Abstract

Objective: The objective of this research is to develop a structural model for measuring cultural tourism behavior, which helps to better understand the profile, motivation, and behavior of Spanish cultural tourists in their trips within Spain and abroad.

Methodology: A hypothetic-deductive method has been used where, after reviewing the literature, focusing on the importance of considering the client’s experience, a set of hypotheses are presented that materialize in an exploratory model. These hypotheses are later tested through a system of structural equations (SEM), estimated with data contained in the Tourism Survey of Residents / FAMILITUR of the National Institute of Statistics (INE).

Results: The model allows confirming a set of indicators that make it possible to analyze the behavior of Spanish cultural tourists in their trips within Spain, in the different Autonomous Communities (Comunidades Autónomas).

Limitations: The variables present in the Resident Tourism Survey/FAMILITUR are framed in the general guidelines given by the World Tourism Organization to study the demand, establishing a general framework and not as specific as would be required for a more segmented study of the demand for cultural tourism.

Practical implications: Help to make decisions that facilitate an improvement of the management of tourist destinations with cultural heritage, implementing specific promotional and marketing tourism policies that generate social and economic profitability in the destination.

Keywords: behavior model; structural equations (SEM); FAMILITUR; tourism demand, cultural tourism; tourist management.
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文章摘要

研究目的：本研究的目的为在文化旅游中发展一个量度行为的结构模型，以协助人们更清楚了解西班牙文化旅游之游客在西班牙国内以及在外地旅游的特点、动机及行为。

分析方法：以考虑客户体验为重点，首先查阅有关文献，然后套用了假设演绎法来组织一个综合假设，再把假设具体化为一个探索性模型。其后，这些假设会通过结构方程模型（SEM）进行对比，并利用国家统计局的居民旅游意见调查/FAMILITUR之数据来作预测。

研究结果：该模型让我们确定一系列指标，来分析于西班牙国内不同自治区参加文化旅游之西班牙游客的行为。

研究限制：居民旅游意见调查/FAMILITUR现有的变量是世界旅游组织综合指引所包括的变量，用于研究旅游需求。可是其只建立一套综合框架，一套不是专门针对细节研究，可以用于集中研究文化旅游需求的框架。

实际应用：改善对拥有文化遗产的旅游目的地的管理，协助决策。实行有助旅游目的地之社会及经济盈利的旅游推广政策及专门营销。

关键词：行为模型、结构方程模型（SEM）、FAMILITUR、旅游需求、文化旅游、旅游管理。

JEL 分类号: C0、M3、Z1。
1. Introduction

Spain is a great tourist and cultural power. In 2018 the historical record of foreign tourists with more than 82 million tourists was surpassed for the sixth consecutive year, of which 18.1% visited the country for cultural reasons, with an expenditure close to 14,000 million euros. In the case of cultural trips made in 2017 by residents in Spain, reaches 12.5 million tourists with an expenditure of 6,747.7 million euros (INE, 2018).

The data reveals the economic importance that cultural tourism generates in the country, for which cultural resources have been vital: for example, having several World Heritage cities (15 historic centers have been recognized as such by UNESCO). Research on cultural tourism (De la Calle, 2003, Troitiño and Troitiño, 2009) evidence, however, the high concentration of visitors in specific Spanish resources and populations and the underutilization of a significant percentage of localities with notable cultural heritage (Barrera and Hernández, 2016).

Therefore, it is essential to analyze the factors that make it possible to increase the perceived value of the client in destinations with a high concentration of tourists to promote the development of a comprehensive management policy between cities and their available resources (Mínguez, 2013; TUR, 2016).

Therefore, this work focuses on identifying the variables that can explain the cultural tourism consumption experience. Starting from the theoretical orientations on the variables that would integrate the client’s experience (Homburg, Jozić and Kuehn, 2017, Garduño and Cisneros, 2018), an empirical analysis is made based on the data of the tourist demand with cultural motivation provided by the Tourism Survey of Residents / FAMILITUR, carried out periodically by the National Institute of Statistics (INE). The analysis of these data is fundamental to obtain more objective knowledge of the behavior of the cultural tourist.

