



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET
Campus Helsingborg

Architecture in tourism

-Case of Copenhagen-

Visitors perspective

Master Thesis

Advisor:

Su Mi Dahlgaard-Park

Student:

Ivana Vukadinović

Helsingborg, 2011

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1 Research Background and Research Question.....	3
1.2 Specified Aims of the Thesis	7
2. Method	9
2.1 Interviews	9
2.1.1 Choice of Interviewees	10
2.1.1 Interviewee Information	11
2.1.3 Interview Process	12
2.2 Advantages and disadvantages of interviews	13
3. Theoretical Framework	14
3.1 Comments on Applied Literature	14
3.2 Cultural Tourism	15
3.2.1 Cultural Tourists	16
3.3 Architecture and Tourism	17
3.3.1 Architourism Phenomenon	19
3.4 Motives for Visiting Architectural Sites	21
4. Empirical Findings	24
4.1 Results of Empirical Findings	24
4.1.1 Importance of Architecture in Tourism – visitors’ perspective	24
4.1.2 Contribution of Architecture to Tourist Experience	31
4.2 Discussion on Empirical Findings	36
4.2.1 Visual Aspect of Architecture	36
4.2.2 Learning Aspect of Architecture	39
4.2.3 Concluding Discussion on Empirical Findings	40

5. Conclusion	42
5.1 Contributions and Limitations	44
5.2 Personal Reflection	45
6. Selected Bibliography	46
Appendix	50

1. Introduction

Architecture always had a great significance in tourism. Most of the visible aspects in cultural landscape is architecture of the place (Hudman & Jackson, 2002) which means that how visitors will perceive the destination and visually experience it depends largely on how appealing is architecture of the destination. When talking about architecture in tourism, we are not mainly interested in theoretical knowledge of architecture, but understanding the culture of the place, artistic flows and influences that created buildings as they are, to have visual experience and take memory back home. In the time of Grand Tours learning about architecture of Italy, or any other country for that matter, was a part of sophisticated education of young people of high society (Lasansky & McLaren, 2004). Admiring, understanding and learning about architecture as a part of education later became a trend in tourism. Branding and targeting unique architecture elements and sights as tourism attraction of a destination can attract more tourists (Pla'tou, 2007) which in turn can bring financial and economic benefits to a host society. That means that architecture can also be a tourism product offered to potential visitors. In the past decade, a new trend has been noticed that large number of tourists are attracted not only to the old architecture sites, but to the new architectural hotspots which was triggered after opening of Gehry's Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, and the phenomenon of creating such buildings was named Bilbao Effect. Therefore, a research on architecture as an attraction element in tourism is necessary not only because of economical but also cultural and educational effects of tourism.

1.1 Research Background and Research Question

Ever since I made a drawing book of strangely shaped buildings as well as of my perfect home, I showed tendency toward architecture. From a childhood choice of life vocation to intensive interest in various forms of art and art history, architecture was both visually and theoretically one of my fields of study. Later on, I was trained for a tour guide when I had to broaden my knowledge of history, art, various cultures as well as architecture. During a brief period of my work as a tour guide, observing, understanding and learning about different styles of architecture became both work and a delight. To me, architecture was telling a story of its society, their way of life, history and influences. Traveling and learning about all those aspects of destinations I have visited, also enhanced my inspiration by architecture. When I first visited Copenhagen, it

was something I have never seen or felt before. Experience was very personal but was also shaped from my professional perspective. Why Copenhagen among all other cities with their remarkable architecture? Because Copenhagen has something new and yet undiscovered, it has different history and culture than any other place I have visited. As a tour guide it is in my nature to discover a place while seeing it from a different angle. Copenhagen was an architectural challenge hiding its wonders behind the corner while generously offering others openly - contemporary and old blended together in harmony, works of many eminent architects. However, a tour guide discovers a place while also questioning how tourists see it from their point of view.

Many experiences had inspired me to investigate how attractive and interesting is architecture of Copenhagen to its visitors. From my first visit to Danish capital onwards, it seemed to me that Copenhagen is much more than business, fashion and shopping center, and after reading about its culture, history and art I have discovered many riches of this city. I was particularly inspired by one of Denmark's finest modern architects, and then it occurred to me if Copenhagen can follow the footsteps of other European cities that brand their architecture to attract more visitors. Before performing a research of tourists' interest in experiencing architecture in Copenhagen, I asked myself what was my experience and impression as a tourist and what did I get from it? The references I have used in this section refer only to the facts mingled with a personal storytelling.

When I first visited Copenhagen I was impressed by its architecture which looked both familiar and seemed to have the sense of uniqueness. Going upstairs from Kongens Nytorv metro station, a city revealed itself to me with old yet classy style. The bare look upon Royal Theatre made me think of buildings I have seen in France, as indeed France is the ideal of this square and even French embassy is located across the square (Stensgaard, 2006). Going further with exploring "The Merchant's Harbor" my impression was that architectural styles differed here and there but are harmoniously incorporated and created the essence of Copenhagen. On one side of the stylish square 17th century Nyhavn takes place with colorful buildings inspired by Dutch baroque with mansard and gable roofs, small harbor with boats and vessels - the site one recognizes mainly from postcards or Copenhagen tourism documentaries. On the other side is Strøget, longest pedestrian street in the world (VisitCopenhagen, 2011), which derives from the 20th century early 60's with architectural sights from earlier periods. While strolling down Strøget from Kongens Nytorv French influence was still present while something genuinely Danish could be felt in all

that architectural blend. Unexpectedly the Court House and Church of Our Lady, built by the best known Danish architect in neo-classical period C.F. Hansen (Faber, 1978), represented the influence of ancient Roman architecture while being surrounded by typically Danish narrow buildings, three to four stories high, colorful and with its many windows watching over the city's crowded street. Couple of architectural styles alternate from Dutch, French to neo-classical styles inspired with ancient Greek and Roman pillars, pilasters, gables and domes. Nowadays cafés, restaurants and boutiques from both side of Strøget reminded me that I found myself in a time machine that takes a visitor from French like Kongens Nytorv, through 60's street decorated with appealing architectural mansions from couple of centuries ago, to Town Square with Martin Nyrop's Town Hall in National Romantic Style (Faber, 1978). Town Hall was inspired by the town hall of Siena while also containing Nordic impulses (Lind & Lund, 2001) which also expressed Italian influence in Nordic way. At the square one can notice blend of old and contemporary architecture. Right across the street is Tivoli, amusement park which surprisingly fits the area. One interesting thing happened when I took a photo from inside Tivoli and noticed a skyscraper in the background. Somehow, mesmerized with older mansions, I haven't noticed 20-stories high SAS Royal Hotel before, work of Arne Jacobsen (Lind & Lund, 2001). Again, Copenhagen surprised me. It took me from old to modern and the journey was not over yet, it has just begun. My walk continued further to Slotsholmen where I was introduced to former Royal Palace, Christiansborg which survived 2 fires and was renovated 3 times (Stensgaard, 2006; Faber, 1978), whereas Royal Family has moved to Aamalienborg after the first fire broke out. The whole Slotsholmen seemed a bit gray and robust to me while still royal and appealing, surrounded by those typical colorful houses I had seen around old city center.

