

2010

Regenerating the Quays in Salford: an Analysis of Visitor Perception, Behaviour and Experience

Ruth Craggs

Technological University Dublin, ruth.craggs@tudublin.ie

Peter Schofield

Salford University, p.schofield@salford.ac.uk

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/tfschhmtart>



Part of the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Craggs, R., Schofield, P.: Regenerating the Quays in Salford: an Analysis of Visitor Perception, Behaviour and Experience. Destinations revisited, proceedings of the ATLAS conference, Viana do Castelo, Portugal, 2007. Part 1: Visitors. Edited by J. Edwards and R. Vaughan ATLAS publications. doi:10.21427/D7361K

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Hospitality Management and Tourism at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, aisling.coyne@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License](#)

Regenerating the Quays in Salford: An Analysis of Visitor Perception, Behaviour and Experience

Ruth Craggs
Lecturer in Tourism and Hospitality
Newcastle Business School
Northumbria University
City Campus
Newcastle Upon Tyne
NE1 8ST
Tel: 0191 227 3247
ruth.craggs@unn.ac.uk

Dr. Peter Schofield
Associate Director
MaMS Research Institute
Salford Business School
University of Salford
Greater Manchester
M5 4WT
Tel: 0161 295 4579
p.schofield@salford.ac.uk

Abstract

Tourism can generate substantial benefits to destination communities and has featured extensively in urban regeneration policy, but whilst there is now an extensive literature covering urban tourism and dockland regeneration, visitor perceptions of urban waterfront destinations and their on-site behaviour and experience remain largely unexplored. The paper focuses on the Quays in Salford, the city's former docklands, which has been regenerated and repositioned as its flagship tourism product. It reports the findings from a questionnaire survey of visitors' perceptions, behaviour and experience of the Quays. A principal components analysis revealed that four product performance dimensions: 'primary attractions', 'secondary attractions', 'access' and 'environment', explained 62 percent of the variance in the data and just under 38 percent of overall visitor satisfaction. Furthermore, the destination's secondary features, explained more of the variance in visitor satisfaction than its primary attractions, which in turn, were more influential than the environment and access components. The implications of the findings for destination marketing and management are discussed.

Introduction

There is now an extensive body of literature concerned with urban waterfront regeneration, but visitor perceptions of urban waterfront destinations and their on-site behaviour and experience have been neglected (van der Knapp and Pinder, 1992;

Shaw and Williams, 1994; Craig-Smith and Fagence, 1995; Selby, 2004). Additionally, whilst integrated frameworks for the study of urban tourism have been proposed (Tyler, 2000), little is known about urban visitors and a greater theoretical and methodological understanding of urban tourism has been called for (Pearce, 2001). Numerous studies have examined visitor satisfaction and its influences at holiday/vacation destinations, but visitor satisfaction with redeveloped waterfront areas or similar day-trip destinations has been neglected. This study aimed to address this gap in the literature and examine visitor perception, behaviour and experience at the Quays in Salford, the former dockland area of the city.

Residential and commercial developments, including a strong leisure component, have repositioned the Quays from a manufacturing milieu to an area of consumption. The regeneration of this area has made a profound impact on the economy of Salford, by creating jobs in the leisure, retail, banking and computing sectors. Additionally, it has provided a new waterfront area for visitors and residents to use for recreation and leisure and has facilitated the development of a new image for both the Quays and the city. However, as is the case with many regeneration waterfront destinations, no detailed visitor study has been undertaken (Struthers, 2003) and there are no published statistics that express visitor patronage.

Literature Review

‘Tourist satisfaction’ has been variously defined in the literature, although there is general consensus that it is a post-consumption evaluative judgement (Westbrook and Oliver, 1991; Yuksel and Yuksel, 2001). Indeed, a number of authors have described it as the ‘outcome’ for the tourist after the consumption of a tourism product or service (Crompton and Love, 1995; Baker and Crompton, 2000; Kozak, 2001a).

