

THE EFFECT OF UTILISING THE WORLD HERITAGE SITES STATUS ON THE DELHI TRIP EXPERIENCE

¹Monisha Juneja, ²Dr. Swati Sharma and ³Prof. Mamata Bhatnagar

¹Research Scholar, Amity University, Noida, (Uttar Pradesh)

²Assistant Professor, Amity School of Travel and Tourism, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh

³Former Director and HOD, School of Management Studies, Shridhar University Pillani, Rajasthan

¹monishajuenja@gmail.com, ²ssharma3@amity.edu and ³hodictm@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Getting sites listed onto UNESCOs World Heritage list is of great importance as it establishes a symbolic value at both national and international level. There are 1121sites on the UNESCOs World Heritage list out of which 38 sites are in Indiaand 30 sites are described as ‘cultural’ sites (UNESCO,2021). While all these cultural sitesare scattered across India, three of them are concentrated in a relatively small area of the capital on India, Delhi. There are many studies which identified the importance of the world heritage sites in attracting tourists whereas this study focused on using the World heritage site status effect on the tourist experience during their trip. The findings reveal that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based on using the World Heritage status of sites and nationality. However, there is a significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based use of World Heritage status of sites status. The implication of this study is that it has helps us pin out avenues which can be utilised by the tourism intermediaries to use the World Heritage Site status in order to enhancing the trip experience of the tourists.

Keywords- World Heritage Sites; Trip experience; Tourist ; 2 Way-ANOVA; Delhi

1. INTRODUCTION

World Heritage Sites logo acts as a brand and provides a certificate of quality totourist who want to visit a new heritage site(Petr, 2009). The process of getting the sites inscribed into the World Heritage List is also a planned process conducted by World Heritage Committee. There are 1121sites on the UNESCOs World Heritage list out of which 38 sites are in Indiaand 30 sites are described as ‘cultural’ sites (UNESCO,2021). While all these cultural sitesare scattered across India, three of them are concentrated in a relatively small area of the capital on India, Delhi. The three sites listed are The Humayun’s Tomb; Qutab Minar and its monuments and The Red Fort Complex.

The World Heritage Sites establishes a symbolic value which is recognised at both national and international level. The role of the world heritage sites has shifted from preservation to helping in selection of a destination. While promoting the heritage site the tourist facilities should also be managed well (Henderson, 2009). Once the site image is enhanced it starts to attract quality international tourist (Bianchi&Boniface, 2002). Su and Lin (2014, pg 33) upon examining the effect of heritage sites on inbound tourism from 2006-2009 and data obtained from 66 countries, it was found that “there exists a positive relationship between having such heritage sites and tourist numbers”.

There are many studies which are working focusing on the importance of the world heritage sites in attracting tourists whereas this study is directed towards the interaction between the use of the World Heritage Sites status and overall trip experience of the domestic and international tourist visiting Delhi. The study uses 2-way ANOVA to study the interaction between the independent variable which are use of the world heritage site status and nationality of tourist with the dependent variable the overall trip experience.

The rest of the paper has been divided into different into the followings sections. Section 2 of the paper talks about the past studies. Section 3 is giving a brief about the research methodology. Section 4 is discussion of results and Section 5 about the conclusion, limitations and the future scope.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW & HYPOTHESIS

World Heritage Convention Setup

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted the international treaty of World Heritage Convection to protect the natural and cultural heritage in Paris in the year 1972. This was an agreement to conserve the everlasting heritage of the world which is run by members elected by the different countries who are represented as “State Party”. The 21 elected member team is called as the World Heritage Committee which has the vital responsibility of selecting the sites to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Along with the committee there are three advisory committees. First is the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) which looks into the technical evaluation of natural sites. The second is the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) which gives technical evaluation for the cultural and mixed sites. The third is the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) which provides conversation advice for cultural heritage. There is also an administrative department known as the World Heritage Centre which maintains all the paper work related to the selection and nomination of the World heritage sites along side provides the communication related assistance to all stakeholders.

Process, Selection Criteria and inscription of World Heritage Sites:

The State Party must prepare a tentative list of sites having Outstanding Universal Value which has to be described based on the Operational Guidelines For Implementation of The World Heritage Convection

(2019). The sites should be of importance to the international community at large along with being authentic and meet the norms of integrity. A nomination list prepared by the state party based on the tentative list which is the primary document to be considered for inscription on the World heritage list. This list is made with the assistance of the advisory bodies and the world heritage centre. The completed nomination list is submitted to the World heritage centre and a receipt of the list is sent by the secretariat. The nomination list is sent to the advisory bodies. The same list is published on the website and sent to the committee. The nomination cycle take one and half year from the submission in the month of February of the first year and the decision by the World heritage committee in June of the second year.