On one side of Slotsholmen I found Bindsbøll's Thorvaldsen's Museum which stood out from its surroundings with its yellow walls, inspired by Pompeian tradition (Lind & Lund, 2001) in classical style. On the other side, stands a distinguishable modern building with its black glass walls and granite – The Black Diamond. I was overwhelmed by this remarkable combination of old and new and how it harmoniously fits together. A friend asked me doesn't this Schmidt Hammer Lassen's work of art look drunk so leaned forward, but my impression was that Black Diamond is extraordinary classy in its simplicity.

When finally reached Amalienborg Palace, where the royal guard marched somewhere, I had met with Eigtved's baroque style (Faber, 1978). The queen was not at home, so the flag indicated but

I was much more interested in buildings I was surrounded with and impressed with the fact that I have seen renaissance, classical, neo-classical, baroque, even gothic architecture of a few churches left from that period and modern buildings equally impressive with a clear Danish architectural style - all in one city. I thought only Rome can surprise me while walking the streets when suddenly stunning building reveals itself to me. I have expected Rome to be fascinating but I haven't expected Copenhagen to win the battle with Rome when Marble Church seemingly appeared out of nowhere and behind my back, across the channel was a modern building of Royal Opera house. Old and new coexist together while giving Copenhagen its specific character.

During my many returns to Copenhagen, I was still surprised by its architecture, style and life. Every time when I thought I have seen it all, I discovered new interesting sites. Discovering this city on my own, without tour guides, architecture and tourism experts by reading literature and using internet recourses, I have familiarized myself with Copenhagen as a true architecture enthusiast. Of course, it is not my only field of interest but other interests surpass the frame of this research. Later on I felt a need to find and explore something new in Copenhagen and I found it at Ørestad. It is a mainly residential area that is being urbanized and modernized but buildings that visitors can find here are worth of their time. Young Danish architect, Bjarke Ingels, whose work has been an inspiration for the topic of my thesis has made quite unacquainted buildings, such as VM Houses, Mountain Dwellings, 8tallet (Yes Is More, 2009) and his company has many ongoing project in Copenhagen that will change the face of the capital while also fitting in with existing structures. I was deeply impressed, as a tourism student researcher and enthusiastic tourist with the appearance of Mountain Dwellings resembling Himalayas with an idea to create residential mountain on Copenhagen flat terrain. VM Houses are a complex of two buildings shaped in forms of letters V and M, which are populated with different types of apartments that from the outside look like an urban tetris (Yes Is More, 2009) and from inside each has special features and qualities (Datz & Kullmann, 2005). To add to its uniqueness, on V building one can see unusual so called "Leonardo Di Caprio Balconies", which made the building look to me as a back of a giant hedgehog. After seeing 8tallet further down the Ørestads Boulevard, residential complex in the shape of a digit 8 seen from above, I was under impression of its architectural brilliance, even drawn to the possibility of eventually living there. The idea of social spaces where flats are connected with a path going around the inner part of the complex (Yes Is More, 2009) seemed very unusual and something I have never seen before. The whole neighborhood is

rather appealing and if tourist want to get off of regular tourist routes and explore something new, in Copenhagen they can have that experience also in Ørestad neighborhood. This was my own impression about Copenhagen architecture, but the reason for doing this research is to find out what is the impression of other visitors in Copenhagen.

When I grasp on how many architectural wonders from different periods I have seen in Copenhagen, I could not ignore the question, how do other tourists feel about architecture and what is their impression of it? Architecture can be very powerful marketing tool of a place and great attractive factor, and whether that is possible or not depends on visitors' perception on existing architectural sites. Therefore it is necessary to perform a research on visitors' perception before developing marketing and branding strategy.

After explaining importance of architecture in tourism and presenting my own interest in this topic it is appropriate to present a research question of my master thesis:



What is the influence of architecture on tourists and their overall tourist experience?

Answer to this question will bring us closer to understanding the role of architecture in tourism as a new phenomenon.

1.2 Specified aims of thesis

The aim of this thesis is to study influence that architecture has in tourism and to find out how architecture contributes to tourists' experience. In order to achieve this, author has chosen Copenhagen as a case.

Architecture can attract tourists to a specific destination which also depends on tourists' needs and interest as well as the possibility of a destination to satisfy those needs. It is not my intention to investigate a target group for architectural tourism in Copenhagen, but to conclude on architectural attractiveness factor from visitors' perspective.

“You would expect Copenhagen and its surroundings to have something rather special up its sleeve in the art and design department and you will not be


disappointed. Copenhagen's architectural richness is one of the first things that strikes new visitors to the city."


"Copenhagen is the mecca of both classic and innovative architecture."

(VisitCopenhagen, 2011)

This was noted at Wonderful Copenhagen's official website, therefore this research is aimed to discover the response of foreign visitors on this matter.

Within the aim of this research, many other questions arise, out of which I find these to be the relevant:

 What is the importance of architecture in tourism from visitors' perspective?

 In what way can architecture contribute to tourists' experience?

After obtaining results of this research I expect to get to a conclusion regarding proposed research question as well as fulfill the aim of the thesis.

2. Method

In making a choice of method for topic of this research I had many doubts and ideas, but it wasn't before a certain occasion that I decided on the matter. While having a random talk with a friend and a group of people I have just met, the conversation led us to what am I working on for my thesis. After a brief explanation, people got interested and without asking any questions they, as visitors, gave me a deep insight into their thoughts and opinions of architecture in Copenhagen. Surprised with their interest and honesty, as well as very inspiring ideas, my decision for method of this research fell on qualitative interview.