In the context of urban tourism supply, a well-established systems approach, pioneered by Jansen-Verbeke (1986) views the inner city environment as a ‘leisure product’. The model illustrates the interrelationship between elements of the inner-city tourism system and the significance of the inner city as a leisure product. Jansen-Verbeke’s (1986) classification of the inner city as a leisure product comprises ‘primary’, ‘secondary’ and ‘conditional’ elements. The ‘primary’ elements include a

variety of facilities which divide the inner city into an ‘activity place’ and a ‘leisure’ setting’. These facilities are seen as the attraction of the urban leisure product. The ‘secondary’ elements consist of the supporting facilities and services which contribute to the leisure function of the inner city. These facilities and services are consumed by tourists during their visit (e.g. hotels, catering outlets and shopping facilities). Finally, the ‘additional’ elements consist of the tourism infrastructure which conditions the visit. For example, accessibility to and around the inner city (e.g. signposts), accessibility and ease of parking, transport provision and tourist-specific services such as tourist information centres, guides, maps and information about things to see and do in the area (e.g. promotional leaflets). The elements of the leisure product are important as they serve as ‘pull factors’ on tourists needs (Jansen-Verbeke, 1986).

Whilst Jansen-Verbeke’s model describes the elements of the inner-city tourism system which are important to the visitor experience, empirical studies have confirmed components of experiences which influence tourist satisfaction. Pizam *et al* (1978) used a questionnaire to measure tourists’ satisfaction with 32 items on a five-point likert-type scale. A factor-analytical approach produced eight factors from twenty-four variables: beach opportunities (factor 1), cost (2), hospitality (3), eating and drinking facilities (4), accommodation facilities (5), campground facilities (6), environment (7) and extent of commercialisation (8). The authors stressed that their findings were not universal but that factors depend on the destination area, its facilities, attractions and weather.

In a study of tourist satisfaction with Mallorca and Turkey, Kozak (2001b) also used factor analysis to compare British and German tourist satisfaction. Eight factors explained 64% of the total variance in satisfaction: accommodation services (factor 1), local transport services (2), hygiene and cleanliness (3), hospitality and customer care (4), facilities and activities (5), level of prices (6), language communication (7) and destination airport services (8). There was no consistency between the two nationalities in terms of the rank order of destination attributes.

In his study of visitor satisfaction with Castlefield Urban Heritage Park in Manchester, Schofield (2001) used factor analysis of visitor ratings on 74 destination attributes to

identify eleven dimensions of Castlefield's urban tourism 'product', from the visitor perspective; 70% of the total variance was explained. The 11 components were labelled as follows: 'extensive leisure provision and social opportunities' (1), 'entertainment and conviviality' (2), 'history and education' (3), 'undemanding recreation' (4), 'quality of the site and its promotion' (5), 'amusement and comfort' (6), 'safety for seniors' (7), 'wet weather facilities' (8), 'special interests' (9), 'peace and quiet' (10) and 'good value and different' (11). The analysis demonstrated the complexity of the visitor experience of this day trip destination and the important influence of both primary and secondary product components on visitor satisfaction.

In their study of Canadian visitors to Las Vegas, Baloglu *et al* (2003) analysed the relationships among visitors' perceptions of destination performance and their overall satisfaction. A factor analysis of the performance attributes resulted in three components: 'variety of activities/entertainment' (1), 'quality of product/environment' (2) and 'value/diversity' (3) which explained 55.2% of the total variance in the performance attributes. Using multiple regression analysis, they found that the 'variety of activities/entertainment' component, relating to the primary attractions, had a significant positive impact on visitor' overall satisfaction.

In their study of UK tourists' satisfaction with Orlando, Fallon and Schofield (2003) used factor analysis to explore underlying dimensions of satisfaction with the holiday destination. The analysis produced a five factor solution: 'facilitators' (factor 1), 'secondary attractions' (2), 'tertiary attractions' (3), 'core attractions' (4) and 'transport plus' (5). Multiple regression analysis showed that the 'secondary attractions' were the single most influential factor affecting tourists' overall satisfaction, with 'core attractions' as the third most influential factor after 'facilitators'

In their study of visitors to New Zealand, Danaher and Arweiler (1996) used multiple regression analysis to assess the relative importance of four components ('tourist activities', 'attractions', 'transport' and 'accommodation') in determining overall satisfaction with New Zealand as a holiday destination. The results showed that 'tourist activities' had the strongest impact on overall satisfaction, followed by 'accommodation' and 'attractions'. The transportation component did not have

significant impact on overall satisfaction. Thus, their study also highlighted the importance of secondary elements (Jansen-Verbeke, 1986) in determining tourist satisfaction.

