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The aim of this dissertation is to investigate the visitor experience at archaeological sites on the basis of the case study of Newgrange. The objectives are to identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange and to examine the visitor perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange. A quantitative research method with the use of a questionnaire as a data gathering instrument is adopted. Altogether fifty questionnaires were administered amongst the visitors to Newgrange. The prevailing reason for going to Newgrange was to visit the archaeological site. The majority of the survey participants considered themselves to be archaeological tourists. The general visitor experience in Newgrange was very positively evaluated.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

Enormous qualitative and quantitative potential, uniqueness and authenticity are beyond doubt the fundamental features that describe archaeological heritage of Ireland. Numerous archaeological sites of the country are accessible to the public view and have become widely-recognised tourist attractions. Nonetheless, the phenomenon of archaeotourism in the Irish context remains largely unresearched. Publications concerning different aspects of archaeotourism are scarce and the link between archaeology and tourism is frequently very imprecise and vague. Therefore, this paper attempts to bridge the gap in the academic literature between these two domains of knowledge, particularly through the investigation of the visitor experience at archaeological sites using the example of Newgrange, which is the primary aim of this dissertation. Newgrange was chosen as the case study for the research due to the fact that it is the biggest tourist attraction of this type in Ireland. Further rationale behind the choice of the topic comprises the secondary research findings, according to which the measurement of the visitor experience has been vastly neglected in the field of destination management studies (Vittersø, Vorkinn, Vistad and Vaagland 2000; Munsters 2010).

The key aim of this research was achieved through two objectives that read as follows: to identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange and to examine the visitor perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange. In order to exhaust the topic, the paper was subdivided into several sections. Firstly, the comprehensive literature review, dealing with works published mostly in the last decade, revealed a distinct need for the research. The findings from the publications that touch on various aspects of archaeotourism were highlighted. Special attention was drawn to the ones that correspond to the objectives of the study. Secondly, the methodology section specified the methodological assumptions for the research, especially including the quantitative method that was used, the research tool characteristics and the sample group specifications. Thirdly, the detailed results of the research were presented. The discussion section was focused on the analysis of the research outcomes that, where applicable, were compared to the previous investigations characterised in the literature review. In the last chapter a summary of the project was provided and recommendations for further research were given.
CHAPTER 2: Literature review

2.1. Introduction
The fundamental aim of this literature review is to provide a theoretical framework for subsequent empirical research concerning the visitor experience at archaeological sites. The first salient subject area addressed is the location of archaeological tourism among the notions and interests of cultural tourism and heritage tourism. Secondly, the relationship between tourist motivations and archaeotourism was outlined. Furthermore, the review is concentrated on the characteristics and importance of the visitor/tourist experience and the critical factors influencing tourists’ satisfaction. Attention is also drawn to the issues surrounding the popularization and preservation of archaeological heritage. The final key concepts discussed are the ones of authenticity and interpretation, as the elements determining the visitor experience and understanding of the archaeological sites as tourist attractions. All the sources used in the text are the most recent and significant works concerning the subject area. The authors are usually widely recognised authorities or experienced researchers in the domains of tourism and archaeology.

2.2. Between culture, heritage and archaeology – definitional considerations
It is widely acknowledged in the academic literature that the notions of culture, heritage and tourism are inextricably linked (Richards 1996; McManus 1997; Leslie and Sigala 2005; Goeldner and Ritchie 2009). Understanding the place where these terms are interrelated with archaeology as the subject of tourists’ interests requires an in-depth analysis of the available conceptual definitions.

Baram (2008) seeks to clarify the term of archaeotourism, stating that it is focused on the promotion of passion and conservation of the historical-archaeological sites. Prentice (1994 cited in McManus 1997) looks into the question of heritage from the tourism perspective stressing its commercial dimension. He notices that not only does it comprise the elements traditionally indicated in various definitional approaches, such as landscapes, buildings, traditions etc., but it also refers to every aspect of heritage that can be promoted as a commodity. In the era of globalization and mass tourism development the case is similar in relation to broadly understood culture (Reisinger 2009) and archaeology (Baram and Rowan...
2004). Yet, as has been noted by Alzua, O’Leary and Morrison (1998), there are no standardized and generally accepted definitions of cultural and heritage tourism, and thus the exhaustive assessment of the nature of these tourism phenomena poses a challenge. At his attempts at defining the concepts, Richards (2001) looks into the theme of cultural tourism, reporting that the learning function is the basic element that differentiates it from other forms of tourism. The author observes the existence of a distinct dichotomy of cultural tourism that stems from the complexity of the notion of culture itself. Firstly, cultural tourism consists in consuming the past in the form of the cultural products created by previous generations. Basing on such understanding of the term, it can be equated with heritage tourism. On the other hand, as Richards declares, cultural tourism is also interdependent with the second constituent of culture, namely contemporary cultural production which therefore can be defined as arts tourism. Similar results emerged from a study by Zeppel and Hall (1991).

Additionally, Richards (1996, p.23) provides the technical definition that was adopted by the European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education and Research (ATLAS) in the Cultural Tourism Research Project in 1991, writing that cultural tourism comprises all movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as museums, heritage sites, artistic performances and festivals outside their normal place of residence. In his typology of cultural tourism resources, the author distinguishes two major groups, namely attractions and events. The first one, aside from museums, routes and theme parks, comprises monuments, with archaeological sites and industrial-archaeological buildings being a subgroup of its components.