As Miller and Glassner (in Silverman, 2011) explained, in-depth interview provides a meaningful opportunity to study and theorize about the social world. Authors also note that researchers who aim to understand and document others' understanding choose qualitative interviewing because it provides them with a means for exploring the points of view for research subject. For all those reasons, interview is the most appropriate method for answering the research question of this thesis. Two types of interviews suit as methods for this research – unstructured and semi – structured interview. May (1997) explains that the main difference between the two types of interviews is that questions in semi-structured interviews are specified while interviewer can still give interviewee a freedom to express his opinion, whereas with unstructured interviews interviewee has much more freedom in talking about the issue. Even though the conversation I have mentioned was as in a form of unstructured interview and gave me valuable insight in their opinion of architecture, the control over the interview process is necessary. This is accomplished by asking specific questions, giving freedom to interviewees to elaborate their thoughts and ideas, while keeping the conversation within the frame of the question. Bryman (2001) notes that interviews are attractive to researchers for their flexibility and it is that characteristic of this method that will enable me to change or direct the course of conversation in desired directions. Therefore, semi-structured interviews will be conducted for this research.

2.1 Interviews

Semi-structured interviews can act as reliable method of gathering information as they are linked to investigating true facts and feelings (Holstein and Gubrium in Silverman, 2011). As opposed

to quantitative methods which bring forth plain facts, qualitative methods, such as interviewing, have the ability to look beneath the surface. Bryman (2001) says that if researcher is beginning the investigation with a fairly clear focus it is likely semi-structured interviews will be used as a choice of method. The focus of this research is to find out what was the influence of architecture on visitors in Copenhagen, did it and how it contributed to their overall tourist experience, which is why semi-structured interview is done as a method for this research.

In semi-structured interviewing, researcher has a list of questions often referred to as interview guide (Bryman, 2001). The author explains interview guide as the list of questions to be asked. They do not have to be asked in the same order while sub-questions can be asked if the interviewer feels it will lead to answering the question. The author also mentions types of questions asked in interview guide, which I also used during interviews: follow-up, probing, specifying, direct, indirect, structuring and interpreting questions. I began the interview with an introduction question followed up with direct questions with added follow-up, probing and specifying questions. Important to note is that I have also used attitude scales (May, 1997) in some questions which will not be used as quantitative results. Interviewees were asked to chose on a scale from 1 to 10 in order to understand how would they evaluate their experience (depending on a question). Therefore, this scale will be used as explanatory and as an edition to a question asked.

Questions in the interview were created based on aims of the thesis and in order to answer the research question.

2.1.1 Choice of interviewees

For this research 10 interviewees were chosen among people I know as well as people I have met along the way in completing the thesis research. All respondents have university education or are still students and are from different countries. They have been randomly selected based on their country of origin but all of them, as educated people, are selected because of their need for more or less cultural experience during their travels.

Educational background can be very significant factor in determining whether architecture is attractive and meaningful to tourists or not, which is why I payed attention on educational background of the respondents.

All interviewees are between 24 and 35 years old, only for the reason that people of that age were more accessible to me.

Also, gender of interviewees is not relevant for this research but to avoid possible irregularities, 6 interviewees are women and 4 interviewees are men.

2.1.2 Interviewee information

All interviewees are foreign tourists who have visited Copenhagen recently. To avoid unreliable results of empirical findings due to outdated tourist experience and memories of Copenhagen, all interviewees were chosen if they have visited Copenhagen from September 2010 onwards.

Interviewees accepted to be interviewed under condition to be anonymous. The author of thesis has agreed to the terms as it made respondents comfortable to answer all the questions freely and openly. Their names have been changed, and only their first names will be mentioned, to avoid misunderstandings in the text.

Stephanie is from Hong Kong. She is 26 years old with a bachelor's degree in marketing. She has visited Copenhagen on various occasions within the period of 2 years, both privately and professionally. Her last visit to Copenhagen was in April 2011. The interview was done on 20th April 2011.

Irina is from Sankt Petersburg, Russia. She is 25 years old and has bachelor's degree in economics. She has visited Copenhagen 4 times in the period of 2 years and her last visit was in March 2011. The interview was done on 21st April 2011.

Elena is from Moscow, Russia. She is 24 years old and she has a bachelor's degree in geography. She has been in Copenhagen 3 times, and the last visit was in March 2011. The interview was done on 22nd April 2011.

Biljana is from Novi Sad, Serbia. She is 28 years old English teacher in elementary school in Stockholm. She has visited Copenhagen once in September 2010. The interview was done on 24th April 2011.

Vesna is from Novi Sad, Serbia. She is 34 years old with bachelor's degree in philosophy. She has visited Copenhagen once in April 2011. The interview was done on 2nd May 2011.

Mario is from Trieste, Italy. He is 35 years old with bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering and is self employed. He has been in Copenhagen once in March 2011. The interview was done on 3rd of May 2011.

Robert is from Novi Sad, Serbia. He is 24 years old student of graphic design. He has been to Copenhagen once in April 2011. The interview was done on 4th May 2011.

Elias is from Munich, Germany. He is 25 years old master student of ecology. He has been in Copenhagen once in October 2010. The interview was done on 5th May 2011

Jordi is from Barcelona, Spain. He is 27 years old master student of marketing. He has been in Copenhagen once in May, 2011. The interview was done on 7th May 2011.

Lea is from Szeged, Hungary. She is 26 years old student of tourism management. She has visited Copenhagen once in May 2011. The interview was done on 14th May 2011.

2.1.3 Interview process

All interviews have been recorded and lasted between 40 and 60 minutes. Language of the interview with Vesna, Biljana and Robert was Serbian as the common native language of the interviewer (the author of the thesis) and mentioned interviewees. All other respondents were interviewed in English. Interviews done in Serbian were translated accurately without changing the context of questions and answers. As author is fluent in English, interviews conducted in English (as non-native language of interviewer and interviewees) were all understandable which also had no influence on reliability of interview results.

Interviews with Stephanie, Irina, Elena, Biljana, Vesna and Robert were done in person in a quiet setting of author's home, while interviews with Mario, Elias, Lea and Jordi were done on skype as they were in their home countries during the work on this thesis.

All questions asked to interviewees aimed for a deeper and better understanding of the influence architecture had on their perception of Copenhagen. During the interviews the interviewer (author of the thesis) has asked sub-questions, follow-up questions and specifying questions such as *What did you mean?*, *Could you explain more?*, *Why do you think so?*, in order to gain better understanding of received answers.

2.2 Advantages and disadvantages of interviews

Using interviews in social research has many advantages. According to Bailey (1994) main advantage is *flexibility* where interviewer can ask more specific sub-questions and elaborate on the question asked if interviewee misunderstood the question. Author notes other advantages such as *response rate*, where it is easier for people to answer the questions then write them down in the case of questionnaires; possibility of interviewer to observe interviewee's *nonverbal behavior*; interviewer can have the *control over environment* meaning to choose place suitable for the interview without noise or other influencing external factors; interviewer can manipulate with *question order*; high level of *spontaneity* where interviewer can record spontaneous answers which can be more informative then direct answers.

