

Sustainable marketing factors : Impact on tourist satisfaction and perceived cultural tourism effects

Bašan, Lorena; Kapeš, Jelena; Brolich, Lea

Source / Izvornik: **Ekonomski vjesnik : Review of Contemporary Entrepreneurship, Business, and Economic Issues, 2021, 34, 385 - 400**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.51680/ev.34.2.11>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:191:544489>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International/Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2025-01-29**



SVEUČILIŠTE U RIJECI
FAKULTET ZA MENADŽMENT
U TURIZMU I UGOSTITELJSTVU
OPATIJA, HRVATSKA

Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management - Repository of students works of the Faculty of Tourism and Hospitality Management](#)



Lorena Bašan
University of Rijeka
Faculty of Tourism and
Hospitality Management
51410 Opatija, Croatia
lorenab@fthm.hr

Lea Brolich
University of Rijeka
Faculty of Tourism and
Hospitality Management
51410 Opatija, Croatia
lea.brolich710@gmail.com

JEL: M31
Original scientific paper
<https://doi.org/10.51680/ev.34.2.11>

Received: May 2, 2021
Accepted for publishing: July 22, 2021

Jelena Kapeš
University of Rijeka
Faculty of Tourism and
Hospitality Management
51410 Opatija, Croatia
jelena.kapes@fthm.hr

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0
International License



SUSTAINABLE MARKETING FACTORS: IMPACT ON TOURIST SATISFACTION AND PERCEIVED CULTURAL TOURISM EFFECTS

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This paper discusses tourists' attitudes towards sustainable marketing factors in the context of cultural tourism. It aims to examine the influence of tourists' attitudes on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience and perceived ecological, social, and economic effects and their impact on satisfaction.

Methodology: The survey was conducted in Croatia in 2020 on a sample of 205 domestic tourists. Based on previous research, two sets of marketing items were defined: items closely related to sustainability (CRS) and items not closely related to sustainability (NCRS). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to extract factors, followed by Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the factors' impact on satisfaction and perceived cultural tourism effects.

Results: The results of factor analysis generated two CRS factors (*Sustainable destination policies, Propensity for sustainable behaviour*) and two NCRS factors (*Respect for cultural heritage, Servicescape*). The two CRS factors and the factor *Respect for cultural heritage* have a statistically significant influence on overall satisfaction. Moreover, the results imply that *Propensity for sustainable behaviour* and *Respect for cultural heritage* positively contribute to overall satisfaction. Among all the observed factors, only *Sustainable destination policy* does not significantly influence any perceived cultural tourism effects. In contrast, the perceived socio-cultural and economic effects have a positive influence on tourist satisfaction.

Conclusion: The research results underpin the influence of sustainable marketing factors on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience and perceived tourism effects and their impact on satisfaction. The findings provide new insights into marketing theory and guidelines for marketing managers regarding sustainability in cultural tourism.

Keywords: Sustainable marketing factors, tourist satisfaction, cultural tourism effects

1. Introduction

Given the expansion of tourism in general, the growth of cultural tourism is predicted to continue in the future (Richards, 2018). Because of the complexity of culture itself, the exact share of cultural tourism cannot be determined, but the estimates say that between 50% and 80% of all travels include some element of cultural motivation (Timothy, 2011). Moreover, according to Europa Nostra (2021), approximately 40% of all European tourism is driven by culture.

Due to various positive implications, cultural tourism is considered a desirable direction for destination development (Artal-Tur, 2018; Su et al., 2019). However, its growing popularity causes some negative consequences in terms of the physical transformation of heritage sites (Caserta & Ruso, 2002). According to Moliner et al. (2019), such growth has a negative impact on the environment despite its great benefits to the economy. Thus, environmental sustainability in tourism has become one of the main concerns that has been addressed by many researchers so far (Moliner et al., 2019; Moise et al., 2018; Goffi et al., 2019).

In response to various environmental and socio-economic problems, scholars suggest for cultural destinations to raise their sustainability awareness and to implement new responsible practices (Goffi et al., 2019; Asmelash & Kumar, 2019). Principally, this means limiting the use of resources while making the best use of those available (Cooper & Wahab, 2005). Furthermore, Cuculeski et al. (2016) emphasise the need to consider the tourists' requirements and behaviour. Sustainable tourism development should thus satisfy tourists' and host regions' needs in the present, while improving opportunities to do the same in the future (Iniesta-Bonillo et al., 2016). Despite the several decades of research on tourism sustainability, its practical application is still a challenge (Mihalic, 2016). Therefore, some new research gaps can be seen in terms of the relationship between sustainable cultural tourism and tourist satisfaction (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019), sustainability marketing indicators (Pomering, 2017), or cultural tourism effects (Richards, 2018).

This paper discusses tourists' attitudes towards sustainable marketing factors in the context of cultural tourism. It observes marketing factors that closely relate to sustainability (CRS) and those that do not closely relate to sustainability (NCRS). The main purpose of the paper is to examine the influ-

ence of these factors on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience and on perceived ecological, socio-cultural, and economic effects. Additionally, it examines the influence of perceived cultural tourism effects on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. In addition to its theoretical contribution, this study draws certain practical implications for achieving sustainability in cultural tourism destinations.

The paper is structured in five main parts. The introduction is followed by the conceptual framework where the theoretical background is given and hypotheses are developed. The third section explains the methodology and is followed by a discussion of the results. The last section presents concluding remarks with suggestions for future research.

