion of the Pragmatics.

The item measuring the perceived quality of photos and inadequacy of services highlights that the Experts disagreed more than the Pragmatics, even if the convergence was higher between Pragmatics.

Finally, the item measuring the perceived quantity of exhibited photos shows that the Experts disagreed more than the Pragmatics, and the convergence was slightly higher than Pragmatics. Similar evidence has been observed by other scholars[83], suggesting that individuals who are less expert on a specific matter express less convergence in judgements.

Comparing the results with previous segmentations carried out in the Umbria Region[84], segments profiles are quite diversified. In the case of the Spoleto Festival[85], two groups of visitors have been identified, Enthusiasts and Moderates, on the basis of behavioral, motivational, and demographic characteristics. Regarding the Umbria Jazz Festival[86], two clusters have been highlighted: out-of-region and Umbria Region visitors, based on differentiating motivations, demographic and event behavior characteristics.

6. Conclusions

The study aimed primarily to underline the importance of segmentation in cultural events for supporting event management and tourism planning. However, besides the traditional segmentation of the destination visitors, it is necessary to develop a specific approach capable of using the most relevant variables and criteria.

When segmenting cultural events visitors, existing studies have mostly focused on socio-demographic characteristics and behavioral intentions, while neglecting psychographic variables such as visitors' perceptions of the event and

---

[83] Warnick, Bojanic 2010.
[84] Formica, Uysal 1995, 1998.
[85] Formica, Uysal 1998.
[86] Formica, Uysal 1995.

their satisfaction. The study contributes to fill this gap in the literature and it would represent an improvement since these variables are considered as the best to explain the behavior and differences among the visitors. This allows to identify which ones are the closest to the offer of the destination/event, in order to optimize the promotion and branding strategies. In the research, focused on a sample of 455 people, visitors have been segmented based on psychographic variables, such as visitors' general perception of the exhibition and related quality. We have also used the variable relationship with photography in terms of competency. This was done by using a latent class approach, a methodology that identifies the subtypes of related cases. The results identify two different types of visitors: pragmatics and experts. These segments of visitors seem to be influenced differently by their level of competence in photography and not to be convergent in the evaluations on the exhibition.

The Pragmatics segment represents visitors who do not have a close relationship with photography, and who attributed their visit to visiting the city as their main motivation, with the intention of discovering the Umbria region. Thus, visiting the exhibition was presumed to represent a complementary activity for this cluster of individuals.

The second segment was composed by Experts, who have a strong relationship with photography. Generally, they visited the exhibition on their own, and declared a willingness to recommend the exhibition and to visit other events in Perugia. Even though the Experts do not represent the greatest segment, they showed a better appreciation of the exhibition and have a higher convergence of opinion.

The contribution of this study to the existing literature lies in focusing on psychographic characteristics when conducting a segmentation in culture-based tourism, confirming that these are reliable segmentation variables. The variables used in the study should be considered as an effective measure of visitors' overall evaluation of their experience of participating in an exhibition, festival or other cultural event. In this context, the latent classes analysis offers an element of originality.

The implications for policymakers and event managers are related to the necessity of segmenting visitors in order to identify different tourist evaluations and perceptions. Strategic segmentation plays an important role in tourism development policies; however, it is often limited by technical difficulties and the lack of skills on the part of the events and exhibitions organizers. Consequently, the variables chosen are always and only of a purely geographic and socio-demographic nature, and often do not identify the key factors underlying satisfaction and perception of quality. This research could allow policymakers and destination marketers to identify target segments and market opportunities more effectively, and to achieve the highest engagement by tourists.

At the same time, the identification of market segments would lead to further advantages, such as the optimization of marketing resources deriving from the control of promotional communication that is more targeted.

With this regard, the Experts segment represents an interesting target segment because its members stay for an average length of time, showing opportunities for extending stays in cultural tourism destinations. In fact, if destinations focused on attracting this type of visitors and then on offering more cultural activities, they could benefit from visitors' longer stays. In addition, it would be advisable to design promotion actions that reflect the characteristics of this target segment, even though few characteristics discriminate well between the two segments.

