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Academic studies on tourism market segmentation have decreased in scale over time, with the focus on tourist segmentation changing from segmenting the market as a whole to segmenting specific tourism niche markets. This change in scale can also be seen in how academics have attempted to segment the religious tourism market moving from discussions related to the pilgrim-tourist dichotomy to segmenting visitors based on religious affiliation to world regions and countries to specific religious activities such as religious festivals and infrastructural amenities such as hotels. In this paper the author, following Wall’s (1997) discussion of the spatial characteristics of tourist attractions (i.e., points, lines, and areas), raises the question as to whether there is a scalar difference in the motivations and the ‘expectation of experience’ of: people who travel to specific religious sites (points); those who travel along religiously - themed routes (lines) and; those who travel to the Holy Land (area). To answer this question the author looks at and compares three case studies - Cathedrals in the United Kingdom (point), the Camino de Santiago de Compostela (line), and the Holy Land (area) - and summarizes the academic literature pertaining to the characteristics, motivations and expectations of experience of visitors to these locations. Cursory findings show that there are differences regarding the motivations and the ‘expectation of experience’ of people who travel to religious points versus religious lines and religious areas.
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Introduction

The intersections between religion and tourism have become of great interest to tourism scholars, promoters, and the media in recent years (e.g., Kamil, 2000; Swatos Jr. and Tomasi, 2002; Badone and Roseman, 2004; Timothy and Olsen, 2006; Jewell, 2007; Raj and Morpeth, 2007; Wright, 2008; Stausberg, 2011; The Indian Express, 2012). This interest has been spurred in part because of both the significant economic impacts of the religious tourism market sector - an estimated 300-600 million people a year visit religious sites as part of an $18 billion dollar industry (Jackowski, 2000; McKelvie, 2005; Wright, 2008; Timothy, 2011: 387) - and the realization that the religious tourism market is no longer a niche market just for low-budget travelers (Bar and Cohen-Hattab, 2003; Wright, 2008; Rundquist, 2010). As such, scholars have written on a number of topics related to religion and tourism, including the structural similarities and differences between pilgrimage / pilgrims and tourism / tourists, the characteristics and travel patterns of religious tourists, the economics of religious tourism, the negative impacts of tourism on religious sites and ceremonies on host communities, religious tourism in the context of various cultures and regions, religious views of tourism, and the management of religious sites (e.g., Vukonić, 1998; Bauman, 1996; Shackley, 1999, 2001; Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000; Fleischer, 2000; Poria et al, 2003c; Woodward, 2004; Sharples and Sundaram, 2005; Olsen and Timothy, 2006; Olsen, 2006a, 2006b, 2010, 2011, 2012a, 2012b; Ron, 2009; Maoz and Bekerman, 2010; Hughes et al, 2013; Olsen and Ron, 2013).

The purpose of this paper is to add to the literature pertaining to the characteristics and travel patterns of religious tourists by first providing an overview of attempts by scholars to segment the religious tourism market and highlight the change in geographical scale of these studies over time. Next, rather than propose a new typology of religious tourists or to suggest a ground-breaking way of synthesizing studies of the religious tourism market to help researchers and
Segmenting the Religious Tourism Market

Segmenting the tourism market has long been an endeavor of tourism scholars. Placing heterogeneous travelers into homogeneous groupings not only helps scholars study the motivations of different types of tourists but also helps destinations to gain a competitive advantage through better understanding the wants and needs of a particular group of travelers so that they can cater to that group more effectively. Over the years a wide variety of segmentation models have been developed (for summaries of these models see Hanlan et al., 2006), which more generally can be divided into two categories: ‘commonsense’ and ‘data-driven’ approaches to segmentation of the tourism market (Dolnicar, 2008). As the most common form of segmentation (Dolnicar, 2004), the ‘commonsense’ approach to tourist segmentation involves the a priori selection of personal or socio-demographic characteristics believed to be the most relevant for dividing tourists into segments. ‘Data-driven’ segmentation models attempt to move beyond the descriptive nature of ‘commonsense’ segmentation models and focus on the actual cause of difference between tourist groups through comparing the benefits people seek when traveling. As such, the benefits derived from travel are developed a posteriori. In many ways this division of ‘commonsense’ and ‘data-driven’ approaches to tourism market segmentation highlights the historical evolution of tourism segmentation which has moved from developing segmentation models for the entire tourism market in general (e.g., Boorstin, 1961; Cohen, 1979; Calantone and Johar, 1984, Plog, 1987; Mo et al., 1994) to segmentation within specific market segments such as cultural tourism, heritage tourism, ecotourism, rural tourism, and wine tourism (e.g., Light and Prentice, 1994; Palacio, 1997; Charters and Ali-Knight, 2002; McKercher et al., 2002; Weaver and Lawton, 2002; Huh et al., 2006; Yan et al., 2007; Zofrafos and Allcroft, 2007; Park and Yoon, 2009; Alebaki and Iakovidou, 2011; Farmaki, 2012) to even more specific segmentation based on socio-demographic criteria (e.g., Lawson, 1991; Ryan et al., 1998; Fleischer and Pizam, 2002; Fleischer and Seiler, 2002; Ćurčić et al., 2009) and marketing media use (e.g., Pesonen, 2012).

Scholars have also attempted to segment the religious tourism market. Early efforts to segment this market were done from a broad or general perspective, usually revolving around attempts to distinguish between pilgrims and tourists (e.g., Pfaffenberger, 1983; Graburn, 1989; Cohen, 1992a). The best known typology is Smith’s (1992) pilgrim-tourist continuum, which places pilgrims and tourists at polar opposites of a continuum with a seemingly infinite combination of sacred-secular motivations a person could conceivably have when deciding to travel to sacred sites. Following Smith, Santos (2003) developed a similar typology, placing tourism and religion at opposite ends of a spectrum, with the gradients between the two based on the religious background of travelers, the values they place on various religious spaces, and the experiences they expect to have in those spaces. Other typologies have focused on more general aspects of religious travel, including Morinis’ (1992) six types of pilgrims (devotional, instrumental, normative, obligatory, initiatory, and wandering), Cohen’s (1992b) distinction between concentric-formal and peripheral-popular sacred sites, Rinschede’s (1992) partitioning of short-term religious travel (religious tourism) and long-term religious travel (pilgrimage), and Singh’s (2013) recent comparison on pilgrimage and tourism attributes.