Other empirical studies have also found secondary elements to be an important constituent of the visitor experience. For example, previous research has found that shopping opportunities and the availability of eating and drinking places play an important part of day-trips to urban areas (Kent, Shock and Snow, 1983; Hudman and Hawkins, 1989; Chadee and Mattson, 1996; Tribe and Snaith, 1998). In his study of visitor satisfaction with Sheffield's tourism products, Bramwell (1998) measured visitor satisfaction with 15 of Sheffield's tourism products (six primary products, four secondary products and five additional products). Visitors were most satisfied with the primary attractions (the swimming complex, arena and the theatre) and the shopping facilities (secondary attractions). Tourism products with the most adverse visitor ratings included the city centre environment, its car parking and public toilets. Clearly, both primary and secondary elements of a wide range of destination products have been found to be influential in both the visitor experience of place and their overall levels of satisfaction.

Methodology

A mixed-method approach was employed for the primary research. This consisted of preliminary qualitative research, including interviews with visitors to the Quays and content analysis of promotional material, to underpin the design of the instrument for the questionnaire survey.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was designed to measure visitor perceptions of the Quays, their experience and behaviour. The main section of the questionnaire consisted of 30 attitude statements about the Quays presented to day trip visitors in the form of a 'performance-only' construct, on balanced 5-point Likert-type scales anchored at 'Disagree Strongly' (1) to 'Agree Strongly' (5), with each intervening option labelled and numbered appropriately. Subjects were asked to indicate their level of agreement

with the statements. Visitors' overall satisfaction and intention to both recommend the Quays and return to the destination were also measured on 5-point Likert-type scales.

Sampling Design

After an initial pilot study in July 2004 which resulted in minor amendments, an on-site self-administered questionnaire was distributed around the Quays' attractions, bars, restaurants and distributional outlets between August and December 2004. Additionally, an intercept survey was conducted throughout August and September 2004.

Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula, as recommended by Jennings (2001), was used to calculate a viable sample for the survey. It was estimated that approximately two million people visited the Quays in 2003 (Salford City Council, 2004) and no further breakdown of this figure was available on any aspect of the visitor profile. A minimum sample of 387 subjects was therefore required. DeVaus (2002) and Veal (2006) also suggest a sample size of 387 for a population of two million with a five percent margin of error. A total of 392 useable questionnaires were obtained from a convenience sample. A non-probability sample was taken because of the constraints imposed by the destination's numerous entry and exit points, the dispersal of the population around the destination's attractions and amenities and the restricted opportunities for interception. However, the sample is considered to be representative of typical visitors to the Quays because the target population was sampled at nine different locations throughout the destination in an attempt to capture any variability.

Data Analysis

The data were analysed using SPSS Version 12.0. The ratings on the scales relating to performance, overall satisfaction and intention to both return and recommend were analysed. A factor analysis, using principle components as the method of extraction and Varimax orthogonal rotation, was conducted on the subjects' ratings on each of the 30 attributes to identify a smaller set of factors with eigenvalues greater or equal to 1.0 and factor loadings greater than 0.4 (Stevens, 1992). Varimax rotation was

used because the factors were considered to be unrelated in theoretical terms (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001).

Regression techniques were employed to examine the influence of the factors on subjects' overall satisfaction levels. Cronbach's alpha coefficient, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity all confirmed the factorability of the correlation matrix.

Results and Discussion

Levels of overall satisfaction with the Quays as a visitor destination were measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 'Very Dissatisfied' (1) to 'Very Satisfied' (5). The large majority of subjects were either satisfied (56.4%) or very satisfied (18.9%) with their visit. Only 24 (6.1%) of subjects were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied (0.5%). A further 65 (16.6%) of subjects were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the destination. The mean value of subjects' overall level of satisfaction was 3.92 which illustrates that, on average the Quays provided visitors with a satisfactory experience. As the Quays is still developing as a tourist destination, it is perhaps vital that visitors are satisfied with their experience as this could result in positive word-of-mouth to future, potential visitors.

Respondents' likelihood of recommending the Quays to others and returning in the future were measured on five-point scale ranging from 'Very Unlikely' (1) to 'Very Likely' (5). The majority of respondents were either likely (50.5%) or very likely (28.3%) to recommend the Quays to others and either likely (36.5%) or very likely (49.7%) to return to the destination.