As disadvantage Bailey (1994) notes the *time* needed to conduct this method, *availability of respondents* who can live in different cities or even countries. All respondents have *less anonymity* which can influence on their discomfort during interviews and influence on final results. Silverman (2011) explains another problem, the challenge to extract the information without contaminating it. But also it is a matter of serious debate whether interviewees would open up and answer the same question with the same answer and explanation to different interviewers as they might not react the same to different people.

In case of this research all interviewees were available, and agreed to be less anonymous. Also, I made sure all of them felt comfortable to answer openly and honestly without my influence on their answers.

3. Theoretical framework

Architecture as an attraction factor is considered to be a part of cultural tourism. As the aim of this thesis is to understand the influence architecture has on tourists' experience, I will, as an author of this research, briefly present theoretical background on cultural tourism as well as on cultural tourists in order to make it easier to conceive the relationship between architecture and tourism, from the cultural tourism perspective. The reason why in this thesis cultural tourism is a starting point for theoretical framework is because architecture has always attracted cultural tourist and is therefore an element of cultural tourism. The author of the thesis understands the complexity of this issue, where architecture can as well be considered as an attraction of urban, educational, heritage or other types of tourism. But the choice was set on architecture with background in cultural tourism, as most of tourists interested in architecture of the visited destination are mainly cultural tourists, participating in cultural tourism. With this short theoretical background in cultural tourism, the author expects readers to get more understanding of architecture tourism, as one of its branches.

Main focus will be set on architecture in tourism, with use of existing literature and researches. Within this frame, architourism will be presented and explained as a new phenomenon in tourism.

The literature chosen as a reference to discuss about mentioned ideas, theories and definitions will provide readers with better understanding of the topic of this research. As there are many related studies, I have selected literature that was both available to me and most convenient and informative for topic of my research.

3.1 Comments on applied literature

Here the author of the thesis emphasizes that literature about architecture and tourism as well as architourism is very few in number, as only in recent years some researches had been done. This is of course a weakness for this research, which is why the author also criticizes and comments on current findings on the issue. There are no exact definitions and theory on architecture tourism. Since it is a new phenomenon there is still no definition on what is architecture tourism and architourism and are they one and the same, who are architecture tourists and architourists or whether there is any difference between the two. So far only numerous case studies exist as an

attempt to explain the phenomenon. The reader will notice more discussion like approach in that part of the thesis, which is not due to authors preference but because all findings and books written on the topic were conducted in a form of discussion, as case studies. Nevertheless, existing literature is enough for this thesis to be conducted as the focus is set on architecture as a part of tourists' experience.

3.2 Cultural tourism

According to Dewar (in Jafari, 2000), most definitions of cultural tourism as a major element include learning about others and their way of life. If every society has its own culture, a part of cultural tourism would be experiencing and learning about the folklore, literature, music, history, architecture, heritage and even gastronomy of the destination.

Khan (2005) explains that cultural tourism satisfies cultural and intellectual curiosity and involves visits to historical monuments, architectural sites and other places of historical and religious importance. Here again cultural tourism was brought up as the most significant type of tourism for the topic of my research.

Dewar (in Jafari, 2000) noted when Herodotus of Halicarnassus first saw the Pyramids almost 3 millenniums ago, he was a cultural tourist admiring architectural wonder of the time. Author emphasizes humans' insatiable curiosity as an essential motivator to conduct travels in order to expose themselves to and learn about new cultures, art and architecture. The author quotes Hunziker and Krapf - *There is no tourism without culture*, whereas if architecture is a part of culture it is one of essential elements of tourism experience.

World Tourism Organization (in Ivanović, 2008) gives its own definition of cultural tourism: *it includes movements of persons for essentially cultural motivations such as study tours, performing arts and other cultural tours, travel for festivals and other cultural events, visit to sites and monuments, travel to study nature, folklore or art or pilgrimages*. There are many other definitions but they all seem to have many common concepts. For this research it is enough to understand broadness of concept of culture and cultural tourism, which also includes architecture and architecture tourism.

In this part of thesis, the author's aim was to shortly explain what is cultural tourism while pointing out connections to architecture as a form of attraction in cultural tourism.

3.2.1 Cultural tourists

Cooper and Hall (2008) explain the term “tourist” as a consumer who undertakes voluntary and temporary mobility away from their home environment, while putting an emphasis on *voluntary* and *temporary*. The simplest definition implies that tourist is a visitor staying at least one night in the place visited (WTTC in Theobald, 2005).

Cultural tourists differ from other tourists in motivation and interests which draw them to certain places (McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). The authors note that cultural tourists want to consume variety of cultural experiences.

Even though all cultural tourists have interest in cultural aspect of travel in common, there are still significant differences between them which led to distinguishing some types of cultural tourists. Stebbins (in McKercher & Du Cros, 2002) proposes two types of hobbyist cultural tourist: *generalized* and *specialized cultural tourist*. Cultural tourist from the first group visits different places with different cultures and over time gains general knowledge of various cultures, while the other group consists of cultural tourist interested in one specific culture or society and travels to a country or a particular city in search of better understanding of that specific culture. This classification seems to be in place since not all cultural tourists have the same amount and type of motivation.

It is possible to distinguish five types of cultural tourists (in McKercher & Du Cros, 2002):

- 1.) *The purposeful cultural tourist*
- 2.) *The sightseeing cultural tourist*
- 3.) *The serendipitous cultural tourist*
- 4.) *The casual cultural tourist*
- 5.) *The incidental cultural tourist*

It was explained that cultural experience and motivation for visiting a place can range from very low to very high, but still all tourists belonging to one of those groups are considered to be cultural tourists. This is also significant for the topic of this research as tourists interested in and experiencing architecture can range from those who had other motives to visit a destination but developed interest for and experienced local architecture to those tourists who came with a purpose to learn more about architectural styles and tendencies of the destination, from tourism perspective.

Hughes (2000) explains that cultural tourism includes visits to heritage and contemporary sites, experiencing visual and performing arts, which means that cultural tourists all have one thing in

common. They are or have become interested in experiencing and learning about various cultural aspects of visited destinations.