As Ron (2009) notes, in recent years the focus of these typologies or segmentation models related to the religious tourism market have changed in terms of scale. This has come about in part, as Collins-Kreiner and Gatrell (2006) argue, because some travel agencies treat religious tourists as a homogenous market based upon generic assumptions (e.g., seniors, low-income travelers, prefer package tours) without considering factors such as the religious background of travelers. From an industry perspective tourism types or market segments are usually made based on the activities in which people engage while traveling rather than on their motives for travel (Timothy and Olsen, 2006). This ‘supply-side’ perspective suggests that religious tourism should include anyone who visits a religious site, with pilgrimage seen as a form of tourism categorized by pilgrim activities (however defined) and pilgrims as a type of tourist. For example, the Hajj would be considered a type of tourism activity with
participants being labeled as tourists (Aziz, 2001). More recently, with the accepted understanding that the religious tourism market is changing and becoming more complex (Wright, 2008), and with the view that religious site managers and religious tourism promoters and operators need to better understand the religious motivations and expectations of various types of visitors to their sites so as to better meet the needs of various visitors (Weidenfeld, 2006; Blackwell, 2007; Francis, et al, 2008; Weidenfeld and Ron, 2008; Finney et al, 2009; Gutic et al, 2010; Triantafillidou et al, 2010), scholars have begun to define the religious tourism market based on motivation for travel rather than on the activities in which people engage or the places they visit while traveling; where religious tourists are defined as those where the ‘impetus to travel combines both religious (dominant) and secular (secondary) motives’ (Timothy and Olsen, 2006: 272).

This view of defining religious tourism based on motivation has led to a number of studies related to the segmentation of and religious motivations for travel within contemporary Christian travel (e.g., Nolan, 1989; Nolan and Nolan, 1989, 1992; Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000; Fleischer, 2000; Fleischer and Nitzav, 1995; Olsen, 2006b; Weidenfeld, 2006; Ron, 2009), Islamic travel (e.g., Din, 1989; Mansfeld et al, 2000; Weidenfeld and Ron, 2008; Haq and Jackson, 2009, Triantafillidou et al, 2010; Breaking Travel News, 2012; Duman, 2012; Naziman, 2012; Ozdemir and Met, 2012; Haq and Wong, 2011, 2013), Jewish travel (e.g., Epstein and Kheimets, 2001; Ioannides and Cohen-Ioannides, 2002; Collins-Kreiner and Olsen, 2004; Cohen-Ioannides and Ioannides, 2006; Collins-Kreiner, 2007, 2010c; Cahander and Mansfeld, 2012), Buddhist travel (Hall, 2006; Wong et al, 2011), Hindu travel (e.g., Bhardwaj, 1983; Singh, 2006), and Sikh travel (e.g., Jutla, 2006). As well, there have also been a number of studies looking at the characteristics of those who engage in religious tourism in specific regions, such as Europe (e.g., Nolan and Nolan, 1992; Bywater, 1994; Petroman et al, 2011), the Middle East (e.g., Al-Hamarneh and Steiner, 2004; Kalesar, 2010) and Asia (e.g., World Tourism Organization, 2011) or individual countries, such as Great Britain (e.g., English Tourist Board, 1984; Brice et al, 2003; Rotherham, 2007), Ireland (Simone-Charteris and Boyd, 2010), Turkey (e.g., Aktaş and Ekin, 2007), Jordan (e.g., Mohammad and Som, 2010), India (e.g., Unisa et al, 1989; Sharpley and Sundaram, 2005; Koldowski and Martin, 2008; Chand, 2010; Collins-Kreiner and Sagi, 2011; Shinde, 2011; Shedalkar et al, 2012), Israel (e.g., Epstein and Kheimets, 2001; Poria et al, 2003c; Collins-Kreiner and Gatrell, 2006; Collins-Kreiner et al, 2006), Italy (Afferni et al, 2011), Thailand (e.g., Chairojudomkul, 2008), Palestine (e.g., Sizer, 1999; Issac, 2010a, 2010b), Iran (e.g., Najmi et al, 2010), Romania (e.g., Vorzsak and Guţ, 2009), Taiwan (e.g., Shuo et al, 2009), and the Azores (e.g., Santos et al, 2013). In addition, there have also been studies looking at the characteristics of those who travel to specific religious sites, such as cathedrals (e.g., Shackley, 2002; Voase, 2007; Francis et al, 2008; Gutic et al, 2010; Hughes et al, 2013) and monasteries (e.g., Ryan and McKenzie, 2003; Stânciulescu and Țîrca, 2010; Klimova, 2011), as well as specific religious activities such as religious festivals (e.g., Blackwell, 2007) and infrastructural amenities such as hotels (e.g., Henderson, 2010; Hung et al, 2013).

While these attempts to segment the religious tourism market indicate a growing level of maturity and scientification in the study of religious travel and tourism (Ron, 2009), segmentation of the religious tourism market can be problematic in terms of definition and operational consistency. For example, Ron (2009) suggests that scholars who attempt to segment the religious tourism market should ideally share the same definitions regarding what constitutes pilgrimage and religious tourism; that the differentiation of pilgrims (usually seen as being akin to the medieval pious pilgrim), religious tourists (whose main motivation to travel is religious), tourists who are religious (i.e., religion is not a main motivation but does define how they act and the activities in which they engage), and tourists who are interested in religious cultures and locations (i.e., cultural or heritage tourists) are consistent in the minds of those who attempt to segment this market. That the scholars listed above hold the same definitions regarding what constitutes religious tourism and fully agree on who is a religious tourist, is of course, doubtful, considering the difficulties with even naming this market segment (e.g., faith tourism, pilgrimage tourism, spiritual tourism, religious tourism, and tourism pilgrimage - see Hudman and Jackson, 1992; Jackowski 1987, 2000; Santos, 2003; Tyrakowski, 1994; Vukonić, 1996), let alone coming up with an operational definition of religious tourism (e.g., Rinschide, 1992; Boisvert and Morisset, 1997; Russell, 1999;
These problems have occurred in part because of the difficulty of differentiating visiting and traveler motivations from a purely visual standpoint. For example, Gupta (1999: 91) argues that *apart from the devotional aspect, looked at from the broader point of view, pilgrimage involves sightseeing, traveling, visiting different places and, in some cases, voyaging by air or sea, etc. and buying the local memorabilia, almost everything a tourist does.*

