

Tłumaczenia artykułów

Armin Mikos v. Rohrscheidt, GWSHM Milenium, Gniezno / KulTour.pl – Poznań

Cultural Tourism – concerning the definition

Key words: Cultural tourism, definition

Abstract

After reviewing and briefly analyzing the contents and scope of several definitions of cultural tourism used in official classifications, in scientific considerations and in teaching practice, the author of the article proposes a functional definition of the phenomenon, by referring to the commonly used term of tourism as a primary concept. The suggested definition on the one hand takes into account both current (broad) understanding of culture and itineraries (goals and programs) of tourist expeditions, and on the other hand it considers the aspect of tourists' culture-related motivation. The author's goal is to provide and spread a useful tool to classify tourism products, and as a consequence, to contribute to standardization of Polish professional terminology related to cultural tourism. The proposal should be treated as a starting point for a discussion to be continued by specialists, concerning the definition of cultural tourism, where such discussion should also take into account entities involved in organization of tourism and their needs.

Introduction

Theoreticians of tourism basically agree with regard to the very old “birth certificate” of cultural tours. Undoubtedly, these included pilgrimages and expeditions taken by ancient Greeks and Romans and involving educational or learning aspect [Mikos v. Rohrscheidt, 2008, p. 40-41]. Therefore, cultural tourism may be recognized as one of the earliest types of tourism (or indeed the oldest one). Yet, it was only as a result of the growing interest in cultural travels, which has occurred in recent decades, and because of the increasingly specialized tourism product that the concept of cultural tourism has been distinguished as a separate group of tourism-related services on offer¹ and, as a consequence, a subject of research and teaching programs. Hence, it has become increasingly important to clearly define the phenomenon for the needs of entities operating within the travel market as well as customers, and for the needs of academic considerations related to the topic. At the same time, as a consequence of the ongoing evolution in the understanding of culture itself, and because of both the recognition for the cultural function of tourism in general and more comprehensive considerations on mutual relations between culture and tourism [Przeclawski 2004, p. 32 and next], researchers have encountered a problem related to identifying the contents and scope of the phenomenon in question. Thus, today we have dozens of definitions describing cultural tourism not only from various standpoints (which would be natural), but also identifying its contents and scope in diverse ways. Therefore, academics talking and writing about cultural tourism, as well as practitioners designing and providing services and products related to cultural tourism do not always speak and write about the same thing or design and organize services within the same segment. This paper is designed to provide an overview of definitions proposed for cultural tourism by various specialist publications, to attempt their classification and to propose a uniform functional definition of cultural tourism for the Polish speaking area, which could be useful for academic and teaching purposes and for the Polish market of tourism related services.

¹ In some countries (e.g. in the German speaking area) the concept of cultural tourism was distinguished during the interwar period in options on offer from travel agencies, as well as in later theoretical considerations focusing on tourism, yet at that time it was referred to by different names: „Bildungsreisen” or „Studienreisen”.

1. Difficulties in defining “cultural tourism”

While attempting to specify the meaning of cultural tourism, it is necessary to start with identifying a few essential problems related to this task.

The first one is the aforementioned **evolution in the very definition of culture** which has occurred during recent decades. Successive changes proposed with regard to the contents and scope of culture as a consequence pose difficulties in attempts to both clearly identify and describe the phenomenon of cultural tourism. Indeed, this is the segment of tourism, which in the first place turns towards cultural assets as a constitutive element of itineraries, which designs its goals and concepts by referring to cultural values and accordingly modifies its methods of organization and practical operations typical for tourism as a whole. As a matter of fact, even though not so long ago, up until the late 1970s, what was generally recognized as culture was in fact limited almost exclusively to components of the so-called high culture (e.g. outstanding works of literature, architecture, music and fine arts), yet then since the 1980s in accordance with a new broad understanding of culture² it is more and more clear that the concept refers also to tangible artefacts (sites) and intangible components (e.g. behaviours, customs) of the so-called low [Richards, 1996, p. 25], popular or daily culture³. As a result the status of certain phenomena has been raised; these include e.g. material rural culture (such as traditional construction), and ethnic assets (such as folk music, and customs) as well as industrial landmarks, military facilities and battlefields [Weissenborn, 1997, p. 8-11]. On the other hand the expanded scope of culture leads to other consequences. Indeed, with such broad definition of culture it is possible to recognize nearly every kind of activity performed by human communities as operations of cultural nature, and their durable effects as cultural heritage⁴. In this manner any kind of tourism containing educational (sightseeing) or entertainment component (participation in any kind of mass events) could be considered as cultural tourism.

Another important difficulty is the open issue of the **criterion for distinguishing cultural tourism** within the overall phenomenon of tourism. The essence of the problem is contained in the question, what importance should be given to culture-related goals during a touring event and/or with what intensity should culture-related contents appear during a trip so that it may be classified as a cultural travel. Using a simplified example we could ask: if a group of travellers spends the night in a historical castle-hotel, and that is combined with a short presentation of the building's history or role in past events – does it mean that the members of such a group are consumers of cultural tourism (since their stay in such a location can definitely be recognized as an element of that); or is it only an itinerary almost entirely comprising cultural program (e.g. sightseeing along the Piast Route, where travellers visit sites belonging to the route) which qualifies the event to be recognized as this type of tourism.

Various opinions presented by specialists in this area and the resulting definitions of cultural tourism show attempts to deal with the consequences of these particular problems. Due to these difficulties related to explicit and final distinction between cultural travels and other types of tourism, some definitions explain the phenomenon from one point of view only, taking into account its specific **catalogue of options**, the existing demand for it or the cultural **values** of the visited sites [Steinecke (2007), p. 4-5]. Other authors point to personal **motivations** of travellers [Dreyer (2000), p.26-27]. Those kinds of definitions obviously limit

² More on understanding of culture as a fundamental term for defining cultural tourism, see: Mikos v. Rohrscheidt (2008), p. 17-20.

³ Cf.: Crepaz M., - Hrovat-Forstinger B (1999), p. 28. The term „*Alltagskultur*” used there, and commonly encountered in German language publications since the 1960s, can be most adequately expressed in Polish by the term “kultura codzienna” (daily culture).

⁴ Cf.: Steinecke (2007), p. 3-4. The author holds a critical opinion concerning such broad definition of culture for the needs of cultural tourism, and believes there is a risk that as a logical consequence of such broad definition, all kinds of institutions and entertainment facilities may be recognized as cultural destinations.

the possibility of understanding the phenomenon of cultural tourism, yet they clearly differentiate it from the other types of tourism. On the other hand **holistic** definitions, containing comprehensive presentation of the phenomenon, pay more attention to culture itself, treated as a purpose for tourism, or to individual traits of consumers of this type of tourism, their preferences and possible benefits of cultural travels.