As Orbaşli and Woodward (2009) explain, archaeological sites are an essential constituent of the cultural built heritage and as such manifest the achievements of the past generations. Smith (2003) presents a comprehensive typology of cultural tourism based on activities and places of tourist interests. The author places archaeological sites in the category of heritage sites. Consequently, when it comes to the typology of cultural tourists, the person who visits archaeological sites is called a heritage tourist.

With reference to locating archaeological sites in the broad studies of cultural tourism, crucial publication for the present thesis is the one by Buczkowska (2008). The researcher proposes the division of cultural tourism into cultural heritage tourism and contemporary cultural tourism that, incidentally, is fully applicable to the dual character of culture that was
previously discussed. In her study, Buczkowska further subcategorises cultural heritage tourism into five subgroups, one of which is protected heritage tourism comprising among other things the notion of archaeotourism or archaeological tourism.

Summarizing the above-mentioned findings, archaeological tourism and its components are a niche tourism category subsumed into the heritage tourism that due to the tourists’ interests and typology is a constituent of a wider term - cultural tourism.

2.3. Tourist motivations and archaeotourism

One of the objectives of the present study is to identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange, hence previous research in the area is crucial for further comparison. Delany (2004) undertakes the investigation of tourist motivations to visit County Meath in the off-peak season. The research findings derived from 100 questionnaires distributed amongst visitors at the Newgrange Interpretative Centre comprise the following areas of analyses: a socio-demographic profile of respondents, a travel planning process specifications, the sources of information used before and during the visit, and finally the dominating motivations behind the visit. The detailed results of Delany’s examination were set against the outcomes of the present study in the discussion section.

In a broader perspective, following suggestions from Richards (2007), the predominant motivations for cultural tourists are seen as a synthesis of atmosphere, culture and history of the visited place. Taking into account the interest in cultural attractions and activities, tourists can be labelled as culture-core or culture-peripheral (Hughes 2002, p.170). The first term applies to tourists for whom culture constitutes the main reason for the visit, the decision of which was made before arrival, whereas culture-peripheral tourists visit cultural destinations for different reasons, e.g. business, VFR (Visiting Family or Friends) or other. Following assumptions made by Hughes (2002), Al-Busaidi (2008, p.53) infers that archaeological tourism can be defined as a form of heritage-based tourism in which archaeological landscape represents a core-motivation or peripheral-motivation for on-site visits and/or off-site experience, e.g. museums, travelling exhibitions. It also includes all structural aspects (e.g. organizations and policies) as well as operational processes (e.g. marketing and tour guiding) which are relative to archaeological heritage in a particular area.
2.4. Visitor/tourist experience

The rationale behind the choice of the major topic of the present study among other things can be justified by the findings that measuring of the tourist experience has been vastly neglected in the realm of destination management studies (Vittersø, Vorkinn, Vistad and Vaagland 2000; Munsters 2010). All the same, Munsters (2010) emphasises that there is a direct correlation between the visitor experience and the possibility of returning to the destination of choice.

Page and Connell (2009) note that tourist experience is composed of subjective and objective variables that determine the level of satisfaction with the visit. Regarding archaeological heritage of Ireland, Costa (2004) claims that the visitor experience at the ancient sites is affected to the same extent by the core heritage as well as by the tourist facilities available on-site. As has been argued by Laws (1995), tourists can be compared to consumers whose contentment is strongly dependant on the quality of services they purchase. The author asserts that in order to ensure a high levels of tourist experience, it is crucial to remember that it is a complex process that begins with the intention of visiting a destination, followed by the on-site reception of the attraction and services, finally ending with the memories retained after the visit.

Amongst the major determinants that make up the visitor experience Shackley (2001 cited in Griffin 2010, p.45) presents the following list of elements: *the journey to reach the site, the characteristics and atmosphere of the site, the influence of staff and site management, availability of visitor services, occurrence of special events, festivals etc.* Yale (1997 cited in Page 2009, p.362) expands on the question of the decisive factors that influence the visitor experience and thereby the success of tourist attractions. He identifies four of them as being the most important, i.e.:

1. *accessibility*,
2. *opening hours*,
3. *on-site amenities, such as parking, visitor centre, signs and labels, shops, guides, refreshments, toilets, litter bins, seating and disabled provision*,
4. *off-site amenities, such as signposting, local accommodation and local services.*

Swarbrooke (2002 cited in Page 2009, p.362) complements the list of the above-mentioned critical areas by adding the expectations of tourists preceding the visit, their on-site behaviour
and attitude, and finally other external factors that are beyond control of the managers (e.g. weather conditions).

Regarding the visitor experience at Brú na Bóinne, the general findings of two studies, namely the Visitor Satisfaction at Brú na Bóinne Survey, a part of the Hospitality Study by Fáilte Ireland (2003) and the Survey of Visitors to Brú na Bóinne carried out on behalf of Dúchas by Tourism Development International in 2000, prove a high level of visitor satisfaction in the archaeological park and are compared with the findings of the present research in the discussion chapter.

2.5. Issues surrounding popularization and preservation of archaeological heritage

Newgrange, being an integral element of the Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne, was designated a World Heritage Site by UNESCO in 1993 (Ireland, Department of Environment, Heritage and Local Government 2010; UNESCO World Heritage Centre 2011) and as such subjects to certain regulations pertaining to legislation, protection and planning which are specified among others by the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972). Another critical document with respect to archaeological heritage is the ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of the Archaeological Heritage drawn up in 1990. According to the second article of the latter, archaeological heritage is a non-renewable cultural source, very fragile in its nature and for this reason its protection and preservation regulations have to be an integral element of the planning policies from local to international levels. It is also stated in the document that the same policies have to recognise the necessity to enable active participation and access to information to general public. This is the starting point for the eternal debate on popularization or touristification of archaeological sites and the necessity of preserving the past for posterity.

