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Abstract: Authenticity of local culture is often a subject of research, especially by tourism sociologists and anthropologists. However, what is most often discussed is authenticity of the intangible culture, like traditions and language. Still, those measures cannot be simply implemented to the analysis of material elements of culture and history. Here, the term is perceived as multifaceted and has as many meanings as in the case of intangible culture, but it has not been researched so deeply yet. Authenticity might be perceived here as an objective feature of the item resulting from no changes past the time. Apart from constructive and existential, this objective approach to authenticity in tourism is one of the three major ways of understanding the term. This can be illustrated by the case studies of three Polish castles: the Royal Castle in Warsaw, which was rebuilt completely after the World War II, the Bobolice Castle, which was rebuilt after several hundred years of being ruined and the fake of the medieval Pszczyna Knights Stronghold, created recently. In each of the cases, tourists’ experiences are concentrated on different elements and the authenticity of their experiences is substantially different. All examples, but especially the Pszczyna Stronghold, maybe a good starting point for the discussion
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Castles and other monuments are often the objects of tourists’ interest. Contemporary tourists concentrate more on their experiences and emotions than on simple sightseeing and looking at monuments. Authenticity of tangible heritage like castles plays an important role in building their attractiveness for tourists as long as it influences positively visitors’ emotions. Presented cases teach us how to create tourists’ experiences perceived as authentic like the feeling of being transferred to previous times (especially medieval ages) based on buildings that are not genuine ones.
about staged authenticity of tangible heritage in tourism. Content analysis of social media, press and travel agencies catalogs was conducted to demonstrate how authenticity of particular castles is perceived by their visitors and how this perception influences customer memorable experiences.
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1. Introduction

The concept of authenticity appeared in tourism literature thanks to MacCannell’s work (MacCannell, 1973). Since then, it has been broadly discussed in tourism research (Andriotis, 2011; Brown, 1996; Chhabra et al., 2003; Cohen, 1979, 1988; Daniel, 1996; Daugstad & Kirchengast, 2013; Ehrentrant, 1993; Hughes, 1995; Jamal & Hill, 2004; Kim & Jamal, 2007; Kolar & Zabkar, 2010; Moscardo & Perace, 1986, 1986; Reisinger & Steiner, 2006; Salamone, 1997; Silver, 1993; Turner & Manning, 1988; Taylor, 2001; Waitt, 2000; Wang, 1997, 1999; Xie, 2004; Zhu, 2012). At first, it was in the field of interest of tourist sociologists and anthropologists (Boorstin, 1963; Cohen, 1988; MacCannell, 1976; Urry, 1990) but since the marketing of experience gained its importance, it has become one of the cornerstones of the tourism marketing (Frochot & Batat, 2013). Tourism development dynamics, as well as diversity of views presented by representatives of different fields of science, caused that nowadays we have a significant number of concepts and approaches in the analysis of this issue. One of the few statements with which most authors agree is the fact that the analysis of authenticity in heritage or cultural tourism is particularly important. (Chhabra et al., 2003; Taylor, 2001; Waitt, 2000; Yeaman, 2008). Still, the most significant number of publications sets intangible culture as the point of interest, whilst the problem of authenticity of tangible heritage remains researched to a lesser degree. Authenticity or genuineness of particular elements of tangible heritage has been discussed for many years by art and history experts (Kozłowska, 2015; Munoz-Vinas, 2012; Silva & Leal, 2015), however, the subject of their research is rather social value than degree of attractiveness for visitors. This tangible heritage that attracts tourists might include totally different elements among others: pieces of arts like paintings, sculptures, etc., monumental buildings like castles, churches, etc., and architectural systems like old towns, historical quarters, etc. It is easy to assume that the notion and the requirements according to authenticity of elements of each group stated above should be different.

The paper is focused on presentation and explanation of how authenticity and its perception enhances or underpins the attractiveness of selected three Polish castles. The scientific aim of the paper is to examine the relationship between objective and existential authenticity and tourist attractiveness of monuments. The novelty of the approach offered in the paper lays in differentiating analysis of authenticity of tangible and intangible heritage and enhancing less developed knowledge on the tangible one that is treated in the paper as not a homogenous group. Additionally, it is also emphasized that a special approach should be established while discussing the authenticity of different elements belonging to it. The paper is focused mainly on the objective authenticity of castles that are examples of monumental buildings. The method of case study is used to reach final conclusions obtained from a comparison of three examples. The content of social media (Trip Advisor), press and travel agencies catalogs were analyzed to gain data necessary for the case study.

The paper is organized as follows: the literature review aimed at the analysis of the notion of authenticity in tourism with special attention paid to authenticity of tangible heritage; the methodology part in which the use of the case study method and selection of chosen objects are justified, presentation of the cases of selected castles and factors affecting the assessment of their authenticity, results of the content analysis of selected sources, discussion and the final part containing conclusions, limitations and directions for the future research.
2. The notion of objective authenticity in tourism research

According to Trilling (1972, p. 93), the first concept of “authenticity” was used in the reference to a museum, “where persons expert in such matters test whether objects of art are what they appear to be or are claimed to be, and therefore worth the price that is asked for them—or, if this has already been paid, worth the admiration they are being given”. According to Wang (1999), it is mainly this museum-linked usage which has been extended to other aspects connected with tourism. For example, tourist products such as festivals, customs, clothing, and so on, are usually described as authentic or inauthentic depending upon whether they are made by local people according to tradition (MacCannell, 1976). In this meaning, authenticity connotes traditional culture and origin in a sense of the genuine (Chhabra et al., 2003).