Another factor, which on the one hand adds depth to considerations on cultural function of tourism, yet on the other hand makes it difficult to specifically distinguish cultural tourism, is the so-called universal approach, encountered in writings by contemporary researchers. According to this approach, tourism as a whole is an element of culture, and nearly every touring event involves certain culture-related aspects and contents. As a consequence, supporters of this approach nearly always propose (frequently, in addition to narrower definitions), the so-called broadest definition of cultural tourism, which comprises majority of touring activities. Irrespective of the obvious benefits of such approach from the standpoint of the desired directions of global developments in tourism, such understanding contributes to blurring the meaning of the phenomenon of cultural tourism and hinders considerations on its specific features, its unique types of expeditions, typical destinations and profiles of cultural tourists.

In order to outline the areas of interest related to cultural tourism and aspects (significant characteristics) emphasized by various researchers, the following chapters present several of these definitions, as well as brief analyses of their contents. Then the author will attempt to construct his own, comprehensive and functional definition of cultural tourism, which will make it possible to clearly distinguish it within the broad category of tourism. Additionally it should provide grounds and clear-cut criteria for distinguishing specific types of cultural expeditions. Most importantly, we would like to ensure that this functional interpretation may in the future become a useful instrument for entities operating in this segment of tourism market in their attempts to design, develop, distinguish and distribute their catalogue of products for cultural tourism. Clear distinction and classification of products on offer may be of great importance for these entities and for their potential customers, who are more and more aware of what they are looking for in tourism.

2. Evolution in understanding of the contents and scope of cultural tourism

Not so long ago, even in the early 1980s, cultural tourism (which in fact was not distinguished within overall tourism) was understood as visits to those sites and participation in those events which were generally associated with high culture. In Poland such opinions were maintained even longer, and that fact is illustrated well by the following definitions of “cultured tourism”:

Example 1 (Medlik):

(This is) “*culturally motivated tourism, such as trips to places of artistic and historical value, visits to museums and galleries, journeys taken in order to participate in artistic performances and other cultural events*” [Medlik, 1995, p. 81-82]

Example 2: (Marczak):

„*Cultured tourism most of all involves visits to places of high values related to tourism and history and constituting human cultural heritage. Hence, it involves visits to landmarks of architecture, archaeological sites, places related to famous people, artistic exhibitions, art galleries, etc.*” [Marczak, 2000, p. 47]

For some time this description had been inconsistent with definitions of culture proposed by its researchers. Yet, gradually the broad understanding of culture was commonly adopted. As a consequence, the term “cultural tourism” was redefined. A good

(today historical) example of this tendency to gradually expand the range of activities described with the term “cultural tourism” can be provided by the pertinent remark presented in the mid 1990s by B. Weissenborn, a German researcher, who said: *„Cultural tourism continues to be associated with ‘high culture’, historical monuments of architecture, city centres as well as museums and exhibitions. Yet it is also the relics of industry and options related to popular or ‘daily’ culture, (such as Oktoberfest in Munich) or evidence of the ‘dark periods’ in European history (fortresses, battlefields, relics of the Third Reich, etc.) that may have the capacity to attract tourists. It also appears that the concept of ‘roots tourism’ („Rootstousismus”) is still largely unknown”* [Weissenborn, 1997, p.8]. Even though the latter author listed only some types of trips (related to industrial and military assets, events and those having sentimental value), which today are commonly recognized as cultural travels, indeed he pointed out a significantly wider range of tourism-related activities of cultural nature.

Evidence of rapid evolution in defining cultural tourism can also be found in officially adopted explanations related to this tourism segment. These emerged as a result of efforts aimed at distinguishing cultural tourism from other kinds of tourism-related activities, which were undertaken e.g. by international organizations focusing on tourism. Such endeavours were designed to enable systematic statistics and in-depth research of the phenomenon. Probably because of this the basic criterion assumed in these definitions was that of specific destinations, as the easiest one to identify. The best known examples, which are presented below, include one of the definitions adopted by WTO (United Nations World Tourism Organization) and a description of cultural tourism proposed by ATLAS (European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education):

Example 3 (WTO: 1985) The so-called „narrow” definition:

(Cultural tourism comprises) *“movements of persons for essentially cultural motivations such as study tours, performing arts and cultural tours, travel to festivals and other cultural events, visits to sites and monuments, travel to study nature, folklore or art, and pilgrimages.”*⁵

Even though the definition seems to assume the range of cultural tourism destinations is broader than just strictly defined cultural heritage of the world (and supplements the potential goals to include “sites” and “monuments”, which in fact are not clearly specified), it basically is nothing more than a kind of “checklist” of recognized landmarks⁶ and does not have the capacity to exhaust all activities taken by tourists focusing on high and popular culture, and therefore cannot delineate accurate scope of contemporary cultural tourism.

Here is the definition adopted a few years later by ATLAS, and significantly expanding the scope of cultural tourism:

Example 4 (ATLAS: 1996):

Conceptual Definition:

“(Cultural tourism is) The movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs.

⁵ WTO (World Tourism Organization) 1985

⁶ One of the world’s leading authorities in the field of cultural tourism, Greg Richards, criticizes this definition for this particular reason. *“Although this ‘narrow’ definition attempts to broaden the sites and monuments approach by adding other cultural manifestations as tourism goals, it is still essentially a checklist of cultural activities undertaken by tourists”* [Richards, 1996, p. 24]

Technical Definition:

(Cultural tourism means): *All movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama outside their normal place of residence*".⁷

Treated as a whole, the definition contains quite a coherent picture of contemporary cultural tourism. Its goals include strictly specified landmarks and cultural events (which is particularly visible in the second part of the definition), as well as all kinds of "cultural attractions" – and this category of cultural goals may include any place, landmark or event, which is considered as such by a traveller. Hence, in accordance with the ATLAS definition, cultural tourism comprises any journey taken in order to personally encounter any kind of cultural asset. The essential criteria for the cultural nature of a journey in this case include: (a broadly understood) cultural goal and intention to personally experience culture as a result of the journey.

The following examples show in what way daily culture is taken into account in definitions of cultural tourism by contemporary researchers:

Example 1 (Dreyer):

„(...) the term of cultural tourism means any journey focusing on (broadly understood) 'culture'. Hence, the term refers to a specific (new) segment of tourism. Educational and study tours constitute special forms within this segment” [Dreyer, 2000, p. 21].