Research by Magness-Gardiner (2004) shows that globalization has both positive and negative impacts on archaeological sites. Nowadays, increasing number of visitors can appreciate archaeological heritage but not without a price. Following the author’s speculations, growing local and international interest in archaeological sites as tourist destinations might lead to jeopardizing their integrity. Hence, the fact that special attention needs to be brought to preservation of highly sensitive to human utilization archaeological assets is beyond dispute. Hollowell-Zimmer (2003) elaborates on the matter of coexistence of
tourism and archaeology holding that similarly to archaeological excavations, archaeotourism can be organised in different ways so that it might bring both benefits and costs. What is more, the author asks a series of ethical questions regarding archaeotourism. First and foremost, she targets the issue of actual beneficiaries from archaeotourism ventures and puts emphasis on the dangers that stem from the excessive promotion of archaeological heritage. Wurz and Der Merve (2005) accentuate that the tourism requirements for archaeological heritage should always be treated as inferior with comparison to preservation and conservation. Shackley (1998) adds to the topic by stressing the role of good visitor management at heritage sites in striking the balance between destruction-prone, inestimable value resources and adverse effects of the tourist pressure. By the same token, Shackel (2005) underscores the fact that in order to develop sustainable heritage tourism, changes in understanding the need of cooperation between archaeology and tourism should be made on the level of academic institutions. An interdisciplinary training combining the archaeological knowledge with the fundamentals of tourism is bound to improve the management of archaeological heritage in the tourism context.

2.6. Authenticity and interpretation of archaeological sites as tourist attractions

The authenticity of archaeological heritage presented in situ, especially with relation to the quality and quantity of tangible architectural traces of prehistory in Ireland, is unquestionable. The matter of reliability and true experience of the past occurs when the heritage undergoes tourist interpretation. The authenticity of the heritage itself, that in fact is the major attracting force to a certain destination, should be perceived as contrasting with the visitors’ perception of it, because that in fact is the predominant factor that shapes the authenticity of the tourist experience (Ivanovic 2008). Due to this discrepancy, as pointed out by Hall and McArthur (1993 cited in Moscardo 1996), visitor experience should play a pivotal role in the process of heritage management. Gazin-Schwartz (2004) delves into the subject and makes the point that interpretation of the authentic archaeological heritage is facilitated by various modern marketing processes. For instance, by promotion or availability of the tourist facilities such as gift shops, the heritage of the past that is consumed seems to become more familiar and recognisable for the visitors. Lastly, Little (2004) highlights the fact that the role of archaeologists in communicating the past to the public is invaluable. They are seen to be the main facilitators for the interpretation of the message that is conveyed by the relics of the past. An interesting study into interpretation evaluation at Brú na Bóinne was carried out by Fitzgerald (2005). The author provides an insight into various facilities and services that
enable interpretation, that is understood as communication with the visitor, and presents its assessment from the tourist perspective. The findings that correspond to the results of the present research were outlined in the discussion.

2.7. Conclusion
Generally speaking, information on archaeological heritage especially in relation to the visitor experience is very limited. Publications concerning different aspects of archaeotourism are scarce and the nation itself seems to be lost in wider terms of cultural and heritage tourism. Therefore the thesis aims to bridge the gap in the academic literature between archaeology and tourism, particularly with reference to measuring the visitor experience at archaeological sites using the example of Newgrange.
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

3.1. Introduction
The methodology section is composed of several key elements. Firstly, it presents the general overview on the research methods as well as justification for the research instrument used as the basis for the empirical part of this study. Secondly, it is concerned with the sample group, and the procedure implied to carry out the research among the selected respondents. What is more, ethical considerations and limitations of the examination are outlined. Lastly, an insight into the method of analysis is provided.

3.2. Research methods
On the whole, there are two predominant subcategories of the research methods, namely quantitative and qualitative. As has been pointed out by Melkert and Vos (2010), even though they stand in contrast to each other, these two research approaches should be seen as complementary, especially with reference to cultural tourism studies.

A researcher employing a quantitative method focuses on quantity of the target information. In other words, aims at gathering relatively large amount of data. The basic research tool should be a well-structured and carefully thought-out questionnaire (McBurney and White 2009). Singh (2007) claims that one of the conditions that play a pivotal role in successful undertaking of quantitative research is the fact that the information to be obtained has to be measurable and definable. Provided that the definitions are mutually shared between all respondents, the research will produce a reliable and comparable results.

Veal (1997, pp.70-71) provides a division of qualitative research techniques that comprise informal and in-depth interviews, group interviews or focus groups and participant observation. While conducting a qualitative research, emphasis is placed on quality of information that is to be gathered from respondents. The questions that are asked are also predesigned, as in the case of the quantitative method, but there is no formal questionnaire distributed and additional areas of investigation can be covered (Thomas 2003). Again, measurability is a necessary requirement regarding the information to be collected. A considerable difference between a questionnaire and an interview is that in case of the latter,
understanding of the addressed issues can be facilitated by the interviewer, whereas it is unfeasible especially when it comes to long-distance completion of questionnaires.