2. Conceptual framework

2.1 Sustainable marketing in cultural tourism

Conventional marketing has often faced criticism for stimulating irresponsible consumption (Font & McCabe, 2017) and thus has been considered as an opponent to sustainability (Kamper & Ballantine, 2019). As Pomering (2017) explains, one problem may be in the previous definition of marketing that was focused only on the relationship of consumers with the organisation, while neglecting other stakeholders. However, in 2013 a new definition was established by the American Marketing Association, which has directed the marketing conceptualization towards sustainability (Pomering, 2017), and nowadays marketing implies "creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large" (AMA, 2017). Sustainable marketing has emerged as an attempt to encourage organizations to accept the ecological and social limitations, as well as to value continuity over short-term profit (van Dam & Apeldoorn, 1996). According to Rakic and Rakic (2015), sustainable marketing focuses on the social goals of the entire community and on environmental protection.

When it comes to a tourist destination, sustainability has become a crucial element of differentiation that increases its competitiveness (Moral et al., 2018). However, the marketing of cultural tourism faces several sustainability issues. As Donohoe (2012) states, heritage sites have often been criticised as overly commodified, they lack stakeholder collaboration and attract mass tourists, thus overburdening the destination's infrastructure and re-

sources. He goes on to emphasize, however, that when organized properly, sustainable marketing is a beneficial tool for balancing cultural site preservation and tourists' needs. It requires the capital and commitment of all stakeholders, namely national and local governments, organizations, and people (Burkisene et al., 2018).

In the literature on sustainable marketing in tourism, destination management policy and responsible tourism demand appear to be some of the most significant topics. Researchers argue that government policy and destination management are the starting points for destination sustainability (Burkisene et al., 2018; Loulanski & Loulanski, 2018). Policies for sustainable tourism management greatly affect destination competitiveness (Goffi et al., 2019), while the value of cultural tourism often depends on the governance style (Richards, 2018). Thus, this institutional component that closely relates to sustainability (Cucculelli & Goffi, 2016) can be seen as the fourth pillar of sustainable tourism development (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019).

However, as Cucculelli and Goffi (2016) emphasize, tourism is both supply and demand-driven, and the responsible behaviour of tourists should be considered as another sustainability component. Tourists are becoming increasingly aware, which reflects on their destination choice, because the environmental quality of a destination has become one of the main decisive factors (Yaw, 2005). Research shows that, along with their growing concern for sustainability, tourists are willing to pay more for a sustainable product or service (Abzari et al., 2013). Besides the sustainability aspects of tourism demand and destination policies, the specific features related to cultural tourism should not be disregarded, such as tourist respect for cultural heritage (Chui et al., 2011) and the quality of main cultural resources and support services (Howard & Pinder, 2003).

2.2 Cultural experience and satisfaction

From a marketing perspective, a tourist is seen as a consumer who is involved in commercial exchange (Mossberg, 2007). However, unlike conventional products, when buying and consuming a cultural tourism service, tourists do not receive any tangible benefit in exchange for their money. Given that a cultural tourism service is not a material or quantifiable good, the benefits it provides are psychological and appear as a tourist experience (Sigala & Leslie, 2005). Tourist experience can be described as a subjective personal reaction felt during tourism

service consumption (Otto & Ritchie, 1996). However, experience is a very complicated psychological process, so many different definitions have emerged (Quinlan Cutler & Carmichael, 2010). Chhetri et al. (2004) state that despite many attempts to define the concept of tourist experience, there is no single theory that could encompass its broadness and complexity. Cultural experience is a vital factor for cultural tourists (Sigala & Leslie, 2005; Domínguez-Quintero et al., 2020) since tourists tend to seek a direct connection with the local history and living culture while traveling (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019).

The relationship between tourist experience and satisfaction is well-established in the literature (Domínguez-Quintero et al., 2020; Nguyen & Cheung, 2016). In the context of tourism, satisfaction can be seen as tourists' overall post-visit evaluation compared to their pre-visit expectations (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019; Gnanapala, 2015; Kotler, 1999). When post-travel experience is lower than pre-travel expectation, dissatisfaction occurs (Oliver, 1980). The utmost goal of tourism for all destinations is achieving tourist satisfaction (Zhan et al., 2018) because it positively influences tourist loyalty (Baker & Crompton, 2000; Yoon & Uysal, 2005) and revisit intention (Alegre & Cladera, 2009; Kozak & Rimmington 2000), and it is a source of competitive advantage (Bagri & Kala, 2015; De Nisco et al., 2015). Additionally, recent studies relate tourist satisfaction with sustainability practices (Asmelash & Kumar, 2019; Awang et al., 2018; Moise et al., 2018). Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: CRS marketing factors have a significant influence on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience.

2.3 Cultural tourism effects

Cultural tourism initially represented an alternative form of tourism; however, due to fast growth and increasing commodification, it has gradually turned towards mass development (Jovicic, 2014). Therefore, cultural tourism in many destinations now faces the triple bottom line (TBL) challenge (Du Cros & McKercher, 2020) or even represents a threat to sustainable development (Mousavi et al., 2016), mostly due to its negative environmental impacts (Moliner et al., 2019). Therefore, this issue has lately become of great interest for scholars and practitioners (Cerquetti & Ferrara, 2018; Su et al., 2019).

Nonetheless, various researchers associate cultural tourism with various positive implications for destinations, considering its economic, socio-cultural, and ecological dimensions (Artal-Tur et al., 2018;

Richards, 2018). Cultural tourism can enhance the quality of life of local residents and positively influence environmental preservation (Du Cros & Mc-Kercher, 2020). Moreover, multiplied income that cultural tourists generate can be used for cultural heritage preservation (Richards, 2018). Thus, heritage managers increasingly recognize that profitability and sustainability do not exclude, but complement each other (Donohoe, 2012).