Taking into account the increasingly widespread new understanding of culture as well as the growing catalogue of tourism products focusing on tangible cultural heritage, the latter Author defines relatively broad scope of cultural tourism. At the same time he emphasizes the importance of traditional types of tours, which are very popular in the German cultural area ("Bildungsreise" and "Studienreise"), and recognizes these as classic forms of cultural tourism which are also specific with reference to the historically developed programs and methods of realization.

Example 2 (Barbier):

Cultural tourism comprises journeys which are mainly motivated by cultural heritage. Heritage is understood here in two ways: 1) narrowly defined heritage, i.e. landmarks and works of art – culture in this sense is strictly related to general history and history of arts; 2) broadly understood heritage including such elements as: daily living, science and technology (factories, machinery), geographical environment (landscapes and their interpretation, methods of utilizing spaces in the past and today), literature devoted to various regions, cuisine treated as an art of living, etc. [Barbier B., 2005, p. 96].

On the other hand, humanistic considerations related to both the cultural aspects of tourism as a whole, and the culture-forming function of tourism, as a consequence led to a number of multi-layer definitions, where the authors gradually expand the concept of cultural tourism, even to include the entirety of human activities connected with tourism (in the broadest sense) to recognize it as a cultural phenomenon. A good example is provided by the author quoted previously, who added the following statement to his definition: *"In broader meaning the term of cultural tourism contains the element of 'culture in tourism'. Hence, each form of tourism with integral cultural features is understood as cultural tourism"* [Dreyer, 2000, p. 21].

⁷ Cf. European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education, [in] Tourism trends for Europe, European Travel Commission, September 2006, p. 5

Expanded in this manner, the concept of cultural tourism is designed to convey the fact that nearly every journey (including travel for recreational purposes, as well as focusing on consumption and experiences) either contains some cultural elements (e.g. visits to tangible attractions, visits to museums), or at least potentially may contain them. The author also points out that this method of defining actually requires a question of critical importance for tourism as a whole: How much culture can be sustained by tourism (or its specific type)? Or: how many cultural elements should be contained in tourism? This explicitly shows the fact, which is commonly accepted by researchers, that generally all forms of tourism-related activities are linked with culture; that life-styles, customs, traditions, dishes and beverages are a part of culture of a given country or area receiving tourists.

In its broadest meaning the concept of cultural tourism becomes identical with the concept of the culture of travelling. The use of the term “cultural tourism” (or in the Polish language area more aptly “kulturalna” /cultured/ - note: AMR) increases awareness that tourism itself is a culture and a link between cultures of the country or area of the travellers’ origin and the country or area hosting them. In accordance with this meaning, cultural tourism is understood as one of the forms of global culture, and at the same time the term contains a requirement related to the quality of tourism. If the essence of culture may be described as communication about meanings, then the concept of cultural tourism in its broadest sense is an expression of the more and more common requirement related to all forms of tourism, namely that they provide opportunities for successful and effective communication between the traveller and the host, as well as between them and the environment (both natural and cultural). Cultural tourism, as a means of communication, is designed to enable understanding and peace between nations, and operate as “soft” tourism, which is non-destructive and does not adversely impact its destinations, and contributes to the widespread awareness of the common global heritage of human culture shaped by history. In accordance with this meaning, cultural (and any other) tourism should lead towards new solidarity between the visitor and the visatee, engender more enhanced forms of cooperation which will transcend the borders of regions and cultures [Dreyer, 2000, p. 22 and 23].

Such understanding of the phenomenon in question may be exemplified by the multi-level approach by H. Hughes [Hughes, 2003, p. 52-53], summarized in a Polish publication by A. Kowalczyk [Kowalczyk, 2008, p. 14]. Hughes identifies four gradually expanding ranges of cultural tourism.

Hence, in terms of sectors (or tourism segments) the term of cultural tourism may be related to tourists’ interest in art (in specialist English language publications referred to as “art tourism”), or in tangible cultural heritage (i.e. “heritage tourism”).

In the narrow understanding cultural tourism comprises on the one hand, tourists’ interest in theatre, music, poetry and other arts, and on the other hand their visits to historical sites and monuments, castles and churches (or tangible cultural heritage);

In its broader understanding, the term “cultural tourism” embraces tourists’ interest in and exploration of arts and crafts, religion, clothing, history of specific places, occupations of local residents, their food, language, customs, architecture, but also their visits to zoological gardens and watching lives of animals. This definition most closely resembles the contemporary broad understanding of cultural tourism.

Finally, in the broadest (universal) understanding, and in accordance with the adopted definition of culture as “the totality of values, ideas, attitudes and other meaningful symbols”, Hughes consistently assumes that any tourism related journey implies a necessity of contact with the culture of the visited place, therefore tourism as a whole is a meeting of cultures.

Based on that, Kowalczyk defines cultural tourism in two ways, in a narrower and in a broader sense.

Example 2 (Kowalczyk: narrow version):

„Cultural tourism is a set of tourists' behaviours linked with their authentic interest in cultural heritage (historical sites, folklore, places connected to important events, etc.) and with their involvement in broadly understood contemporary cultural life” [Kowalczyk, 2008, p.13].

While identifying cultural heritage and cultural life as the goal of travellers in the segment of tourism in question the author defines these phenomena very broadly. Evidence for this comes in the recognition of folklore as cultural heritage and in giving up distinctions of the term “sites” used in the definition, which suggests that the term comprises e.g. landmarks of technology or military art. On the other hand the expression “broadly understood cultural life” suggests the term comprises events related to mass culture, i.e. fairs, festivals and stage presentations. Defined in this way the set of goals of contemporary cultural tourism goes far beyond historical landmarks, and sites recognized as heritage of high culture. Therefore, this is in fact a definition of cultural tourism taking into account distinctions into segments and tourism-related activities generated by demand for specific types of goals.

Example 3 (Kowalczyk: broad / universal version):

“In its broad sense cultural tourism may be defined as all kinds of tourists' behaviours, since the underlying needs and preferences always result from preconditioning of cultural nature (e.g. the tourist's system of values), regardless of the fact whether these behaviours are a consequence of the tourists' interest in the so-called cultural assets or other types of tourism-related (e.g. natural) assets.” [Kowalczyk, 2008, p.14].

Even though the author of this definition refers to it only as a wider concept (“broad sense”) indeed he comprises in it the universal understanding of tourism as a cultural phenomenon. Just like in the case of the authors referred to previously, this approach acknowledges and emphasizes the cultural function of tourism and recognizes it as an integral element within the widest ranging context of human activity. Obviously such a broad definition cannot be used for in-depth considerations concerning this specific form of travelling or for further classification of cultural tourism or for application in professional operations of specialized segments of the tourism market.