By virtue of the fact that the primary aim of this study is to investigate the visitor experience at archaeological sites, the author has decided to choose the quantitative research method. The complex character of the notion of the tourist experience, with all the variables determining its character, contribute to the situation where the investigation seeks to examine a wide and diverse data set. The quantity of the target information has to be accentuated, and hence a questionnaire-based method is the most suitable solution that meets these requirements.

3.3. Sample group
On Sunday the 27th of February 2011, a representative sample of fifty respondents was selected from the population of all visitors to Newgrange. As far as the method of choosing the participants is concerned, probability sampling was used, i.e. the selection of the sample was random. Every visitor had the same chance to take part in the examination.

3.4. Procedure
In order to avoid any ambiguity of the questions and to predict possible difficulties with comprehension of the questionnaire’s contents a pilot survey was conducted. The initial research was carried out among the group of five people who visited Newgrange in the past and are familiar with the site and all its tourist facilities. The purpose of the study was explained and the participants were asked to draw attention to any confusing parts of the research instrument. As a result of this procedure, the wording and layout of the questionnaire were enhanced. The main research was conducted at Brú na Bóinne Visitor Centre after previous correspondence and receiving an official permission from the manager of the object.

3.5. Ethical considerations
Following the view by Garner, Wagner, and Kawulich (2009) concerning the significance of ethical considerations for every scientific research, the cover letter was prepared for the tourists who were asked to undergo the survey. It contained the information clearly stating the objectives of the study and the note that taking part in the survey is voluntary and anonymous. In order to encourage participation, special emphasis was placed on confidentiality of the obtained data. Additionally, the questionnaire was administered in a sensitive and respectful
manner, so as not to interfere with the visitors’ enjoyment of the site and thereby tamper with the possible outcomes of the research.

3.6. Limitations
In accordance with the general criteria for the thesis, the questionnaires were filled in by fifty visitors to Newgrange. Following suggestions from Finn, Elliott-White and Walton (2000), such a small subset of the whole population excludes the possibility of making inferences concerning the overall group of tourists to the archaeological site. Nevertheless, for the reason that the target group of visitors was chosen under the rules of random sampling, it is likely that the outcome is more realistic and less biased than it could have been in the case of nonprobability sampling. Furthermore, the questionnaire was designed in such a way so as to avoid suggestive and leading questions and enable visitors to express their subjective opinions.

3.7. Method of analysis
The results section of this research project shows the visual representation of the analysis of the statistical data amassed adopting a quantitative research method. The use of graphs and charts not only facilitates understanding of the outcomes but it also helps to infer about the correlation between the variables measured.

3.8. Conclusion
Recapitulating, after broad library research and consideration of the methodological solutions pertaining to tourism studies and the visitor experience in particular, it can be concluded that the quantitative method will enable the author to fully attain the initial aim and objectives of the study.
CHAPTER 4: Results

4.1. Introduction
This section focuses on the results derived from fifty questionnaires which were administered among the visitors to Newgrange on Sunday, the 27th of February 2011. The findings are presented under two main objectives of the study in both graphical and narrative form. The initial information necessary for further discussion comprises chosen aspects of the visitor profile along with the sightseeing group specifications that are believed to influence the visitor experience.

4.2. Visitor profile and sightseeing group specifications
The gender ratio (Q.1) in the sample group was exactly 50% of male and 50% of female visitors. There was a broad age distribution (Q.2) between all participants, with the majority (40%) falling into the age bracket of 25-34. As many as 34% of visitors were aged between 35-44, 10% were 45-54 years old. The least numerous were the groups of the youngest and the oldest tourists, with 4% younger than 14, 6% aged between 15-24, 2% in the age box from 55 to 64 and 4% at the age of 65 or more.

Figure 4.2.1.

With reference to visitors’ companions (Q.3), on the day of conducting the research Newgrange was visited mainly by tourists travelling with a spouse/partner (48%) or with friends (48%). As many as 16% of visitors declared coming to the site with children, the same
percentage indicated other family members as their companions. Only 4% of respondents visited the site with an organised group.

Figure 4.2.2.

![Sightseeing Group Types](image)

The results also found that 38% of respondents came to Newgrange with one companion, 30% travelled with three persons. The number of two or four companions was indicated by 8% of visitors in each group. Only 4% of participants visited the site with a bigger group of seven people.

Figure 4.2.3.

![Size of Sightseeing Groups](image)
4.3. Objective 1: To identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange

**Q.4 What sources of information prompted you to visit Newgrange? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)**

The greatest significance among the sources of information that prompted respondents to visit Newgrange was information on the Internet (38%) followed by recommendation from family or friends (36%) and guide book(s) (30%). The sources of lesser importance comprise a former visit (20%) and school (8%), indicated under ‘other’. On the spot decision, seeing a road sign, was made by only one person, whereas a tour operator or travel agency offer was not reported by any visitors.

**Figure 4.3.1.**

![Diagram showing sources of information that prompted the visit to Newgrange]

**Q.5 What was the main purpose for undertaking today’s trip?**

Research proved that for 82% of tourists a visit to an archaeological site was the main purpose for undertaking the trip to Newgrange. Holiday was indicated by 10% of visitors, whereas 6% chose visiting family and friends. One person specified other reason, namely *outing for children.*
Q.6 Which features of the site and its surroundings influenced your decision about the arrival to Newgrange? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)

The vast majority of respondents (70%) indicated historical significance as the influencing factor for their visit to Newgrange. Uniqueness was crucial for exactly a half of visitors. Authenticity and natural environment accounted for 28% of the answers in each category. Spiritual atmosphere was significant for 16% of respondents. One visitor distinguished the fact that Newgrange is a local attraction.