I have noted elsewhere (Olsen, in press) that, *anyone who has read Chaucer’s classic work Canterbury Tales (Furnivall, 1967) would note that many medieval Christian pilgrims were more akin to modern tourists in their behaviours rather than true pilgrims,* and as such *modern pilgrims should perhaps be treated as tourists rather than ‘true pilgrims,’ primarily because of the evident fact that religious tourism is combined with elements of ordinary (profane) tourism (Hitrec, 1990: 19).*

As such, the shift mentioned above to defining religious tourism based on dominant religious motivation, or religiosity, however measured (see Poria et al, 2003c), just adds to the complexity of defining religious tourism in any meaningful way, especially operationally (see Palmer et al, 2012; Olsen, in press).

Some scholars have made attempts to overcome these definitional problems by taking a phenomenological approach to religious tourism market segmentation. Unlike previous studies that passed out questionnaires with *a priori* questions to sacred site visitors, these studies utilize qualitative interviews in order to examine the self-perceptions of visitors regarding their spiritual identities, their motivations and expectations for travel, and the personal meanings visitors place on their visits to sacred sites so as to develop a better understanding of travel motivations and expectations *a posteriori* (e.g., Aziz, 1987; Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000; Wickens, 2002; Belhassen et al, 2008; Androitis, 2009; Maoz and Bekerman, 2009; Moscardo et al, 2012). Taking this a step further, other studies have focused on segmenting the religious tourism market through the perceptions and opinions of various stakeholders in this market (Tkaczynski et al, 2009) such as religious site managers (Ryan and McKenzie, 2010; Stănculescu and Ţîrca, 2010; Chis et al, 2012) and tour guides (Gelbman and Collins-Kreiner, 2013) regarding the motivations and expectations of people who travel to religious sites. However, there is still a great need for the development of an overarching operational definition of religious tourism and the religious tourist if there is to be any consistency in the segmentation of the religious tourism market.

**Points, Lines, and Areas**

The geographical concepts of scale and place are inherent in the above discussion regarding the segmentation of religious tourism. In fact, the discipline of geography has a long history of contributing to tourism studies (e.g., Butler, 1980; Britton, 1991; Mitchell and Murphy, 1991; Hall, 2005; Edensor, 2007; Gibson, 2008, 2009, 2010; Hannam, 2008; Lew et al, 2008; Duncan, 2011; Keese, 2011; Zampoukos and Ioannides, 2011; Wilson, 2012; Nelson, 2013). One of the earliest, most common, and most basic ways in which scholars have attempted to segment the tourism market is through segmenting groups of tourists by country of origin (Moscardo et al, 2001; Dolnicar, 2008). The popularity of country of origin as a segmentation tool is due in part because visitors from different countries exhibit distinguishable and definable differences in terms of motivations, expenditure potential, and spatial behavior, and as such tourism marketers and promoters can easily develop promotional campaigns for preferred visitor markets in specific target countries (Flögelfelt Jr., 1999; Reid and Reid, 1997; Moscardo et al, 2001; Dejbakhsh et al, 2011).

A related contribution of geographers to tourist segmentation is the study of tourist attractions which is an important part of marketing studies that attempts to identify products that are best suited to particular types of consumers (Lew, 2012). Research in this area has tended to fall within three broad perspectives: the ideographic definition and description of attraction types (based on universal and abstract characteristics); the organization and development of attractions (based on the spatial and temporal attributes of attractions as well as their capacity); and the cognitive perception and experience of tourist attractions by different groups (Lew, 1987). Within the research on the organization and development of attractions, Wall (1997) has suggested an additional classification of tourist attractions that divides them into three types based on their spatial characteristics: points, lines, and areas. Point attractions are where large numbers of visitors concentrate, which can result in congestion, over-exploitation, and commercial exploitation of the tourism resource. Linear attractions are based on attractions with linear properties that channel visitors...
along particular paths, which encourage some dispersal of tourists along the path. Areas, while potentially attracting large numbers of visitors, are even more widely dispersed than linear attractions. These three spatial characteristics, as Wall points out, can be viewed at different scales. For example, at a country scale a theme park can be seen as a point, but at the scale of the theme park the individual rides can be viewed as points and the park itself as a region.

Wall’s classification of tourist attractions fits well with attempts by some scholars to develop typologies of religious sites (e.g., Jackson and Henrie, 1983; Cohen, 1992b; Shackley, 2001; Garg, 2013). For example, Jackson and Henrie (1983) divided sacred sites into mystic-religious sites, where supernatural events have occurred (e.g., God or gods have had direct contact with humans), homelands that are sacred due to their association with ancestral homelands (e.g., Israel), and historical sacred sites that have been assigned sanctity because a location’s association with religious history (e.g., the birth of a religious leader). Shackley’s (2001: 2) typology highlights a number of categories of sacred sites that range from single nodal points to whole towns to sacred islands (see Table 1). Like Wall (1997), Shackley also notes the spatial characteristics of religious sites that range from ‘single nodal features’ (e.g., temples, mosques, cathedrals) to ‘pilgrimage foci’ or lines (e.g., pilgrimage trails) to whole towns, sacred mountains and islands (areas).