3. Emphasis on various aspects in definitions of cultural tourism

Depending on specific needs constituting their context and objectives assumed by their authors, numerous definitions of cultural tourism emphasize selected aspects which may also become the main or the only criterion for distinguishing this type of tourism. In many cases this approach facilitates further research and, most importantly, has practical significance for employing relevant findings in business operations. Obviously definitions formulated this way do not present the full picture of the phenomenon, so their value for academic considerations is significantly limited. However, they may be useful in discussions conducted by practitioners and aimed at information exchange, as well as in the process of designing strategies for operations focusing on promotion of tourism. In order to make sure that the universal definition of cultural tourism proposed by us will also be useful in practice, we must examine the previous attempts which were taken for this particular purpose. Below we are going to present examples of such one-sided definitions. The assumed boundaries for their classification are sometimes very fluid (particularly in the case of definitions emphasizing individual motivations and general demand), yet, as it has already been pointed out, the common feature of this group of definitions is their intentional one-sided approach to describing the phenomenon.

Definitions focusing on the catalogue of cultural tourism products on offer:

Example 1 (Becker): "Cultural tourism uses buildings, relics and customs within specific landscapes, locations and facilities, in order to show cultural, social and economic development of a given territory to visitors by regularly providing them with access to touring options on offer, guiding services on location, opportunities for sightseeing and specific information materials. Similarly, cultural events frequently stimulate cultural tourism." [Becker 1993, p. 8].

The definition clearly identifies the target sites and components of cultural tourism. In the former group it classifies landmarks ("relics") of both material culture and nature; interesting and valuable buildings (hence not only historical buildings, and as suggested by the expression "economic development" also structures used in agriculture, production and trade); as well as elements of living tradition of the region (e.g. music, religious and secular rituals, dance, preserved languages and dialects). In its final part the definition also mentions cultural events (e.g. festivals, concerts, fairs). The existence and attractive force of these locations, sites and events provide motivations for the journey, and the opportunity to encounter them is treated as a value because of which the tourist will take such a trip, and such encounters are supposed to broaden travellers' minds. On the other hand the definition takes into account services typical for cultural tourism, and constituting its products (tours); such services, strongly emphasized in the program of the trip, are the distinctive features (in comparison with other types of tourism). These include: expeditions with specially designed itineraries (trips mainly focusing on cultural program), specialist guiding services at the sites and locations, and information materials meeting expectations of cultural travellers (e.g. books, pamphlets, brochures, albums, multimedia publications, etc.). Such components contribute to the informative aspect of the trip and facilitate deeper contact with tangible and intangible assets encountered and experienced at the destination. Perceived in this way, cultural tourism is a response to a specific type of demand for witnessing cultural assets, and in order to meet such demand this type of tourism builds its catalogue of products using for this purpose adequate means, techniques and methods (which may even be created for this particular purpose). Obviously, it uses all the necessary and usual types of infrastructure (means of transport, catering and accommodation facilities), yet unlike other types of tourism it cannot cope without specific tools necessary for culture-oriented sightseeing or "meeting"⁸.

Example 2 (Metelka):

(From the point of view of the planning strategy) *"cultural tourism is an attempt to create an environment enriching both inhabitants of and visitors to an area, where the hosts try to balance tourists' requirements and the preconditions for the well-being of the visited area, defined by the local enterprises and the community of those supporting nature conservation"* [Metelka, 1990, p. 41].

The multi-dimensional phenomenon of cultural tourism here is defined from one point of view: as a catalogue of products consisting of various elements, created at a given territory and addressed to visitors (among others). The distinctive feature is personal enrichment of both the visitors and the hosts. Notably, the author emphasizes the necessity to maintain proportions between tourists' needs and fulfilment of these, and proper development of the host area and community; secondly, he points to the equal importance of nature conservation in relation to development of tourism and as a consequence assumes that those

⁸ The term "culture-oriented meeting" will be used with reference to these actual facts, which more and more frequently in the international specialist language of experts of culture is referred to as "event". These include events of strictly cultural nature (e.g. concerts, performances, festivals, etc.), as well as meetings with specific people organized at travel destinations (e.g. artists, the so-called time witnesses, etc.), presentations designed for tourists and connected with various human occupations, such as traditional crafts, agriculture, cultural activity related to folklore, etc.

supporting the natural environment are entitled to participate in decisions regarding the scope and type of tourism-oriented operations.

Definitions emphasizing culture-related demand

Example (Lohmann): *“The concept of cultural tourism comprises all journeys taken by people who temporarily leave their place of residence mainly in order to get informed, encounter and/or experience tangible and/or intangible assets of high as well as daily culture of the visited area.”* [Lohmann1999, p. 63].

In this case the definition of cultural tourism is based on motivations and behaviours of tourists, and the distinguishing criterion is that of destinations chosen by travellers. Hence, the factors setting cultural tourism apart from other types of tourism include the choice of destinations (sites related to high or daily culture), and travellers' open-mindedness to knowledge (mainly of historical or cultural nature) and personal encounter with foreign culture, or even (probably only in some cases) their willingness for more in-depth experience of the related values, e.g. during a longer stay in a given environment. Even though the definition seems to narrow down the group of those interested in cultural tourism to a probably small number of people, who consciously choose this type of travel (taking advantage of their relatively good knowledge of relevant topics), it contributes a significant element into the understanding of cultural tourism, by emphasizing its strictly individual aspect. Of critical importance in cultural tourism are the individual traveller, and the intellectual preferences of those to whom catalogue of cultural tourism products is addressed. This significantly reduces the target group of consumers interested in cultural tourism in its strict sense, yet on the other hand indicates its independence from tourism related fashions and trends and makes it easier for entities involved in designing products for this kind of tourism (specialized travel agencies or sites) to focus on relatively affluent group of potential customers. As we will see later, this aspect highlights the essential difference between cultural and other types of tourism, since the factor of price is no longer of critical importance for a tourist during the selection process. This particular factor may to the greatest extent distinguish cultural tourism (and some other types of tourism) from mass tourism. This definition clearly takes into account individual tourism, which does not use options on offer for groups, and is not affected by program predefined by third parties.

Definitions focusing on cultural values

Example 1 (Eder): *“Cultural tourism is defined (...) as the sustainable use of cultural and historical monuments/relics and as specialist attention to traditional and unique regional forms of habitation and life-styles for the purpose of increasing inbound tourism in a given region and in order to expand and enhance understanding for the original character of such region within the European cultural union, in particular through improved exchange between populations of the European continent and through informative, comparative and dialogue-provoking evidence of the past and present at the location.”* [Eder, 1993, p. 165-166].