This study is a contribution to generate a metric, a model of the behavior of the Spanish cultural tourist that allows measuring the congruence between the value perceived by this type of visitors, and the cultural heritage. It is about analyzing the value related to the use or experience of consumption (Pine and Gilmore, 1998; Schmitt, 1999), in this case, tourism. In this way, it responds to the need to generate models that make it possible to understand the behavior of the demand for cultural tourism better and to provide information to the agents involved in the management of cultural tourism destinations. In this way, it will serve as a guide/basis to design, develop and implement tourism policies and actions for specific promotion and commercialization that generate social and economic profitability in the destination (Bote and Álvarez, 1998, Molina, Martín-Consuegra, Esteban and Díaz, 2007).

The rise of cultural tourism in cities with heritage and the repercussions of its use as a product by tourists (Kim, Cheng and O’Leary, 2007, Velasco, 2009, Troitiño, 2015) entails the need to develop new management models of historical heritage aimed at its dissemination (Mondéjar and Gómez, 2009, Fresneda and Lobo, 2014, Caro, Luque and Zayas, 2015). In short, it seeks to achieve a more significant competitive advantage within the immense tourist offer.
2. Conceptual framework

2.1. Definition of the term satisfaction

In the marketing of services, customer satisfaction and perceived quality of service are two closely related concepts (Liljander, 1994). Although they may seem the same, they are different concepts, with the perception of the quality of service being one more component that affects the client’s satisfaction (Cronin and Taylor, 1992, Bloemer and de Ruyter, 1995). Thus, satisfaction would be a broader concept that is not only affected by the benefits-rewards, but also by personal and situational factors that escape the control of the service provider (Zeithaml and Bitner, 2002).

Satisfaction is drawn as a complex concept in which numerous variables are combined both by the consumer (cultural, personal, economic, experiential elements), and the product/service (quality, the expenditure made, features).

In the case of tourists, their satisfaction is given by a set of activities-experiences that have turned out to be positive. The visitor wants to live a satisfactory “experience” even before his arrival at the destination and, of course, during his stay in it. In this way, the ultimate satisfaction would be the set of several rewarding actions given at different times of the trip, including its organization before the trip. Consequently, the satisfaction will depend both on the expectations of the consumer-visitor and on the evaluation of the experiences lived in the product-destination once consumed (Kotler, Cámara, Grande and Cruz, 2000).

Moreover, in that satisfaction affect both the tangible elements (tourism resources of the destination, tourist infrastructure, accessibility) and intangibles (emotions experienced, the perceived quality of services, the degree of compliance with expectations). The latter are difficult to quantify, but they can influence tourist satisfaction to a greater extent than tangible elements (Bordeau, 2002, Devesa, 2005, Sukanthasirikul and Trongpanich, 2016).

In this sense, it is relevant that tourist companies, when trying to know the value of the service they offer, rely on the concept of value for the client. Value perceived by the client that, starting from a business point of view, has been described by Woodall (2003), adopting an intermediate position between the value approach for the client (utility of the product, perceived benefits/costs) and the value for consumption (consumption as experience). Thus, the different variables that determine the customer’s value are derived from the same product or service and other derivatives of the client (sociodemographic characteristics, expectations) - and the temporal context in which the consumption is made, thus reconciling the two visions of perceived value and proposing a complementary approach between them.

The scientific literature derived from this complementary approach to perceived value studied both from the benefits/sacrifices relation of the practical value and the emotional relationship (experience) of the consumer with the products. It has sought to find metrics of the different dimensions of the value perceived by the consumer of a product.
In this way, a multidimensional vision has been incorporated into the concept of perceived value that includes both functional dimensions of value (quality, price) and emotional (hedonistic), social or epistemic values (novelty, search for knowledge), demonstrating the critical role they play in the perception of consumers' tourism experiences (Williams and Soutar, 2000) and, therefore, in their degree of satisfaction (Caruana, Money and Berthon, 2000).

2.2. Variables that influence the satisfaction of cultural tourists

As already noted, in the ultimate satisfaction of the tourist involved different variables, both those related to the destination (Chen and Chen, 2010), as derived from the socioeconomic profile of the tourist (Valls, 2003) or motivational (Yoon and Uysal, 2005).

In this section, it is reviewed the conceptual foundations of the different factors that influence the satisfaction of the cultural tourist, focusing only on those variables of the demand study of FAMILITUR analyzed for the model proposed. FAMILITUR is a complete survey of resident households in Spain regarding detailed information on both the number of trips and the traveler’s profile and motivation (Prado, 2013).