3.3 Architecture and tourism

Architecture has always been an attraction factor in tourism (Cambie, 2009), ever since Herodotus admired ancient pyramids in Egypt and made a list of ancient wonders of the world. As it is in human nature to travel, which is one of the reasons why tourism is one of the fastest growing industries, people have built and discovered new architecturally attractive places throughout the history. In the period of Grand Tours, members of high society undertook travels or sent their children on a journey for educational reasons. Kourelis (in Lasansky & McLaren, 2004) notes that Grand Tour travelers invented a new chapter of architectural history, describing them as a diverse group of amateurs, professionals, diplomats, military men, doctors, architects and artists as well as adventure seeking travelers. Interesting thing about those travelers is that their travels could last for up to two years, while they would discover, learn and understand various forms of art and history. Architecture was inevitable element in their travels. Famous architectural wonders of ancient, medieval times or times closer to the time they lived in, were their motive of travel. Author also describes how those early travelers documented their experience with architecture in writings and paintings while Benson (in Lasansky & McLaren, 2004) mentions early souvenirs depicting famous buildings as a way of materializing a memory and bringing it home but also as a way of canonizing a site. Places known for their glorious history as well as glorious artists, architects and philosophers were destinations to those early tourists. Later, as travels evolved to tourism as we know it today, motives, duration of stay as well as perceptions have changed drastically.

Even though architecture was always there, attracting people to places, not many studies have been done on that matter. Only recently, after Bilbao Effect took place have authors started to question the relationship between architecture and tourism. They still haven't agreed on what is architecture tourism or architourism, what motivates tourist to become architecture tourists as it is still a new phenomenon, to enthusiastically travel for architecture. Only couple of books in English language have been written on the topic as well as some useful articles. I have also used literature in other languages with the help of online translators only to get an overview how do

authors comment on and describe architecture as an attraction factor in tourism. Nevertheless, most of the written material I came across with is on the topic of architourism which includes contemporary architecture while not entirely excluding historical buildings. But before we can understand architourism, we have to understand what architecture in tourism represents. I will refer to architecture tourists as tourists who travel for architecture motives, but as there is no definition given by authors within the field, it is not my aim to separate architecture tourist from cultural tourists as they are still considered to belong to the same group of tourists with various traveling motives in common.

Grčić (2009) argues that architectural tourism recourses include buildings with exceptional stylist and esthetic forms and can have residential, administrative, educational, cultural, service or other functions while being very different depending on the period they were built in. It is this diversity of styles and function that makes exceptional buildings unique, symbolic and visually appealing to tourists. Those buildings dominate the landscape (Jelinek, 2008) influence the perception of tourists, improves their experience while offering a piece of past and present times. But why are architectural sites attraction elements in cultural tourism? Architecture is a face of a destination. It expresses the history of the society, their artistic styles and preferences but moreover it gives tourist an impression of a place. Architecture represents the people because people made it. It is a cultural experience whose depth depends on personal background and cultural needs of architecture tourist.

In research done by Austrian platform for architecture in tourism Pla'tou (2007) it was noted that historical buildings are important attractors while contemporary architecture has the ability to extend the cultural offers. Thus, architecture is still perceived within the frame of cultural tourism as it is inevitably difficult to separate motives for visiting architectural monuments from motives for visiting any other cultural attraction. Therefore, similarly as with other cultural tourists', motivations for visiting architectural attractions vary from a simple desire to see famous site one has heard of in the media or literature to a specific interest in deeper understanding of styles as well as of the society. In the same research it was argued about common prejudice about tourists and architects where tourists do not understand architecture and aesthetics while architects are artists with no relation to reality. Authors of this research argue that tourist are becoming more educated and sophisticated, their cultural demands are increasing,

while architects mostly do their work according to the needs of the society and their preferences - which again brings us to the cultural aspect of architecture in tourism.

In attempt to understand who are architecture tourist I have compared them to classification of cultural tourist, based on their motivation, who range from tourist accidentally becoming cultural tourist by visiting some sites or events of cultural tourism, to tourist specifically motivated by culture. Schwarzer (in Ockman & Frausto, 2005) had an interesting observation during his trip to China when he noticed how other tourist on the excursion he attended, rushed through Forbidden City without giving deeper interest in the site. They took number of photographs and video recordings of the place to acknowledge to others and themselves that they have visited the extraordinary site, without really being aware of its authenticity, while author himself felt anxiety for not getting more information on the architecture of Forbidden City. He also noticed that not a lot of quality time was spent on the visited sites, which he explained as a fast consumption of mass tourism. According to the classification of cultural tourists, people author described would be those accidental cultural tourists while the author was an intentional cultural tourist. It is quite interesting how different the two groups are which makes me question, can we say that architecture tourists are all those tourist visiting architectural hotspots? It is still a matter of debate as the type and depth of motivation for visiting such a destination can vary greatly.

3.3.1 Architourism phenomenon

Architecture was always there, attracting tourists, architects, artists, historians and adventure seekers. It became normal to perceive Italy as an open air museum of architecture, that Spain offers its history of Visigoths overpowered by Moors who were defeated by joined Spanish regions just before Columbus has set off to the new world, all depicted in architecture, or that dark medieval period of Europe resulted in robust Romanesque and bold, lacelike Gothic style. When something is present for a long time, it is still interesting for one reason or another but it doesn't make noise as loud as it once did. The world of architecture and tourism was awakened when in 1997 Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, Northern Spain, was opened. All eyes were fixed on forth largest city in Spain, as architect Frank Gehry made a spectacle of titanium, glass and limestone twisted in random curves. Museum attracted 1,360,00 visitors that year and infused 160 million dollars into local economy, and it still attracts average of 100,000 tourists a month (Ockman in Lasansky & McLaren, 2004). Interesting fact is that local government planned to

attract tourists and economic growth with an iconic building (Cambie, 2009) but the results went far beyond their expectations. The phenomenon is known as Bilbao Effect. It affected both architecture and tourism, as other cities copied the Bilbao pattern to attract tourists with remarkable architecture designed by famous architects. Schwarzer (in Ockman & Frausto, 2005) noted that tourists would be ever more attracted to the architectural hotspots if the sites were signed by star architects or starchitects, such as Norman Foster, Santiago Calatrava, Rem Koolhaas, Tadao Ando, Toyo Ito, Jean Nouvel, I. M. Pei or Denmark's own young and rising Bjarke Ingels. All one needs to do to understand the uniqueness and authentic works of mentioned brilliant architects is to take a look at the buildings. Is that how Herodotus felt when he saw the Pyramids of Giza?

The term architourism was first mentioned at the conference "Architourism: Architecture as a Destination for Tourism" organized by Temple Hoyne Buell Centre for the Study of American Architecture in 2002 (Chang, 2008) whose aim was to try to explain the new trend of traveling for contemporary architecture. Author agrees that authentic and innovative ideas had always attracted attention of tourists, but this new trend in tourism needs to be observed and studied more in order to be explained and understood. Architourism is a new concept which is interrelated to previous interest in architecture with new types of tourist behavior and tendencies. After more studies are done, we will have clearer understanding of architourism.