Figure 4.3.2.

Q.7 Was the fact that Newgrange (as a part of the Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne) is designated a World Heritage Site by UNESCO one of the criteria of value and decisive factors behind your visit?

With reference to the fact of designating Newgrange a World Heritage Site by UNESCO as one of the variables behind the visit, 64% of visitors stated that it was not significant for them, whereas it was a motivating element for the rest (36%).

Q.8 Which of the following archaeological sites in Ireland did you visit within the last year? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)

As many as 58% of visitors declared visiting at least one other archaeological site within the last year. From the list of the sites provided in the question, most frequently visited were the Burren (26%) and the Rock of Cashel (24%). The Hill of Tara was ranked as the third in sequence (14%). Skellig Michael was visited by 6% of visitors to Newgrange and
Clonmacnoise by 4%. Other sites enumerated by the visitors comprised the Gallarus Oratory (4%), and Glendalough (6%).

**Figure 4.3.3.**

![Archaeological Sites Visited within the Last Year](chart)

**Q.9 Taking into account your interests and motivations for today's visit, does the term archaeological tourist suit you?**

The results revealed that from the sample group, 32 visitors to Newgrange (64%) consider themselves to be archaeological tourists, while for 18 (36%) this term was not applicable.

**4.4. Objective 2: To examine the visitor perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange**

**Q.10 What mode of transport have you used to get to Newgrange today?**

An overwhelming majority of respondents (92%) reached the site using private transport. Only 8% travelled by bus or train. None of the respondents came to the site on a coach tour with an organised group or used a taxi.

**Q.11 Was it easy to reach the site?**

For 82% of the survey participants the access to the site was either very easy (52%) or easy (30%). ‘Not sure’, ‘difficult’ or ‘very difficult’ were the options chosen by 6% of the respondents for each group respectively. Among the prevailing difficulties in getting to the site the following were mentioned: *not enough signs*, and a *sign missing on the main crossing in Slane*. 
Q.12 How much time are you planning to spend visiting the site and its surroundings?
The majority of visitors (62%) decided to spend less than 2 hours visiting the site and its surroundings, while 8% needed between 2 to 3 hours to visit the site. From 3 to 5 hours was the time range indicated by 30% of participants. No-one from the people questioned planned to spend more time doing sightseeing in Newgrange.

Q.13 Which in your opinion is the most satisfying way of sightseeing archaeological sites?
There is almost no difference between the number of tourists who prefer visiting archaeological sites with a guide (44%) and those who like sightseeing partially individually and partially with a guide (48%). Merely 8% of visitors favour visiting archaeological sites individually.

Q.14 Which of the following elements is the most important in facilitating understanding and interpretation of archaeological heritage?
For 70% of respondents guide services play a pivotal role in facilitating understanding and interpretation of archaeological heritage. Exhibitions and replicas, and information boards are equally important for 10% of visitors for each group respectively. Film and multimedia presentations were assessed as the most important by 6% of visitors, while guidebooks were chosen by only 4% of tourists.

Figure 4.4.1.
Q.15 Indicate the MAIN ROLE of archaeological sites as tourist attractions
Educational role of archaeological sites was reported as the main one by 56% of visitors, 34% ticked cultural and 10% recreational role.

Q.16 Tick ONE of the statements below that you agree the most with
1) Protection of archaeological sites in Ireland should be increased and direct access for tourists reduced
2) Protection of archaeological sites in Ireland and promotion to the public are at an acceptable level
3) More tourists should gain direct access to archaeological sites in Ireland
Over a half of the visitors surveyed (56%) agreed with the second statement. For the rest, opinions were split exactly half in half between the first (22%) and the third assumption (22%).

Q.17 Please rate the following tourist facilities and services in Newgrange by ticking one box in each line
In general, tourist facilities and services in Newgrange were very positively assessed by most visitors. Visitor centre was rated as very satisfactory by 64% of tourists, the rest (36%) perceived it to be satisfactory. Guide services were evaluated as ‘very satisfactory’ by 70% of visitors, which was the highest score among all elements subject to rating. A great number of respondents (68%) were not sure about the level of disabled facilities in Newgrange. Only the restaurant, gift shop and parking received some negative evaluation that was given by merely 4%, 2% and 6% of visitors respectively. Detailed findings relating to tourist facilities and services in Newgrange are presented in figure 4.4.2.

Q.18 How would you evaluate your overall visitor experience in Newgrange today?
Nearly all sample group assessed the visitor experience very highly, allocating 66% of the responses to ‘excellent’ and 32% to ‘good’. Only one person evaluated the experience as ‘fair’.
Figure 4.4.2.

Evaluation of Tourist Facilities and Services in Newgrange

Facilities & Services

Visitor Centre Exhibitions and Replicas Guide Services Tourist Information Office Restaurant Gift Shop Disabled Facilities Parking Toilet Facilities

- Very unsatisfactory
- Unsatisfactory
- Not sure
- Satisfactory
- Very satisfactory
Q.19 Do you have any comments concerning your visit or suggestions for further improvement of the tourists' experience in Newgrange?

With reference to additional comments concerning the visit to Newgrange, the following are the exact citations from the questionnaires:

- A walkway along the river, area for picnic and BBQ should be created
- Great service!
- Congratulations! All very enjoyable experiences. Very friendly staff. Thank you.
- Very well organised bus, guide and timing. Lunch was lovely but portions were extremely large!
- Need to develop more connections with local community. Locals need to benefit more from WHS (World Heritage Site). Should develop walking routes through WHS and open up smaller sites in cooperation with landowners. Should explore the idea of visitors having to purchase tickets a day in advance to benefit local economy.
CHAPTER 5: Discussion

5.1. Introduction
This chapter discusses the research results with reference to the main objectives of the study. Emphasis is placed on justification of the dominating trends and, where applicable, a comparison to the previous studies.