2.2.1. Sociodemographic variables: age, gender, level of studies, and purchasing power

Age is essential within sociodemographic variables. Various authors note that the age segment of the cultural tourist is between 25 and 55 years, with the age range of 30-44 years made the most trips, mainly due to economic stability and family independence (Valls, 2003; Lara de Vicente y López, 2004, Royo and Serarols, 2005, Pulido and Sánchez, 2010).

With regard to cultural motivation according to age, the latest research conducted in the city of Madrid (Spain) conclude that there are differences between tourists over 45 years compared to those between 18 and 44 years, the first being that present lower levels of motivation (Bautista, Duque, Fernández, Da Silva, 2015).

Gender is one of the personal characteristics of the tourist highlighted in the literature. It affects the perception of the destination and the motivations to visit it, as evidenced by several studies that point to it as a discriminating factor in the perception of the client, often being more positive on the part of the woman (Callan and Bowman, 2000). It would also exert some significant influence on the motivations, since women, when they visit a destination, present motivations more related to knowledge than men (Gil, Beierli and De León, 2012). However, other authors do not show significant differences between their sexes about their cultural motivation or their satisfaction with the resources or infrastructures of the destination (Bautista et al., 2015).

The educational level of cultural tourists is high, with university or secondary studies, as shown by several types of research (Lara de Vicente et al., 2004, Royo et
and field studies developed in different Spanish cities. Humanity (Troitiño et al., 2000). This level of studies would have a positive impact on satisfaction by providing a better understanding and interpretation of the cultural resources visited. At the same time, having higher education would have a higher level of demand on the part of the tourist, which has a decisive influence on their satisfaction (Valls, 2003).

Regarding the purchasing level, studies indicate that the cultural tourist has a medium-high purchasing power (De la Calle, 2003); which implies a higher expense in the destination.

2.2.2. Variables related to the tourist experience

Linked to the influence of the variables related to the tourist’s experience (among which would be those concerned to the organization of the trip, activities carried out and spending) and their degree of satisfaction, several studies analyze the positive relationships in a cultural destination between the quality of the tourist experience and satisfaction with fidelity to the destination (Chen and Chen, 2010). Dominguez (2015, p. 237) cites Chen et al. (2010).

These studies emphasize that it substitutes the variables related to the quality of service for the quality of the experiences, to explain the degree of satisfaction and fidelity since it considers that in the case of cultural tourism this variable better explains existing relationships.

The clients–and the tourist with even more intensity, due to the nature of tourism– seek experiences that complete their identity, so it is essential to generate satisfaction that these experiences are authentic, not artificial.

Thus, as pointed Alcoba (2017), not always the price or quality will be the most important, but the creation of value given by the quality of experiences. In this way, “memorable” experiences are inserted in the client’s biographical and identity imaginary, increasing fidelity, spending, or recommendations.

Other works highlight that the ability of the destination to provide the visitor with an experience according to their expectations and needs will generate a greater or lesser level of fidelity of the tourist towards the destination, manifested both in the intention to recommend the destination, and to repeat the visit (Bigné, Sánchez and Sánchez, 2001).

Along the same lines are the studies by Yoon and Uysal (2005) on satisfaction in destinations. Through a model of structural equations which analyze the relationship between the degree of satisfaction, motivations tourist destination and fidelity to positively confirm the relationship between motivation and loyalty to the destination with satisfaction as mediating variable.

Similarly, research conducted on destinations such as the city of Seville in Spain (Medina, Rey and Rufin, 2010, Domínguez, Camúñez, Pérez and González., 2017) or Eureka Springs in Arkansas, United States, (Chiy Qu, 2008) evidence the relationship between the perceived value of the destination, its authenticity, the general satisfaction and the direct impact of it in the fidelity to the destination.
About spending, the works carried out by Cárdenas and Pulido (2017) in various cultural urban destinations show that there is a correlation between tourist satisfaction and tourist spending in the destination. Consequently, of all the above, the following hypotheses have been proposed:

**INFLUENCES THE CULTURAL TOURIST’S SATISFACTION**
- **H1:** The different socio-demographic and cultural variables of the tourist.
- **H2:** The variables that make up the organization of the trip.
- **H3:** The variables that make up the activities carried out.
- **H4:** The expense made before and during the trip.