Still, authenticity is a term that became ambiguous due to varied usages and contexts (Golomb, 1995, p. 7). Also, Cohen (1988) points out that the difficulty with using the concept of authenticity in tourism studies is that it is a philosophical concept which has been uncritically transferred into a sociological analysis. Broad review of different definitions and approaches to this term can be found in Frochot and Batat (2013, pp. 134–136) and Hillman (2007). According to Wang (1999), the wider concept of authenticity has been used, the bigger its ambiguity is and more limitations have been noticeable. Visiting friends and relatives, beach holidays, ocean cruising, visiting Disneyland, personal hobbies such as shopping, fishing, hunting or sports, and so on, have nothing to do with authenticity in the narrow, traditional sense (Wang, 1999, p. 350).

The first popular concept used in tourism research is “staged authenticity”. MacCannell (1973) introduced this notion as a response to more and more popular cases of the commodification of local culture. He (MacCannell, 1973, 1976) developed this concept to illustrate that tourists are often provided with experiences or performances that are purposely acted or orchestrated in order to meet their expectations. They are usually shallow and reflect only the “front stage” area of a particular culture. Therefore, tourists who seek “the real” or “the genuine”, that is access to the “backstage” of the local community in order to gain a detailed understanding of a particular culture, have to settle for experiences that are fake and staged for them. As Cohen (1988, p. 372) states: “as cultural products lose their meaning for the locals, and as the need to present the tourist with ever more spectacular, exotic and titillating attractions grows, contrived cultural products are increasingly staged for tourists and decorated so as to look authentic. Fake “airport art” (Graburn, 1967) is sold to tourists as if it were a genuine cultural product.”

While commenting on MacCannell’s concept of staged authenticity, Mohamad et al. (2011), point out that two issues are noteworthy. Firstly, a short, few-hour visit to a particular destination does not provide tourists with a complete view of its culture. Cultural events or performances that are provided to tourists are only snapshots of interesting cultural aspects that might be used to entertain and educate the tourists. Furthermore, it is a bit of a controversy that despite the fact of owning money and being ready to pay for these experiences, tourists are not allowed to the “back region” unless communities are willing to show it to them. It should be local communities’ decision that they deem appropriate for tourists to see and experience. Secondly, staged authenticity has been a common practice in the tourism industry despite criticism from “authenticity” supporters. Mass tourism and connected with it specified route and program have given rise to staged authenticity and many destination communities are using the above-mentioned approach to manage these activities more efficiently. What is more, according to Cohen (1979), tourists are aware of their participation in staged cultural events and accept this situation feeling safe in it as well as having their entertainment needs satisfied.

This debate on staged authenticity, which was particularly intense in late the seventies and eighties of the twentieth century, started a broad discussion regarded proper approach and understanding of “authenticity” in tourism. For example, while arguing with MacCannell’s interpretation, Cohen (1988, p. 374) suggests that authenticity is a socially constructed concept and its social (as opposed to philosophical) connotation is, therefore, not given, but “negotiable.” Since
there are many definitions and ways of understanding “authenticity” in tourism, it resulted in phrasing totally contrary, but well-justified postulates. Frochot and Batat (2013) point out that contemporary tourists are more and more educated, strengthened and competent and that is why they are not going to accept easily fake and artificial products. In contrast, starting from the hedonistic nature of tourists’ behavior, Kozak (2009) points out that for contemporary tourists authenticity of the product is much less important than its usefulness. It seems that both views might be correct if we notice that both cited authors use the term in different meanings. Being close to what was presented by MacCannell, Kozak concentrates on objective characteristics of tangible or intangible tourism product, while following Cohen’s interpretation, Frochot and Batat are in fact describing the relationship between a tourist and a product consumed, or an experience derived by a tourist from consumption of the product.

Probably the most influential attempt to put order into different approaches to authenticity is the one made by Wang (1999). Wang noticed that authenticity can be approached in three separate ways. These approaches can be made through the theoretical foundations of objectivism, constructivism, and postmodernism. Objective and constructive authenticities in Wang’s concept are object-related, while existential authenticity is activity-related. Objective authenticity refers to the authenticity of originals and, correspondingly, authentic experiences in tourism are considered equal to an epistemological experience (i.e., cognition) of the authenticity of originals. Objective authenticity presumes that there is an undistorted standard to determine what is or is not genuine (authentic). A quest for it here is viewed as a quest for “originals” or for the “truths” that underlie the logic of modernity (Kim & Jamal, 2007, p. 183). Existential authenticity refers to a potential existential state of being that should be activated by tourist activities. Correspondingly, authentic experiences in tourism are to achieve this activated existential state of being within the basic process of tourism. Therefore, existential authenticity might have nothing to do with the authenticity of toured objects. Finally, constructive authenticity refers to the authenticity projected onto toured objects by tourists or tourism producers in terms of their images, expectations, preferences, beliefs, powers, etc. According to Wang (1999, p. 352), there are various versions of authenticities regarding the same objects. Correspondingly, authentic experiences in tourism and the authenticity of toured objects are fundamental to one another. In this sense, the authenticity of the latter is, in fact, symbolic authenticity. Wang (1999) further classifies the idea of existential authenticity as divided into two subcategories—interpersonal and intrapersonal. He also believes that this newly developed concept may help explain more tourism experiences than previously and also enhance the illustrative strength of the “authenticity quest” representation in tourism (Hillman, 2007). Next, Wang (1999) also discusses the limits to objective authenticity. He claims that existential authenticity is an alternative way to perceive tourism and that the objects or places that are toured need not be classified as authentic. The Wang’s concept of objective, existential and constructive authenticity is widely used and cited by other authors in their publications (Chhabra et al., 2003; Hillman, 2007; Mohamad et al., 2011), and still remains to be one of the most important concepts. It underlines the significance of tourists’ experiences of authenticity, thereby helps us to understand the complex issue of authenticity in tourism. However, like the whole issue, it is full of questions and paradoxes that mirror contemporary tourism. As the pace of life becomes faster and faster, which is reflected also in tourism, less time is spent in particular destinations. It results in shallow contacts with the culture and the heritage of visited places that makes the authentic experience of tourists questionable. This phenomenon is particularly evident in mass tourism. Many authors (Hillman, 2007; Frochot & Batat, 2013) are still using the term “quest for authentic experiences” as typical in describing contemporary tourists. This “quest” is reflected by how contemporary tourism products are promoted, emphasizing how important tourist experiences are (Frochot & Batat, 2011). In particular, those that might be labeled as “authentic” are fashionable and desired.