There is a growing number of studies observing this issue from the residents' point of view (Muller González et al., 2018; Rasoolimanesh & Jaafar, 2017), while the perspectives of other stakeholders, such as tourists, remain understudied (Kim et al., 2019). Unlike the earlier understanding, the previous research shows that tourists are aware of economic, ecological, and social sustainability issues in destinations, and sustainability consciousness can lead to changes in their preferences (Cottrell et al., 2004; Asmelash & Kumar, 2019). Therefore, the relationship between the aforementioned sustainable marketing factors and tourist perception of cultural tourism effects should be addressed. Accordingly, the following hypotheses are defined:

H2: CRS marketing factors have a significant influence on the perceived ecological effects of cultural tourism.

H3: CRS marketing factors have a significant influence on the perceived social effects of cultural tourism.

H4: CRS marketing factors have a significant influence on the perceived economic effects of cultural tourism.

Studies show that tourist satisfaction is affected not only by tourists' awareness of sustainability but also by the perceived effects of sustainability (Iniesta-Bonillo et al., 2016). Asmelash and Kumar (2019) determined that the perception of social and economic sustainability dimensions has an influence on tourist satisfaction. Furthermore, Moliner et al. (2019) established a relationship between perceived environmental sustainability and tourist satisfaction, indirectly through the tourist experience. Based on that, the following hypothesis is defined:

H5: Perceived cultural tourism effects have a significant influence on tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience.

3. Methodology

According to the proposed hypotheses, a quantitative approach was taken. In empirical research, the

survey method was applied based on a structured questionnaire. The data were collected through the combination of a personal and online survey on Facebook. The research instrument consisted of three parts. The first part included questions about the respondents' socio-demographic profile (gender, age, level of education, employment status, and income). The second part of the questionnaire included 32 items relating to attitudes regarding the implementation of sustainable marketing in cultural tourism. Four items included in the last part of the questionnaire referred to attitudes about cultural tourism effects and satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. Respondents were asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with each statement, using a five-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = I strongly disagree to 5 = I strongly agree).

Items were collected from the previous studies of Cucculelli & Goffi, 2016; Chui et al., 2014; Chui et al., 2011 and Petrić & Ljubica, 2012. Of the 32 items included in instruments relating to sustainable marketing implementation in cultural tourism, 29 items were taken from previous research, and three new items were added (Table A.1 and Table A.2 in the Appendix). In the present study, the classification of items was implemented following Cucculelli and Goffi (2016), who classified factors as sustainability factors and factors not directly related to sustainability. Based on their findings, items were initially classified in the context of cultural tourism as marketing attributes closely related to sustainability (CRS) with 14 items and marketing attributes not closely related to sustainability (NCRS) with 18 items.

The survey was conducted in Croatia during June and July 2020 on a sample of 205 domestic tourists. We used the survey method as a combination of a personal and online survey through Facebook. This sample was chosen considering the present situation caused by the Covid-19 pandemic, where the emphasis is on tourism demand generated by domestic tourists. The sample size can be considered adequate, and it is above the recommended minimum level of at least five observations per variable (Hair et al., 2014). Data analysis was carried out using the statistical software SPSS 23. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to extract factors, followed by Principal Component Analysis (PCA). Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the obtained factors' impact on satisfaction and perceived cultural tourism effects.

4. Results and discussion

4.1 Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

The structure of respondents by gender shows there are more males (57.07%) than females (42.93%). The majority of the respondents are between 35 and 45 years of age (32.68%); 28.29% of the respondents are aged 26 to 35, and 9.76% are aged 18 to 25. Respondents over the age of 56 account for 10.15%.

More than one-half of the respondents hold graduate university degrees (58.05%), and 47% have secondary school qualifications. 87.80% of the respondents are employed, and 9.76% are students. Regarding the average monthly

income, 58.05% of the respondents earn from 5,000 to 10,000 HRK, and 27.80% earn from 3,000 to 5,000 HRK.

4.2 EFA and reliability analysis

In order to delineate perceived dimensions of marketing factors closely related to sustainability (CRS) and marketing factors not closely related to sustainability (NCRS) in cultural tourism, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and reliability analysis were performed.

The analysis results for CRS marketing factors in cultural tourism are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Results of factor and reliability analysis for marketing factors closely related to sustainability (CRS) in cultural tourism

Marketing factors closely related to sustainability (CRS)				
Item number	Item	Factor loading	Total variance explained (%)	Alpha coefficient
FACTOR 1 – Sustainable destination policy			61.297	0.935
114	It is important to me that the destination cares about the implementation of sustainable marketing in cultural tourism.	.848		
19	It is important to me that the destination monitors the effects of tourism.	.818		
18	It is important to me that the destination's public sector seeks to minimize tourism's negative social impact.	.769		
16	When choosing a destination, it's important to me that service providers apply sustainable practices.	.754		
113	It's important to me that the destination encourages alternative (sustainable) forms of transport.	.736		
17	It is important to me that the destination's public sector seeks to minimize tourism's negative environmental impact.	.723		
15	It is essential for me that the hospitality facilities I visit operate following sustainable development principles.	.694		
FACTOR 2 – Propensity for sustainable behaviour			7.752	0.907
13	I am willing to pay more for cultural tourism products if it's guaranteed the money goes to preserving the local environment.	.814		
12	I am willing to participate in sustainable cultural tourism products.	.771		
11	I am willing to pay more for sustainable cultural tourism products.	.756		
112	I want to participate in preserving the environment.	.691		
110	I try to preserve the environment even if it's more expensive and time-consuming.	.670		
14	I prefer trips that minimally damage the environment.	.638		
111	I would describe myself as an environmentally conscious person.	.611		
Cumulative total variance explained (%)			69.050	