**TRAVEL ORGANIZATION INFLUENCES**
- **H5:** In the expenditure made.
- **H6:** In the activities developed.

**THE EXPENSES MADE BEFORE AND DURING THE TRIP INFLUENCE**
- **H7:** In the activities developed.

**THE PROFILE OF THE CULTURAL TOURIST INFLUENCES**
- **H8:** In the activities performed during the trip.
- **H9:** In the organization of the trip.
- **H10:** In the expenses incurred.

3. **Proposed model**

This study posits and analyzes a structural model for measuring the behavior of tourists whose primary motivation is cultural, which helps to know and better understand their behavior. The model has been estimated, and its hypotheses have been empirically tested with the data provided by the Resident Tourism Survey/FAMILITUR, carried out by the Spanish Statistical Institute (INE) for the study of tourist movements of Spaniards in the domestic market and abroad with an approximate monthly sample size of 16,400 surveys. This statistic constitutes a primary reference to establish the general framework of tourism demand in Spain.
Table 1. Shows a summary of its main characteristics.

Table 1. Sample (National Institute of Statistics, 2018)

| Type of survey       | Continue every quarter                                      |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scope of the population | Population over 15 years of age residing in the main family dwelling. |
| Ambit                | All the national territory.                                 |
| Reference period     | Monthly.                                                    |
| Sample size          | Around 16,400 interviews conducted every month.            |
| Collection of information | Telephone interviews and, in some cases, personal interviews. |

From the theoretical foundations explained in the previous section, the conceptual model proposed has been structured, identifying the most significant elements and proposing the system of interdependencies that relate them.

For this, first, based on the review of the scientific literature on the subject, those variables of the questionnaire of the Resident Tourism Survey/FAMILITUR have been identified that are considered to influence the behavior of the cultural tourist.

Next, the factors that will determine the behavior model, whose structure is tested through the relationships established in the proposed causal model, are presented.

1. Factor 1: Socioeconomic and cultural tourist profile. Composed of four variables (indicators): age, sex, educational level, and home income.
2. Factor 2: Trip Organization: Dividing the variables according to the destination, type of organized trip, the services used in the destination, and the reservations made.
3. Factor 3: Activities carried out in the destination, formed by five variables: cultural visits, attendance to cultural shows, other cultural activities, visiting cities, and visiting rural destinations.
4. Factor 4: Expenses made, composed of the variables related to the expenditure made and its amount.
5. Factor 5: Named Satisfaction.

4. Methodology

The data used for the study were obtained from the Resident Tourism Survey / FAMILITUR conducted by the National Institute of Statistics (INE), for the study of tourist trips and excursions carried out by the population residing in primary family dwellings in Spain for the period between February 2015 and September 2016.
The research framework used aims to demonstrate the relationship between the following five factors: *Socioeconomic and cultural profile of the tourist, Organization of the trip, Activities carried out in the destination, Expenses, and Satisfaction.*

The modeling was carried out by systems of structural equations (SEM); a statistical technique that allows, simultaneously, to estimate and contrast the causal relationships between several dependent and independent constructs, through a single systematic and comprehensive analysis (Gefen *et al*., 2011). SEM modeling is used in research to estimate and test causal relationships between multiple dependent and independent constructs, using quantitative data and qualitative causal assumptions.

There are many distinguishing and advisable characteristics, in this context, of SEM modeling. Among them, their acceptable behavior with a reduced sample size, which supports latent variables, impose few or no restrictions on the distribution that the data must follow (Fornell & Bookstein, 1982), minimizes the unexplained variance and converges quickly, even in complex situations.

The estimation of the model has been based on the application of the method of partial least squares (PLS) basing the adequacy of its use on the following criteria: the relative novelty of the phenomenon investigated so that its modeling is in a stage of development, minimum requirements of the PLS with respect to the sample size, the higher precision of the prediction and the demands, low in comparison with other techniques, with respect to the multinormality of the data.