Disregarding the fact that the definition refers exclusively to Europe and European culture (its content could obviously be transposed to other cultural areas), it is possible to notice strong emphasis on describing the context in terms of cultural values exclusively, independently from economic aspects of tourism (or relating to this aspect only to a small extent). The author of this definition wants to distinguish cultural tourism from other types of travelling, as an implementation of a pan-European idea of cultural unity, in the first place through attention to cultural landmarks, cultivation of regional traditions, international and inter-regional dialogue and sharing values – and only in this light – through organization of touring events as specific endeavours carried out for these purposes.

Example 2 (Metelka):

Cultural travels mean “tourist expeditions which involve a degree of intense interaction with inhabitants of the visited areas, in order to get first-hand experience of their art, history and life style” [Metelka, 1990, p. 41, translation into English based on quotation in: Bąk, 2007 p.126.]

According to Metelka, an encounter with broadly understood cultural assets of the destination (which is implied by the term “life style” used next to art and history, commonly understood as high culture) does not exhaust the concept of authentic “cultural” tourism. It is only an intense contact with bearers of these values (inhabitants of the visited areas) and even limited cultural dialogue that will turn a trip into cultural expedition. Indeed, the readiness for “first-hand experience”, which is a synonym of a dialogue with another culture, is a distinctive quality of a cultural traveller. Meeting and dialogue (which require intellectual and emotional involvement of both parties) are the distinctive features and goals of tourism. Such exchange is obviously possible when the program of expedition is adequately designed (in the case of an organized trip) or as a result of the tourist’s decisions on location (in the case of an individual, unscheduled trip). Therefore, a journey may be classified as a real cultural expedition only if personal meetings with people who are authors, successors or intermediaries of high and daily culture are a part of such trip.

Example 3 (Hall-Zeppel):

Cultural tourism is an experience based on being involved in and stimulated by theatre performances, visual arts and festivals. On the other hand tourism narrowed down to cultural heritage is connected with visiting selected landscapes, historical places, buildings and landmarks – here the experience occurs via searching for contact with nature and sense of unity with the history of the visited site [Hall C. M., Zeppel H., 1990a, p. 87, English translation based on quotation in Buczkowska, 2008, p. 17].

Cultural events and heritage places or sites mentioned in this definition, are first a matter of choice – as the destination of a cultural expedition, and then the object of conscious “experiencing” during the journey. Therefore, the expedition of this kind should be understood as a consequence of choice, motivated by the willingness to personally meet with the values manifested by such events and places. Notably, we can see that here the scope of cultural tourism has been narrowed to travels connected with cultural events – as opposed to the separately recognized segment of cultural heritage tourism (understood as visits to related landscapes, sites and places). Yet, regardless of this additional internal distinction, the group of destinations assumed in both cases by most other researchers would be considered as tourism destinations related to high culture⁹.

Definitions emphasizing individual motivations of consumers

Example 1 (Dreyer): *“The term ‘cultural tourism’ may comprise all journeys which are motivated mainly by activities of cultural nature.”* [Dreyer, 2000, p. 26].

⁹ In another definition proposed by Hall and Zeppel the scope of cultural tourism is significantly expanded: *“The term ‘cultural tourism’ relates to historical areas and those linked with heritage, places hosting presentations of arts and crafts, festivals, museums, artistic performances and visual arts, which the tourist encounters in the process of looking for cultural experiences. Visits to places connected with arts and participation in special cultural events, such as ethnic festivals or living history events also represent this kind of cultural tourism, in the general sense, or cultural heritage tourism”* ([Hall C. M., Zeppel H., 1990b, p. 54; English translation based on quotation in: Buczkowska, 2008, p. 17]. The authors here retain the additional distinction of cultural tourism and cultural heritage tourism, yet they expand these segments to include new types of events (e.g. living history performances) and sites (places hosting presentations of crafts), recognized within the broader concepts of intangible or tangible culture.

The author supplements his definition with an extremely important clarification: “*From the standpoint of economics of tourism, cultural activities are all those which are recognized as such by the traveller.*” [Dreyer, 2000, p. 27].

Here we can clearly see the tendency to leave it up to the traveller to classify his/her trip. Therefore, according to Dreyer it is the tourist who ultimately defines “culture” and the cultural nature of his/her journey. As a consequence it is possible to recognize a large variety of tourism-related activities as cultural tourism, yet this is not helpful in distinguishing its scope in comparison to other kinds of tourism.

The definition proposed by Dreyer illustrates another significant factor contributing to the phenomenon of cultural tourism. Accordingly, cultural tourism is distinguished from other types of tourism exclusively by the intention of travellers since it is them who ultimately decide about the fact that a journey takes place. An important distinctive feature of this definition is its intended vagueness. It eliminates two problems connected with attempts to strictly define the scope of cultural tourism, as they were pointed out earlier. Indeed, this is the tourist him/herself who decides what culture is (unlike in the demand-based definition leaving this decision for a specialist in cultures or a sociologist), and who takes a trip in accordance with such values¹⁰. Therefore, it seems that any distinctions into high and daily (or popular/mass) culture become insignificant if we adopt such subjective meaning of culture and related cultural tourism. Similarly, the criteria of intensity of cultural component in the itinerary, otherwise assumed “behind the consumer’s back”, also becomes immaterial because the travellers ultimately decide whether they prefer more or less culture in the program of the trip. This definition, failing to include the entire scope of tourism products or the organizational aspect of tourism, clearly incorporates into the concept of cultural tourism private journeys taken by individuals or small groups, who do not use options on offer for organized tourism and related itineraries.

A good example of a definition based on the same criteria, in Polish language publications, is that which was proposed by J. Małek: “*Cultural tourism comprises all forms of travelling, which are primarily motivated by a desire for contact with broadly understood culture*” [Małek, 2003, p. 20-21].

Example 2 (Metelka): „*Cultural tourism is a form of tourism in which travellers’ interests focus on varied history of peoples or territories, which is preserved and manifested in landmarks, historical areas, traditional architecture and crafts*” [Metelka 1990, p. 41]

The definition proposed by Ch. Metelka, adopted for instance in the European Union documents for the needs of tourism related statistics [Bał, 2007, p. 126]¹¹ starts only with travellers’ “interests” in culture (hence, the multidimensional outcome), yet it draws a very broad range of objects of potential interest; these include landmarks, as well as entire historical regions, sites of regional or national architecture, works of traditional crafts. Notably, the author also emphasizes the history of territories or peoples as the objects of focus for cultural travellers. Therefore, destinations of cultural travels must, in his opinion, be related to history, and such focus on the past is the distinguishing criterion of cultural tourism. This definition seems to be excessively narrow, and the object of cultural tourism defined this way would be limited to cultural heritage (high culture) and relics of broadly understood daily culture.