Source: Authors' calculations

The suitability for conducting EFA analysis was determined using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficient (0.925; KMO>0.7) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 2434.301$; $p < 0.001$) according to Hair et al. (2014). Upon determining suitability, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation was performed to identify the number of dimensions among CRS marketing attributes. Following Hair et al. (2014), factors were considered acceptable, providing the eigenvalue was greater than 1, the total variance explained was greater than 60%, and factor loading was above

0.5. EFA results generated a CRS marketing construct with a two-factor structure with eigenvalues above 1: Factor 1 – *Sustainable destination policy*, and Factor 2 – *Propensity for sustainable behaviour*. Total variance explained by the two factors accounted for 69.050%. The scale's internal consistency for each component is confirmed by Cronbach's alpha coefficients (>0.70), as recommended by Hair et al. (2014).

Based on the criteria mentioned above, the results are also calculated for NCRS marketing factors in cultural tourism (Table 2).

Table 2 Results of factor and reliability analysis for marketing factors not closely related to sustainability (NCRS) in cultural tourism

Marketing factors not closely related to sustainability (NCRS)				
Item number	Item	Factor loading	Total variance explained (%)	Alpha coefficient
FACTOR 1 – Respect for cultural heritage			60.260	0.951
13	I believe in the benefit of maintaining the authentic atmosphere of the destination.	.837		
11	I believe in the benefits of preserving cultural heritage.	.830		
12	I believe in the benefits of maintaining distinctive city streets.	.827		
14	I believe in the benefit of being part of a community rich in culture and history.	.813		
17	I respect residents in the destination.	.773		
16	I respect local customs and the destination's tradition.	.760		
15	I believe in the benefit of sharing cultural heritage with visitors.	.753		
19	Promotion of cultural heritage will introduce tourists to the destination's important socio-cultural characteristics.	.671		
18	The implementation of cultural heritage in the tourist offer will encourage its protection and promotion.	.645		
FACTOR 2 – Servicescape			8.439	0.933
117	It is important to me that the destination is dedicated to education related to tourism and hospitality.	.786		
118	The quality of communal infrastructure is important to me.	.785		
114	The quality of transport infrastructure is important to me.	.769		
112	It is important to me that the natural resources in the destination are preserved.	.758		
116	It is important to me that the destination encourages the cooperation of and partnerships between public and private stakeholders.	.758		
111	It is important to me that the environment in the destination is preserved.	.756		
113	It is important to me that the cultural resources in the destination are preserved.	.693		
115	It is important to me that the community participates in destination tourism.	.669		
Cumulative total variance explained (%)			68.698	

Source: Authors' calculations

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficient (0.901; KMO>0.7) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 4138.996$; $p < 0.001$) show the suitability for carrying out factor analysis. PCA with Varimax rotation was performed. Item 10 with a factor loading lower than 0.50 was removed from further analysis. The EFA results generated a NCRS marketing construct with a two-factor structure with eigenvalues above 1: Factor 1 – *Respect for cultural heritage*, and Factor 2 – *Servicescape*. Total variance explained by the two factors accounted for 68.698%. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each component confirm the scale's reliability (>0.70).

4.3 Multiple linear regression analysis

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the impact of CRS and NCRS marketing factors on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. In the multiple regression analysis, two CRS marketing factors and three NCRS marketing factors were taken as independent variables and satisfaction with the overall cultural experience as the dependent variable. Satisfaction with the overall cultural experience was measured with the item: "Tourists are satisfied with the overall cultural experience in Croatia." ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.819$). The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Multiple regression analysis for marketing variables affecting satisfaction with overall cultural experience

Independent variable	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
CRS marketing factors					
Constant	2.976	.275		10.810	.000
Sustainable destination policy	-.042	.014	-.314	-2.958	.003
Propensity for sustainable behaviour	.060	.015	.423	3.992	.000
R ²	0.074				
Adjusted R ²	0.065				
Standard error	0.792				
F ratio	7.981				
Significance	0.000				
NCRS marketing factors					
Constant	2.309	.324		7.122	.000
Respect for cultural heritage	.033	.012	.278	2.669	.008
Servicescape	-.022	.013	-.015	-.140	.889
R ²	0.071				
Adjusted R ²	0.062				
Standard error	0.794				
F ratio	7.741				
Significance	0.001				

Source: Authors' calculations

The regression analysis results for CRS marketing factors indicate a statistically significant influence ($p < 0.05$) on tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience, and, accordingly, hypothesis *H1* was confirmed.

The results imply that *Propensity for sustainable behaviour* positively contributes to satisfaction with

the overall cultural experience. However, *Sustainable destination policy* with a negative β coefficient does not enhance tourist satisfaction. These results support some recent suggestions that destinations should be aware of the interaction issues between tourists and cultural attractions when forming the outcome and perceptions of visitors regarding

their tourist experience (Artal-Tur et al., 2018) and should employ new sustainable tourism practices (Goffi et al., 2019; Asmelash & Kumar, 2019), based on an understanding of the role of tourists in creating a sustainable destination policy and on an understanding of sustainable tourist behaviour.

Among NCRS factors, only *Respect for cultural heritage* shows a statistical significance ($p=0.008$) and contributes positively to satisfaction with the overall cultural experience ($\beta=.278$). A negative

and not significant contribution to tourist satisfaction is evident with regard to *Servicescape* ($\beta=-.140$, $p=.0889$).