### Scalar Comparisons of Motivations and Expectations

The geographical typology as noted by Wall (1997) is used here to suggest another potential way of segmenting the religious tourism market, which revolves around the question of whether the motivations and the ‘expectation of experience’ of people who travel to specific religious sites (points) differ from those who travel along a religiously-themed pilgrimage route (lines) or those who travel to sacred areas. Rather than list and synthesize the vast literature related to the characteristics, motivations, and expectations of visitors to specific religious sites, pilgrimage trails, and religious regions, seeing as this is an exploratory study, I chose to investigate representative samples of sacred points, lines and areas. In particular, I chose academic studies related to religious travel to cathedrals in the United Kingdom (point), along the Camino de Santiago (line), and to the Holy Land (area), in part because multiple studies have been completed on each of these sites (see Table 2). In examining the research related to each case study I specifically looked to see if there were differences regarding the characteristics, motivations, and expected outcomes of those who travel to points, lines, or areas. I also focused specifically on cases of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single nodal feature</td>
<td>Canterbury Cathedral (England), Emerald Buddha (Bangkok), Hagia Sophia (Istanbul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological sites</td>
<td>Machu Picchu (Peru), ChichénItzá (Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial sites</td>
<td>Catacombs (Rome), Pyramids (Giza)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached temples / shrines</td>
<td>Borobudur (Indonesia), AngkorWat (Cambodia), Amristar (India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole towns</td>
<td>Rome (Italy), Jerusalem (Israel), Assisi (Italy), Varanasi (India), Bethlehem (Palestinian Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrine/temple complexes</td>
<td>Lalibela (Ethiopia), Potala (Tibet), St. Katherine’s Monastery (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Earth energy’ sites</td>
<td>Nazca lines (Peru), Glastonbury (England)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred mountains</td>
<td>Uluru (Australia), Mt. Everest (Nepal), Tai Shan (China), Mt. Athos (Greece), Mt. Fuji (Japan), Mt. Shasta (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred islands</td>
<td>Rapa Nui (Chile), Lindisfarne (England), Iona (Scotland), Mont-St-Michel (France)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilgrimage foci</td>
<td>Mecca (Saudi Arabia), Medina (Saudi Arabia), Mt. Kailash (Tibet), Santiago de Compostela (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular pilgrimage</td>
<td>Robben Island (South Africa), Goree (Senegal), Holocaust Sites (e.g., Auschwitz-Birkenau, Poland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Shackley (2001: 2).

### Table 2: Case Studies with References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>Cathedrals in the United Kingdom</td>
<td>David, 1992; Jackson and Hudman, 1995; Winter and Gasson, 1996; Shackley, 2002, 2006; Voase, 2007; Williams et al., 2007; Francis et al., 2008; Francis et al., 2010a, 2010b; Guttic et al., 2010; Hughes et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Camino de Santiago de Compostela</td>
<td>Murray and Graham, 1997; Frey, 2004; Rojo, 2007; Vilaça, 2010; Cazaux, 2011; Doi, 2011; Fernandes, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>The Holy Land</td>
<td>Fleischers, 2000; Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000; Collins-Kreiner et al., 2006.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Christian travel for ease of comparison between the case studies.

**Point: Cathedrals in the United Kingdom**

Cathedrals are an important part of the historical, economic and architectural fabric of many urban areas in the United Kingdom, and act as the geographic and spiritual center of a diocese where the bishop literally sits (cathedra = throne) (Shackley, 2006). Shackley (2006) notes that there are 42 Anglican cathedrals in England which can be divided into five broad categories, ranging from internationally significant buildings which attract over one million visitors a year to parish church cathedrals which attract primarily local visitors (see Table 3). While the core function of these buildings is the conservation and preservation of religious tradition and the provision of a space for adherents to worship, pray, and meditate (Shackley, 2001, 2002), cathedrals are increasingly being treated by government officials and tourism stakeholders as tourism attractions because of the important role the heritage tourism industry has in England’s overall tourism strategy. Indeed, both tourism stakeholders and religious leaders have recognized the importance of ‘cathedral tourism’ (Hughes et al, 2013) to the overall development of tourism in England - particularly when over 30 million people a year visit these cathedrals (Shackley, 2002). As stated in the Archbishops’ Commission on Cathedrals (1994: 135; cited in Francis et al, 2008):

Tourism is of great significance to cathedrals - in terms of their mission of teaching, evangelism, and welcome, and as an important source of income. Cathedrals also play a major part in the nation’s tourism.

Based on the references used for this case study, there seem to be a few typologies that attempt to segment those who visit cathedrals. Some of these typologies are quite simple. For example, Shackley (2002) suggests that visitors to cathedrals can be categorized into visitors whose primary motivation to visit cathedrals is religious versus visitors whose motive to visit is based on historic and architectural interests (see Winter and Gasson, 1996). However, while this may be the case, this typology is too simplistic and binary, and, considering discussions of the pilgrim / tourist dichotomy mentioned earlier in the paper, more complex typologies of cathedral visitors have been developed. For example, Davis (1992) suggests that one can divide cathedral visitors into four different categories. ‘Gawpers’ are visitors who come to a cathedral for non-religious reasons but end up having some sort of spiritual or emotional experience. ‘Cultural despisers’ are those visitors who are comfortable entering a cathedral but get upset when religious doctrines are discussed. ‘Prayer-makers’ are those who fill in prayer cards to ask others to pray on their behalf. Finally, ‘True believers’ are visitors that hold strongly to their Christian beliefs and do not like their faith to be challenged. Hughes et al (2013), in their study of Canterbury Cathedral, applied Falk and Storksdieck’s (2010) identity-related typology and divided visitors into five categories: ‘Explorers’ (those who are curiosity-driven and have a generic interest in the site); ‘Facilitators’ (those who are socially motivated and focus on enabling the experience and learning of others); ‘Professional / Hobbyists’ (those who feel a close tie to the site due to their professional or hobbyist passion); ‘Experience seekers’ (those who see the site as an important destination and derive satisfaction from having ‘been there and done that’); and ‘Rechargers’ (those who are primarily seeking to have a contemplative, spiritual or restorative experience). Of these five categories, Hughes et al (2010) found that the majority of visitors to the Cathedral were either Hobbyists or Experience seekers.