¹⁰ See: supporting definition by Dreyer: „*From the point of view of economics of tourism, cultural activities are all those which are recognized as such by the traveller*” [Dreyer, 2000, p. 27 – English translation based on the author’s translation into Polish].

¹¹ The author gives an example of a European manual for tourism statistics, dating from 1998, which applied this particular definition.

Example 3. (WTO) - Broad definition:

*“Cultural tourism: all movements of persons, because they satisfy the human need for diversity, tending to raise the cultural level of the individual and giving rise to new knowledge, experience and encounters.”*¹²

The definition specifies the underlying human needs rather than the subject matter of interest in cultural tourism, and this way combines both the elite tourism focusing on elements of high culture (including the recognized cultural heritage) and mass tourism whose catalogue of products includes evidence/artefacts of the culture of daily life. Therefore, the proposed description of cultural tourism takes into account the consequences of the broader definition of culture. Accordingly, specific goals of cultural travel may include evidence of the past, as well as contemporary works of human culture or events containing cultural components. In accordance with this description, the enriching function of cultural tourism is not only that of providing new knowledge and experience; indeed, through the meetings which take place during a journey, it also facilitates a dialogue between the tourist and the ancient or foreign culture (i.e. from the viewpoint of the values on offer), and finally satisfies specific human needs (i.e. from the viewpoint of individually understood demand). This way, deliberately avoiding any distinctions, the definition seems to solve the problem of differing concepts of culture – because both its programs and components may use both elite and daily culture. Yet, without establishing a criterion for the intensity of cultural components, it does not make it possible to clearly distinguish cultural tourism within the whole phenomenon of tourism.¹³

Example 4 (Marciszewska):

„(...) cultural tourism means activities performed by people during their stay at locations visited for tourism-related purposes, and during trips taken from the place of their permanent residence, which make it possible to learn or experience diverse life-styles of other people – reflecting social customs, religious traditions, intellectual concepts, cultural heritage and designed to satisfy human needs, desires and expectations related to culture”
[Marciszewska, 2002, p.5]

Tourist's open-mindedness, intellectual curiosity for the world other than his/her own place of residence, is – in the light of this definition – a criterion distinguishing this segment of tourism from other types, which mainly focus on leisure, health or activities more or less related to one's occupation. Learning and experiencing (deeper and more personal contact with the encountered reality) are the main motivations for cultural travellers. Willingness to personally come in touch with components of foreign or common culture, mentioned in the definition, is a factor which determines tourists' behaviours at the visited location, their choices regarding the way of spending time and visits to specific places there, and participation in events. The above approach assumes high level of awareness on the part of the tourist concerning cultural values, which as a consequence, may significantly limit the scope of the phenomenon defined this way.

Attempts of holistic definitions

In addition to interpretations focusing on specific aspects of tourism, obviously there have been attempts to approach this phenomenon of cultural tourism in a holistic way. These try to define it and clarify its specificity in a wider context of underlying values as well as human needs and interests which are to be satisfied by cultural travels, or they even take into

¹² WTO (World Tourism Organization): 1985

¹³ G. Richards again criticises this definition as a whole, and claims that it cannot be functional since it does not really distinguish cultural tourism and does not clearly specify what it is: *„(...) This extremely optimistic conceptual approach is however of little use for definition purposes, because it provides no basis for distinguishing what cultural tourism actually is”*. (Richards, 2007, p. 24).

account a certain “added value” gained by consumers. Here we would like to present and analyze an example existing in Polish literature devoted to tourism, i.e. a definition proposed by W. Gaworecki.

Example (Gaworecki): *“Cultural tourism is movement of people from places of their permanent residence to places of cultural attractions in order to acquire new information and experience and satisfy their own needs.(...) Cultural tourism comprises artefacts of culture from the past and works of contemporary culture, life-styles of specific populations or regions; it comprises travels focusing on cultural heritage and travels focusing on art.*

The concept of cultural tourism comprises all forms of tourism which contain culture-related products on offer.” [Gaworecki, 2003, p. 81].

The definition proposed by the Polish researcher to an extent is based on the aforementioned “broad” definition adopted by ATLAS. Even the term “turystyka kulturalna” rather than “kulturowa” is probably a deliberately applied calque (literally “borrowed” from the English term “cultural tourism”). The author, however, supplements the picture of cultural tourism, emphasizing its focus not only on the past (heritage) but also on contemporary forms of culture, as well as by including an important segment of travels where the participants aim for contact with works of art. A certain novelty in comparison with the applied original is the clearly identified suggestion that the concept of cultural tourism should comprise all forms of tourism which contain cultural components (in any manner and at any level). This means, any attempts to clearly distinguish cultural tourism have been given up. This type of definition makes it possible only to briefly describe cultural tourism as one of the aspects of tourism as a whole, and it can be used to point out these forms of tourism which in designing itineraries take into account certain preferences on the part of tourists. This definition, however, cannot provide foundations for more detailed analysis of cultural tourism as a separate phenomenon or for attempts aimed at its internal classification.

4. Proposed holistic functional definition of cultural tourism

After presenting selected definitions of the multidimensional phenomenon, which is cultural tourism, we can proceed to make our own attempt at its functional description. It is our intention to work out a functional definition, which will not only present academic approach to significant features of cultural tourism, but will also make it possible to practically distinguish its catalogue of products from options on offer from other branches of tourism. In order to fulfil its goal, such definition must take into account and, to a degree, solve the problem of diverse understanding of the concept of culture – as a distinctive goal and motivation for cultural tourism – as well as remove the difficulty connected with the choice of basic criterion for identifying the contents of “cultural travels” in comparison to “trips with cultural components”, i.e. nearly all journeys other than those taken specifically on business. Moreover, it can only fulfil its goal if it also facilitates analysis of the phenomenon, allows for its adequate description, proves to be a useful instrument in designing and distribution of tourism products and may be commonly applied in this particular area.

The term ‘cultural tourism’ may relate to all tourist expeditions taken by groups or individuals, where encounters with sites, events and other assets of high culture or popular culture, or effort aimed at improving one’s knowledge of the surrounding world organized by man are the essential part/aspect of the traveller’s itinerary or are a clinching argument for individuals’ decision on whether or not take up such a journey/participate in such a trip. [Mikos von Rohrscheidt, 2008, p. 31]

As it can be seen, the definition proposed by us, using the term “tourist expeditions”, from the start automatically shows cultural tourism as an integral part of tourism as a whole, both in the phenomenological aspect (as a common occurrence) and from the standpoint of economics (as a sector of economy). Therefore, it acknowledges the superiority of the

commonly accepted general definition of tourism¹⁴ and recognizes cultural tourism as its part and a specific type of travelling.