In the context of perceived effects, we employed multiple regression analysis to determine the influence of CRS and NCRS marketing factors on perceived cultural tourism effects.

Table 4 shows the results for the impact of CRS marketing factors on perceived effects in cultural tourism.

Table 4 Multiple regression analysis for CRS marketing factors affecting perceived effects in cultural tourism

Independent variable	Ecological effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
CRS marketing factors					
Constant	2.195	.292		7.528	.000
Sustainable destination policy	.008	.015	.058	.544	.587
Propensity for sustainable behaviour	.034	.016	.225	2.127	.035
R ²	0.074				
Adjusted R ²	0.065				
Standard error	0.840				
F ratio	6.008				
Significance	0.001				
	Social effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
Constant	1.720	.292		5.895	.000
Sustainable destination policy	-.012	.015	-.081	-.820	.413
Propensity for sustainable behaviour	.083	.016	.511	5.195	.000
R ²	0.204				
Adjusted R ²	0.196				
Standard error	0.840				
F ratio	25.650				
Significance	0.000				
	Economic effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
Constant	2.475	.307		8.065	.000
Sustainable destination policy	-.010	.016	-.064	-.610	.542
Propensity for sustainable behaviour	.059	.017	.366	3.508	.001
R ²	0.102				
Adjusted R ²	0.093				
Standard error	0.884				
F ratio	11.402				
Significance	0.000				

Source: Authors' calculations

The results reveal that CRS marketing factors were statistically significant for estimating perceived effects in cultural tourism. CRS marketing factors explain a total of 20.4% variance of social effects ($R^2=0.204$), 10.2% variance of economic effects ($R^2=0.102$), and 7.4% variance of ecological effects ($R^2=0.074$). The main CRS marketing predictor of perceived cultural tourism effects is the *Propensity for sustainable behaviour* (PSB) for all perceived effects. As PSB has the strongest positive and significant influence on social effects ($\beta=.511$, $p=0.000$),

hypothesis *H2* is confirmed. Based on the influence of PSB on economic effects ($\beta=.366$, $p=0.001$), hypothesis *H3* is confirmed. Hypothesis *H4* is confirmed by the positive and significant influence of PSB on ecological effects ($\beta=.225$, $p=0.035$). These findings are supported by Chafe's (2005, as cited in Budeanu, 2007) research results, which indicate that tourists have high concerns about a holiday's eco-social components.

The results calculated for the influence of NCRS marketing factors are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Multiple regression analysis for NCRS marketing factors affecting perceived effects in cultural tourism

Independent variable	Ecological effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
NCRS marketing factors					
Constant	1.996	.342		5.840	.000
Respect for cultural heritage	.010	.013	.083	.806	.421
Servicescape	.029	.014	.216	2.087	.038
R ²	0.081				
Adjusted R ²	0.072				
Standard error	0.836				
F ratio	8.897				
Significance	0.000				
	Social effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
Constant	1.271	.344		3.697	.000
Respect for cultural heritage	.038	.013	.286	2.964	.003
Servicescape	.027	.014	.190	1.973	.050
R ²	0.201				
Adjusted R ²	0.193				
Standard error	0.842				
F ratio	25.363				
Significance	0.000				
	Economic effects				
	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
Constant	1.757	.350		5.021	.000
Respect for cultural heritage	.029	.013	.216	2.179	.030
Servicescape	.029	.014	.206	2.074	.039
R ²	0.156				
Adjusted R ²	0.148				
Standard error	0.857				
F ratio	18.726				
Significance	0.000				

Source: Authors' calculations

NCRS marketing factors explain 20.1% of the total variance of social effects ($R^2=0.201$), 15.6% of economic effects ($R^2=0.156$), and 8.1% of ecological effects ($R^2=0.081$). It is evident that *Servicescape* has a positive and significant influence on ecological ($\beta=.216$, $p=0.038$) and economic ($\beta=.206$, $p=0.039$) effects, while *Respect for cultural heritage* positively and significantly influences social ($\beta=.286$, $p=0.003$) and economic ($\beta=.216$, $p=0.030$) effects.

Based on the findings that economic, social, and environmental factors affect trip satisfaction

(Jarvis et al., 2016), multiple regression analysis was applied to determine the impacts of the perceived effects on tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. Effects were measured with the following items: “Cultural tourism in Croatia has positive ecological effects” ($M=3.34$, $SD=0.868$), “Cultural tourism in Croatia has positive social effects” ($M=3.67$, $SD=0.937$), and “Cultural tourism in Croatia has positive economic effects” ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.928$). The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Multiple regression analysis of the impacts of the perceived effects on satisfaction with the overall cultural experience

Effects	B	SE	BETA	t	Sig.
Constant	1.501	.223		6.743	.000
Ecological	.012	.075	.012	.156	.877
Social	.287	.084	.328	3.430	.001
Economic	.246	.074	.278	3.328	.001
R^2	0.325				
Adjusted R^2	0.315				
Standard error	0.678				
F ratio	32.314				
Significance	0.000				

Source: Authors' calculations

The findings indicate that the perceived effects are significant in estimating tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience and explain a total of 32.5% variance of tourist satisfaction ($R^2=0.325$). The perceived values of two cultural tourism effects: social ($\beta=.328$, $p=0.001$) and economic ($\beta=.278$, $p=0.001$), have significant and positive impacts on tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. The present study's findings support the results of Aydin & Alvarez (2016, as cited in Asmelash & Kumar, 2019), indicating that economic and socio-cultural sustainability pulls more visitors than ecological sustainability. Asmelash & Kumar (2019) also found that socio-cultural sustainability was the strongest predictor of tourist satisfaction, followed by economic sustainability. Based on these findings, hypothesis $H5$ is confirmed.