Despite the contribution provided to the current literature, the study presents several limitations. Firstly, a random sampling process was conducted. A probability sampling could have provided us with a better representation of the visitors. Secondly, the response rate is low as 1.08% of visitors have been interviewed. Thirdly, few variables which were used as covariates significantly discriminated among groups; it means that the two segments are not different in many of the variables chosen as covariates. Finally, the data collection and analysis also included visitors who are residents in Perugia (34.29%), which has been previously done by existing research, as noted by Tkaczynski and Rundle-Thiele[87] in reviewing more than one-hundred contributions on event segmentation. However, this may be interesting to replicate the study in different international locations in order to investigate the possible influence of country-specific factors in cultural events.

References / Riferimenti bibliografici

Akhoondnejad A. (2016), *Tourist loyalty to a local cultural event: The case of Turkmen handicrafts festival*, «Tourism Management», n. 52, pp. 468-477, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.027>.

Baez-Montenegro A., Devesa-Fernandez M. (2017), *Motivation, satisfaction and loyalty in the case of a film festival: differences between local and non-local participants*, «Journal of Cultural Economics», 41, n. 2, pp. 173-195, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-017-9292-2>.

Barić D., Anić P., Bedoya A.M. (2016), *Segmenting protected area visitors by activities: A case study in Paklenica National Park, Croatia*, «European Journal of Tourism Research», n. 13, pp. 103-121.

Beesley L. (2005), *The potential role of cultural tourism on the Gold Coast*, Gold Coast: Cooperative Research Centre for Sustainable Tourism.

Beh A., Bruyere B.L. (2007), *Segmentation by visitor motivation in three Kenyan national reserves*, «Tourism Management», 28, n. 6, pp. 1464-1471, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.01.010>.

Bellini N. (2004), *Territorial governance and area image*, «Symphonya.

---

[87] Tkaczynski, Rundle-Thiele 2011.

Emerging Issues in Management», n. 1, pp. 14-26, <https://doi.org/10.4468/2004.1.03bellini>.

Berridge G. (2010), *Event pitching: The role of design and creativity*, «International Journal of Hospitality Management», n. 29, pp. 208-215, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.016>.

Bimonte S. (2008), *Park visitors vs beach tourists a comparative study in an Italian coastal region*, «European Journal of Tourism Research», 1, n. 2, pp. 112-127.

Bracalente B., Chirieleison C., Cossignani M., Ferrucci L., Gigliotti M., Ranalli M.G. (2011), *The economic impact of cultural events: the Umbria Jazz music festival*, «Tourism Economics», 17, n. 6, pp. 1235-1255, <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2011.0096>.

Bracalente B., Ferrucci L. (2009), *Eventi culturali e sviluppo economico locale. Dalla valutazione d'impatto alle implicazioni di policy in alcune esperienze umbre*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Brida J.G., Bukstein D., Garrido N., Tealde E. (2012), *Cruise passengers' expenditure in the Caribbean port of call of Cartagena de Indias: a cross-section data analysis*, «Tourism Economics», 18, n. 2, pp. 431-447, <https://doi.org/10.5367/te.2012.0115>.

Brida J.G., Disegna M., Osti L. (2013), *The effect of authenticity on tourists' expenditure at cultural events*, «Current Issues in Tourism», n. 16, pp. 266-285, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2012.674105>.

Calantone R.J., Johar J.S. (1984), *Seasonal segmentation of the tourism market using a benefit segmentation framework*, «Journal of Travel Research», 23, n. 2, pp. 14-24, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758402300203>.

Carmichael B.A. (2002), *Global competitiveness and special events in cultural tourism: the example of the Barnes Exhibit at the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto*, «Canadian Geographer», 46, n. 4, p. 310, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0064.2002.tb00753.x>.

Caroli M., Valentino A. (2016), *Does recurrence matter? The impact of music festivals on local tourist competitiveness*, in *Tourism in the city – towards an integrative agenda on urban tourism*, edited by N. Bellini, C. Pasquinelli, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 221-234.

Cervantes M., González A., Muñiz D. (1999), *La segmentación del Mercado de los turistas de destinos de interior en la comercialización turística*, II Congreso de Turismo, Universidad y Empresa, Benicassim: Tirant Lo Blanch.