In particular, PLS has an advantage over all other methodologies by not requiring distributions to be normal or known. To clarify the relationships between the variables of the model and, given that complex hypotheses are required, curvilinear effects are used to test the complete range of relations between the factors using the Warp 3 algorithm (Temme, Kreis, & Hildebrandt, 2006) applying the WarpPLS 6.0 software (Kock, 2017). This algorithm identifies relationships between latent variables whose derivatives are curves in U.

In this way, not only nonlinear effects can be modeled but also, simultaneously, the effects of mediation and moderation, which constitutes a considerably closer approximation to reality. Although it is estimated that 200 bootstrap samples are sufficient (Efron *et al*., 2004), 5,000 samples were taken (Hair, 2011).
5. Results

Table 2. Overview of the fit and reliability indexes of the model

| Index                                      | Value                  | Value Interpretation                        |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Average path coefficient (APC)             | APC = 0.161, P < 0.001 | Significant if p < 0.05                     |
| Average R-squared (ARS)                    | ARS = 0.208, P < 0.001 | Significant if p < 0.05                     |
| Average adjusted R-squared (AARS)          | AARS = 0.208, P < 0.001 | Significant if p < 0.05                     |
| Average block VIF (AVIF)                   | AVIF = 1.278           | Acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3          |
| Average full collinearity VIF (AFVIF)      | AFVIF = 1.437          | Acceptable if <= 5, ideally <= 3.3          |
| TenenhausGoF (GoF)                         | GoF = 0.281            | Small >= 0.1, medium >= 0.25, large >= 0.36 |
| Simpson’s paradox ratio (SPR)              | SPR = 1,000            | Acceptable if >= 0.7, ideally = 1           |
| R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)        | RSCR = 0.1,000         | Acceptable if >= 0.9, ideally = 1           |
| Statistical suppression ratio (SSR)        | SSR = 1,000            | Acceptable if >= 0.7                        |
| Nonlinear bivariate causality direction ratio (NLBCDR) | NLBCDR = 0.600 | Acceptable if >= 0.7                        |

Source: Own estimations using WarpPLS 6.0 software.

Figure 1 shows a schema of the proposed model. The values on the arrows represent the value of the estimated parameters followed by, in parentheses, their corresponding p-value.
Of the 10 hypotheses proposed, 9 have been accepted with a confidence level higher than 95%, p<0.05.

**H1:** The different socio-demographic and cultural variables (“profile”) of the tourist influence the degree of satisfaction of the cultural tourist.

Figure 2. Hypothesis 1
The figure shows that the independent variable (profile) influences the dependent variable (satisfaction), so that by increasing the variables of the sociodemographic profile (age, purchasing power) the degree of satisfaction is lower. In the same way, as the variables that make up the profile decrease (lower level of studies, purchasing power, and age), satisfaction would increase.

The cultural tourist has, in general, a high cultural level (higher studies), which implies that he is more “close” to the culture of the destination he visits. Its higher educational level allows access, interpretation, and understanding of what is visited, as pointed out by Bordieu (1985).

They are informed clients about the destination and the tourist-cultural resources they choose to visit, which generates defined expectations and feeds the desire for actual experiences. He is a tourist who knows what he wants, what he is looking for and who already has previous cultural tourism experiences (his primary motivation to travel is cultural, so he has already visited destinations with similar characteristics).

This knowledge and empathy with the cultural tourism resource could suggest a high degree of general satisfaction. However, as shown in the graph, the above makes it a more demanding tourist and sensitive to lower overall satisfaction (resulting in both from the expectations created and from the actual valuation perceived at the destination). Those tourists with particular personal social, hedonistic or psychological needs, in general, have high expectations about the tourist service (Grande, Hernández, Muñoz and Núñez, 2005).

As analyzed by Weiermair (2000), they are demanding tourists with the quality of experience when they are “close” to the culture of the destination. On the other hand, those who are more “culturally distant” from the destination tend to be more tolerant, with a higher level of general satisfaction.

To explain the point of inflection from which satisfaction rises with respect to a more considerable increase in the variables that make up the socioeconomic profile, it can be established as a relationship that, with higher purchasing power, more significant possibility of contracting personalized tourist products, exclusive and of high quality that satisfy all the expectations generated by this segment of demand of high sociocultural profile, increasing its general satisfaction.

On the other hand, the estimations of the proposed model confirm the hypotheses proposed in the relations established between the sociocultural profile (age, gender, level of studies and purchasing power) of the cultural tourist-satisfaction (H1), activities performed-satisfaction (H3) and expenses incurred-satisfaction (H4).