Many cities developed a strategy to attract more visitors with iconic buildings but also with brand architecture. Buncle (2010) wrote in his article about how branding architecture can create a recognizable destination, while Lasansky (in Ockman & Frausto, 2005) gives an example of Tuscany being recognizable as the Renaissance Mecca. This shows an interesting relationship between architecture and tourism, when certain buildings or architectural styles are an immediate reminder of certain destinations. This relationship always existed, but with the expansion of architourism and enthusiasm about contemporary architecture alongside historical buildings, many stakeholders have recognized economical benefits.

Bilbao Effect caused many authors to argue about the new trend in tourism where historical buildings are not anymore the only architectural sites to attract tourists, but have to share "piece of the cake" with extraordinary contemporary buildings. Many questions were raised and many debates occurred on whether or not is too expensive and time consuming to build an iconic building to attract tourists or when iconic buildings are over consumed by tourism will they stop

attracting tourists and profit (Cambie, 2009; Schwarzer in Ockman & Frausto, 2005)? Many authors agree architecture will be attractive to tourists even though intensity of the attraction might be more or less reduced. As historical architecture still has the attention of modern tourists, contemporary works of architectural wonders will also keep the attention as they gradually become historical as well. One thing is certain to most authors, and I myself agree that architecture will keep on drawing attention and refreshment to tourism trends.

3.4 Motives for visiting architectural sites

As explained, architecture is not a new term in tourism. Author of the thesis noted it was an attraction of cultural tourism, but ever since Bilbao Effect occurred a new trend in tourism took place and was described as architourism. Therefore, attempt to understand what draws tourist to architectural sites is still in process and there is no study yet published to add to this research. Cultural tourism was introduced primarily to help the reader understand architecture tourism from cultural tourism perspective. Another important issue to help interpret empirical findings is understanding what attracts people to architecture. Since there is no study done on that account directly explaining the issue, author will try to connect current findings in the field of architecture tourism with findings from a similar type of tourism. Since many types of tourism and motives for travel can have the same or similar pattern, author has found few directions and has chosen one that was found most appropriate in this case. Motives for visiting urban sites, events, and cultural heritage sites can all be very similar to motives for visiting architecture sites. Cultural tourism is too broad concept in understanding the motives for visiting only architectural sites, therefore these motives will be connected through cultural heritage tourism. Cultural heritage tourism is a form of cultural tourism and it involves, among other aspects, visiting architectural sites of historical importance.

So far in Ockman and Fausto (ed., 2005) four major attractors as motivation for visiting architectural sites have been identified but not defined - *authentic*, *exotic*, *escapist* and *spectacular*. In the book review, Gruen (2006) notes that even though those terms were not precisely defined, they do raise questions for further debate.

The concept of *authentic* is still a matter of debate, and Hertel (in Ockman and Fausto, 2005) tries to explain the term on an example of Frauenkirche in Dresden as something unchanged and kept in an original form. Still, the term and explanation are blurry. Vannini and Burgess (in Vannini and Williams, 2009) argue that in general, authenticity refers to the condition or quality of realness. Authors explain that when we say something is authentic we mean that we find it genuine, real and not an imitation. The concept of *exotic* is also a matter of debate, while Wark (in Ockman and Fausto, 2005) notes exotic is something that hails us from a place away from home, something that we consider to be different from what is familiar to us.

The term *escapism*, as explained by Marling (in Ockman and Fausto, 2005) often means avoidance, but it can be referred to as occasion for a transformation, dislocation and as a kind of transcendence. Tuan (1998) notes that escapism often means that what someone is escaping from is reality and what someone is escaping to is fantasy. Crompton (in Morgan, Lugosi and Ritchie, 2010) noted that need to escape from perceived mundane environment and routine is one of the main motivators for tourists.

The concept of *spectacular* as a motivator was also widely discussed by D’Acierno (in Ockman and Fausto, 2005) and it may be explained as something impressive or sensational. Author also quotes on Guy Debord’s view on spectacle as not being simply a reference to the mass media but a totalizing figure that describes the entire ensemble of social, political and cultural relations.

All four concepts have been identified as dominant attraction factors which motivate tourists to visit architecture hotspots. Authors (in Ockman and Fausto, 2005) do not explain why they have identified those four attractors in particular, assuming it to be self explanatory. They argue throughout the textbook that architectural hotspots which draw attention of tourists have one or more of those attraction factors.

Four attracting factors that motivate people to visit architectural sites are creating tourists’ experience. In a study done by Poria, Butler and Airey (2011) motives for visiting cultural heritage sites, which also includes built environment, can be divided into three groups: 1.) *emotional experience*, 2.) *learning history* and 3.) *recreational experience*. Authors explain that first group joins motives for experiencing the place emotionally, the second group represents their willingness to learn about the history and culture of the place, while third group of motives has nothing to do with the content presented and is connected to the site as a recreational place. In case of architecture, a motive to experience something authentic, exotic, escapist and

spectacular can fit in all three groups, depending on whether visitors want to experience it emotionally (if a particular architectural site has a certain meaning for them), recreationally (if they want to visit architectural site as a part of leisure time) or if they are motivated by a desire to learn more details about architectural background of a site.

According to McIntosh (1999), what will determine the kind of motivation of tourists to visit places of cultural and heritage importance are their personal thoughts, feelings, imaginations and the unique backgrounds which visitors bring with them on site.

Chen (in Timothy and Boyd, 2003) found out in his study of motivations that heritage visitors are driven by two broad motives: 1.) *pursuit of knowledge* and 2.) *other more personal benefits*. Both old and modern architecture are considered to be a part of cultural heritage, which is why these motives can also refer to architecture tourists. Author noted that his respondents named enriching their personal knowledge as a main motivation for visiting such sites, which belongs to the first group of motives. In the group of personal benefits belong motives for recreation activities and enjoying sightseeing. As Kourelis (in Lasansky and McLaren, 2004) noted, travelers who traveled for architecture were interested in gaining knowledge about it, whereas there are also travelers who are motivated to see rather than learn. Finch (Point Of View of Architeam, 2010) said those tourists traveling for architecture are motivated by its historical background as well as in engaging in human experience. Both motives are linked to motives previously mentioned from heritage tourist motives perspective, where traveling for historical background would fit in *emotional experience*, *learning history* and *pursuit of knowledge* and engaging in human activities is linked to *recreational experience* and *other more personal motives*.

Author of the thesis aims at connecting these theories to empirical findings presented in following part of this research in order to fulfill the aims of the thesis set to answer a research question.

4. Empirical findings

In this part of thesis author will present the results of empirical findings, analyze them with an attempt to answer the research question and aim of this research. First, the author will present and analyze the results of empirical findings. At the end conclusions and further comments will be made.