The results from the analysis of the subjects' ratings on 30 statements about the Quays presented on 5-point agreement/disagreement scales, are presented in Table 1. The five highest rated attributes are 'a clean environment' (mean 4.10), 'interesting buildings' (mean 4.09), 'an attractive place' (mean 4.08), 'good car park facilities' (mean 3.95) and 'good customer service' (mean 3.80). By contrast, the Quays is not perceived to be 'a good place for a night out' (mean 2.84) and in general, subjects disagree that there is 'usually something new to see' (mean 3.12), that it is 'a good

place to socialise' (mean 3.19), 'an exciting place' (mean 3.20) and 'a surprising place' (mean 3.24).

Table 1-Frequency Scores for the Quays Attributes

Attributes	Mean	Std.	Std. Error of Mean	Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Agree Strongly	Missing*	Total
A Clean Environment	4.10	.77	.04	1 / 0.3%	17 / 4.3%	42 / 10.7%	212 / 54.1%	118 / 30.1%	2 / 0.5%	392 100%
Interesting Buildings	4.09	.78	.04	3 / 0.8%	14 / 3.6%	44 / 11.2%	213 / 54.3%	114 / 29.1%	4 / 1%	392 100%
An Attractive Place	4.08	.68	.03	2 / 0.5%	10 / 2.6%	34 / 8.7%	254 / 64.8%	91 / 23.2%	1 / 1%	392 100%
Good Car Park Facilities	3.95	.86	.05	6 / 1.5%	18 / 4.6%	54 / 13.8%	194 / 49.5%	91 / 23.2%	29 / 7.4%	392 100%
Good Customer Service	3.80	.77	.04	3 / 0.8%	11 / 2.8%	103 / 26.3%	193 / 49.2%	60 / 15.3%	22 / 5.6%	392 100%
A Relaxing Place	3.80	.78	.04	2 / 0.5%	23 / 5.9%	82 / 20.9%	220 / 56.1%	57 / 14.5%	8 / 2.0%	392 100%
A Friendly Place	3.79	.71	.04	2 / 0.5%	11 / 2.8%	102 / 26.0%	221 / 56.4%	49 / 12.5%	7 / 1.8%	392 100%
A Place to Take the Family	3.78	.86	.04	5 / 1.3%	33 / 8.4%	63 / 16.1%	222 / 56.6%	60 / 15.3%	9 / 2.3%	392 100%
It has Educational Value	3.76	.92	.05	8 / 2%	30 / 7.7%	78 / 19.9%	193 / 49.2%	72 / 18.4%	11 / 2.8%	392 100%
Easy to Get Around	3.75	.94	.05	8 / 2%	42 / 10.7%	59 / 14.5%	214 / 54.6%	69 / 17.6%	2 / 0.5%	392 100%
Good Wheelchair Access	3.74	.80	.05	4 / 1%	8 / 2%	99 / 25.3%	142 / 36.2%	48 / 12.2%	91 / 0.3%	392 100%
Good Value for Money	3.67	.84	.04	5 / 1.3%	22 / 5.6%	114 / 29.1%	174 / 44.4%	51 / 13%	26 / 6.6%	392 100%
A Safe Place	3.66	.84	0.4	7 / 1.8%	24 / 6.1%	101 / 25.8%	193 / 49.2%	44 / 11.2%	23 / 5.9%	392 100%
A Unique Place	3.63	.98	.05	13 / 3.3%	32 / 8.2%	103 / 26.3%	164 / 41.8%	66 / 16.8%	14 / 3.6%	392 100%
A Place to Explore	3.56	.94	.05	10 / 2.6%	41 / 10.5%	112 / 28.6%	173 / 44.1%	52 / 13.3%	4 / 1%	392 100%