Significant features of cultural tourism, i.e. qualities distinguishing it from other types of tourism, are reflected in this definition by two (complementary) criteria. Therefore, a trip may be classified as cultural tourism if it fulfils two conditions. In the first case, its itinerary must comprise cultural components at a level considered as “essential”, i.e. their quantity or intensity clearly prevails, as a constitutive feature of a given trip which also distinguishes its program from other options on offer for the same destination. In the second case, the cultural component is a decisive factor for the traveller, who takes a trip (independently) because of such values or participates in such a trip based on such personal motivations.

Cultural assets, which our definition enumerates as those determining the character of cultural travels, include: sites (such as landmarks, monuments, buildings and urban complexes, works of art, etc.), events (e.g. festivals, concerts, exhibitions, fairs, religious acts, etc.), but also personally recognized values, such as knowledge acquisition (hence: educational asset). Therefore, tourism designed strictly for educational purposes is also recognized as cultural tourism. This is because, unquestionably, nearly every type of humanistic education involves opening up for one’s own and for foreign culture; therefore if educational endeavours are combined with travelling, that process of “opening up” is always included. Certain problems will be posed in this context by temporary educational visits or academic scholarships, where students/academics stay abroad for less than one year. Because of the nature of both the type of such visits, and the related journeys to and from the destination, these should be classified as systematic educational process, in which travelling and sightseeing are only of secondary importance, yet in accordance with the common definition of tourism and tourist we would be obliged to recognize this group as cultural travellers, in the broadest meaning of the term. It seems however, that the expression “improving one’s knowledge of the surrounding world organized by man” contained in our definition makes it possible to narrow down the concept of educational tourism, therefore we can disregard activities carried out by those people who, during their prolonged stay away from their place of residence, for schooling or academic purposes, improve only their specialist knowledge and are not generally interested in that “surrounding world”. As a consequence, persons studying abroad, on a regular basis or temporarily, or those participating in research or university scholarships exclusively for academic purposes should not be directly considered as cultural travellers. Obviously, this does not exclude the possibility that persons benefiting from such forms of education may, during their stay abroad, participate in shorter cultural expeditions.

The expression “surrounding world organized by man” means that cultural tourism may focus not only – even though it does in the first place - on any anthropogenic assets (effects of human activities) but also, in specific situations, on natural assets (e.g. unique landscapes, geological formations or processes/phenomena of nature, living forms of plants and animals, etc.), provided that these have been transformed or at least ordered in some way by human activities. This approach has been adopted for two reasons. Firstly, because in the contemporary, densely-populated and highly urbanized European environment, nature is almost inseparable from human activities designed to put order, or “civilize” or indeed adjust the environment to human requirements; such activities include: designating protected areas, landscape reserves, hiking trails, regulation of waterways, as well as establishing sites designed for natural education, such as arboreta and palm houses, orangeries, natural museums, botanical and zoological gardens. Secondly, there is a distinctive educational

¹⁴ Here we refer to the definition adopted in 1993 by WTO Conference in Ottawa: „Tourism comprises the totality of activities undertaken by persons traveling to and staying in places outside their usual environment for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited”. Polish text of the definition in: Terminologia turystyczna. Zalecenia WTO, ONZ-WTO, UKFiT, Warszawa 1995, p.5

element in frequent exploration of nature, particularly trips to protected areas, which is also a significant element of cultural travels from the time these first emerged. Therefore, a tourist expedition focusing on natural environments organized by people, and motivated by the willingness to improve one's knowledge of nature should also be recognized as cultural tourism. This obviously does not mean that a mountain-climbing expedition, a clearly sporting endeavour, should be classified as cultural tourism – since it does not contain features required from cultural or educational tourism, it does not involve a meeting with man-made artefacts or an encounter of environment transformed by people; neither is it motivated by a wish to improve one's knowledge.

Another significant expression "improvement of one's knowledge" referring to those participating in tourist expeditions means that typical research expeditions taken by scientists and specialists will not be classified as cultural tourism. Indeed, in that case the point is not in expanding one's personal knowledge (education) to learn previously discovered and recognized facts, but in acquiring new knowledge, previously unknown to mankind, and participants of research expeditions usually receive remuneration for their professional work (and this generally contradicts the adopted definitions of tourism and tourist).

On the other hand the clear specification of "assets of high culture" and "assets of popular culture" shows that the definition wants to embrace these two realities within cultural tourism, therefore a relevant distinction (if necessary) will occur only as a result of (internal) classification of types comprised within this kind of tourism. Similarly, a distinction into narrowly and broadly understood cultural tourism (as well as educational tourism) must be undertaken, and in fact has been discussed in further considerations of cultural tourism [Mikos v. Rohrscheidt, 2008, 51 and next].

The scope of cultural tourism, as it is presented here, comprises expeditions taken by groups (usually organized in advance and following a pre-designed itinerary) and those taken by individuals, where travellers frequently spontaneously decide, on the spot, to visit specific sites or participate in a cultural event. Such clear identification of the two methods of travelling is necessary to acknowledge the rapidly increasing number of trips taken independently by individuals who do not use package tours, and to explicitly recognize this phenomenon as a part of cultural tourism. In many cases, such individual and independent travellers to a large degree (so "essentially") focus on visiting cultural heritage sites, learning about material culture of a place or region, or on improving their knowledge, therefore they meet the necessary conditions to be recognized as cultural travellers. This however, leads to a problem concerning interpretation: many of such trips, with no pre-designed itinerary, turn out to be cultural trips only after the fact, when it is possible to determine that the actual journey, among other purposes, included numerous cultural components. Due to this, it may be impossible to avoid difficulties in academic considerations and statistic classifications of this kind of journeys. In spite of that, given the clear tendencies in the development of tourism as a whole and cultural tourism in particular, in our opinion, for the purpose of the definition, it was necessary to take into account this group of travellers who undoubtedly are tourist.

The presented definition, obviously, does not exhaust all the multidimensional components of cultural tourism, nor does it account for all the inherent factors. In particular, it cannot be absolutely adequate with respect to personal ideas and concepts related to culture and cultural tourism, and the resulting behaviours of individual travellers. It obviously may happen that someone decides to participate in an organized trip because of one specific component of cultural significance; nevertheless the journey as a whole, in accordance with its overall program, does not have to be classified as a cultural travel. In this case we could speak of a "subjective cultural trip", because it meets culture-related expectations of that one participant. Because tourism (and particularly cultural tourism) is, to a high degree, a humanistic phenomenon, any attempts at describing and classifying it are bound to encounter isolated exceptions resulting from personal decisions taken by specific individuals.