4.1 Results of empirical findings

Here the author of the thesis will present the results of semi-structured interviews. This part is divided between two defined aims of this research in attempt to answer a research question:



What is the influence of architecture on tourists and their overall tourist experience?

As questions in the interview guide were created to answer two research aims, each question with answers will be presented and commented under an aim it was meant for.

4.1.1 Importance of Architecture in tourism – visitors perspective

Firstly, respondents who previously visited Copenhagen were directly asked to explain:



How important is architecture when making a decision to visit a destination?

Only Elias answered it is not important to him at all in decision making, explaining that he notices architecture at a destination, but that he is more interested and drawn to the way of life at a destination than to architecture. Lea on the other hand answered architecture is not her priority in decision making, and that it is more important to her as a part of the whole destination experience. All other respondents agreed that architecture plays important part in their decision making.

Stephanie answered architecture is definitely one of the reasons she visits the destination especially if a city is famous for its buildings. Here is what she said: *It is an attraction by itself, and it would be one of the main reasons for me to make a decision to visit such a place. It also depends, if the place is not very famous for its architecture, [...] and if architecture fascinates me for some reason [at a place], it will add up to my general experience at a visited destination.*

Elena answered similarly, explaining she thinks architecture is important to most people because usually most popular destinations have attractive architecture.

Irina explained she likes reading about famous buildings and that one of the main reasons for her travel is to see them.

Vesna was also convincing with her answer: *It is very important to me. If a place doesn't have beautiful and esthetic architecture, then it is not interesting to me. I cannot imagine intentionally visiting a place and not caring about the architecture.* When she was asked why architecture is important to her she answered that is the way she learns about local environment. She added that esthetic element is important to her because if she likes the building she will want to know more about it.

Mario and Biljana had similar answers. Architecture is important to them even when it is not the main reason for their travels because it will add up to their perception about the place.

Robert mentioned the aspect of *beauty* explaining that the more beautiful architecture of a place is, better are the chances he will visit that place.

The context of Jordi's answer was similar to answers of other respondents while he emphasized architecture is what attracts him to a city in a first place.

This means that 8 respondents answered architecture is important to them when they decide to visit a place, one respondent answered it is not important to him at all and one respondent said it is not her priority when she is making a decision but that architecture does have an influence on her decision as a part of a destination package.

Within the same question, respondents were asked to explain *what architecture means to them and what can they gain from it as visitors.*

Few respondents share similar attitude on the topic, while others had a different observation. It was mentioned frequently that architecture represents history, culture, tradition and art of local societies, while most of the responses differed in explanation.

Stephanie's answer was absolutely different. In her opinion architecture stands for something modern while telling her about the prosperity of the city. She mentioned, however, that old architecture can depict how city looked in the past.

Irina explained architecture as a part of history is a concept too wide for her to understand, therefore she perceives architecture as representing spirit of a city.

Vesna mentioned architecture represents people and historical development while adding: *To me architecture is like a postcard, a picture of everything.*

Biljana's answer did not include anything above mentioned as for her architecture besides telling about local traditions, also tells about the way a society perceives and expresses beauty.

Elias also had a different answer. For him architecture can make a place better or worse visually. For him, architecture is more of a visual experience.

Respondents were also asked to explain *if architecture has influence of their perception of a place*. 8 respondents answered that architecture has higher influence on their perception, and 2 respondents said it has certain amount of influence.

Irina and Vesna explained that architecture has *the most influence* on their perception of a place, Robert, Stephanie and Elena explained how *it has a lot of influence* on their perception, Biljana and Jordi defined the level of influence as *significant*, while Mario said architecture has *high influence* on his perception of a place.

Elias and Lea had unspecified opinion. Both of them agreed architecture has an influence on their opinion were Elias explained it depends from a place to place as well as his mood, while Lea said the influence of architecture on her perception of a place is not crucial, only has a part in her overall perception.

All further questions were related to architecture in tourism, case of Copenhagen.



Please name the architectural site you knew of before your visit which you wanted to see (if there is one) and why did it attract you?

Question was aimed to understand how much attention have respondents paid to architecture of Copenhagen before their visit and what did they find attractive about it that would motivate them to visit those architectural sites.

Repeatedly mentioned was Nyhavn by 6 respondents, followed with Black Diamond by 3, Royal Opera House by 1 as well as Carlsberg Brewery, while 4 respondents did not know of any buildings before their visit.

Stephanie, Mario and Jordi got familiar with Nyhavn from tourism brochures they have seen before their visit. Stefanie said she was attracted to beauty of Nyhavn, Mario was attracted to it because it is different from architecture of his home city. This is what Mario said: *It felt quite*

authentic. Almost as how tourist in Venice would pay 20 Euros just to have cappuccino on Piazza San Marco, feed the pigeons and enjoy the idyllic scenery of architectural wonders. Nyhavn was my Piazza San Marco and the coffee was cheaper. Jordi said: I wanted to see it because it looks like it is pulling you inside of a fairytale. ... Nyhavn still has that feeling of old times that seem a bit mysterious and interesting to me. Vesna, as Mario, was attracted to Nyhav because it is different from her home city as well as because the whole scenery is like a dream about past times. Elias and Lea saw their friends' photos and got interested to see it. Elias was attracted because it looks nice, while Lea thought of it as unreal and pulling back to the past. Mario, Elias and Lea mentioned they knew about Black Diamond before their visit. Mario explained he was attracted to both Black Diamond and Royal Opera House because they look, classy, fashionable yet simple and special which was intriguing for him. Elias didn't even want to see Black Diamond as it looks odd and causes confusion in him. Reason why Lea was attracted is because she thought of it as modern and pushing toward future.

Stephanie mentioned also Carlsberg Brewery as beside beer story the attraction is its architecture signed by a famous architect who made the Elephant Gate.

Elena, Irina, Biljana and Robert did not know of any architectural sites before their visit. Elena, Irina and Biljana explain the reason might be because their first visit was unplanned. Elena and Robert note that another reason might be because architectural sites are not promoted enough, while Irina and Biljana admitted they were not interested in Copenhagen in general, before their visit.



Are you familiar with Danish or foreign architects that have worked in Copenhagen and how did you find out about them?

Question is asked in order to understand how much interest respondents have in architecture. Basic assumption is that the more respondents are interested in architecture more likely is that they will also be familiar with architects and their work.

In this question, 5 respondents mentioned some architects and 5 didn't know of any, giving various explanations.