More complex typology of approaches to authenticity in tourism was presented later by Cohen (2007). He listed six alternative definitions, which are: “authenticity as customary practice or long usage; authenticity as genuineness in the sense of an unaltered product; authenticity as sincerity
when applied to relationships; authenticity as creativity with special relevance to cultural performances including dance and music; and, authenticity as the flow of life in the sense that there is no interference with the setting by the tourism industry or other managers”. According to Pearce (2007), these definitions of the term “authenticity” can be identified as components of objective authenticity because they seem to include the concept that any situation experienced by tourists can be assessed using external measurements.

In the paper, a more situational approach to authenticity in tourism is postulated which underlines that this term should be understood and used differently depending on a situation. One of the reasons for misunderstandings and disputes among tourism researchers is the fact that we try to name a lot of different elements of tourism product having well-differentiated nature as authentic or inauthentic. At first, this can be used to evaluate the whole local culture as well as particular elements of the local heritage. In the first case, we have a very complex mix of tangible and intangible elements that are very difficult to be assessed in terms of its authenticity. In the second case, we have to use different approaches both for tangible and intangible heritage. In most research, even if this is not stated directly, the debate is focused on intangible heritage, including events (see, for example, Chhabra et al., 2003; Gonzalez, 2008; Zhu, 2012), and culture as a whole (see, for example, Daugstad & Kirchengast, 2013; Halewood & Hannam, 2003; Taylor, 2001). This approach needs very sophisticated methods because the value of authenticity might be very subjective. Not only particular tourists may experience the relation with the local culture differently, but also the involvement of people as a kind of “suppliers” of elements of culture makes the product consumed by tourists unique. In that context, it might be surprising that the less complicated subject of authenticity of tangible heritage is discussed so rarely. Among examples of publications regarding the issue of tangible heritage authenticity in tourism, the works of Kolar and Zabkar (2010), Reisinger and Steiner (2006) and Alberts and Hazen (2010) can be pointed out. Kolar and Zabkar researched the influence of authenticity of several European castles on visitors’ loyalty as a base for heritage marketing while Alberts and Hazen were interested in issues of World Heritage Sites preservation.

The subject of authenticity of tangible heritage might be perceived as a bit less complicated because the issue of subjectivity of the assessment regards only the demand side, and the toured object is the same for all visitors. However, although it is easier, it does not mean that that kind of analysis is free from problems. Also, elements of tangible heritage are differentiated and they require different approaches to overcome different problems. Those problems usually involve two issues (Zemla, 2006). The first one is a fundamental, museum-based understanding of objective authenticity (Che, 2004). What is really authentic, who can decide about that and how tourists can evaluate this? The next problem involves the relationship between this museum-based evaluation of authenticity and authenticity of tourists’ experiences (Frochot & Batat, 2013). When we consider those two issues, we can observe that they differ significantly in terms of the kind of a particular object of heritage.

At first, it is good to consider a piece of art, like a painting or a sculpture. The issue of authenticity of artifacts presented usually within museums’ exhibitions is widely represented in the contemporary literature. There is a long-lasting controversy in the tourism literature on what makes artifacts authentic or not, but what is certain is that museums are expected to contain only genuine artifacts (Brida et al., 2014). Contemporary visitors are thought to develop their trust in the museum as a result of its community engagement and the opportunities it provides for visitors to form their own opinions (Hede et al., 2014), the reliability and balance of its offerings (Cameron, 2003) and its truthfulness and honesty (Gilmore & Pine, 2007). Museums artifacts’ authenticity is judged on whether it fulfills its expository role—i.e. to what extent it develops and shares knowledge with visitors in a truthful and open manner (Hede et al., 2014). In general, authenticity here is not an inherent quality of an object or experience but rather something ascribed to it (Rubridge, 1995). Tourists can easily get familiar with each contemporarily popular painting or sculpture visiting the Internet. Because of that the reason for visiting the Mona Lisa painting in the Louvre Museum most probably is not curiosity. The main strength that attracts visitors to this particular
museum is authenticity of the painting, the opportunity to “get in touch” with an original, genuine piece of art (Mikos von Rohrscheidt, 2010). When visitors are confronted with the inauthentic, they often experience feelings of dissonance (Hede & Thyne, 2010). Therefore, offering the copy identical to the original is out of the question. However, most visitors do not have enough knowledge to evaluate authenticity of the painting, and if Louvre Museum presented a good copy instead of an original painting, probably nobody would notice that (Skowrońska, 2010). Still, without being convinced that they can see the original painting, the tourists would not be interested in seeing it.