Good Quality Attractions	3.53	.87	.04	6 / 1.5%	37 / 9.4%	128 / 32.7%	169 / 43.1%	40 / 10.2%	12 / 3.1%	392 100%
Good Tourist Information	3.50	.84	.04	4 / 1%	34 / 8.7%	127 / 32.4%	151 / 38.5%	32 / 8.2%	44 / 11.2%	392 100%
A Variety of Attractions	3.49	.91	.05	7 / 1.8%	56 / 14.3%	93 / 23.7%	191 / 48.7%	33 / 8.4%	12 / 3.1%	392 100%
A Trendy Place	3.47	.94	.05	7 / 1.8%	53 / 13.5%	116 / 29.6%	159 / 40.6%	44 / 11.2%	13 / 3.3%	392 100%
Good Quality Shopping	3.47	1.02	.05	18 / 4.6%	47 / 12.0%	96 / 24.5%	165 / 42.1%	47 / 12.0%	19 / 4.8%	392 100%
Good Signposting	3.46	1.08	.05	25 / 6.4%	53 / 13.5%	80 / 20.4%	180 / 45.9%	50 / 12.8%	4 / 1%	392 100%
An Historic Place	3.44	1.02	.05	13 / 3.3%	56 / 14.3%	109 / 27.8%	139 / 35.5%	53 / 13.5%	22 / 5.6%	392 100%
Easy to Get to	3.40	1.12	.06	30 / 7.7%	58 / 14.8%	73 / 18.6%	180 / 45.9%	46 / 11.7%	5 / 1.3%	392 100%
Good Places to Eat / Drink	3.39	.99	.05	15 / 3.8%	64 / 16.3%	92 / 23.5%	173 / 44.1%	34 / 8.7%	14 / 3.6%	392 100%
Something for Everyone	3.35	1.01	.05	7 / 1.8%	91 / 23.2%	83 / 21.2%	164 / 41.8%	38 / 9.7%	9 / 2.3%	392 100%
A Surprising Place	3.24	.93	.05	11 / 2.8%	69 / 17.6%	149 / 38%	125 / 31.9%	28 / 7.1%	10 / 2.6%	392 100%
An Exciting Place	3.20	.96	.05	12 / 3.1%	80 / 20.4%	144 / 36.7%	120 / 30.6%	30 / 7.7%	6 / 1.5%	392 100%
A Good Place to Socialise	3.19	1.00	.05	16 / 4.1%	77 / 19.6%	120 / 30.6%	120 / 30.6%	28 / 7.1%	31 / 7.9%	392 100%
Usually Something New to See	3.12	.95	.05	11 / 2.8%	89 / 22.7%	122 / 31.1%	112 / 28.6%	20 / 5.1%	38 / 9.7%	392 / 100%
A Good Place for a Night Out	2.84	1.10	.06	36 / 9.2%	105 / 26.8%	100 / 25.5%	76 / 19.4%	23 / 5.9%	52 / 13.3%	392 100%

* Subjects were undecided about their level of agreement / disagreement with the statements (don't know option).

Factor Analysis of the Quays' Attribute Performance

The results from the principle components analysis of subjects' ratings on the 30 statements about the Quays are presented in Table 2. Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the performance scale is 0.93, indicating a high degree of internal consistency. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy can be described as 'meritorious' at 0.89 (Kaiser, 1974). Barlett's test for sphericity was used to assess the sampling adequacy of the data and to test whether the correlation matrix was an identity matrix. The value of the test statistic was 1962.32 with 120 degrees of freedom and a high significance level ($p > .001$) thus, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix.

The analysis produced a four-factor solution (with eigenvalues > 1.0) which explained 62% of variance in the data. Factor 1 is comprised of 6 items ($\alpha = .83$) and accounts for 36.02% of the variance in the data. The attribute loadings suggest that it relates to the primary attractions of the Quays. The variables which loaded most highly on this factor were all items relating to the primary attractions of the destination.

Factor 2 consists of four items ($\alpha = .81$) and explains 11.42% of the variance. It seems to describe the 'secondary elements of place' defined by Jansen-Verbeke (1986), for example, 'good places to eat / drink' (catering facilities) and 'good quality shopping' (shopping facilities). All of the attributes loaded on this factor relate to the secondary attractions of the Quays, therefore, this factor was named Secondary Attractions.

Factor 3, which accounts for 7.95% of the variance, loads on four attributes ($\alpha = .75$) relating to access in terms of movement both to and around the Quays and also its broad appeal.

Factor 4 loads on only two attributes ($\alpha = .60$) and accounts for 7.09% of the variance in the data. It appears to be environmental in orientation.