A more complex typology has been developed by Francis et al (2008) in which the authors use Jung’s (1971) personality type theory to compare and contrast different types of visitors based on their perceiving processes (sensing or intuition) and judging processes (thinking or feeling) with regards to how they evaluated information and their orientations (extraversion or introversion) and attitudes (judging or perceiving) regarding how they express their lives. Their findings suggest that cathedrals tend to attract ‘introverts’ (those who enjoy solitude and inner contemplation) rather than ‘extroverts’ (who enjoy stimulating and exciting environments) in part because cathedrals tend to project an atmosphere of ‘solitary quiet introspection’ rather than ‘engaged social interaction’ (p. 73). Francis et al also found that

<p>| Table 3: Classifications of England’s 42 Anglican Cathedrals |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large international (6)</td>
<td>Canterbury, Durham, St. Pauls, Salisbury, Winchester, York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized (18)</td>
<td>Carlisle, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, Norwich, Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (5)</td>
<td>Bristol, Liverpool, Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium sized modern (2)</td>
<td>Guildford, Truro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish church (11)</td>
<td>Bradford, Coventry, Leicester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘sensers’ (who focus on specifics rather than the overall picture) will value the facts and information provided by cathedrals via information leaflets, guidebooks, bookshops, and websites more than ‘intuitives’ (who focus more on the overall picture); that ‘feelers’ (who value interpersonal relationships more important than interpersonal objectivity and feel that their heart is more important than the mind) will value the atmosphere of the cathedral more than ‘thinkers’ (who make decisions and judgments based on objective and impersonal logic, find interpersonal objectivity more important than interpersonal relationships, and feel that mind is more important than heart) because of the architecture designed to elicit emotional reactions and create a ‘sense of place’; and that ‘judgers’ (who seek to order, rationalize and structure their outer world) will visit cathedrals more often than perceivers (who are more reflective, perceptive, and have a more open-ended approach to life) because of the ordered management and presentation of cathedrals (see Francis et al, 2010a, 2010b).

Visitors to cathedrals tend to be domestic visitors, with about 30-35% of visitors being from overseas (Winter and Gasson, 1996). Visitors also tend to visit either as part of a small group comprised of friends and family or with a tour group; very few visitors visit cathedrals alone (Jackson and Hudman, 1995; Winter and Gasson, 1996). In addition to the cathedral itself, visitors not only seem to expect a range of facilities associated with the cathedral, such as information, parking, tours, and coffee and bookshops (Shackley, 2006), but also want the surrounding urban area to be architecturally sympathetic with the cathedral, replete with multiple shopping, drinking and eating opportunities (Voase, 2007). The majority of visitors also tend to be motivated by historic and architectural interests or by recreational or educational reasons rather than spiritual reasons (Jackson and Hudman, 1995; Winter and Gasson, 1996; Shackley, 2006, 2010; Hughes et al, 2013). In fact, while a small minority of visitors are motivated to visit cathedrals for spiritual or religious considerations, the majority seem to have little expectation of a spiritual encounter (Shackley, 2010), do not label themselves as pilgrims (Hughes et al, 2013), do not want to have religious doctrines and practices pushed upon them (Voase, 2007), and state that visiting a cathedral is generally not the primary purpose of the their trip; rather the cathedral visit is secondary to visiting the town in which the cathedral is located (Voase, 2007). However, some studies have shown that many of the visitors to cathedrals did have some sort of emotional experience during their visit, whether because of the ‘perception of sanctity’ of the site (Shackley, 2002), feelings of awe regarding the cathedral’s architecture (Jackson and Henrie, 1995; Williams et al, 2007), or visitors having what they considered to be an authentic spiritual or religious experience. As Shackley (2010: 757) notes, even those visitors that are not openly considering a search of spirituality as their prime motivation to visit a cathedral are likely to derive some sense of sanctity from their visit.

Indeed, Jackson and Henrie (1995) found that half of the respondents to their study reported having experienced religious feelings during their visit, and Voase (2007) notes that visitors tend to at least acquired a feeling of ‘calmness’ during their cathedral visit that remained with them after they left.

While Hughes et al (2013: 218) suggest that with the importance placed by visitors on historical and architecture reasons for visiting cathedrals “[i]t seems that for many visitors, tourism at religious sites has very little to do with religion’, with cathedrals acting as visitor attractions rather than a place to visit for religious activities (Shackley, 2010), this may not be entirely the case. For example, Jackson and Henrie (1995) found that the older the visitor, the more that religion and the search for religious experiences seem to be motivating factors. As well, Williams et al (2007) found that visitors who attended church meetings on a weekly basis tend to have a more favourable impression of a cathedral in terms of atmosphere and the cathedral staff, reported higher rates of emotional experiences regarding sensing the presence of God, had a more favourable view of the usefulness of the information leaflet, tended to visit the gift shop more often and were more apt to make a purchase from the gift shop than visitors who went to church meetings occasionally or rarely. Interestingly enough, even though visitors tend to state on surveys that their primary motivation to visit is historical or architectural in nature, it seems as if they go away disappointed if they do not have some sort of emotional experience while in the cathedral (Voase, 2007; Shackley, 2010).

According to Shackley’s (2010) study of visitors to Chichester Cathedral, the majority of visitors who came for historical or architectural reasons stated that some of the most satisfying aspects of their visits tended to fall into what Shackley considered to be the spiritual or emotional category, with a significant number of respondents maintaining that their visit had affected them emotionally. This may be why, according to Voase (2007), the modus operandi of visitors visiting cathedrals consists of periods of ‘looking around’ and ‘sitting still’. While looking
around a cathedral is to some extent a shared experience, Voase (2007: 44) notes that

... the pace of looking around varie[s] from individual to individual ... the different paces of looking around created a situation where individuals, either explicitly or implicitly, agreed to separate from their companions for part of the visit. The ‘sitting still’ element seemed to be a de facto solitary experience, even if companions were seated adjacent.

As such, it seems as if visitors to cathedrals like to ‘romantic[ally] gaze’ - defined by Urry (1990: 45) as having ‘...[an] emphasis upon solitude, privacy and a personal, semi-spiritual relationship with the object of the gaze’ - with their modus operandi being looking around a cathedral - at the stained glass windows, the artwork and statues - at their own pace. This is not to say that tours of cathedrals are not important; for visitors interested in learning about the history and architecture a tour would be desirable, but such tours should remain optional, with the emphasis on the meditative and individualized experience of the visitor.