The different situation might be observed in the case of monumental buildings like castles, churches or chateaux (Thomsen & Vester, 2016; Worsley, 2004; Zemla, 2014). The first, very important difference is that objective authenticity of such a building, i.e. its genuineness is much more complicated to be proved without doubts (Kozak, 2009). Most of the monumental buildings were changed, improved, or redecorated during past centuries and some of those improvements have been made contemporarily. Setting a clear borderline between what is and what is not authentic is difficult, and maybe even impossible. This problem is well illustrated in the cases presented further in the paper. Also, the relationships between the toured object and its authenticity and tourists’ experiences are much more complex (Bryce et al., 2015). Historical authenticity is here only one of the influencing factors while the others might be beauty, ambiance or presentation. What is more, the hierarchy of importance is not the same for various visitors as well as in relation to different places (Prentice, 2001). Visiting monumental buildings satisfies also the need for curiosity. Pictures or even virtual trips available in the Internet cannot give similar knowledge and experiences like visiting real monuments can do (Zemla, 2014).

The next situation regards complex architectural monumental zones (Gfeller, 2017). Visiting such places should give tourists the experience of spending their time in historical times while authenticity of the monuments can be a factor that enhances this feeling. Still, tourists do not usually demand that all elements of such a zone are genuine. The case of Carcassonne in France illustrates this well (J. Cohen, 2011; Lewi, 2008).

3. Methodology

To analyze the meaning of authenticity of tangible heritage, three Polish castles were selected to be presented within the case study methodology. A multiple-case design, in which conclusions are drawn from a group of cases, was selected from the four different case-study designs in the typology presented by Yin (1981, 2004). Multiple-case designs are appropriate when the same phenomenon is regarded to be a common part of a variety of situations. Under these circumstances, each individual case study still must be rigorously conducted, but the collection of several case studies on the same topic is intended to be the basis to replicate or confirm the results (Yin, 1981, p. 101).

The cases were selected purposely. All of them are different regarding their historical significance, localization, role in the tourism market and contemporary history. The Royal Castle in Warsaw, the Bobolice Castle and the Stronghold of Pszczyna Knights were selected. The first one, located in the capital city of Poland—Warsaw, can be listed among a few most important monuments in Poland, while another two located in a rural area (Bobolice) or in a small town (Pszczyna) play important roles only as attractions for tourists at the regional scale. They are also significantly smaller than the Royal Castle. Similarly to the Warsaw Castle, the medieval stronghold in Bobolice is offered to tourists mainly as a sightseeing attraction, however, due to its remote localization, additionally a hotel and a restaurant is located at the place. In contrast, the Stronghold of Pszczyna Knights which was built purposely for catering tourists attracts customers mainly by its ambiance and gastronomic services offered inside. All of them are separated buildings and are themselves objects of interest of tourists. This places them in the second category in the typology of tangible heritage presented above. All of them attract tourists also with their scenic beauty, but the completely different role is played by their...
objective authenticity. In all three cases, there might be some doubts about whether they are genuine which is reflected in how they are promoted on the tourism market.

The case study analysis was conducted with the use of secondary sources of information. In a search for information on the castles, several different sources were scanned. They are: the archive of the biggest Polish newspaper—Gazeta Wyborcza (years 2000–2017), visitors’ opinions posted to official profiles of the castles on Trip Advisor, catalogs (season 2017) of two big travel agencies that organize domestic sightseeing trips in Poland—Index and Ecotravel. Using all three types of secondary sources of information is very popular in analyses of the tourist market. Lately, social media user-generated content analysis has been among the most frequently used methods, especially when surveying impressions of visitors (Bulchand-Gidumal et al., 2013; Chen & Law, 2016; He et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2017; Lu et al., 2018; Tilly et al., 2015). This approach is often used instead of the costly and long-lasting process of interviewing visitors (Chen & Law, 2016; Lu et al., 2018). Analysis of the content of traditional media, especially daily newspapers, even though it is very popular in the scientific research (Luke et al., 2011; Torres & Alsharif, 2016), is not used in tourism market very often; still, there are numerous examples (Nickerson, 1995; Wilson & Becken, 2011) that present how efficient this method is. It can be especially useful to analyze the opinions of experts presented in media comments (Wilson & Becken, 2011). Finally, the content of tour-operators catalogs is a typical method for the tourism industry. This method is commonly used (Cavanagh, 1994; Nechita et al., 2019; Wilson et al., 2011) as it enables to reach a huge number of sources which are easily available and reflects how tourism professionals perceive attractiveness of particular places and objects (Wilson et al., 2011).

4. Case studies: three castles in Poland

4.1. The Royal Castle in Warsaw

Without doubts, together with the Wawel Castle in Cracow, the Royal Castle in Warsaw is one of the most important castles in Poland in terms of what it means for the Polish society, its history, and beauty. It is a castle residency that formerly served throughout the centuries as the official residence of the Polish monarchs. The monument is located in the Castle Square, at the entrance to the Warsaw Old Town. The personal offices of the king and the administrative offices of the Royal Court of Poland were located there since the sixteenth century until the Partitions of Poland. The Royal Castle dates back to the 14th century when a tower and wooden buildings stood here. The construction of the castle in its current form began at the end of the 16th century. King Sigismund III (Zygmunt III) ordered the expansion shortly after Warsaw became the capital of Poland in 1596. Later, the castle was expanded several times. The largest modifications were done by Poland’s last king Stanislaw August Poniatowski after he came to power in 1764. He changed several details inside and built the south wing. The significance of the castle was decreased after Poland had lost its sovereignty. Still, it kept its symbolic meaning and was also the seat of the Russian Tsars’ governors. During that time, some segments of the castle and its surroundings were partially damaged for a few times as well as some modernization works were conducted. When Poland regained its independence after the World War I, it again turned out to be an important symbol of the Polish State. Being a symbol, it became a target for German military attacks as early as in the first days of the World War II. On 17 September 1939, it was in flames. Later in 1944, the remaining parts were destroyed. Today’s Royal Castle is a reconstruction of the old castle. Still, lots of original details can be seen today as they had been kept at a secure location during the war. The decision to rebuild the castle was taken in 1971 so that the reconstruction took almost 50 years since it was destroyed. In 1977, the first interiors were completed. The next ones were put in service in August 1984, during an official ceremony of opening of the castle to the public. In the Great Assembly Hall, the plafond reconstruction works were still going on and were not completed until 1988. The castle was rebuilt with an immense involvement of the Polish nation. The whole investment was financed almost in full with the money obtained from donations made by Poles in the country and abroad.
Contemporarily, The Royal Castle is one of the most important tourist attractions in Warsaw and even in the whole country. The fact that the building that might be visited by tourists is not the original one but it was rebuilt several years ago has become its asset. For Poles, especially for those who belong to the generation that was directly involved in its rebuilding, the castle, its contemporary shape and its reconstruction as a whole, became a good reason to be proud of. For other tourists, especially for those from abroad, the fact that a monument, in the country which was severely destroyed during the World War II, has been reconstructed is neither surprising nor discouraging. Those conclusions might be substantiated by the impressive numbers of the castle visitors, enthusiastic comments in social media as well as by the fact that this is a must-see item of every sightseeing program offered by travel agencies in Warsaw.