There appears to be a good fit between the four factor solution presented above and Jansen-Verbeke's (1986) leisure function of the inner city in that *primary elements*, *secondary elements* and *conditional elements*, such as accessibility, signposts, and parking facilities were identified. The dimension also has similarities with the five

factor solution presented by Fallon and Schofield (2003) which identified *core attractions*, *secondary attractions* and *transport plus* factors, albeit in two different types of destination. Core and secondary attractions represent the ‘pull’ elements of the destination and the transport plus grouping enable the attractions to be accessed and experienced by visitors.

Table 2 - Results of the Principal Components Analysis of Subjects’ Ratings on the Statements about the Quays

The Quays’ Attributes	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Communality
Factor 1: Primary Attractions					
A place to explore					
Good quality attractions	.781				.694
A surprising place	.732				.635
It has educational value	.727				.639
An exciting place	.701				.498
A trendy place	.684				.649
	.552				.511
Factor 2: Secondary Attractions					
Good places to eat / drink					
A good place to socialise		.784			.645
Good quality shopping		.765			.663
A good place for a night out		.694			.568
		.666			.576
Factor 3: Access					
Good signposting			.823		.689
Easy to get around			.779		.655
Easy to get to			.744		.606
Something for everyone			.609		.551
Factor 4: Environment					
A clean environment				.809	.732
An attractive place				.779	.689
Eigenvalue	5.764	1.827	1.273	1.135	
Variance (%)	36.022	11.419	7.954	7.092	
Cumulative Variance (%)	36.022	47.442	55.395	62.488	
Cronbach’s Alpha	.83	.81	.75	.60	
Number of Items (Total = 16)	6	4	4	2	

Multiple Regression of Visitors’ Overall Satisfaction on the Factors

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was carried out on the variable ‘overall level of satisfaction with the Quays’ using the four factors. The results are given in Table 3. The model is significant ($p < .001$) with all four factors making a significant contribution to visitor satisfaction with the Quays. The R Square value shows that the

four factor model explains 38.3% of the variance in overall visitor satisfaction. Factor 2, secondary attractions, makes the strongest contribution to overall level of satisfaction (.377) when the variance explained by all other factors in the model is controlled for. A one unit increase in the performance of the secondary attractions would lead to a 0.377 unit increase in visitors' overall level of satisfaction, all other variables being held constant. Factor 1, primary attractions, makes the second largest contribution to the model (.355). A one unit increase in the performance of the primary attractions would lead to a 0.355 unit increase in visitors' overall level of satisfaction. Factors 4 (environment) and 3 (access) make weaker, albeit significant contributions to the dependent variable. A one unit increase in the performance of the environment would lead to a 0.242 unit increase in visitors' overall level of satisfaction. Similarly, a one unit increase in the performance of access variables would lead to a 0.225 increase in visitors' overall level of satisfaction with the destination.

The results show the importance of secondary attractions in the visitor experience of the Quays. Additionally, they lend support to the findings of Fallon and Schofield (2003) who also found secondary attractions to be the most influential indicator of tourists overall satisfaction. Other research has also found that eating/drinking and shopping opportunities can often function as attractions and thus play an important part of day-trips to urban areas (Kent, Shock and Snow, 1983; Hudman and Hawkins, 1989; Ryan, 1991; Law, 1993). However, while the findings of the multiple regression analysis identified secondary attractions as the single most influential factor affecting visitors' overall satisfaction with the destination, subjects were not 'highly' satisfied with the performance of the attributes loading on this factor. For example, 'good quality shopping' (mean 3.47) and 'good places to eat and drink' (mean 3.39). Additionally, the Quays is not perceived to be 'a good place for a night out' (mean 2.84) or 'a good place to socialise' (mean 3.19). Consequently, from a destination management perspective, the secondary elements of the destination should be improved to achieve higher levels of visitor satisfaction.

Factor 1 (primary attractions) was also found to be a significant predictor of visitor satisfaction. This supports Baloglu *et al's* (2003) study which found the primary elements of place to be a key determinant of visitor satisfaction. It also supports

Danaher and Arweiler's (1996) research; they found that both primary and secondary attractions had a significant impact on overall satisfaction.

Not surprisingly, the environment (factor 4) and access (factor 3) were also found to be significant predictors of visitor satisfaction with the Quays. The two variables loading on factor 4 were among the highest rated performance statements. Clearly, given their importance in relation to visitor satisfaction, these destination elements, together with those loading on the other significant factors, should be maintained and/or improved.