In addition, while visitors to cathedrals seem to be interested in engaging with a cathedral’s ‘focal points’ (i.e., well-known features of the cathedral that are known about by visitors in advance) and ‘peripheral areas’ (i.e., backstage locations that seem to be off limits to regular guests; e.g., go up the tower to see the view or go down to the crypt or see where an intriguing doorway leads) (Voase, 2007) and also are interested in acquiring historical and architectural information about particular aspects of the cathedrals they visit (e.g., Latin inscriptions, stained glass windows) (Shackley, 2010), many visitors also seem to want a more ‘human connection’ with these sites; they want to have an experience of the heart rather than of the head. According to Voase (2007: 51),

visitors to cathedrals seek a sense of connectedness with the founders and the builders of cathedrals; visitors want to experience the feelings and convictions that led their ancestors to invest their time and wealth in such a way.

Since the quality of the visitor experience is primarily a response to the atmosphere generated by cathedral management (Shackley, 2010), and since visitor experience can be enhanced through guides and brochures explaining the significance and history of the place (Shackley, 2002), Voase (2007: 52) suggests that a ‘rewriting of supporting literature, perhaps through the eyes and mouths of those who worked on the building of the cathedral’ would greatly enhance the connectedness between visitors and cathedrals. In addition, visitor experience seems to be enhanced by the provision of good directional signage, good quality displays and exhibits, helpful and friendly attendants, and good access to all areas of the cathedral for people with disabilities (Hughes et al., 2013).

**Line: Camino de Santiago de Compostela**

The Camino de Santiago de Compostela, sometimes called the ‘Camino’ or ‘Way’, is a network of thousands of miles of roads and trails that extend across Europe with an end point at Santiago de Compostela, Spain.[2] Walking the route generally takes about 30 days if participants start at the border of France and Spain (Frey, 2004). While this pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela - the location of the shrine of St. James the Apostle, the first Christian evangelizer of Spain and patron Saint of the Iberian Peninsula - has, since medieval times (c. 9th Century) (Costen, 1993; Graham and Murray, 1997), been a pilgrimage route for hundreds of thousands of pilgrims, since the 1980s travel along this route has seen a resurgence of interest, with an estimate 170,000 people now walking the Camino each year (Crowley, 2012). This surge in popularity, Clinehens (1999) argues, is due in part because of the investment of the Spanish government in the development of the Camino as part of a broader push for cultural tourism development in North Spain. As well, the growth of travel along the Camino has also coincided with the designation of Santiago de Compostela as a World Heritage Site in 1985 and the labeling of the Camino as the first ‘European Cultural Itinerary’ in 1987 by the European Council (Vilaça, 2010). Therefore, it seems that as government investment in the Camino as a linear tourist attraction has increased, so has the popularity of pilgrimage along the Way (Clinehens, 1999; González and Medina, 2003).

Multiple scholars have noted that it is difficult to fit those who travel the Camino into neat categories (e.g., Graham and Murray, 1997; Frey, 2004; Egan, 2011; Doi, 2011), in part because travelers along the Camino not only have too wide a variety of motives, social backgrounds or beliefs to generalize (Frey, 1998; Doi, 2011), but also because tourists and pilgrims, however defined, do not ‘engage the Camino as a sustained religious activity’ (Egan, 2011: 4), and in many instances combine religious acts with leisure activities

---

1 There are three main routes to Santiago de Compostela depending upon the country of origin of the travelers: the French Way, the English Way, and the Portuguese Way. See Rojo (2007: 26-35) for a comprehensive listing of other routes also taken by travelers to Santiago de Compostela.
- and thereby combine elements of tourism and pilgrimage - as they travel (Frey, 2004; Vilaça, 2010; Fernandes, 2012). In fact, while still an important Roman Catholic route of pilgrimage, the Camino de Compostela is also a path taken by a wide variety of people from different ethnic and religious backgrounds. As such, in order to weed through the overlapping market segments that utilize the Way, scholars have resorted to the use of quantitative surveys, ethnographic studies, and the analysis of travelers’ diaries to understand the socio-demographic characteristics, motivations, and expectations of those who travel the Camino from a more ‘organic’ perspective.

With regards to who travels the Camino, Frey (2004: 91), based upon her years of research along the Camino, suggests that

\[ \text{... modern pilgrims to Santiago are often urban, middle-class, educated Europeans who, rather than having a religious motive, are often on the road for a host of cultural, spiritual, athletic, and person reasons.} \]

Frey also notes that just over half of travelers are male, and that in addition to Catholics, Protestants, Agnostics, Buddhists, and those belonging to New Age or esoteric spiritual movements walk the Camino (see Zwissler, 2011). Murray and Graham (1997) and Rojo (2007) note that the vast majority of people who travel the Camino are religious; however, according to Rojo’s (2007) study, a good third of Camino travelers did not consider themselves religious and did not travel the Way for religious reasons. One of the reasons for the high reported numbers of travelers who claim to be religiously motivated may come from the fact that those who wish to travel the Camino as a pilgrim, in addition to wearing a scallop shell as a badge demarcating them as a pilgrim to Compostela, require a special passport which acts as a record of their journey. As described by Murray and Graham (1997) and Doi (2011), if the traveler can prove, via their stamped passport, that they have traveled at least 150 km on foot or on horseback (or 200 km by bicycle) along the Camino, the authorities at the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela will issue a document known as the Compostela, which anoints the traveler as a ‘traditional pilgrim’ and authenticates the completion of their pilgrimage.

While qualification for the Compostela is based on mode of travel rather than by motivation, those seeking a Compostela are required to state their primary motivation for traveling the Camino - defined as religious / spiritual, religious / cultural, or cultural (Murray and Graham, 1997). While the answer one gives to this query has no bearing on the outcome of the application for the document, it is possible that those answering the question may feel obligated to answer one of the first two categories considering that they are receiving the Compostela from a priest at the Cathedral’s Pilgrim Office. Interestingly, while many travelers suggest that the Compostela is ‘just a piece of paper’, these same travelers treasure the scallop shells they wore on their backpacks and proudly display their Compostela upon arriving home (Frey, 2004; Doi, 2011).