Chalip L., McGuirty J. (2004), *Bundling sport events with the host destination*, «Journal of Sport & Tourism», 9, n. 3, pp. 267-282, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1477508042000320241>.

Cordell V.V. (1997), *Consumer knowledge measures as predictors in product evaluation*, «Psychology & Marketing», 14, n. 3, pp. 241-260, <https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6793(199705)14:3<241::AID-MAR3>3.0.CO;2-B>.

Cordente M. (2011), *Competitiveness and image of cultural tourism destinations:*

a longitudinal analysis, PHD thesis, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain.

Cordente M., Mondéjar J.A., Villanueva J.J. (2014), *Sustainability of nature: The power of the type of visitors*, «Environmental Engineering and Management Journal», 13, n. 10, pp. 2437-2447, <https://doi.org/10.30638/eemj.2014.273>.

Correia A., Oliveira N., Silva F. (2009), *Bridging perceived destination image and market segmentation-n application to golf tourism*, «European Journal of Tourism Research», 2, n. 1, pp. 41-69.

Crask M.R. (1981), *Segmenting the vacationer market: Identifying the vacation preferences, demographics, and magazine readership of each group*, «Journal of Travel Research», 20, n. 2, pp. 29-34, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758102000205>.

Crowther P. (2010), *Strategic application of events*, «International Journal of Hospitality Management», 29, n. 2, pp. 227-235, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.10.014>.

Davis F.D. (1989), *Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use and user acceptance of Information Technology*, «MIS Quarterly», 13, n. 3, pp. 319-340, <https://doi.org/10.2307/249008>.

Del Chiappa G., Sini L., Atzeni M. (2020), *A motivation-based segmentation of Italian Airbnb users: an exploratory mixed method approach*, «European Journal of Tourism Research», n. 25, pp. 1-20.

Della Lucia M. (2013), *Economic performance measurement system for event planning and investment decision making*, «Tourism Management», n. 34, pp. 91-100, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.03.016>.

Devesa M., Laguna M., Palacios A. (2010), *The role of motivation in visitor satisfaction: Empirical evidence in rural tourism*, «Tourism Management», 31, n. 4, pp. 547-552, <https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.006>.

Diaz-Martin A.M., Iglesias V., Vazquez R., Ruiz A.V. (2000), *The use of quality expectations to segment a service market*, «Journal of Services Marketing», 14, n. 2, pp. 132-146, <https:// doi.org/10.1108/08876040010320957>.

Díaz-Pérez F.M., Bethencourt-Cejas M., Álvarez-González J.A. (2005), *The segmentation of Canary Island tourism markets by expenditure: implications for tourism policy*, «Tourism Management», 26, n. 6, pp. 961-964, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2004.06.009>.

Dolničar S. (2002), *A review of data-driven market segmentation in tourism*, «Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing», 12, n. 1, pp. 1-22, <https:// doi.org/10.1300/J073v12n01_01>.

Dolničar S. (2004), *Beyond "commonsense segmentation": A systematics of segmentation approaches in tourism*, «Journal of Travel Research», 42, n. 3, pp. 244-250, <https:// doi.org/10.1177/0047287503258830>.

Dolničar S. (2005), *Empirical market segmentation: What you see is what you get*, in *Global tourism the next decade*, 3rd ed., edited by W.F. Theobold, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 309-325.

Dolničar S. (2008), *Market segmentation in tourism*, in *Tourism Management: Analysis, Behaviour and Strategy*, edited by A.G. Woodside, D. Martin, Cambridge: CAB International, pp. 129-150.

Duran E., Hamarat B. (2014), *Festival attendees' motivations: the case of international Troia festival*, «International Journal of Event and Festival Management», 5, n. 2, pp. 146-163, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-07-2012-0020>.

Echtner C.M., Ritchie J.R.B. (1991), *The meaning and measurement of destination image*, «The Journal of Tourism Studies», 2, n. 2, pp. 1-12.

Ferrucci L., Sarti S., Splendiani S., Rodríguez M.C. (2017), *Enhancing the tourism image of Italian regions through urban events: The case of Steve McCurry's sensational Umbria Exhibition*, in *Tourism in the City*, Cham: Springer, pp. 235-245.