H2: The variables that make up the organization (“travorg”) of the trip have a positive impact on overall satisfaction.
Figure 3. Hypothesis 2

This hypothesis about the influence of travel organization on tourist satisfaction (H2) is not supported with a 95% confidence level. A relationship is appreciated, but the level of confidence is 88%, slightly lower than the commonly established standard. Thus, its influence on satisfaction would not be as relevant as initially thought, following the hypothesis posed by various studies on the positive influence that the organization of travel has on tourist satisfaction (Kozak, 2001; Hui, Wan and Ho, 2007).

The graph shows that an increase in the degree of organization of the trip, alone or in the company of other people, through the advance purchase of tourist packages and tourist services used in the destination, do not significantly affect the final satisfaction of the tourist cultural.

**H3:** The variables that make up the activities (“activ”) carried out in the destination have a positive impact on overall satisfaction.
Figure 4. Hypothesis 3

The activities carried out in the destination exert a direct influence on the general satisfaction \((p<0.01)\) (H3), thus gaining importance the tourist cultural offer available at the destination. According to the graph, the independent variable (activ) influences the dependent variable (satisfaction), increasing satisfaction as the variables that make up the activities carried out in the destination increase.

The experiences lived in the destination, through the activities carried out, are one of the aspects that the tourist will value, once the trip is made, comparing it with the projected expectations, resulting in his degree of satisfaction (Kotler, Cámara, Grande y Cruz, 2000).

The increase in satisfaction can derive from the positive assessment by the cultural tourist of the experiences given by the performance of specific cultural activities, personal treatment or the quality of the accommodations. In comparison, the rest of non-cultural activities or aspects derived from the overall experience of the trip (signaling, information, excessive influx of visitors in certain tourist resources…) affects to a lesser extent in its assessment (Esteban, 2005).

**H4:** The expenditure made before and during the trip (“expenses”) influences the overall satisfaction.
Also, the *expense incurred* during the trip has a direct influence on overall satisfaction ($p<0.01$) (H4). Therefore, relationships can be established between the welfare of the tourist and the expenditure made on the destination. The graph shows how the increase in the independent variable of spending influences positively satisfaction. However, the satisfaction obtained by means of spending on specific products or services, in this case before and during the trip, does not increase indefinitely in the face of a more considerable increase in expenditure but instead reaches a maximum point from which more spending implies lower satisfaction. It is the so-called “satisfaction curve” that in the case of the cultural tourist is also fulfilled.

The fall in satisfaction, although there is a higher expense, could also be explained by the fact that the tourist seeks a satisfactory quality-price relationship, which can be inverted if a high price is paid for a product whose value of change does not correspond to the satisfaction of that need.

**H5**: The organization of the trip (“travorg”) influences the expenditure made.

*The organization of the trip* (destination, type of organized trips, services used at the destination and reservations made) confirms a statistically positive and significant relationship on the expenditure made at the destination ($p<0.01$) (H5).

According to the graph, the independent variable (travorg) influences the dependent variable (expenses). The progressive increase of the variables that make up the organization of the trip entails an increase in spending before and during the trip. The cultural tourist use of tourist services, both for the organization of the trip and those hired at the destination, entails an increase in expenditure.
In this relationship, the sociocultural profile of the cultural tourist would directly affect both its educational level, which make it an “active” tourist willing to interact with the destination (heritage, local population…), as well as its medium-high purchasing power, make up a consumer willing to hire certain quality tourist services (H1). An example can be the choice of the category of accommodations or the hiring of tourist visits that offer a different and exclusive experience of the destination according to their created expectations.

The data provided by the survey object of this study (FAMILITUR) on the organization of the trip confirm the above. They reveal that this typology of tourists makes little use of standard organized trips (tourist packages), which is also explained by the fact that the hiring of this tourist product increases as the physical and/or cultural distance between the point of origin increases and the place of destination (De la Calle y García, 2008). FAMILITUR, being a survey of the internal demand for cultural tourism, reflects the lower use of tour packages and a more significant presence of the organization of the trip independently. This would affect the distribution of tourist spending at the destination and an increase in the leisure time of the cultural tourist that would allow him to make/contract more tourist activities with its consequent increase in spending.