5.2. Objective 1: To identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange
In attempt to establish the prevailing motivations for the visit to Newgrange, the survey participants were to answer six questions. Firstly, they were asked to indicate the sources of information that prompted them to visit the site. As expected, in the global era of exchanging information at a click of a button, Internet received the biggest number of answers (38%). It can be linked with the dominating age group of visitors that accounted for 40% of all respondents. Almost equally significant (36%) was recommendation from family and friends as the factor encouraging the visit. Corresponding results were achieved in the research by Delany (2004), where information from family and friends combined with the word of mouth accounted for 28% of responses, Internet however was reported to be used by 21% of visitors to Brú na Bóinne prior to arrival. Guidebooks also remain an important source of information consulted before the visit to the site for 30% of respondents. Tourist attractiveness of Newgrange finds its confirmation in the fact that it is repeatedly visited by one in every five survey participants.

Secondly, the visitors were asked to choose the main purpose for undertaking the trip and the overwhelming majority (82%) came to Newgrange to visit the archaeological site. This is understandable taking into account the outstanding features of the place, the most appealing of which were its historical significance (70%), uniqueness (50%), authenticity (28%) and the natural environment (28%). Similar motivation, expressed as an interest in the attraction was revealed in the research by Fitzgerald (2005, p.17) and accounted for 52% of answers.

Amongst the different reasons for visiting Newgrange, 10% of respondents chose a holiday, whereas 6% were visiting family and friends. These findings differ considerably from the results of the research by Delany (2004), which demonstrated that 58% of visitors to Brú na
Bóinne indicated a holiday being the main reason for the visit, while 17% were visiting friends and relatives on this occasion.

Surprisingly, in contradiction to a well-known fact that designation as a World Heritage Site by UNESCO attracts tourists and proves very high value of the site, it was not a motivating factor for most of the survey participants (64%).

The research also revealed that 64% of the surveyed visitors to Newgrange consider themselves to be archaeological tourists. The combined analysis of the answers for question 7 (Which of the following archaeological sites in Ireland did you visit in the last year?) and 8 (Taking into account your interests and motivations for today’s visit, does the term archaeological tourist suit you?) shows that 56% of the respondents who think of themselves as archaeological tourists visited at least one of the sites enumerated in the question. The most frequently chosen were the Rock of Cashel (31%), the Burren (25%) and the Hill of Tara (19%).

An interesting fact demonstrated by this research is that one in two non-archaeological tourists also visited at least one other Irish archaeological site but presumably being motivated by other reasons than willingness to see an archaeological attraction. The most frequently visited among them once again was the Burren (28%).

The overall frequency of visiting other archaeological sites, both among archaeological and non-archaeological tourists, was rather low. One of the most probable reasons is a vast geographical dispersion around the country. The location of Newgrange in the vicinity of Dublin causes that the access to the site is considerably easier than, for instance, to Skellig Michael. What is more, Newgrange is undoubtedly one of the most popular archaeological sites in Ireland. This is proved by the annual number of visitors reaching over 200,000 visitors each year (Dúchas 2002). Another significant reason is that archaeological sites, especially those that are not as well-preserved and prepared for tourism movement as Newgrange, do not appeal to mass tourists to the same extent as other cultural attractions. The fact that as many as 64% of visitors to Newgrange, considering their interests and motivations, call themselves archaeological tourists might be a starting point for future research and discussion, one of the basic objectives of which should be establishing their visitor profile followed by further endeavours in encouraging repeated visits.
5.3. Objective 2: To examine the visitor perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange

In order to achieve the second objective of the study, the visitor questionnaire was created according to the following headings:

- access to the site,
- length of stay,
- archaeological sites as tourist attractions,
- evaluation of tourist facilities and services in Newgrange,
- assessment of the visitor experience.

With reference to access, 46 surveyed visitors reached the site using a private mode of transport (a car, a motorcycle, etc.) and only 4 decided to visit Newgrange with the use of public transportation. No visitors came to the site by coach or taxi. These findings are compatible with the number of companions, according to which only 2 visitors came to Newgrange with an organised group consisting of 8 people, which was the most substantial number for the day, and they used private transport as well. The lack of bigger organised groups among visitors to Newgrange on the day of the research can be justified by the fact that the questionnaires were administered in February, which according to seasonality of the tourism movement is an off-peak season. Additionally, even though there are tours that are organised on a daily basis, for instance by Over the Top Tours (Dublin Tourism 2009), the Day Tours of Newgrange and the Hill of Tara by Mary Gibbons, which are advertised on the main website of Brú na Bóinne (Newgrange.com 2011a), take place from Monday to Saturday, excluding Sunday. It is also possible to draw a conclusion that the surveyed visitors to Newgrange prefer visiting the site with companions because no respondents came to the site alone. Most common visitor group type comprises couples and groups of friends (48% of responses for each category). This question was also addressed by Fitzgerald (2005) whose research proved that the majority of visitors came to the site accompanied by family members (62%) and only 9% came alone.