Utilising World Heritage Sites in Attracting Tourists

World Heritage Sites logo acts as a brand and provides a certificate of quality to tourist who want to visit a new heritage site. This world heritage site brand is highly valued by the heritage tourist plus it helps in reducing the consumer search cost while selecting which places to visit (Petr, 2009). According to Shackley (1998) UNESCO Heritage Site tag helps to make the site more visible and it also establishes a symbolic value at both the national and international level and Smith (2002) agrees that it becomes well known to the tourists. The heritage status makes the tourists want to visit that destination (Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Cohen, R. 2011). Ryan and Silvanto (2009) indicated that the WHS designation has shifted from preservation to attracting tourist to these sites and plays an important role in selecting the destination.

TOURIST

According to U.N. in 1963 during the conference on international Travel and Tourism proposed the definition of tourist. "A temporary visitor staying at least 24 hours in the country visited and the purpose of whose journey can be classified under one of the two headings:(i) Leisure (recreation, holiday, health, study, religion, sport);(ii) business, family, mission, meeting. Cohen (1974) had established 6 dimensions which help to understand the role of the tourist. The tourist travel is temporary, voluntary, ends at the place of origin, is a relative long journey, non-recurrent and non-instrumental where the tourist is not on a trip for economic, political or religious purpose. According to UNWTO a domestic tourist is one takes a trip within the own country and an international tourist is one visits another country and stays in a collective or private accommodation. Tourists looking for leisure have intension to travel and search for experiences beyond their local environment (Cetin & Bilgihan, 2014).

Overall Trip Experience

Tourist experiences are constructed on the different dimensions which they encounter on their trip. Tourist tends to build upon each of these which become their actual experiences. (Swarbrooke, 2001; Sorensen, 2004; Cetin & Bilgihan, 2014). The various dimensions of trip experience according to Mill & Morrison (1985) are places of interest, facilities, infrastructure, transportation and accommodation. Dickman (1997)

has provided the 5A's of a destination which include: Attraction, Accessibility, Accommodation, Amenities and Activities. These components help the tourist build their experiences of the destination visited by them (Prebensen et al., 2012). Trip experience is a compilation of infrastructure, lodging facilities, places of interest and accessibility to a destination (Surthathip, 2014). The tourist destination is a combination of services and facilities which help to create the overall tourist experience (Cetin & Bilgihan, 2014). These experiences are both tangible (physical) and intangible (emotional) (Hosany & Gilbert, 2010; Murphy et al., 2000).

Rational of the Study

Su and Lin (2014, pg 33) upon examining the effect of heritage sites on inbound tourism from 2006-2009 and data obtained from 66 countries, it was found that "there exists a positive relationship between having such heritage sites and tourist numbers". Once tourist have selected a destination for its heritage sites for them to have a positive experience the tourist facilities should also be managed well (Henderson, 2009). This helps to enhanced the site image and attract quality tourists (Bianchi & Boniface, 2002). Keeping this in view point Delhi the capital city of India has been selected as the site locations. As are three World Heritage Sites which are concentrated in a relatively small area. The three sites listed are The Humayun's Tomb; Qutab Minar and its monuments and The Red Fort Complex. The research objective of the study is to understand the relationship between the use of the World Heritage Sites status and overall trip experience of the domestic and international tourist visiting Delhi. Which has been framed into a hypothesis which states that?

H_{01} : There is no relationship between the dimensions of tourist trip experience and the use of World Heritage status of sites in Delhi.

H_{a1} : There is a relationship between the dimensions of tourist trip experience and use of World Heritage status of sites in Delhi.

The sub objectives which have emerged from this is are:

A) Using World Heritage Site status and Nationality interaction Effect: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based on opportunities of using the World Heritage status of sites and nationality of tourist.

B) Using World Heritage Site status main effect: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based on using the World Heritage status of sites.

C) Nationality Main Effect: There is no statistically significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based on nationality of tourist.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research has used quantitative research design. For data collecting a self administered structured questionnaire was used which is commonly used in tourism studies (Hassan &Shahnewaz, 2014). The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section dealt with closed-ended questions related to the overall trip experience of the tourist which the respondents had to rate from 1 to 5 based on their experience. The second section dealt with the use of World Heritage Sites site status during their entire course of their trip. Closed ended questions were asked which had to be marked for one of the three options. “Yes”; “No” and “Didn’t notice/ Experience”. The third section asked questions related to the demographic profile of the respondents. Parametric tests are being used to analyse the data.

For central tendency mean and for variability standard deviation has been used.The study uses 2-way ANOVA to study the interaction between the independent variable which are use of the world heritage site status and nationality of tourist with the independent variable the overall trip experience.