Figini P., Vici L. (2012), *Off-season tourists and the cultural offer of a mass-tourism destination: The case of Rimini*, «Tourism Management», 33, n. 4, pp. 825-839, <https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.09.005>.

Formica S., Uysal M. (1995), *A market segmentation of festival visitors: Umbria Jazz Festival in Italy*, «Festival Management and Event Tourism», 3, n. 4, pp. 175-182, <https://doi.org/ 10.3727/106527095792232523>.

Formica S., Uysal M. (1998), *Market segmentation of an international cultural-historical event in Italy*, «Journal of Travel Research», n. 36, pp. 16-24, <htpps://doi.org/ 10.1177/004728759803600402>.

Freire N.A. (2011), *Sensitive Sensory Tourism (SST): a Proposal for Spain*, in *Renovation of Tourist Consolidated Destinations*, edited by D. López, Valencia: Tirant Lo Blanch, pp. 661-680.

Frochot I. (2005), *A benefit segmentation of tourists in rural areas: a Scottish perspective*, «Tourism Management», 26, n. 3, pp. 335-346, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.11.016>.

Frochot I., Morrison A.M. (2000), *Benefit segmentation: A review of its applications to travel and tourism research*, «Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing», 9, n. 4, pp. 21-45, <https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v09n04_02>.

Fruet-Cardozo J.V., Perez-Galvez J.C., Jara-Alba C., Gomez-Casero G. (2019), *36th Cordoba guitar festival: spectator analysis using structural equation modelling (SEM)*, «Sustainability», 11, n. 3, 826.

Getz D. (1991), *Festivals, special events, and tourism*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Getz D. (1997), *Event management and event tourism*, New York: Cognizant.

Getz D. (2008), *Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research*, «Tourism Management», 29, n. 3, pp. 403-428, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.07.017>.

Getz D., Page S.J. (2016), *Progress and prospects for event tourism research*, «Tourism Management», n. 52, pp. 593-631, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.03.007>.

Gomez-Casero G., Jara Alba C.A., Lopez-Guzman T., Pérez Galvez J.C. (2020), *Theatre festival as a tourist attraction: a case study of Almagro International Classical Theatre Festival, Spain*, «International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research», 14, n. 4, pp. 599-617, <htpps://doi.org/ 10.1108/ ijcthr-04-2019-0061>.

González Reverté F. (2010), *La celebración de eventos en Cataluña y su uso turístico / The organization of events for tourism purposes*, «Anales de Geografía de la Universidad Complutense», 30, n. 2, pp. 107-131.

Goodall B., Cooper C.P. (1991), *Understanding holiday choice*, «Progress in tourism, recreation and hospitality management», n. 3, pp. 58-77.

Grande F.A., Vallejo M.C., Moya D. (2002), *Análisis de las expectativas de la oferta y la demanda relativas a la calidad del Servicio en zonas turísticas de interior: implicaciones de gestión*, «Estudios Turísticos», n. 154, pp. 79-112.

Gregori G.L., Pencarelli T., Splendiani S., Temperini V. (2013), *Sustainable tourism and value creation for the territory: towards a holistic model of event impact measurement*, «Calitatea», 14, n. 135, pp. 97-102.

Grubb E.L., Grathwohl H.L. (1967), *Consumer self-concept and market behavior: A theoretical approach*, «Journal of Marketing», n. 31, pp. 22-27, <https:// doi.org/10.2307/1249461>.

Hede A.M., Jago L., Deery M. (2005), *Segmentation of special event attendees using personal values: Relationships with satisfaction and behavioural intentions*, «Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism», 5, n. 2-4, pp. 33-55, <https://doi.org/10.1300/J162v05n02_03>.

Hernández-Mogollón J.M., Folgado-Fernández J.A., Oliveira P.A. (2014), *Event tourism analysis and state of the art*, «European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation», 5, n. 2, pp. 83-102.

Herrero L.C. (2000), *El patrimonio histórico o la riqueza de las regions*, in *Turismo cultural: el patrimonio histórico como Fuente de riqueza*, Valladolid: Fundación del Patrimonio Histórico de Castilla y León, pp. 11-21.