4.2. The Bobolice Castle

This castle is much different than the residential Royal Castle in the city center described above. It was established as a medieval stronghold to defend the borders and trade trails. Until now, it is located outside of urban areas, in the wilderness and its location in the forest and in the surrounding of white limestone is one of the most important factors that make it more attractive for tourists. Another fact that encourages tourists to visit the Bobolice Castle is the fact that it belongs to the whole system of similar strongholds called “Eagles’ Nests’ which consists of many picturesque castles. They exist today mainly, as at least partially ruined castles. The castle is an example of a building that was rebuilt in modern times after centuries of being ruined.

The Bobolice Castle was built in the early fourteenth century by The King Casimir III the Great. It was erected as a part of the Jurassic defense system, which was supposed to protect the Western border of the state. The castle and its surrounding suffered heavily during multiple invasions. The most dramatic one was the Swedish Deluge, which took place in the seventeenth century and left the castle in a state of great destruction. From that time onwards, the castle’s condition continued to deteriorate. Everything changed after the Lasecki family had bought the castle at the very end of the 20th century. They decided to reconstruct the castle following the medieval plans. The current shape of the castle is the effect of this reconstruction. The castle is available for tourists for sightseeing purposes and the hotel, as well as the restaurant, have been opened in former outbuildings of the castle.

Among the most important aspects related to the contemporary restoration of the Bobolice Castle is the discussion about its influence on the monumental value of the object. Many experts including architects, historians of art, conservators of monuments and other experts have advocated the view that restoring the castle to its medieval shape makes it even more valuable although many experts were skeptic and wishing not to change the historical ruins (Kozłowska, 2015). This may be perceived as a part of a wider discussion among architecture and art conservation specialists on whether and (if so) how to restore the monumental buildings and other objects and how such an action influences their historical and monumental value (Ashurst, 2007; Huyssen, 2010; Kozłowska, 2015; Light & Watson, 2016; Munoz-Vinas, 2012; Silva, 2011; Silva & Leal, 2015). However, usually, in such a discussion argument of historical value is the core (Huyssen, 2010; Kozłowska, 2015; Silva, 2011), while tourist perception of this action is not often analyzed (Light & Watson, 2016). Considering this scientific discussion and disagreement about how to perceive the authenticity of contemporary buildings, it is easy to notice that most tourists have neither enough knowledge nor tools to make this evaluation for themselves. According to numerous posts in social media, many tourists who visit the Bobolice Castle are interested in scenic beauty and underline a good experience of having “a touch” with the ancient times available there. But, on the contrary, opinions that the castle in its current shape lost its ambiance and it is much more a cliché or an amusement park instead of a monument, might also be found among tourists, especially among those who visited the ruins formerly. Another effect that was gained thanks to this public debate is that the social awareness of the existence of this remotely located, small castle has increased a lot and it has become a quite popular item in the sightseeing trips, especially school trips. This might also be a result of a big interest of news media in this debate, which was extensively presented in the Gazeta Wyborcza papers analyzed below.
4.3. The stronghold of Pszczyna Knights

The third example presented above differs from the previous ones, mainly because it is not a monument at all. The castle was built ten years ago in a place where there was no such building at all earlier. It was projected from the very beginning to be a special idea in the tourism sector and its main business activity is a restaurant and organizing events. According to promotional materials of the place, “it is a perfect place for everyone who wants to embark on an adventure, taste the Middle Ages and feel the Europe of knights’ ambiance. (...) Thus, a place was established where everyone can feel good, a place that is different from others. (...) The architectural design of the stronghold reflects the era of prosperity, which the Middle Ages were for Pszczyna”.

The stronghold is located close to one of the most important and busiest motorways in Poland. It comprises the main, three-level building and its surroundings with attractions for children fenced with a stylized wall. The middle ages ambiance is achieved thanks to solicitude to all details (including all restaurants equipment, selection of dishes, etc.) and having employed a lot of staff dressed in medieval clothes and presenting medieval arts and crafts as well as playing spontaneous scenes.

The task of taking visitors back to medieval times in contemporary walls is very challenging, but the number of guests, as well as enthusiastic opinions presented in social media, convince that the stronghold is close to putting this into practice. Similarly like the Bobolice Castle, the stronghold is also the reason for some disputes. This time, however, this is a dispute about monuments within tourists and tourism-related experts rather than within scientists. Apart from many satisfied customers, also opinions presenting disgust can be easily found. Many tourists underline that they would never visit a place pretending to be a castle and which actually is a kind of an amusement park. Surely, it is not supposed to be a place for tourists who search authentic contact with history and genuine details.