The data was collected in the 4th quarter of the year which ranges from October to December 2019 according to India Tourism Statistics (2018) is the peak time for tourists. The data was collected using convenience sampling. The total number of questionnaires distributed was 450 out of which 411 were usable. This shows that there were 91.33 percent of valid questionnaires.

4. RESULTS

The data has been analysed using SPSS version 21. The demographic characteristic of the sample are displayed in Table No.1 The majority of the respondents had opted for group tour which comprised of 88.56 percent. More than half of the respondents fell in the age bracket of 36-55years with 51.09 percent followed by 16 – 35 years with 39.17 percent. Male respondents were 65.45 percent which were in majority. Under occupation 63.75 percent fell in the category of employed / self employed/ working from home.

Table 1: Respondents Demographic Profile

Characteristics	Respondents (n=411)	
	Frequency	Percentage
Tour		
Group Tour Package	364	88.56%
Customised Tour Package	47	11.44%
Age		
16-35 years	161	39.17%
36 - 55 years	210	51.09%
Above 55 years	40	9.73%

Gender		
Female	142	34.55%
Male	269	65.45%
Nationality		
Domestic	292	71.05%
International	119	28.95%
Occupation		
Student	121	29.44%
Employed/Self Employed/Working at home	262	63.75%
Retired	28	6.81%

The two way ANOVA compares the mean difference between groups that have been split on two independent variables making it appropriate to test the null hypothesis.

Before conducting the two- way ANOVA, assumptions testing was completed. The assumption of normality was evaluated by using histograms and Shapiro-Wilk tests. The evidence demonstrated that normality for one group of the independent variable was normally distributed for all remaining $p < 0.05$ where normality couldn't be assumed. For the independent variable, the use of World Heritage status of sites those under the "No" category $p = 0.231$. In the remaining three categories $p < .05$ could not be assumed. However, the ANOVA is reasonably robust to violations of normality when the group sizes are similar (Warner, 2013). So the two way ANOVA was conducted.

The cases in use the World Heritage status of sites, under "yes" category 147,191,192,190,208,148,117 and 188; "No" category 212 and "Didn't experience or notice" 187 were outliers in the Box plot. In the second independent variable in the "No" category 159 and 191 and under "yes" 188 and 187 were the outliers. However there were no extreme outliers in any cases. The assumption of the homogeneity of variance is based on the results of Levene's test of equality of error provided, $F(5,405) = 1.46$, $p = 0.202$.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for during trip experiences

Descriptive Statistics				
Dependent Variable: Overall trip experience				
Use of the World Heritage Site Status	Tourist	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Yes	Domestic	61.18	12.01	186
	International	60.86	9.17	74

	Total	61.09	11.25	260
No	Domestic	57.15	10.08	59
	International	51.00	7.17	22
	Total	55.48	9.73	81
Didn't exp/notice	Domestic	53.31	10.42	47
	International	53.78	9.765	23
	Total	53.47	10.14	70
Total	Domestic	59.10	11.75	292
	International	57.67	9.83	119
	Total	58.68	11.23	411

Table No. 2 displays the descriptive statistics of the tourists based on the nationality on their Delhi trip experiences relating to the use of World heritage site status during their overall trip experience. The average score of domestic tourist and international tourist is 61.18 and 60.86 who had responded to “Yes”. Similarly the average score of Delhi trip experience who had responded as “No” is 57.15 for domestic tourists and international tourist is 51.00. The mean of who didn't notice or experience the use of World heritage status during their Delhi trip experience is 53.31 for domestic and 53.78 for international tourists.

Table 3: Two Way ANOVA

Dependent Variable:OverallTrip Experience					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4855.950	5	971.190	8.386	.000
Intercept	779006.159	1	779006.159	6726.425	.000
Use of the World Heritage Site Status	4107.295	2	2053.648	17.732	.000
Nationality	247.070	1	247.070	2.133	.145
Use of the World Heritage Site Status * Nationality	476.392	2	238.196	2.057	.129
Error	46904.187	405	115.813		
Total	1467387.000	411			

Corrected Total	51760.136	410			
-----------------	-----------	-----	--	--	--

The two way ANOVA was conducted and the results are shown in table no. 3. It reveals that there was an insignificant evidence to reject the interaction effect of null hypothesis, $F(2,405)=2.057$, $p= 0.129$. Using the original model in which the interaction was maintained, the main effects were evaluated. There was insignificant evidence to reject the nationality main effect null hypothesis, $F(1,405) = 2.133$, $p = 0.145$. Domestic and international tourists do not significantly differ in their trip experience. The results revealed that using the World Heritage site Status main effect was significant, $F(2,405) = 17.732$, $p < 0.001$. There is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and conclude there is a significant difference between the mean of tourist trip experience based on using the World Heritage status of sites. Those who opted for option “Yes” stating the use of the World Heritage status of sites was statistically significantly greater than those who opted for option “NO”.

5. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SCOPE

The study has revealed that there is insignificant evidence to reject the null hypotheses which stating that there is no relationship between the dimensions of tourist trip experience and the use of World Heritage status of sites in Delhi. But we further analysed the main effect it was revealed that the mean score of the trip experience for those tourist who said “Yes” to the use of the World Heritage status of sites is greater than those who opted for “NO”.

This helps us understand that there is importance of using the World Heritage status of sites not during the promotion but also during the execution of the trip. This in turn impacts the overall trip experience. The majority of the tourist did see the use of the world heritage sites in the promotional material and brochures. The tourists also experienced it during the narrations being made by the Tour guides and tour leader, in the food being served, audio visual presentation, while buying souvenirs and in the decor of the hotels they were staying at. The managerial implication of this study is that it has helps us pin out avenues which can be utilised by the tourism intermediaries to use these opportunities to the fullest as they help in enhancing the trip experience of the tourist. As previous studies have highlighted the importance of the heritage sites in attracting the tourist to the destination the finding from this study has added that the use of the world heritage sites status should be carried even during the trip, as it is an additional improvement to tourists trip experience.

There are a few limitations to this study which can be addressed in future research. The study has only on tourists travelling to Delhi which was the study area. Similar study can be conducted for other tourist destinations with World heritage sites. To extend this study further one can look assess the impact of using the World Heritage Site status at different levels of the tourist trip.

REFERENCES

1. Bianchi,R.&Boniface,P.(2002). Editorial: the politics of World Heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. doi: 10.1080/13527250220143887
1. Cetin, G., & Bilgihan, A. (2014). Components of cultural tourists' experiences in destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, (ahead-of-print), 1-18.
2. Cohen, Erik(1974) Who is a Tourist?: A Conceptual Clarification. *The Sociological Review*. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.1974.tb00507.x
3. Dickman, S. (1997). *Tourism: an introductory text* (edisi ke-3). Sydney: Hodder Headline.
4. Hassan, M. M., & Shahnewaz, M. (2014). Measuring tourist service satisfaction at destination: A case study of Cox's Bazar sea beach, Bangladesh. *American Journal of Tourism Management*, 3(1), 32-43.
5. Henderson, J. C. (2009). The meanings, marketing, and management of heritage tourism in Southeast Asia. In *Cultural heritage and tourism in the developing world— a regional perspective*. London: Routledge.
6. Hosany, S., & Gilbert, D. (2010). Measuring Tourists' Emotional Experiences toward Hedonic Holiday Destinations. *Journal of Travel Research*, 49(4), 513–526. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287509349267>
7. Mill, R.C., & Morrison, A.M. (1985). *The tourism system*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
8. Murphy, Peter & Pritchard, Mark & Smith, J.. (2000). The destination product and its impact on traveller perceptions. *Tourism Management*. 21. 10.1016/S0261-5177(99)00080-1.
9. Petr, C. (2009) Fame is not always a positive asset for heritage equity! Some clues from buying intentions of national tourists. *Journal of travel & tourism marketing* 26(1):1.
10. Poria,Y., Butler,R., Airey,D. (2004) Links between tourist, heritage and reason for visiting sites heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(1)
11. Prebensen, N. K., Woo, E., Chen, J. S., & Uysal, M. (2012). Motivation and involvement as antecedents of the perceived value of the destination experience. *Journal of Travel Research*. DOI: 0047287512461181
12. Ryan, Jason & Silvanto, Sari. (2009). The World Heritage List: The making and management of a brand. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. 5. 290-300. 10.1057/pb.2009.21.
13. Shackley,M.L. (1998). *Visitor management: case studies from World Heritage sites*. Butterworth Heinemann

-
14. Sorensen, F. (2004). Tourism experience innovation networks. Roskilde, DK: Center of Service Studies.
 15. Sthathip, S. (2014). Factors Affecting Tourist Satisfaction: An Empirical Study in the Northern Part of Thailand. SHS Web of Conferences. 12. 10.1051/shsconf/20141201027.
 16. Su, Yu-Wen & Lin, Hui-lin. (2014). Analysis of international tourist arrivals worldwide: The role of world heritage sites. Tourism Management. 40. 46-58.10.1016/j.tourman.2013.04.005.
 17. Swarbrooke, J. (2001). Key challenges for visitor attraction managers in the UK. Journal of Retail and Leisure Property, 1(4), 318-336.
 18. UNSECO (2021) <https://whc.unesco.org/>. Accessed on 13th February 2021.