Ecological effects have a positive but not significant influence ($\beta=.156$, $p=0.877$) on tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. According to these findings, results from a previous study of

Asmelash & Kumar (2019) imply that ecological effects are not a significant predictor of tourist satisfaction.

5. Conclusion

Culture has become a key tourism product in the international tourism market (Artal-Tur et al., 2018). The emergence of the sustainability issue stems from the fact that cultural heritage as the main cultural tourism resource is irreproducible, and it often becomes banalized, while the visitor/resident ratio in cultural destinations is growing (Caserta & Russo, 2002). Given the recent cultural tourism sustainability concerns and insufficient research on the subject, this research attempts to expand the knowledge on the relationship of sustainability marketing factors in cultural tourism from a tourist perspective. This study contributes to the literature by providing insights into the influence of sustainable marketing factors on satisfaction with

the overall cultural experience and their impact on perceived ecological, social, and economic effects in cultural tourism. The research concept in this article, together with the proposal of marketing factors closely related to sustainability (CRS) and not closely related to sustainability (NCRS) in a cultural tourism context, provides new insights into marketing theory and encourages further research.

The findings in this article can serve as a guideline for marketing managers regarding sustainability in cultural tourism. Thus, several implications for managers can be drawn. Managers must be aware of the importance of marketing sustainability factors and their contribution to achieving customer satisfaction. A propensity for sustainable behaviour as a marketing variable positively contributes

to satisfaction with the overall cultural experience. In cultural tourism, marketing managers and decision-makers must give special attention to socio-cultural effects as the strongest predictors of tourist satisfaction with the overall cultural experience.

This study has some limitations. The data were collected through a combination of a face-to-face and an online survey. Since the research was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, the sample is relatively small. For future research, it is suggested to expand the sample and distribute the questionnaire through multiple channels. Finally, the research instrument could be expanded with additional items related to the importance of sustainable marketing implementation for tourists.

REFERENCES

1. Abzari, M., Safari Shad, F., Abedi Sharbiyani, A. A. & Parvareshi Morad, A. (2013). Studying the effect of green marketing mix on market share increase. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences: Proceedings*, 2(3), 641-653.
2. Alegre, J. & Cladera, M. (2009). Analysing the effect of satisfaction and previous visits on tourist intentions to return. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(5/6), 670-685. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560910946990>
3. American Marketing Association (2017). *Definitions of marketing*. <https://www.ama.org/the-definition-of-marketing-what-is-marketing/>
4. Artal-Tur, A., Villena-Navarro, M. & Alamá-Sabater, L. (2018). The relationship between cultural tourist behaviour and destination sustainability. *Anatolia*, 29(2), 237-251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13032917.2017.1414444>
5. Asmelash, A. G. & Kumar, S. (2019). The structural relationship between tourist satisfaction and sustainable heritage tourism development in Tigray, Ethiopia. *Heliyon*, 5(3), e01335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01335>
6. Awang, Z., Ysnita, Y. & Aftanorhan, A. (2018). Sustainable Tourism: The Moderating Effect of Tourists' Educational Background in the Relationship Between Green Practices and Customer Satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 4(34), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i4.34.23574>
7. Bagri, S. C. & Kala, D. (2015). Tourists' satisfaction at Trijuginarayan, India: an importance-performance analysis. *Advances in Hospitality and Tourism Research*, 3(2), 89-115.
8. Baker, D. A. & Crompton, J. L. (2000). Quality, satisfaction and behavioral intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 785-804. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00108-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5)
9. Budeanu, A. (2007). Sustainable tourist behaviour – a discussion of opportunities for change. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 31, 499-508. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-643.2007.00606.x>
10. Burkisene, V., Dvorak, J. & Burbulyte-Tsiskarishvili, G. (2018). Sustainability and sustainability marketing in competing for the title of European Capital of Culture. *Organizacija*, 51(1), 66-78. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2018-0005>