H6: The organization of the trip (“travorg”) influences the activities.
According to the graph, the increase in the variables that make up the organization of the trip increases the activities carried out in the destination, made up of five variables (cultural visits, attendance at cultural shows, other cultural activities, visiting cities and visiting rural destinations). However, reaching a certain level of travel organization, the better organization does not entail carrying out more activities at the destination.

As in hypothesis five (H5), it is necessary to take into account the incidence of the socio-cultural profile of the tourist in their preferences when choosing the organization of the trip and the little use of regular organized trips (tour packages) as they provide the survey data. This explains that the organization of the trip can be high but does not entail the use of tourist services that imply a greater realization of activities in the destination.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) should be taken into account in which the educational level makes this tourist have sought information about the destination and its tourist-cultural resources. The organization of the trip formed by choice of destination, the daily itinerary of the trip or hotel reservations, may not include tourist services that offer all kinds of visits and activities to be carried out at the destination. Likewise, this type of tourist seeks quality experiences so it is not defined by an exhaustive realization of activities, but a knowledge more profound of the destination to visit.

**H7**: Travel expenses have a positive influence on activities.
In the H7 hypothesis, the *expenses incurred during the trip*, including both those before the start of the trip and those made at the destination, confirm a statistically positive and significant relationship on the activities carried out by the tourist (p < 0.01).

The graph indicates how the realization of a moderate expense, before and during the trip, and its amount, does not entail a significant increase in the activities carried out at the destination (cultural visits, attendance at cultural shows, other cultural activities, visiting cities and visiting destinations rural). Thus, when a certain level of expenditure is reached, its increase does not generate a greater realization of activities at the destination.

The scientific literature shows that tourist spending is determined by different factors such as the psychographic aspects of the tourist (personality, lifestyle, interests, hobbies, and values), its sociodemographic profile, its primary motivation to travel or the characteristics of the trip. However, not all variables influence equally; The primary motivation of the tourist determines in large part the activities carried out at the destination, being more critical than the socioeconomic variables to explain the expenditure in the case of the cultural tourist (Lee, Lee, and Wicks, 2004, Chang, 2006).

Thus, the more interest the cultural tourist feels towards the activities related to the culture of the destination (traditions, gastronomy) the more he will increase his spending in activities of higher added value that go beyond the mere visit to the points of cultural interest that they make the tourists with less cultural motivation.

Therefore, following Pulido, Cárdenas, and Carrillo (2016) not all cultural activities have the same influence on the total expenditure made by the cultural tourist. As different studies have shown (Hausmann, 2007, Marrero and Abdul-Jalbar, 2012), some cultural activities carried out at the destination (cultural visits, attendance at...
shows or gastronomic experiences) have a more considerable influence on the tourist expenditure made in urban-cultural destinations.

**H8:** The profile of the tourist (profile) influences the activities carried out during the trip.

Figure 9. Hypothesis 8

The socio-economic profile of tourists directly influences the activities carried out at the destination ($p<0.01$) (H8). The graph shows how the independent variable (profile) influences the dependent variable (activ) so that as the variables that make up the socioeconomic profile increase, the activities carried out at the destination decrease (cultural visits, attendance at cultural shows, other cultural activities, visit cities and visit rural destinations). The decrease in the variables of the socioeconomic profile affects an increase in the activities carried out.

In the relationship between the profile and the greater or lesser number of activities carried out at the destination, the degree of cultural motivation of the tourist would affect. Currently, the importance of motivation-experience as an influence on the visits made and its intensity is accepted in the scientific literature (OMT, 2005). Thus, there is a cultural tourist segmented according to the degree of cultural motivation in the visit and the different degrees of experiences made at the destination that result in different behaviors. Among independent tourists, it is possible to differentiate those who present a strong motivation of a cultural nature from those who have a more secondary or light (Bote, 1998, Mckerchery du Cros, 2002).

An explanation of the decrease in the activities carried out in relation to the socio-economic characteristics of the cultural tourist lies in the new profile of the tourist, who currently has a higher educational level, being more autonomous and demanding and fleeing from organized trips or standardized products (Lara de
Vicente et al., 2004; Royo et al., 2005). Look for personalized experiences (feel different) where quality over quantity prevails. Therefore, if the activities offered by the destination do not meet expectations, the tourists can do less cultural activities, even if they enjoy a high purchasing power. This is the case of the erudite tourist who travels “on his own” and looks for specialized personnel to carry out activities that guarantee a high level of quality.