An accurate definition, designed to facilitate distinctions and classifications, cannot at the same time fully take into account the aforementioned broadest and most universal approach to cultural tourism. Even though it is necessary to appreciate the role of this approach in the entire humanistic considerations related to tourism, in analyzing its social significance, and in identifying its goals from the standpoint of multicultural dialogue – the definition proposed by us cannot fully share these. This results from the fact that a functional definition must primarily focus on making clear and explicit distinctions between cultural and other segments of tourism. The definition proposed herein on the one hand is trying to fulfill criteria for academic definition, which can be employed for classifications within the emerging independent studies of tourism and in the light of the most common contemporary understanding of cultural tourism. On the other hand, because the definition uses two complementary criteria for distinguishing cultural travels, it can be applied for practical purposes: designing and segmentation of products on offer, their distribution and widespread promotion of cultural tourism defined in this way, as a comprehensible leisure time option for consumers. This is because irrespective of the academic ambitions of researchers, and their theoretical discussions, this exactly is the nature of the issue in question.

References:

- Barbier B., 2005 *Wybrane aspekty turystyki kulturowej Francuzów*, *Turyzm*, Nr 15/1-2, ss 95-120
- Bąk S.A. 2007, *Działania Unii Europejskiej na rzecz kultury i turystyki kulturowej*, Difin, Warszawa
- Becker Ch., 1993, *Kulturismus. Eine Einführung*, [in:] Ch. Becker, A. Steinecke (ed.) *Kulturismus in Europa. Wachstum ohne Grenzen?* ETI GmbH, Universität Trier, Trier
- Becker Ch., Steinecke A., 1997, *Kulturismus: Strukturen und Entwicklungsperspektiven*, Fern-Universität, Hagen
- Buczowska K., *Turystyka kulturowa*, manuscript, Poznań 2008
- Crepaz M., Hrovat-Forstinger B., 1999, *Die strategische Führung von Kulturbetrieben unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Burgen und Schlössern*, [in:] H. Pechlaner (ed.) *Burgen und Schlösser zwischen Tradition und Wirtschaftlichkeit. Probleme und Perspektiven*. Linde, Wien
- Dreyer A., 2000, *Der Markt für Kulturismus*, [in:] A. Dreyer (ed.), *Kulturismus*, Oldenbourg, München/Wien
- Eder W., 1993, *Wissenschaftliche Reiseleitung und Kulturismus* [in:] Becker Ch., Steinecke A. (ed.), 1997, *Kulturismus: Strukturen und Entwicklungsperspektiven*, Fern-Universität, Hagen
- Gaworecki, W., 2003, *Turystyka*, 4th (altered) edition, PWE, Warszawa
- Hall C. M., Zeppel H., 1990a, *Cultural and heritage tourism: the new grand tour?*, *Historic Environment*, No 7(3/4), pp. 86-98.
- Hall C. M., Zeppel H., 1990b, *History, Architecture, Environment: Cultural Heritage and Tourism*, *Journal of Travel Research*, No 29, pp. 54-55.
- Hughes H., 2003 *Arts, entertainment and tourism*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford-Burlington
- Kowalczyk A., 2008, *Współczesna turystyka kulturowa – między tradycją a nowoczesnością*, [in:] A. Kowalczyk (ed.) *Turystyka Kulturowa (spojrzenie geograficzne)*, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa
- Lohmann M., 1999, *Kulturisten oder die touristische Nachfrage nach Kulturangeboten* [in:] T. Heinze *Kulturismus: Grundlagen, Ziele, Trends und Fallstudien*, Westdeutscher Verlag, München – Wien
- Małek J., 2003, *Turystyka kulturowa jako czynnik rozwoju lokalnego*, *Prace i Studia Geograficzne*, vol. 32, Geografia turystyki, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Warszawa
- Marciszewska B., 2002, *Spoleczno-ekonomiczne uwarunkowania rozwoju turystyki kulturowej w Polsce*, *Problemy Turystyki i Hotelarstwa*, No. 3, pp. 5-9
- Marczak M., 2000, *Rodzaje turystyki*, [in:] A. Szwichtenberg, (red.) *Podstawy turystyki*, Politechnika Koszalińska, Koszalin
- Medlik S., 1995, *Leksykon podróży, turystyki, hotelarstwa*, PWN, Warszawa

- Metelka Ch. J., 1990, *The Dictionary of Hospitality, Travel and Tourism*, Delmar Publishers Ins., Merton house travel and tourism publishers, Albany, New York, USA
- Mikos von Rohrscheidt A., 2008, *Turystyka kulturowa. Fenomen, potencjał, perspektywy*, GWSHM Milenium, Gniezno
- Przeclawski K., 2004, *Człowiek i turystyka. Zarys socjologii turystyki*, Albis, Kraków
- Richards G., 1996, *Cultural Tourism in Europe*, CABI, Wallingford
- Richards G., 2007, *Cultural Tourism. Global and local perspectives*, The Haworth Hospitality Press, New York – London - Oxford
- Steinecke A., 2007, *Kulturtourismus. Marktstrukturen, Fallstudien, Perspektiven*, Oldenbourg, München
- Weissenborn B., 1997, *Kulturtourismus*, [in:] *Trierer Tourismus Bibliographien*, vol 10., Trier

Turystyka Kulturowa – wokół definicji

Słowa kluczowe: Turystyka kulturowa, definicja

Streszczenie:

Po dokonaniu przeglądu i krótkiej analizy treści i zakresu kilkunastu definicji turystyki kulturowej, stosowanych w oficjalnej klasyfikacji, w refleksji naukowej oraz w praktyce dydaktycznej, autor artykułu przystępuje do przedstawienia propozycji definicji funkcjonalnej tego fenomenu, odnoszącej się do powszechnie stosowanego określenia turystyki jako pojęcia nadrzędnego. Propozycja uwzględnia zarówno współczesne (szerokie) pojmowanie kultury, jak i programy (cele i treści) wypraw turystycznych z jednej, zaś aspekt motywacji kulturowej turystów z drugiej strony. Celem autora jest udostępnienie i upowszechnienie użytecznego narzędzia dla klasyfikacji ofert turystycznych oraz w konsekwencji doprowadzenie do ujednoczenia polskojęzycznej nomenklatury fachowej w dziedzinie turystyki kulturowej. Propozycję należy traktować jako punkt wyjścia dla dyskusji w kręgach fachowych na temat definiowania turystyki kulturowej z jednoczesną opcją na rzecz uwzględnienia w tej dyskusji środowiska organizatorów turystyki oraz jego potrzeb.