Related to the fact that the Compostela is given out based on mode of travel rather than by motivation (Murray and Graham, 1997) is that along the Camino it seems to be that the ‘how’ one travels the Camino takes precedence over the ‘why’ one travels (Frey, 2004: 91). Many travelers along the trail differentiate between those who walk or bike the Way versus those who drive along the way in the comfort of tour buses. As Graham and Murray (1997: 402) note,

\[ \text{there is an explicit assumption here that the realization of such values [like spiritual or internal enlightenment] does not occur to travelers by car or coach. This motive meshes with mode, and the physical hardship of walking - or cycling - the Camino de Santiago - becomes a (if not the) primary distinction of the pious or true pilgrim.} \]

Graham and Murray also suggest that many travelers along the Camino take a puritan perspective of pilgrimage and feel that some sort of self-suffering must take place in order to be considered an ‘authentic’ pilgrim. As well, they suggest that this ‘new puritan’ does note spend money, eschews hotels in favour of basic refugios, tends to walk alone, and tends to spend as little money as possible. This is in contrast to the Liberal/Humanist pilgrim who spends money, walks in a group, and stays in hotels (see Table 4). In essence it is the travelers along the Camino rather than the researchers that are the ones doing the typologizing!

Interestingly, while the arrival at the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela can act as the climax of the journey along the Way, in many cases those who complete the Camino find their entrance into Santiago de Compostela as anticlimactic; where the value of reaching the end goal of the Camino is ‘somewhat undermined by the accumulation of experience gained directly by the body on the move’ (Doi, 2011: 281). As well, as Slavin (2003) notes, the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela is not a ‘thaumaturgic’ centre; that is, it does not produce miracles. This, coupled with the fact that most people traveling the Camino are searching for a personal ‘something’ that they feel can only be
gained through slow modes of travel (see Howard 2012) outside the boundaries of everyday life, travelers along the Way tend to place more emphasis on the development of one’s identity while walking and are therefore mostly ambivalent about the end destination (Slavin, 2003; Frey, 2004; Doi, 2011; Cazaux, 2011). The importance of journey along the Way is noted by Frey (2004), who suggests that those traveling the Way seek encounters and experiences that lead to change; that meaningful contacts with other pilgrims or travelers, residents of towns, and the built religious landscape (see Crowley, 2012) that lead to personal growth and change are the key experiences travelers desire and expect to have when re-creating the medieval journey to Santiago de Compostela.

**Area: The Holy Land**

The Holy Land generally defined as the area between the Mediterranean Sea and the Jordan River, has long been the destination for pilgrims (Wilkinson, 1977; Hunt, 1984; Stone, 1986; Vogel, 1993; Stemberger, 2000; Kark, 2001; Bar and Cohen-Hattab, 2003; Kaell, 2010), although countries like Jordan are looking to expand that geographical definition (Katz, 2003). Today the Holy Land is a major destination for European and North American tourists. In 2010 approximately 2.8 million visitors travelled to Israel, creating $3.7 billion in tourism-related income for the country. Of these 2.8 million visitors, 66% came for either pilgrimage or tourism-related reasons (38% pilgrimage; 28% touring) (Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, 2012). Considering the numbers of visitors to the Holy Land as well as the fact that this area is considered sacred to three major world religions, there is a surprising paucity of information within the academic literature pertaining to the characteristics, motives and expectations of travelers to the Holy Land. From what little academic literature there is, the majority of studies have examined the differences between Catholic and Protestant travelers in terms of their motivations, their itineraries, the activities in which they participate, and the experiences they seek. Even though other Christian groups travel to the Holy Land (e.g., Latter-day Saints, Bahá’í; see Hudman and Jackson, 1992; Collins-Kreiner and Gatrell, 2006; Olsen, 2006b), there have been no segmentation studies of these groups. Therefore, the discussion here will be limited to Catholic and Protestant travelers to the Holy Land.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria to be a true pilgrim along the Camino de Santiago de Compostela</th>
<th>New Puritan</th>
<th>Liberal/Humanist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drivers and car passengers excluded</td>
<td>Admitted in the espouse ‘correct’ attitudes towards pilgrimage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours walkers over cyclists</td>
<td>Includes all types of travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours mountain bikes over racing cycles, as latter are restricted to surfaced roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favours long-distance walkers and cyclists over short-distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively seeks suffering</td>
<td>Accepts suffering as inevitable but tries to minimize consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not spend money</td>
<td>Spends money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschews hotels in favour of basic <em>refugios</em></td>
<td>May even stay in a <em>parador</em> as a ‘cultural experiment’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observes a version of tradition which claims that a pilgrimage on foot is the only way in which God and nature can be communicated to humans</td>
<td>Prepared to admit the conditional and contested nature of tradition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walks alone</td>
<td>Seeks camaraderie of a group of like-minded friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual salvation</td>
<td>A pilgrim for a cause such as charity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty of knowledge</td>
<td>Admits doubts and ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solemnity of pilgrimage</td>
<td>Chaucerian view of pilgrimage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the studies referred to for this case study (Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000; Fleischer, 2000; Collins-Kreiner et al, 2006), both Catholic and Protestant visitors described themselves as low-budget travelers, with those who label themselves as pilgrims being in lower socio-economic categories than those who described themselves as ‘tourists’ or both ‘pilgrim and tourist’ (Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000). Therefore, travelers in both religious groups tend to want value for their money, and as such tend to book out-of-season, prefer to visit on important Christian religious holidays, shop around for good deals, and plan to come to the Holy Land when conditions are safe. These travelers also want clean and sanitary hotels with air-conditioning (Fleischer, 2000). A high percentage of Catholic and Protestant tourists consider themselves to be ‘pilgrims’ rather than ‘tourists’. This may be in part because both Catholic and Protestant travelers tend to participate in Holy Land tours organized and conducted by ecclesiastical leaders of their faith. These tours are organized months in advance (Fleischer, 2000) and in many cases involve numerous meetings to prepare spiritually and intellectually for their trip. As well, with a religious leader heading the tour, which in most cases is desirable so that the Holy Land can be presented to travelers from their own faith-perspective (Wilkinson, 1998) - so that their preconceived notions of the Holy Land, including views of its politics, can remain intact when they travel (Bowman and Harrison, 1992) - the emphasis of the trip remains highly religious-focused. As Collins-Kreiner and Kliot (2000: 60) note, the main reasons why people visit the Holy Land are due to motives strongly tied to religion, whether these motives are to ‘walk where Jesus walked’, ‘to strengthen my belief’, ‘to get to know the bible’, to fulfill a vow, ‘to get close to God’, or ‘to be open to God and say thank you to him’. As such, travelers in both groups expected to have some sort of Christian religious experiences during their travelers (Collins-Kreiner et al, 2006).