Huang S., Choi H.S.C. (2017), *Understanding Canadian and US tourists: a self-concept based segmentation study*, «European Journal of Tourism Research», n. 16, pp. 201-213.

Ignatov E., Smith S. (2006), *Segmenting Canadian culinary tourists*, «Current Issues in Tourism», 9, n. 3, pp. 235-255, <https://doi.org/10.2167/cit/229.0>.

Kang S.K., Hsu C.H., Wolfe K. (2003), *Family traveler segmentation by vacation decision-making patterns*, «Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research», 27, n. 4, pp. 448-469, <https://doi.org/10.1177/10963480030274005>.

Khodadady E., Natanzi M. (2012), *Designing and validating a scale measuring cultural capitals of Irian University Students Majoring in English*, «Theory and Practice in Language Studies», 2, n. 8, pp. 1627-1634.

Kim J., Wei S., Ruys H. (2003), *Segmenting the market of West Australian senior tourists using an artificial neural network*, «Tourism Management», 24, n. 1, pp. 25-34, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(02)00050-X>.

Kozak M. (2002), *Comparative analysis of tourist motivations by nationality and destinations*, «Tourism Management», 23, n. 3, pp. 221-232, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00090-5>.

Laguna M., Palacios A. (2009), *La calidad percibida como determinante de tipologías de clients y su relación con la satisfacción: Aplicación a los servicios hoteleros*, «Revista Europea de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa», 18, n. 3, pp. 189-212.

Laws E. (1995), *Tourism destination management. Issues analysis and policies*, London: Routledge.

Lazzeroni M., Bellini N., Cortesi G., Loffredo A. (2013), *The territorial approach to cultural economy: new opportunities for the development of small towns*, «European Planning Studies», 21, n. 4, pp. 452-472, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2012.722920>.

Lee C.K., Lee Y.K., Wicks B.E. (2004), *Segmentation of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction*, «Tourism Management», 25, n. 1, pp. 61-70, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00060-8>.

Lee S.Y., Petrick J.F., Crompton J. (2007), *The roles of quality and intermediary constructs in determining festival attendees' behavioral intention*, «Journal of Travel Research», 45, n. 4, pp. 402-412, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287507299566>.

Legohérel P., Hsu C.H., Daucé B. (2015), *Variety-seeking: Using the CHAID segmentation approach in analyzing the international traveler market*, «Tourism Management», n. 46, pp. 359-366, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.07.011>.

Li M., Huang Z., Cai L.A. (2009), *Benefit segmentation of visitors to a rural community-based festival*, «Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing», 26, n. 5-6, pp. 585-598, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548400903163152>.

López-Sánchez Y., Pulido-Fernández J.I. (2016), *In search of the pro-sustainable tourist: A segmentation based on the tourist "sustainable intelligence"*, «Tourism Management Perspectives», n. 17, pp. 59-71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2015.12.003>.

Lynch M., Duinker P.N., Sheehan L.R., Chute J.E., (2011), *The demand for Mi'kmaw cultural tourism: Tourists perspectives*, «Tourism Management», 32, n. 5, pp. 977-986, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.08.009>.

Markusen A., Gadwa A. (2010), *Arts and culture in urban or regional planning: A review and research agenda*, «Journal of planning education and research», 29, n. 3, pp. 379-391, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X09354380>.

Mazanec J. (2000), *Market segmentation*, in *Encyclopedia of Tourism*, edited by J. Jafari, London: Routledge, p. 525.

McKercher B., Du Cros H. (2002), *Cultural Tourism. The partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*, New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press.

Molera L., Albaladejo I.P. (2007), *Profiling segments of tourists in rural areas of*

South-Eastern Spain, «Tourism Management», 28, n. 3, pp. 757-767, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2006.05.006>.

Monga M. (2006), *Measuring motivation to volunteer for special events*, «Event Management», n. 10, pp. 47-61, <https://doi.org/10.3727/152599506779364633>.

Nicolau J.L. (2002), *Assessing new hotel openings through an event study*, «Tourism Management», 23, n. 1, pp. 47-54, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00062-0>.