In general, access to the site did not pose any difficulties for 82% of visitors. Some tourists included a note next to ranking the access as very easy saying *with the use of navigation system*. As many as 12% of visitors reported having problems reaching the site due to not adequate signage that shows an improvement in comparison to the Survey of Visitors to Brú na Bóinne carried out on behalf of Dúchas by Tourism Development International in 2000,
where the necessity to improve signposting was mentioned in additional suggestions by 18% of visitors.

Regarding the time that visitors reported to spend visiting the site and its surroundings, 62% of them declared less than 2 hours, whereas for 30% the time ranged from 3 to 5 hours. It is crucial to add that the weather on the day of conducting the research was very nice and sunny. An interesting idea for maximising the time of visiting the site was provided in additional comments. The visitors suggested creating walking routes through the WHS and a walkway along the river with places for picnic and barbeque. One tourist also implied making it available to purchase the tickets one day prior to the visit that would benefit the local economy. Currently, only organised tours can be booked in advance, individuals have to arrive as early in the day as possible so as to be able to buy the ticket (Newgrange.com 2011b).

Furthermore, it can be stated that the most preferable way of visiting archaeological sites by the surveyed visitors involves guide services (92%), which corresponds with the answers relating to the importance of the elements facilitating understanding and interpretation of archaeological heritage because the category of guide services was chosen by 70% of respondents. All the same, nearly a half of visitors (48%) requires time for individual sightseeing. Fortunately, Brú na Bóinne allows combining the sightseeing preferences of visitors through visiting the interior of the Newgrange passage tomb exclusively with a guide, while the tomb’s surroundings and the visitor centre can be appreciated individually with the use of other elements reported as important for visitors while sightseeing, namely exhibitions and replicas, films and multimedia presentations and information boards.

Touching on the dominating role of archaeological sites, over a half of the visitors highlighted educational values, for 34% cultural values were the most important, whereas recreational role occurred in 10% of the answers.

Since the visitor numbers to Newgrange tomb are strictly limited, the author aimed at asking tourists about their attitude to protection of archaeological sites and access to the public view. Over a half of visitors perceives the present situation to be on an acceptable level. Equal number (22%) believes that protection is not sufficient and fewer number of visitors should be allowed to have direct access to the site, whereas the rest holds an opposite view.
The overall level of visitor satisfaction with tourist facilities and services in Newgrange was very high, which is consistent with the general evaluation demonstrated by the Survey of Visitors to Brú na Bóinne (2000). In the present study, the general evaluation of the visitor centre was reported as very satisfactory (64%) and satisfactory (36%). More detailed findings revealed that guide services were scored the highest, with 70% of answers for very satisfactory and 30% satisfactory evaluation. This is comparable with the findings by Fitzgerald (2005), according to which guided tours were liked a lot by 67% of visitors.

As expected, the visitor experience in Newgrange was highly evaluated by as many as 98% of respondents. These findings can be confirmed by the Visitor Satisfaction at Brú na Bóinne Survey, a part of the Hospitality Study by Fáilte Ireland (2003), which revealed that 93% of visitors would recommend this attraction to a friend.

5.4. Evaluation of the method, research limitations and recommendations for further investigation

The quantitative research method proved successful since it allowed the author to achieve the main objectives of the study. There were no significant issues while administering the questionnaires amongst the visitors to Newgrange. However, relating to the limitations of the research, it has to be accentuated that it was conducted in the off-peak season and hence, in some respects, the results are not consistent with the statistical data gathered in the summertime. What is more, organised groups accounted for very insignificant percentage of the sample, which resulted in making inferences mainly about individual tourists. Thirdly, due to the word count requirements for the thesis, questions concerning the visitor profile were restricted to the necessary minimum. Extending the visitor profile section would allow the author to establish the detailed profile of archaeological tourists. Special attention should be drawn to such elements as nationality, the place of residence, education, occupation and the household income. The exact needs and expectations of this group of visitors towards archaeological sites as tourist attractions should be investigated. There is also a need to increase the visitors’ awareness of the potential of the country as a tourist destination abundant in historical-archaeological sites that are competitive tourist attractions. These are the main recommendations for the future research in the realm of archaeotourism in Ireland.
CHAPTER 6: Conclusion

This study addressed the question of the visitor experience at archaeological sites based on the case study of Newgrange. With respect to the first objective, namely identification of motivations behind the visit to the site, the conducted research revealed that the surveyed visitors to Newgrange were prompted by a vast array of information sources, with the Internet and recommendation from family and friends being the dominating ones. The visit to the archaeological site, the most important feature of which is its historical significance, was the chief reason for undertaking the trip for the vast majority of respondents. In contradiction to initial expectations, the fact that Newgrange is a World Heritage Site was not a criterion of value and a motivating factor for a vast number of visitors. One of the most interesting findings was that nearly two thirds of the survey participants considered themselves to be archaeological tourists, which confirms that archaeotourism is a separate and significant subcategory of tourism.

As for the perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange, a very positive visitor experience at the site was a resultant of the unique values of the archaeological site itself, easily accessible location, the natural environment of its surroundings, friendly personnel, general good management of the site and finally, very satisfactory and modern tourist facilities, in particular the visitor centre including all the necessary elements facilitating understanding of the archaeological heritage of the Bend of the Boyne.