Even though Catholic and Protestant travelers seem to have some of the same characteristics and similar motivations to travel to the Holy Land, Fleischer (2000) argues that Christian tourists cannot be treated as a homogenous group, for there are vast differences in terms of itineraries, activities, and outcomes for each group of followers. Following the work of Ginsburg (1995), Fleischer (2000) suggests that because Catholics get spiritual merit for visiting the actual location where biblical events took place, Catholic tours tend to be very rigid and focused mainly on sites that have been given an institutional ‘stamp-of-approval’. As well, time is set aside in the trip itinerary for prayer and frequent participation in mass. As such, Catholic tours tend to be very structured and restricted to specifically sacred sites (Fleischer and Nitzav, 1995). In contrast to Catholics, Protestants are more interested in the Holy Land as a whole, and, while Protestant tours do visit biblical sites, they also visit places related to Israel’s history, biblical scenery and landscapes, and archaeological sites. This occurs in part because more so than Catholics, Protestants feel that the construction of newer-style churches and other buildings over original biblical sites takes away from the authenticity of these sites (Collins-Kreiner and Kliot, 2000). Thus, they prefer locations that are more ‘authentic’ and less commercialized (Fleischer and Nitzav, 1995). This may be the reason why as noted earlier, even though a high percentage of Catholic and Protestant visitors considered themselves to be ‘pilgrims’ rather than ‘tourists’, a higher percentage of Protestants consider themselves to be ‘tourists’, in part because of the less structured and more active itinerary in which they participate (Fleischer, 2000).[3] These differences between Catholics and Protestants in many ways highlight the need to consider the religious world views of visitors when segmenting the religious tourism market (Vukonić, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Olsen, 2011).

Discussion

The purpose of this paper is to examine whether there are differences in the motivations and expectations of experience among visitors to religious sites based on their spatial characteristics (i.e., points, lines, and areas). This seems to be the situation as seen in the case studies presented in this paper. In the case of the Cathedrals in the United Kingdom (point), visitors to cathedrals have very mixed motivations for visiting. While very few visitors label themselves as ‘pilgrims’ per se, most visitors seem to expect to have some sort of emotional experience during their visit. Visitors also expect some solitary time to explore cathedrals through both ‘looking around’ and ‘sitting still’ so as to take in the sites ‘sense of place’ (Shackley, 2001). These visitors expect certain amenities such as book stores and gift shops and expect the surrounding area to conform to the architectural style and timeframe of the cathedral itself. As well, visitors want the information about the history and personalities involved with the construction of the cathedral to help them connect to the building.

For the pilgrimage along the Camino de Santiago de Compostela, people also travel for a variety of reasons.

---

However, travelers seem to place more emphasis on the journey rather than the destination. Even visits to churches and religious monuments along the way are only seen as a part of the religious landscape through which travelers pass. Travelers feel that the mode of transportation on their journey is the key distinguishing feature between those who are more pilgrim-like and those who are more tourist-like. Travelers of the Way mark themselves with shells and seem to treasure both their shell and their official Compostela, using them as reminders of the experiences and people they met as they traveled slowly outside the boundaries of everyday life on their personal quest.

In the case of travelers to the Holy Land there was not as much blurring of pilgrimage- and tourism-like behavior as was seen in the first two case studies. This was evident more so among Catholic travelers who stick to an itinerary consisting of biblical sites combined with mass and frequent prayers. Protestant travelers, on the other hand, find most of the biblical sites to be built-over with later-period church buildings and over commercialized, and thus seek out more authentic and natural landscapes and participate in more recreational activities during their trip. However, a very high percentage of people in both groups told researchers that they considered themselves ‘pilgrims’ rather than ‘tourists’. As well, both groups prefer to travel with an ecclesiastical leader of their faith so as to have the Holy Land interpreted through the lens of their own belief-system.

There are admittedly a number of problems with this study. The most obvious problem is that the case studies in this paper align themselves with various sects within the Christian faith. An expansion into examining the influence of the spatial characteristics of religious sites on the motivations and expectations of experiences of travelers from other faiths and in other regions of the world does warrant attention. Another problem arises in that while Christian examples were used in this paper, the comparisons were between Anglican cathedrals, a Catholic pilgrimage path (where many traveling the path are not always Catholic), and Catholic and Protestant travelers to the Holy Land. This study on the influence of spatial characteristics of sites on visitor motivations and expectations may have been improved if both the religious sites and the visitors were from the same faith, which would allow for some better comparisons between the spatial characteristics. A third problem is that in these three case studies the modes of transportation were not equal. While travel to cathedrals and through the Holy Land were mainly via buses and automobiles, those who research Camino pilgrims tend to talk to those who are walking rather than those on bikes, horseback, or who are riding in a car or a tour bus. As such, not only might future research along the Camino benefit from looking at the motivations and experiences of those who ‘ride’ the Camino to see if they also consider themselves to be pilgrims in the same way as those who are walking the Way, but further research delving into the topic of this paper might benefit from choosing case sites where visitors are using the same modes of transportation. Finally, more empirical work investigating the motivations of travelers to geographic points, lines, and areas is sorely needed.

However, in sum, differences were shown in terms of motivations and expectations of experience when it came to comparing the spatial characteristics of religious sites. At ‘points’ people expect to have an emotional experience at the site. Along ‘lines’ people are more interested in the process of movement along the route. And in ‘areas’ people are interested in emotional experiences throughout their trip both while visiting religious sites and while traveling through religious landscapes. With this in mind, marketers and managers of religious locations need to note that people want emotional experiences at religious sites or as they walk along pilgrimage paths or as they tour a religious area. As such, marketing of these locations, whatever their spatial characteristics may need to include the ‘expectation of experience’; that there is the potential for these experiences, however interpreted, to take place at these sites. As well, site managers need to be aware of the desire for solitude and human connection with these sites, and must plan their welcome practices and educational materials accordingly.
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