11. Caserta, S. & Russo, A. (2002). More means worse: Asymmetric information, spatial displacement and sustainable heritage tourism. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 26, 245-260.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019905923457>
12. Cerquetti, M. & Ferrara, C. (2018). Marketing research for cultural heritage conservation and sustainability: Lessons from the field. *Sustainability*, 10(3), 774. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030774>
13. Chhetri, P., Arrowsmith, C. & Jackson, M. (2004). Determining hiking experiences in nature-based tourist destinations. *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 31-43. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177\(03\)00057-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5177(03)00057-8)
14. Chui, C. T. B., Abd Rahim, F. H., Khan, N. R. M., Cheng, C. S. & Hassan, F. H. (2011). Assessing tourists' attitude towards responsible cultural heritage tourism in Melaka: Development and validation of responsible heritage tourism scale. *2011 IEEE Colloquium on Humanities, Science and Engineering* (pp. 497-502). Penang: IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CHUSER.2011.6163780>
15. Chui, C. T. B., Khan, N. R. M. & Abd Rahim, F. H. (2014). Understanding cultural heritage visitor behavior: the case of Melaka as world heritage city. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 130, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.001>
16. Cooper, C. & Wahab, S. (2005). *Tourism in the Age of Globalisation*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203995853>
17. Cottrell, S., Van der Duim, R., Ankersmid, P. & Kelder, L. (2004). Measuring the sustainability of tourism in Manuel Antonio and Texel: A tourist perspective. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 12(5), 409-431. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669580408667247>
18. Cucculelli, M. & Goffi, G. (2016). Does sustainability enhance tourism destination competitiveness? Evidence from Italian Destinations of Excellence. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.069>
19. Cuculeski, N., Petroska, I. & Cuculeski, V. (2016). Sustainable marketing and consumers' preferences in tourism. *European Journal of Tourism, Hospitality and Recreation*, 7(2), 84-90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ejthr-2016-0010>
20. De Nisco, A., Riviezzo, A. & Napolitano, M. R. (2015). An importance-performance analysis of tourist satisfaction at destination level: Evidence from Campania (Italy). *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 10, 64-75.
21. Domínguez-Quintero, A. M., González-Rodríguez, M. R. & Paddison, B. (2020). The mediating role of experience quality on authenticity and satisfaction in the context of cultural-heritage tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(2), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2018.1502261>
22. Donohoe, H. M. (2012). Sustainable heritage tourism marketing and Canada's Rideau Canal world heritage site. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 121-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.617826>
23. Du Cros, H. & McKercher, B. (2020). *Cultural tourism* (3rd ed). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429277498>
24. Europa Nostra (2021). *Europa Nostra supports the #Tourism4Recovery campaign*.
<https://www.europanostra.org/europa-nostra-supports-the-tourism4recovery-campaign/>
25. Font, X. & McCabe, S. (2017). Sustainability and marketing in tourism: Its contexts, paradoxes, approaches, challenges and potential. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(7), 869-883. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2017.13017213>
26. Gnanapala, W. A. (2015). Tourists' perception and satisfaction: Implications for destination management. *American Journal of Marketing Research*, 1(1), 7-19.
27. Goffi, G., Cucculelli, M. & Masiero, L. (2019). Fostering tourism destination competitiveness in developing countries: The role of sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 209, 101-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.10.208>
28. Hair, J. F. Jr., Black, W., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2014). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed). Pearson Education Limited.

29. Howard, P. & Pinder, D. (2003). Cultural heritage and sustainability in the coastal zone: experiences in south west England. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 4(1), 57-68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1296-2074\(03\)00008-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1296-2074(03)00008-6)
30. Iniesta-Bonillo, M. A., Sánchez-Fernández, R. & Jiménez-Castillo, D. (2016). Sustainability, value, and satisfaction: Model testing and cross-validation in tourist destinations. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5002-5007. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.071>
31. Jarvis, D., Stoeckl, N. & Liu, H. B. (2016). The impact of economic, social and environmental factors on trip satisfaction and the likelihood of visitors returning. *Tourism Management*, 52, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.06.003>
32. Jovicic, D. (2014). Cultural tourism in the context of relations between mass and alternative tourism. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 19(6), 605-612. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2014.932759>
33. Kim, S., Whitford, M. & Arcodia, C. (2019). Development of intangible cultural heritage as a sustainable tourism resource: the intangible cultural heritage practitioners' perspectives. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 14(5-6), 422-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743873X.2018.1561703>
34. Kotler, P. (1999). *Marketing management: The millennium edition* (10th ed). Prentice Hall.
35. Kozak, M. & Rimmington, M. (2000). Tourist satisfaction with Mallorca, Spain, as an off-season holiday destination. *Journal of Travel Research*, 38(3), 260-269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728750003800308>
36. Loulanski, T. & Loulanski, V. (2011). The sustainable integration of cultural heritage and tourism: a meta-study. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 19(7), 837-862. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.553286>
37. Mihalic, T. (2016). Sustainable-responsible tourism discourse – Towards “responsustable” tourism. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 111, 461–470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.12.062>
38. Moise, M., Gil, I. & Ruiz, M. (2018). Effects of green practices on guest satisfaction and loyalty. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 20(20), 92-104.
39. Moliner, M. Á., Monferrer, D., Estrada, M. & Rodríguez, R. M. (2019). Environmental sustainability and the hospitality customer experience: A study in tourist accommodation. *Sustainability*, 11(19), 5279. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195279>
40. Moral, M. M., Alles, M. T. F. & Franco, M. J. S. (2018). Attitudes of rural accommodation managers towards the development of sustainable tourism. *Cuadernos De Turismo*, 41, 443-464. <https://doi.org/10.6018/turismo.41.327101>
41. Mossberg, L. (2007). A marketing approach to the tourist experience. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(1), 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250701231915>
42. Mousavi, S. S., Doratli, N., Mousavi, S. N. & Moradiahari, F. (2016). Defining cultural tourism. *Proceedings of International Conference on Civil, Architecture and Sustainable Development* (pp. 70-75). London: DRCAEE. <https://doi.org/10.15242/IICBE.DIR1216411>
43. Muler González, V., Coromina Soler, L. & Galí Espelt, N. (2018). Overtourism: residents' perceptions of tourism impact as an indicator of resident social carrying capacity-case study of a Spanish heritage town. *Tourism Review*, 73(3), 277-296. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-08-2017-0138>
44. Nguyen, T. H. H. & Cheung, C. (2016). Chinese heritage tourists to heritage sites: what are the effects of heritage motivation and perceived authenticity on satisfaction? *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(11), 1155-1168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2015.1125377>
45. Oliver, R. L. (1980). A cognitive model of the antecedents and consequences of satisfaction decisions. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 460-469. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3150499>
46. Opoku, A. (2015). The role of culture in a sustainable built environment. In Chiarini, A. (Ed.). *Sustainable Operations Management* (pp. 37-52). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-14002-5_3
47. Otto, J. E. & Ritchie, J. B. (1996). The service experience in tourism. *Tourism Management*, 17(3), 165-174. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(96\)00003-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(96)00003-9)