To sum up, this research results in deepening the understanding of the phenomenon of archaeotourism that due to its multidimensional character can be recognised as a distinct category of tourists’ interests. The author infers that high quantitative potential and outstanding features of the archaeological heritage of Ireland may play a pivotal role as the attracting force for future visitors, and hence further research including the detailed profile of archaeological tourists, in particular comprising their needs and expectations towards the Irish archaeological sites as tourist attractions, should be undertaken. The author also believes that especially overseas tourists’ awareness of Ireland as an archaeological tourist destination is limited. Therefore, the existence of exceptionally well-preserved archaeological attractions,
that in many cases provide high-class tourist facilities, should be promoted. Marketing campaigns raising the visitors’ awareness of this angle of the Irish tourism potential can be seen as one of the routes to the recovery of the tourism industry in Ireland.
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APPENDIX 1
COVER LETTER

27th, February, 2011

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Agnieszka Rozenkiewicz, I am a student of the 4th year of Tourism and Hospitality Management at Athlone Institute of Technology conducting research under the supervision of Ms. Frances McGettigan. The topic of my thesis reads as follows: An investigation of the visitor experience at archaeological sites – the case study of Newgrange. The main objectives of this research are to identify motivations behind the visit to Newgrange and to examine visitor perception of archaeological sites as tourist attractions based on the example of Newgrange.

Completion of the questionnaire would take approximately 10 minutes of your time. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary and anonymous. If there are any questions that you prefer not to answer, you may skip them. If you would like to write additional comments on the questionnaire, please do not hesitate to do so.

Please be assured that all information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. You will not be identified in the thesis or in any report or publication based on this research. All results from the study will be reported as statistical summaries only.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation in my research.

Yours sincerely,

Agnieszka Rozenkiewicz
APPENDIX 2
VISITOR QUESTIONNAIRE

I) Visitor Profile

1. Please indicate your gender
   □ Male  □ Female

2. What age group you are in?
   □ 14 or less  □ 45-54
   □ 15-24  □ 55-64
   □ 25-34  □ 65 or over
   □ 35-44

II) Sightseeing Group Specifications

3. Please specify who you are visiting the site with (Tick all boxes that apply to you and write in the number of companions)
   □ Alone  □ With other family members
   □ With a spouse/partner  □ With friends
   □ With children  □ With an organised group
   Number of companions ..........

III) Motivation

4. What sources of information prompted you to visit Newgrange? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)
   □ Internet  □ Guide book(s)
   □ Other media  □ Road signs
   (TV/Radio/Newspaper/Magazine)  □ Tour operator or travel agency offer
   □ Recommendation from family or friends  □ Other (Please specify)
   ........................................

5. What was the main purpose for undertaking today’s trip?
   □ Visit to an archaeological site  □ Holiday
   □ Visiting family and friends  □ Other (Please specify .................)

6. Which features of the site and its surroundings influenced your decision about the arrival to Newgrange? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)
   □ Historical significance  □ Spiritual atmosphere
   □ Authenticity  □ Natural environment
   □ Uniqueness  □ Other (Please specify..................)
7. Was the fact that Newgrange (as a part of the Archaeological Ensemble of the Bend of the Boyne) is designated a World Heritage Site by UNESCO one of the criteria of value and decisive factors behind your visit?

☐ Yes ☐ No

8. Which of the following archaeological sites in Ireland did you visit within the last year? (Tick all boxes that apply to you)

☐ Burren ☐ Rock of Cashel
☐ Céide Fields ☐ Skellig Michael
☐ Clonmacnoise ☐ Stone Forts of Aran Islands
☐ Hill of Tara ☐ Other (Please specify......................)

9. Taking into account your interests and motivations for today’s visit, does the term archaeological tourist suit you?

☐ Yes ☐ No

IV) Access

10. What mode of transport have you used to get to Newgrange today?

☐ Private transport (car, motorcycle, etc.) ☐ Taxi
☐ Public transport (train, bus) ☐ Coach (with an organized group)

11. Was it easy to reach the site?

☐ Very easy
☐ Easy
☐ Not sure
☐ Difficult (Please specify the difficulties) ...........................................
☐ Very Difficult (Please specify the difficulties) ..............................

V) Length of Stay

12. How much time are you planning to spend visiting the site and its surroundings?

☐ Less than 2 hours ☐ From 5 to 8 hours, without spending the night
☐ From 2 to 3 hours ☐ A few days, please write in the number of days ...............
☐ From 3 to 5 hours

VI) Archaeological Sites as Tourist Attractions

13. Which in your opinion is the most satisfying way of sightseeing archaeological sites?

☐ Individually
☐ With a guide
☐ Partially individually and partially with a guide
14. Which of the following elements is the most important in facilitating understanding and interpretation of archaeological heritage?

□ Guide services
□ Guidebooks
□ Exhibitions and replicas
□ Films and multimedia presentations
□ Information boards

15. Indicate the MAIN ROLE of archaeological sites as tourist attractions

□ Educational
□ Cultural
□ Other (Please specify......................)

16. Tick ONE of the statements below that you agree the most with

□ Protection of archaeological sites in Ireland should be increased and direct access for tourists reduced
□ Protection of archaeological sites in Ireland and promotion to the public are at an acceptable level
□ More tourists should gain direct access to archaeological sites in Ireland

VII) Evaluation of Tourist Facilities and Services in Newgrange

17. Please rate the following tourist facilities and services in Newgrange by ticking one box in each line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor Centre</th>
<th>Very unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Very satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions and Replicas</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide Services</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Information Office</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Shop</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Facilities</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Facilities</td>
<td>Very unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII) Assessment of the Visitor Experience

18. How would you evaluate your overall visitor experience in Newgrange today?
☐ Excellent
☐ Good
☐ Fair
☐ Poor
☐ Very poor

19. Do you have any comments concerning your visit or suggestions for further improvement of the tourists’ experience in Newgrange?
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................