Another difficult task that the managers of Pszczyna stronghold have to cope with is to avoid not being perceived as a tourist trap (Kruczek, 2010). Kruczek (2010, p. 148) defines a tourist trap as a place that is purposely built to make money on tourists. It might be characterized by several features:

1. it should attract tourists at all costs,
2. it appeals to primitive tastes,
3. the tourist trap is kitsch, a site or event with no cultural value, or situated in the sphere of low culture,
4. the aim of the trap is to extort money out of tourists,
5. products based on traps are the opposite of the notion of “cultural tourism”.

It is easy to notice that the stronghold is very close to this description and avoiding being perceived through the lens of what is stated in (1) and (2) seems to be the most important and challenging issue. Again, solicitude to all details seems to be the only effective way to achieve that goal. This place should not be perceived as an amusement park or kitsch. Opinions found in social and traditional media prove that that aim was partially achieved, as there is a significant group of tourists who appreciate stronghold managers’ efforts, but still, there is also another group that does not accept that approach to creating tourist attractions.

4.4. Results of the content analysis

Analysis of offers of travel agencies allowed to justify the importance of the selected castles as well as of regions of their localization on the tourism market (Table 1). All offered programs of visiting Warsaw suggested also visiting The Royal Castle. Both companies offered one-to-three days programs of visiting the Polish capital city. Only in few one-day programs concentrated on visiting particular facilities like the Copernicus Science Centre, the Royal Castle was offered as an additional place to visit in all other programs it was presented as a must-be attraction. Another
|                    | Number of excursions to Warsaw | Number of excursions including the Royal castle | Number of excursions to Kraków-Częstochowa Upland | Number of excursions including the Bobolice castle | Number of excursions to Silesian Agglomeration | Number of excursions including the Pszczyna Stronghold |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| **Ecotravel**      | 7                               | 7                                               | 12                                                | 3                                                | 0                                                | 0                                                      |
| **Index**          | 3                               | 3                                               | 4                                                 | 2                                                | 7                                                | 0                                                      |
characteristic element of the leaflets of both researched travel agencies (Index and Ecotravel) was the fact that the Royal Castle was not presented in details, the descriptions were rather sketchy. Other attractions to visit were described to justify the importance of visiting them, while in the case of the Royal Castle probably the editors of both programs found that all readers understand the significance of this attraction and further justification is needless.

Most trips to Kraków-Częstochowa Jura tourism region also offered to visit the Bobolice Castle. The only exception is one-day programs concentrated in other places of this rather wide region (the distance from Kraków to Częstochowa is more than 100 kilometers). However, the Bobolice castle was included in all two- and three-days programs.

However, the stronghold of Pszczyna knights was not offered in any of the programs in the catalogs analyzed. This can be justified by the fact that the place is not prepared for catering for the organized groups. Additionally, this place is not really dedicated to organized sightseeing trips.

Based on the analysis of Gazeta Wyborcza archive (Table 2), it was found that all three castles were described relatively often, but, as expected, the number of texts mentioning the Royal Castle in Warsaw was significantly bigger than in cases of other two castles. Additionally, the Bobolice and Pszczyna castles were described mainly on the local pages of the newspaper, while the Royal Castle was presented both on the local and the national pages. However, a significant number of texts mentioning any of the castles cannot be perceived as a direct illustration of the interest of media in those objects. Especially, the Royal Castle was mentioned frequently in texts regarded other topics and places. Out of over 1100 texts mentioning the Royal Castle, almost half were rejected as irrelevant to the study. What is more, in papers accepted to the research, the Bobolice and Pszczyna castles were presented mostly as attractions for tourists, while the castle in Warsaw was described also in other contexts (culture—presentation of exhibitions in castle museum, local development—as part of the Old Town in Warsaw). Plenty of articles were connected with events being organized in particular castles—the newspaper contained a short announcement of them. What is also characteristic, in reference to the Pszczyna and Bobolice castles, many articles presented different points of view of experts and tourists involved in the evaluation of their attractiveness and authenticity. Opinions of the experts cited were diverse, both supporters and opponents were presented. Those opinions were often connected with authenticity issues. Especially, very negative comments concerned the Pszczyna stronghold, however, the reconstruction of the Bobolice Castle was also criticized severely in few articles. In contrast, the Royal Castle in Warsaw was presented in the newspaper in a positive light, as one of the major attractions and one of the most valuable monuments in the whole country, and scant negative remarks referred to how it is available to visitors.

The analysis of Trip Advisor content (Table 3) revealed that only the Bobolice Castle has been evaluated by internet users in the category “Monuments, tourism attractions/castles”. The Warsaw Castle was classified by Trip Advisor as a museum, while the Pszczyna stronghold as a restaurant. As it was expected, the Royal Castle was evaluated on Trip Advisor by over 2500 tourists, while in cases of the Bobolice Castle and the Pszczyna stronghold, those numbers were several times lower (about 150). This clearly reflects the difference in the significance of tourism traffic between those three castles. Additionally, almost 90% of reviews of the Bobolice and Pszczyna castles were written in Polish, while the same index in the case of the Warsaw castle was 10% which proves how attractive this castle is for foreign tourists. It also reflects the fact that, unlike the Polish capital city, regions of the Bobolice and Pszczyna are generally visited by international tourists rarely. Most comments found on social media were positive. Bobolice and Pszczyna castles scored 4.0 in Trip Advisor while the Warsaw Castle scored 4.5.