Table 3 - Multiple Regression Analysis of Overall Satisfaction with the Quays with Performance Factors as Predictors

Summary Statistics					
	R: -.619		R Square: .383		Adjusted R Square: -.375
Analysis of Variance					
	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Test	
Regression	4	75.675	18.919	47.032	
Residual	303	121.884	.402		<i>P</i> =.000
Total	307	197.560			
Beta Coefficient Table					
Variable (Factor)	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>T</u>	<u>Sig. T</u>
Factor 2 (Secondary Attractions)	.292	.036	.377	8.359	.000
Factor 1 (Primary Attractions)	.280	.036	.355	7.869	.000
Factor 4 (Environment)	.189	.035	.242	5.370	.000
Factor 3 (Access)	.179	.036	.225	4.984	.000
Constant	3.912	.036		108.061	.000

Conclusions

This study has examined visitor perceptions of the Quays in Salford, their on-site behaviour and experience and as such, makes a contribution to the existing literature on urban waterfront destinations. The findings have demonstrated that the secondary attractions explained more of the variance in satisfaction than the primary attractions, which in turn, were more influential than the environment and access components. This suggests that whilst the Quays' primary tourism product components and

environment and access components are important in influencing visitors' satisfaction with the destination; it is the secondary tourism components, for example, the shops, cafes and restaurants that are particularly important to the visitor experience and the success of the destination.

Whilst previous research has acknowledged the importance of secondary attractions in determining visitor satisfaction, the majority of previous studies have focused on holiday/vacation destinations. The outcomes of this research suggest that a general model may exist, i.e. that secondary attractions are relatively more important than other destination components irrespective of the type of destination; this could be tested in future research at other destinations but in relation to day-trip destinations in particular.

The findings of the research have also provided valuable practical information about visitor perceptions and experience of the Quays in Salford. The outcomes can be regarded as being of foremost relevance for the North West Development Agency and Salford City Council for planning and marketing the Quays in Salford with particular reference to product development and promotional strategies. For example, the design of promotional material for the Quays should place further emphasis on the secondary attractions of the destination; at present, the primary attractions are featured most prominently.

Further research is needed to assess visitor perception, behaviour and experience at other regenerated waterfront areas or similar day-trip destinations; this would allow meaningful comparisons to be made. The notion of a general model referred to above, should also be tested. Finally, whilst the practical findings of this research are specific to the Quays, the methodology for this study could be applied in other studies to evaluate visitor perception, behaviour and experience at other day-trip destinations.

Reference List

- Andreassen, T. W. (1995) Dissatisfaction with public services: the case of public transportation, *Journal of Services Marketing*, Vol. 9, No. 5, pp. 30-41.
- Baker, D. A. and Crompton, J. L. (2000) Quality, satisfaction and behavioural intentions, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 785-804.
- Baloglu, S, Pektan, A, Chen, S. and Santos, J. (2003) The relationship between destination performance, overall satisfaction and behavioural intention for distinct segments, in J. A. Williams and U. Muzaffer (eds.), *Current Issues and Development in Hospitality and Tourism Satisfaction*, New York: The Haworth Hospitality Press, pp. 149-176.
- Bramwell, B. (1998) User satisfaction and product development in urban tourism, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 35-47.
- Chadee, D. D. and Mattsson, J. (1996) An empirical assessment of customer satisfaction in tourism, *Services Industries Journal*, Vol. 16, No.3, pp. 305-320.
- Craig-Smith, S. J. (1995) The role of tourism in inner-harbour redevelopment, in S. J. Craig-Smith and M. Fagence (eds.), *Recreation and Tourism as a Catalyst for Urban Waterfront Redevelopment: An International Survey*, Westport: Praeger Publishers, pp. 15-35.
- Crompton, J. L. and Love, L. L. (1995) The predictive validity of alternative approaches to evaluating quality of a festival, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 34, No. 1, pp. 11-24.
- Danaher, P. J. and Arweiler, N. (1996) Customer satisfaction in the tourist industry: a case study of visitors to New Zealand, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1, pp. 89-93.
- De Vaus, D. A. (2002) *Surveys in Social Research*, Fourth Edition, London: UCL Press.
- Fallon, P. and Schofield, P. (2003) "Just trying to keep the customer satisfied": a comparison of models used in the measurement of tourist satisfaction, *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality and Tourism*, Vol. 4, No. 3/4, pp. 61-76.
- Guadagnoli, E. and Velicer, W. F. (1988) Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns, *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 103, pp. 265-275.
- Hudman, L. E. and Hawkins, D. E. (1989) *Tourism in Contemporary Society*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall.
- Jansen-Verbeke, M. (1986) Inner-city tourism: resources, tourists and promoters, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 13, pp. 79-100.