Oom do Valle P., Mendes J., Guerreiro M. (2010), *Sustainable cultural events based on marketing segmentation: The case of Faro capital of culture*, «PASOS, Revista de Turismo y Patrimonio Cultural», 8, n. 3, pp. 91-104.

Paker N., Vural C.A. (2016), *Customer segmentation for marinas: Evaluating marinas as destinations*, «Tourism Management», n. 56, pp. 156-171, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.03.024>.

Palacio V. (1997), *Identifying ecotourists in Belize through benefit segmentation: A preliminary analysis*, «Journal of Sustainable Tourism», 5, n. 3, pp. 234-243, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589708667288>.

Park D.B., Yoon Y.S. (2009), *Segmentation by motivation in rural tourism: A Korean case study*, «Tourism Management», 30, n. 1, pp. 99-108, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.03.011>.

Parsons E., Maclaran P. (2009), *Contemporary issues in marketing and consumer behavior*, Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

Pencarelli T., Conti E., Splendiani S. (2017), *The experiential offering system of museums: evidence from Italy*, «Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development», 7, n. 4, pp. 430-448, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCHMSD-02-2017-0009>.

Perdue R. (1996), *Target market selection and marketing strategy: the Colorado downhill skiing industry*, «Journal of Travel Research», 34, n. 4, pp. 39-46, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759603400406>.

Picón E., Lévy J.P., Voces C. (2006), *Modelización con variables latentes y mezclas finitas*, in *Modelización con estructuras de covarianzas en ciencias sociales: temas esenciales, avanzados y aportaciones especiales*, edited by J.P. Lévy, J. Varela, London: Netbiblo, pp. 419-449.

Prentice R., Andersen V. (2003), *Festival as creative destination*, «Annals of Tourism Research», 30, n. 1, pp. 7-30, <https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(02)00034-8>.

Preuss H., Seguin B., O'reilly N. (2007), *Profiling major sport event visitors: The 2002 Commonwealth Games*, «Journal of Sport Tourism», 12, n. 1, pp. 5-23, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14775080701496719>.

Pulido-Fernández J.I., Sánchez-Rivero M. (2010), *Attitudes of the cultural tourist: A latent segmentation approach*, «Journal of Cultural Economics», 34, n. 2, pp. 111-129, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-010-9115-1>.

Richards G. (2000), *Políticas y actuaciones en el campo del turismo cultural*

europeo, in *Turismo cultural: el patrimonio histórico como Fuente de riqueza*, Valladolid: Fundación del Patrimonio Histórico de Castilla y León, pp. 69-96.

Richards G. (2001), *Cultural tourists or a culture of tourism? The European cultural tourism market*, in *Innovations in cultural tourism*, Proceedings of the 5th ATLAS International Conference (Rethymnon, Crete, Greece, 1998), edited by J. Butcher, Tilburg: ATLAS, pp. 11-17.

Rid W., Ezeuduji I.O., Pröbstl-Haider U. (2014), *Segmentation by motivation for rural tourism activities in The Gambia*, «Tourism Management», n. 40, pp. 102-116, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.05.006>.

Rittichainuwat B., Mair J. (2012), *Visitor attendance motivations at consumer travel exhibitions*, «Tourism management», 33, n. 5, pp. 1236-1244, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.11.002>.

Sánchez M. (2001), *Segmentación de la población Española según su grado de concienciación ecológica mediante modelos de variables latentes*, «Investigaciones Europeas de Dirección y Economía de la Empresa», 7, n. 3, pp. 173-196.

Savinovic A., Kim S., Long P. (2012), *Audience members' motivation, satisfaction, and intention to revisit: an ethnic minority cultural festival*, «Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing», 29, n. 7, pp. 682-694, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2012.720154>.

Scott D. (1995), *A comparison of visitors' motivations to attend three urban festivals*, «Festival Management and Event Tourism», 3, n. 3, pp. 121-128.

Scott D., Thigpen J. (2003), *Understanding the birder as tourist: Segmenting visitors to the Texas Hummer/Bird Celebration*, «Human Dimensions of Wildlife», 8, n. 3, pp. 199-218, <https://doi.org/ 10.1080/10871200304311>.