For each of the castles the content of a hundred of the newest reviews was analyzed (Table 4). All reviews of the Bobolice Castle were written from the position of a visitor to this attraction. It was also the case in almost all reviews of the Royal Castle. However, the Stronghold in Pszczyna was evaluated
Table 2. The appearance of the analyzed castles in Gazeta Wyborcza archive (years 2000–2017)

| Castle Name                        | Number of texts in main pages | Number of texts in local pages | Number of texts with positive opinions | Numbers of texts with negative opinions | Numbers of texts presenting the castle in another context than as a tourism attraction | Number of texts addressing authenticity issues |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| The Royal Castle in Warsaw         | 126                           | 487                            | 552                                    | 81                                      | Cultural events—279, Local development—168, Exhibitions—144                      | 15                                            |
| The Bobolice Castle                | 6                             | 68                             | 65                                     | 31                                      | Hotel and restaurant—6, Cultural events—5                                         | 39                                            |
| The Stronghold of Pszczyna Knights  | 1                             | 37                             | 30                                     | 19                                      | Restaurant—14, Cultural events—8                                               | 21                                            |
mainly by customers of the restaurant located inside. However, also visitors of this restaurant were raising issues typical for evaluation of a tourism attraction like ambiance or facilities. The issue of authenticity was raised mainly by visitors of the Bobolice Castle, and only few reviews were connected with this topic in the cases of Warsaw and Pszczyna. Similarly, the evaluation of authenticity issues was different in the case of Bobolice than in the other castles. The statements about the authenticity of the Royal Castle and the Pszczyna Stronghold were not very frequent. The difference between those two castles is that those complaints were not connected with strong negative emotions in the case of Warsaw. They were rather statements like “don’t forget that the original castle was ruined during the World War II and the contemporary castle only a replica”. Oppositely, among the reviews of the Pszczyna castle, it is possible to find very strong, negative statements on cheating people, or saying “I’ll never come back to this castle-like fake”. The Bobolice Castle was reviewed by both supporters and opponents of its reconstruction. Among 35 reviews underlying the problem of its authenticity, 15 were negative and addressing spoiling the ambience of original ruins and 20 presented satisfaction by the contemporary shape of the castle. However, even in the case of the Bobolice Castle, authenticity was not the major issue underlined in neither positive nor negative comments. Much more often, visitors of all three castles were addressing prices, quality of services or aesthetic impressions. It is worth mentioning that in the majority of positive opinions good overall impression or ambiance of the place was underlined in the cases of all three castles. It may mean that even in the completely

Table 3. Rates of analyzed castles on Trip Advisor (retrieved 20.10.2018)

| Category                                      | Overall score | Number of reviews | Number and percentage of review in Polish |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|
| The Royal Castle in Warsaw                    | 4,5           | 2587              | 275/10,7%                                |
| The Bobolice Castle                           | 4,0           | 152               | 140/92%                                  |
| The Stronghold of Pszczyna Knights            | 4,0           | 138               | 121/87%                                  |

Table 4. Content analysis of the last 100 reviews of particular castles on Trip Advisor (retrieved 20.10.2018)

| Rated as a tourism attraction | Number of reviews addressing authenticity issues | Elements most often underlined in a negative context | Elements most often underlined in a positive context |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| The Royal Castle in Warsaw    | 98                                               | Quality of service—13                                | General/overall impression—62                        |
|                               |                                                  | Ticket prices—11                                     | Beauty of exhibition—29                              |
|                               |                                                  | Not interesting exhibition—8                         | Localization—18                                       |
|                               |                                                  | Lack of authenticity—4                               |                                                      |
| The Bobolice Castle           | 100                                              | Ticket prices—17                                     | Localization—61                                       |
|                               |                                                  | Bad organization—15                                  | Ambiance—48                                          |
|                               |                                                  | Lack of authenticity—15                              | Quality of additional services (food)—21             |
|                               |                                                  | Not interesting interior—13                          | Successful reconstruction—20                          |
| The Stronghold of Pszczyna Knights | 8                                               | Quality of food—28                                   | Ambiance—72                                          |
|                               |                                                  | Employees behavior—17                                | Quality of service—32                                 |
|                               |                                                  | Artificial environment—9                             | Quality of food—26                                    |
|                               |                                                  | Crowd—8                                              | Facilities for children—21                            |
contemporarily built environment of the Pszczyna Knight Stronghold and in partially artificial walls of
the Bobolice Castle, visitors appreciated the final effect of experiencing the historical times or
probably something unusual. Lack of authenticity was not an obstacle to create a memorable
ambiance of the places.

5. Discussion
The three examples presented above include castles that play important roles as tourism attrac-
tions in Poland. Still, the Royal Castle in Warsaw is significant on the national or even international
scale, while smaller objects in Bobolice and Pszczyna are more local or regional attractions. None
of the castles presented above can be labeled as a totally authentic building in the objective
meaning, as they were significantly reconstructed or even constructed in contemporary times.
However, one may ask whether there are any cultural tourism attractions that might be labeled as
fully genuine. This remains in accordance with Kim and Jamal (2007, p. 183) statement that
tourism is an inevitably commodifying process, and ruins the authenticity of the object. Taylor
(2001, p. 15) adds that the moment that culture is defined as an object of tourism, or segmented
and detached from its indigenous sphere, its aura of authenticity is reduced. The contemporary
shapes of the castles presented are evaluated differently by architecture and history experts,
starting from very high value attached to the Warsaw Castle, through controversies that involve
Bobolice, to even feeling sometimes disgusted in Pszczyna.