48. Petrić, L. & Ljubica, J. (2012). Potencijal turističke valorizacije nematerijalne kulturne baštine ruralnih područja Dalmacije. In Crnjak Karanović, B. et al. (Eds.), *Identitet jadranskog prostora Hrvatske; retrospekt i prospekt*, (pp. 211-232). University of Split.
49. Pomeroy, A. (2017). Marketing for sustainability: Extending the conceptualisation of the marketing mix to drive value for individuals and society at large. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 25(2), 157-165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ausmj.2017.04.011>
50. Quinlan Cutler, S. & Carmichael, B. A. (2010). The dimensions of the tourist experience. In Morgan, M. et al. (Eds.), *The tourism and leisure experience: Consumer and managerial perspectives* (pp. 3-26). Channel View Publications. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781845411503-004>
51. Rakic, B. & Rakic, M. (2015). Holistic management of marketing sustainability in the process of sustainable development. *Environmental Engineering & Management Journal*, 14(4), 887-900. <https://doi.org/10.30638/eemj.2015.100>
52. Rasoolimanesh, S. M. & Jaafar, M. (2017). Sustainable tourism development and residents' perceptions in World Heritage Site destinations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2016.1175491>
53. Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 36, 12-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005>
54. Sigala M. & Leslie, D. (2005). *International cultural tourism: Management, implications and cases*. Routledge.
55. Su, Z., Aaron, J. R., McDowell, W. C. & Lu, D. D. (2019). Sustainable Synergies between the Cultural and Tourism Industries: An Efficiency Evaluation Perspective. *Sustainability*, 11(23), 6607. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11236607>
56. Timothy, D. J. (2011). *Cultural heritage and tourism: An introduction*. Channel View Publications.
57. van Dam, Y. K. & Apeldoorn, P. A. (1996). Sustainable marketing. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 16(2), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027614679601600204>
58. Yaw, F. J. (2005). Cleaner technologies for sustainable tourism: Caribbean case studies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 13, 117-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2003.12.019>
59. Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2003.08.016>
60. Zhang, H., Cho, T., Wang, H. & Ge, Q. (2018). The influence of cross-cultural awareness and tourist experience on authenticity, tourist satisfaction and acculturation in World Cultural Heritage Sites of Korea. *Sustainability*, 10(4), 927. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10040927>

Appendix

Table A.1 Marketing attributes closely related to sustainability in cultural tourism (CRS)

No.	Taken and adopted items	Original model determinants	Authors
I1	I am willing to pay more for sustainable cultural tourism products.	Concern for responsible tourism	Chui et al. (2014)
I2	I am willing to participate in sustainable cultural tourism products.		
I3	I am willing to pay more for cultural tourism products if it's guaranteed the money goes to preserving the local environment.		
I4	I prefer trips that minimally damage the environment.	Willingness to pay tourist	
I5	It's essential for me that the hospitality facilities I visit operate following sustainable development principles.		
I6	When choosing a destination, it's important to me that service providers apply sustainable practices.		
I7	It's important to me that the destinations' public sector seeks to minimize tourism's negative environmental impact.	Sustainable tourism policy and destination management	Cucculelli & Goffi (2016)
I8	It's important to me that the destinations' public sector seeks to minimize tourism's negative social impact.		
I9	It's important to me that the destination monitors the effects of tourism.		
I10	I try to preserve the environment even if it's more expensive and time-consuming.	Environmental responsible behaviour	Chui et al. (2011)
I11	I would describe myself as an environmentally conscious person.		
I12	I want to participate in preserving the environment.		
I13	It's important to me that the destination encourages alternative (sustainable) forms of transport.	Added items	
I14	It's important to me that the destination cares about the implementation of sustainable marketing in cultural tourism.		

Source: Authors

Table A.2 Marketing attributes not closely related to sustainability in cultural tourism (NCRS)

No.	Taken and adopted items	Original model determinants	Authors
I1	I believe in the benefits of preserving cultural heritage.	Respect and preservation of cultural heritage	Chui et al. (2011)
I2	I believe in the benefits of maintaining distinctive city streets.		
I3	I believe in the benefit of maintaining authentic destinations' atmosphere.		
I4	I believe in the benefit of being part of a community rich in culture and history.		
I5	I believe in the benefit of sharing a cultural heritage with visitors.	Culturally Significant Tourist	Chui et al. (2014)
I6	I respect local customs and the destination's tradition.	Memorable experience seeking tourist	
I7	I respect residents in the destination.		
I8	The implementation of cultural heritage in the tourist offer will encourage its protection and promotion.	Functions of ICH	Petrić & Ljubica (2012)
I9	Promotion of cultural heritage will introduce tourists to important socio-cultural destinations' characteristics.		
I10	It's positive and useful for tourists to know the destination's socio-cultural characteristics because it reduces possible tensions between them and residents.		
I11	It's important to me that the environment in the destination is preserved.	Quality of environmental and natural resources	Cucculelli & Goffi (2016)
I12	It's important to me that the natural resources in the destination are preserved.		
I13	It's important to me that the cultural resources in the destination are preserved.	Historical and artistic sites	
I14	The quality of transport infrastructure is important to me.	General infrastructure	
I15	It's important to me that the community participates in destination tourism.	Sustainable tourism policy and destination management	
I16	It's important to me that the destination encourage the cooperation and partnerships of public and private stakeholders.		
I17	It's important to me that the destination is dedicated to education related to tourism and hospitality.		
I18	The quality of communal infrastructure is important to me.	Added item	

Source: Authors