Kent, W. E., Shock, J. and Snow, R. E. (1983) Shopping: tourism's unsung hero(ine), *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 2-4.

Kozak, M. (2001a) A critical review of approaches to measure satisfaction with tourist destinations, in J. A. Mazanec, G. I. Crouch, J. R. Brent Ritchie and A. G. Woodside (eds.), *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*, Vol. 2, Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 303-318.

Kozak, M. (2001b) Comparative assessment of tourist satisfaction with destinations across two nationalities, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 22, pp. 391-401.

Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. (1970) Determining sample size for research activities, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 30, pp. 607-610.

Law, C. M. (1993) *Urban Tourism: Attracting Visitors to Large Cities*, London: Mansell Publishing.

Loundsbury, L. W. and Hoopes, L. (1985) An investigation of factors associated with vacation satisfaction, *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-13.

Pearce, D. G. (2001) An integrative framework for urban tourism research, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 926-946.

Pizam, A. and Milman, A. (1993) Predicting satisfaction among first time visitors to a destination by using the expectancy disconfirmation theory, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 12, pp. 197-209.

Pizam, A., Neumann, Y. and Reichel, A. (1978) Dimensions of tourist satisfaction with a destination area, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 314-322.

Ryan, C. (1991) *Recreational Tourism: A Social Science Perspective*, London: Routledge.

Ryan, C. (1995) *Researching Tourist Satisfaction: Issues, Concepts and Problems*, London: Routledge.

Salford City Council. (2004) Pers. Com. With Lindsay Hebden, Tourism and Marketing Manager, Salford City Council.

Schofield, P. (2001) Evaluating heritage visitor attractions from the consumer perspective: a focus on Castlefield urban heritage park in Manchester, UK, in J. A. Mazanec, G. I. Crouch, J. R. Brent Ritchie and A. G. Woodside (eds.), *Consumer Psychology of Tourism, Hospitality and Leisure*, Vol. 2, Oxon: CABI Publishing, pp. 285-301.

Selby, M. (2004) *Understanding Urban Tourism: Image, Culture and Experience*, London: I.BTauris.

Shaw, G. and Williams, A. M. (1994) *Critical Issues in Tourism: A Geographical Perspective*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Stevens, J. (1992) *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*, Second Edition, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Struthers, T. (2003) *The Redevelopment of Salford Quays, Greater Manchester: Its Impact on Urban and Regional Development from 1983 to 2003*, Salford: Salford City Council.

Tabachnick, B. G. and Fidell, L. S. (2001) *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Fourth Edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Tribe, J. and Snaith, T. (1998) From SERVQUAL to HOLSAT: holiday satisfaction in Varadero, Cuba, *Tourism Management*, Vol. 19, No.1, pp. 25-34.

Tyler, A. (2000) A framework for analysing urban tourism, in M. Robinson, R. Sharpley, N. Evans, P. Long and J. Swarbrooke (eds.), *Developments in Urban and Rural Tourism: Reflections on International Tourism*, Sunderland: Business Education Publishers, pp. 287-299.

Van der Knaap, G. A. and Pinder, D. A. (1992) Revitalising the European waterfront: policy evolution and planning issues, in B. S. Hoyle and D. A. Pinder (eds.), *European Port Cities in Transition*, London: Belhaven, pp. 155-175.

Veal, A. J. (2006) *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*, London: Pitman.

Westbrooke, R. A. and Oliver, R. L. (1991) The dimensionality of consumption emotion patterns and consumer satisfaction, *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 18, pp. 84-91.

Yuksel, A. and Yuksel, F. (2001) Comparative performance analysis: tourists' perceptions of Turkey relative to other tourist destinations, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 333-355.