Opinions about the castles described, especially those in Bobolice and in Pszczyna, are also
differentiated among tourists; still, for both tourist attractions, there is a group of visitors that is big
equal to decide that they play important roles in tourism traffic in Southern Poland. This proves
that the creation of well-planned tourists’ experiences might compensate for the lack of authen-
ticity of a tourist attraction. After all, authenticity in the existential sense is what many tourists
search for and this existential authenticity might be linked with a partially authentic facility in the
objective sense. As it was stated before, this relationship is typical for monumental buildings, or
also architecture systems rather than for particular pieces of art. However, the high level of
objective authenticity makes the task less challenging. Finally, the example of the Warsaw Royal
Castle shows that the lack of objective authenticity may also increase the perceived value of a
toured object. Heritage tourism is almost always connected with stories told by the buildings,
artifacts, and other tourist attractions. A successful reconstruction may become part of such a
story. Also, when studying promotional materials of the Bobolice Castle, it can be seen that this
way of thinking is presented here. The message about the contemporary rebuilding is not hidden
and the castle does not pretend to be a historical building in those leaflets. Instead, the detailed
information about this reconstruction and curiosities about this are presented. A kind of pride of
“we managed to do this” is presented. This pride and this story are expected to attract tourists and
enhance their experiences.

If it is agreed that the existential authenticity rather than the objective one, is the most
important factor for tourists, a thin borderline between heritage and cultural tourism and tourist
traps, amusement parks and “having fun” must be stated. However, this borderline is subjective
and opinions of particular tourists might be totally different. An attempt, like in the Pszczyna
stronghold, to build memorable experiences of being transferred in time without using genuine
heritage buildings leads to the question about a parallel to what was described by MacCannell
as staged authenticity. A castle that pretends to be a historical building plays the role of a
theatre in which historical plays are presented, or rather co-created by actors and visitors.
Similarly, like in the original MacCannell’s concept, this case can be disputable, and similar
arguments by supporters and opponents can be used. Definitely, such an offer is a kind of a
cheat, however, in cases so obvious like the Pszczyna one, most visitors understand the theatre
play in which they are taking part. Still, the questions about how deep the experience can be,
how educative the visit can be, if we visit a fake castle, remain. But these questions are often
not asked by mass tourists who do not expect long-lasting, deep relationships with toured
objects (Cohen, 1988). On the contrary, they may appreciate the huge tourism potential of these
fake heritage objects. Real monuments, objects that have a significant historical value, are under special rules intended to preserve them. It limits the possibilities of making them available and more attractive for tourists, and, additionally, it increases the cost of facility maintenance. When building an attraction for tourists from scratch, all details can be planned and constructed to make tourists’ visits more attractive. Developers of the Pszczyna stronghold presented well how to achieve this effect. An example can be a collapsible ceiling between the first and the second floor that allows combining the halls into a very high, one impressive one.

6. Conclusions
The subject of authenticity in tourism is multilayered and complex. The term is used by researchers representing different fields and conducting their surveys in relation to different elements of heritage. Therefore, it is often difficult to make generalizations and it would be more appropriate to evaluate the authenticity concept in specific case studies (Brida, et al., 2014). Contemporary the existence of the big number of approaches and lack of commonly accepted definitions are at least partially the effect of the impossibility of application of tools developed for the purpose of a particular case in reference to other ones. The paper follows the other direction. It is postulated that it is necessary to develop different approaches to the subject of authenticity in relation to different forms of heritage. The most important division is between tangible and intangible heritage. Authenticity of intangible heritage has been researched so far more often. There are also more tools and theories developed for such an analysis. That is why it is necessary to consider which of those tools and theories might be applicable to the analysis of authenticity of tangible heritage in tourism.

The scientific outcome of the paper is drawing attention to the issue of authenticity of tangible heritage. Three different approaches to this issue were presented that should be used in regard to different types of heritage: pieces of art, buildings and monumental zones. Additionally, reasons for making it necessary to use those different approaches were presented. The case study analysis enabled to confirm the results of the previous research conducted on the examples of intangible heritage. That research clearly underlined the key role of existential authenticity in creating tourism experiences. Nevertheless, in reference to all three castles researched, their authenticity might be questioned in the objective meaning; they all create memorable and usually appreciated experiences for visitors. This is the starting point for asking the question which should be considered as a major area of the future studies in this subject. The question is whether there is a phenomenon like the staged authenticity of tangible heritage.

Still, it is postulated that perceiving tangible heritage as a homogenous group when analyzing its authenticity in tourism is also misleading. Different approaches should be developed to consider authenticity of pieces of art, particular buildings, and monumental zones, however, the list of different types of elements of tangible heritage that need specific approach might be even enlarged.

The results of the content analysis conducted within the case study of three Polish castles offer some insights into different approaches to authenticity of buildings. The results support statements on the key role of existential authenticity in the creation of visitors’ satisfaction developed for the analysis of intangible heritage. The role of authenticity in the objective meaning is in such a case not as important but should not be underestimated. Opinions of tourists found on Trip Advisor and in press prove that there is a group of tourists who truly care about the objective authenticity of toured castles and do not accept contemporary reconstructions and other forms of staged authenticity. However, in the case of all three castles, this group is a minority and their opinions are not representative of the whole society of potential visitors. Most of the visitors of all three castles search for memorable experiences and evaluate toured objects regarding their ability to offer such experiences.

The outcome of the research presented is limited in a way that is typical for case studies (Yin, 2004). The selection of objects of analysis, even though it was justified earlier, was subjective and purposeful. Extended research with more examples with different backgrounds is necessary. The
paper justifies presented rules only in particular cases, but in order to give a detailed and general description, further studies are required. In particular, repeating similar research in other countries, especially on different continents, should bring new insights to conclusions presented here.
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