On the other hand, as the socio-economic variables of the cultural tourist decrease, although it has less purchasing power, it is less autonomous and is willing to carry out more activities organized by tour operators to know the destination. Their lesser approach to the destination given by their more limited level of training entails a higher predisposition to perform more activities to obtain better knowledge.

**H9:** The profile of the tourist (“profile”) influences the organization of the trip (“travorg”).

Finally, the results of the estimated model allow to state that the variables that make up the socio-economic and cultural profile factor of tourists influence statistically in a positive and significant way the organization of the trip (H9) and the expenditure made (H10) (p < 0.01). An increase in the socioeconomic characteristics causes a lesser organization of the trip. On the contrary, the decrease of the variables of the socioeconomic profile would increase the presence of a more significant organization of the trip.

The explanation of this hypothesis is related to what is stated in hypothesis 8 (H8), confirming the influence of the socio-cultural profile of the cultural tourist in the activities carried out at the destination, as well as in the organization of the trip.
The decrease in the organization of the trip in relation to the socio-economic characteristics of the cultural tourist lies, as already mentioned, in the medium-high educational level of this type of tourist, more autonomous and demanding with the tourist experience that he wishes to obtain. In comparison, the demand segment of cultural tourists with less training and purchasing power, feeling less “close” to the destination, is more willing to perform standardized activities organized by tour operators (always together or always separately) to obtain knowledge and, for So, to a greater organization of the trip.

**H10**: The profile of the tourist (“profile”) influences the expenses

As the variables that make up the socioeconomic profile increase, the presence of the variables that make up the expenditure (made before and during the trip, as well as its amount) decrease. The decrease in socioeconomic variables would increase spending. The influence of the profile on the realization of spending is directly related to hypothesis 8 (H8), and hypothesis 9 (H9) since both the degree of organization of the trip and the activities carried out at destination significantly influence what and how much is spent.

6. Conclusions

Knowing the consumer, in this case, the cultural tourist, is not natural. Therefore, the variables present in any direct survey of tourism demand, made once completed the visit, are fundamental for obtaining data that will provide with a better
knowledge of their behavior. The results obtained in this study, based on the Resident Tourism Survey/FAMILITUR, allow relating a set of indicators that influence the behavior of Spanish cultural tourists.

Specifically, the results have allowed to verify, in the first place, the influence exerted by the socioeconomic characteristics of the tourist, as well as the organization of the trip; the activities carried out at the destination and the expense on the general satisfaction of the tourist.

Secondly, the importance of the profile of the cultural tourist has been tested about the activities developed during the stay, the degree of organization of the trip, and the expenses incurred. Thus, as the relationship between these and the activities carried out.

Finally, the hypotheses regarding the relationship between the organization of the trip with the expenditure and activities carried out have also been confirmed in a significant way.

Results, therefore, relevant for the planning and management of cultural tourism destinations. The fact of being able to identify different variables that affect their degree of satisfaction, the importance of the socioeconomic characteristics of this segment of demand in their behavior with respect to the expense and activities carried out, as well as, the degree of organization of the manifested trip for this type of tourist would allow carrying out specific policies of promotion and commercialization of cultural destinations, adapting marketing strategies to the cultural pattern of this segment of demand.

On the other hand, identify the cultural resources and tourist services of the destination can help raise overall satisfaction or customer loyalty to the destination.

The limitations that have been found in this research are mainly due to the kind of variables mainly present in the Survey of Residents’ Tourism/FAMILITUR, framed more in the general orientations given by the World Tourism Organization for the study of the demand, not carrying out a more operational adaptation of certain variables, including such as those related to satisfaction or fidelity to the destination.

For this reason, the exploitation of these statistics establishes a general framework and not as specific as would be required for a more segmented study of demand, such as the flow of cultural tourism. This implies that, for a closer approach to the analysis of this type of tourism demand, it is necessary to integrate more operational concepts or variables adapted to the needs of the studied area, in this case cultural tourism, that provide specific data on the different segments of the demand making possible, among other actions, a differentiated marketing.
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