Sirgy M.J. (1982), *Self-concept in consumer behaviour: A critical review*, «Journal of Consumer Research», 9, n. 3, pp. 287-300, <https://doi.org/10.1086/208924>.

Smith S., Costello C. (2009), *Segmenting visitors to a culinary event: Motivations, travel behavior, and expenditures*, «Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management», 18, n. 1, pp. 44-67, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368620801989022>.

Snelgrove R., Taks M., Chalip L., Green B.C. (2008), *How visitors and locals at a sport event differ in motives and identity*, «Journal of Sport & Tourism», 13, n. 3, pp. 165-180, <https://doi.org/ 10.1080/14775080802310215>.

Spielberg T. (1995), *Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritages sites*, «Tourism Management», 16, n. 5, pp. 361-365, <https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(95)00039-Q>.

Stokes R. (2008), *Tourism strategy making: insights to the events tourism domain*, «Tourism Management», 29, n. 2, pp. 252-262, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.03.014>.

Tkaczynski A., Rundle-Thiele S.R. (2011), *Event segmentation: A review and research agenda*, «Tourism Management», 32, n. 2, pp. 426-434, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.03.010>.

Torre A., Scarborough H. (2017), *Reconsidering the estimation of the economic impact of cultural tourism*, «Tourism Management», n. 59, pp. 621-629, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.09.018>.

Troitiño M.A., Troitiño L. (2006), *Turismo cultural y destinos patrimoniales*, in *La actividad turística española en 2006*, edited by D. López, J.I. Pulido, Castellón: Editorial Centro de Estudios Ramón Areces, pp. 631-645.

Tsiotsou R., Vasioti E. (2006), *Satisfaction: A segmentation criterion for "short term" visitors of mountainous destinations*, «Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing», 20, n. 1, pp. 61-73, <https://doi.org/10.1300/J073v20n01_05>.

Ugarte Otero X. (2007), *Imagen y posicionamiento de Galicia como destino turístico a nivel nacional e internacional*, PhD thesis, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

UNWTO (2019), *UNWTO Tourism Definitions*, Madrid: UNWTO, <https://doi.org/10.18111/9789284420858>.

Van der Ark L.A., Richards G. (2006), *Attractiveness of cultural activities in European cities: A latent class approach*, «Tourism Management», 27, n. 6, pp. 1408-1413, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.014>.

Van Raaij W.F. (1986), *Consumer research on tourism mental and behavioral constructs*, «Annals of Tourism Research», 13, n. 1, pp. 1-9, <https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(86)90054-X>.

Vermunt J.K., Magidson J. (2002), *Latent class cluster analysis*, in *Applied latent class models*, edited by J. Hagenaars, A. McCutcheon, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 89-106.

Vermunt J.K., Magidson J. (2005), *Latent Gold 4.0 user's guide*, <https://www.statisticalinnovations.com/wp-content/uploads/LGusersguide.pdf>, 07.06.2021.

Warnick R.B., Bojanic D.C. (2012), *Purchase decision involvement: Event management segments and related event behavior*, in *Proceedings of the 2010 Northeastern Recreation Research Symposium*, edited by C.L. Fisher, C.E. Jr. Watts, Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-P-94, Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station, pp. 248-256.

Wedel M., Kamakura W.A. (2000), *Market segmentation – Conceptual and methodological foundations*, 2nd ed., Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wood L., Snelgrov R., Danylchuk K. (2010), *Segmenting volunteer fundraisers at a charity sport event*, «Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing», 22, n. 1, pp. 38-54, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10495140903190408>.

Woodside A.G., Jacobs L.W. (1985), *Step Two in Benefit Segmentation: Learning the Benefits Realized by Major Travel Markets*, «Journal of Travel Research», 24, n. 1, pp. 7-13, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758502400102>.

Wu S., Chan H. (2011), *Perceived service quality and self-concept influences on consumer attitude and purchase process: A comparison between physical and internet channels*, «Total Quality Management», 22, n. 1, pp. 43-62, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2010.529645>.

Yeoman I., Robertson M., Ali-Knight J., Drummond S., McMahon-Beattie U. (2003), *Festival and events management: An international arts and culture perspective*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.