Stephanie and Vesna both mentioned C.F. Hansen and Bjarke Ingels, as two Danish architects they know of. Stephanie said she heard of C.F. Hansen on a channel tour and saw some of his buildings which is why she remembers, while she heard about Bjarke Ingels through a word of

mouth and went to see his work in Copenhagen. Vesna on the other hand heard about C.F. Hansen because it was frequently mentioned in tourism brochures and she has also seen his buildings. But unlike Stephanie she has heard of Bjarke Ingels on another occasion: *he was a guest at Belgrade Design Week last year [June 2010] and his ideas are extraordinary, in my opinion. I know he has some project done in Copenhagen but I had no time to go to that district, unfortunately. You see, I am not interested in modern architecture, yet I like his ideas and solutions.* Irina also mentioned Bjarke Ingels and with him Henning Larsen explaining she is interested in modern architecture and likes knowing about architects. She also said she found out about them after her first visit to Copenhagen and when she saw their buildings she was interested to know about their architects. Lea mentioned Bjarke Ingels along with Jean Nouvel. She said she has heard about a lot of architects during guided tours she participated in Copenhagen, but she doesn't remember all the names. She knew of Jean Nouvel before, and she remembers Bjarke Ingels as his name was on a brochure she took from one of the buildings. Jordi had a different answer saying she knows Norman Foster has worked in Copenhagen and he has seen the Concert Hall of Jean Nouvel. He is familiar with both architects because of their work in his home town. On the other hand Elena and Elias were not interested to know about any architects that worked in Copenhagen. Elena explained she did not like Copenhagen enough to pay attention to architects, while Elias said: *I remember watching on TV, after the trip to Copenhagen, about Danish modern architecture, Danish design and such stuff. But I rarely remember any names. It is not that important to me, but the documentary was good, I understood more what I've seen in Copenhagen.* Robert, Mario and Biljana don't know of any architects but are interested to know more after they visited Copenhagen.



How much are you willing to explore about architecture in Copenhagen?

Within this question certain patterns were noticed as some of the respondents gave quite similar answers. All respondents want to learn but the level of learning differs.

Irina, Vesna, Mario, Biljana and Jordi said they want to know enough to understand architectural styles, about architects, historical background and such. Vesna said she has already started reading about it among reading about other attractions of Copenhagen, while all mentioned respondents said they like to learn, which is why they are also interested to learn about architecture.

Robert and Lea answered they would like to know only as much to know more about the city. Elias said he has already learned something during his visit and that he likes to learn about architecture on site as he doesn't have a lot of free time to do it at home. Stephanie said she doesn't have to know the details at all and that she is more interested in visual appearance. She added she would like to know only if there are some interesting details about architecture. Elena's answer was specific. She said she wants to learn about architecture if she likes the city, but as she did not like Copenhagen she sees no point in learning about its architecture.



In your opinion is Copenhagen architectural mecca or does it have a future of architectural mecca?

Aim of this question is to see how respondents feel about the hypothesis stated at VisitCopenhagen website (see page 7).

3 respondents said that Copenhagen is an architecture mecca, 4 respondents said it has a future of architecture mecca and 3 respondents said they don't see Copenhagen as a mecca of architecture at all.

Stephanie, Vesna and Mario said that they believe Copenhagen is already an architectural mecca. Stephanie explained that it is because the city has a lot to offer on that account, Vesna said it is because of the diversity of styles, while Mario added that Copenhagen is currently mecca of old architecture but all three of them agreed that Copenhagen has a future or architecture mecca with modern architecture and more such buildings.

Irina, Robert, Elias and Jordi mention they see Copenhagen as a future architectural mecca. Irina and Elias said they don't think of Copenhagen as mecca of architecture at the moment but that with progress of modern architecture it has a bright future. Robert's answer was a bit different since he said that it has a future of mecca because of diversity of architectural styles. Jordi said something interesting: *I think it is an undiscovered mecca of architecture. But it definitely has a future of architecture mecca since there are more and more modern buildings that draw attention. Combined with old architecture the city will have a strong base to be an architecture mecca.*

Elena, Lea and Biljana said they don't see Copenhagen as architectural mecca now or ever. They added that it might have a future as such with modern architecture but, speaking in general since they don't see Copenhagen from that perspective.



Would you recommend Copenhagen as architecture tourism destination?

Within this question respondents were asked to use a scale from 1 to 10 (refer to interview guide in the Appendix) in order to understand the level of their own impression as a reason to recommend Copenhagen or not.

All respondents replied they would recommend Copenhagen as an architecture tourism destination, while also grading was very similar. 6 respondents graded their recommendation with 10, 1 respondent graded it with 9, 2 respondents gave a grade 8, and one respondent gave a grade 7.

Irina, Vesna and Biljana said they would definitively recommend Copenhagen as a destination for architecture tourism because of diversity of styles and attractiveness. Irina said that every experience is valuable and people should travel and see it for themselves. Robert and Jordi said they are already recommending where Robert recommends because of beautiful buildings and Jordi because of *wonderful learning and cultural experience*. This is what Mario said: *Not only would I recommend Copenhagen for architecture tourism, but I would suggest it as a mandatory destination of architecture tourism. [...] It is worth of attention without a doubt*. These responded gave a grade 10.

Stephanie said she would definitively recommend but gave the grade 9 because she thinks Copenhagen has more to offer than architecture. Here is a part of her answer: *Variety of European styles in one city is what visitors can see here. Even in the movie Sex and the City 2 they mention a person who is a Danish Architect [...] Sometimes in movies when they introduce and architect they say he is a Danish architect, to make him cool. [...] and I'm not surprised after all I have seen in Copenhagen*.

Elena said every experience is valuable and that Copenhagen might be architecturally interesting. Lea said she would recommend Copenhagen because people who are interested in architecture have what to see, but it is not the only attraction in the city. Both of them graded their recommendation with 8.

Elias said he would recommend but as it is not the first thing he would recommend about Copenhagen, he gives the grade 7.

4.1.2 Contribution of architecture to tourists' experience



How would you describe your perception about architecture in Copenhagen before and after your visit?

This question was aimed at seeing how architecture has influenced the change in respondents' perception in case of Copenhagen:

Perception of the respondents before their visit to Copenhagen has some similarities as well as differences.

Stephanie and Elena didn't know anything about the city before their first trip to Copenhagen. Stephanie explained that she didn't have any expectations about Copenhagen architecturally: I did not even think about its architecture. My association of Copenhagen was beer, Danish pastry and blond Scandinavians. Elena on the other hand did have some architectural perception as she mentioned she thought she would see nice small houses with City Hall at a main square.

Both Vesna and Jordi perceived architecture of Copenhagen to consist of colorful houses. Vesna answered she expected to see colorful houses that remind her of H. C. Andersen stories while adding she also expected to see a lot of history depicted in architecture. Jordi added that beside colorful houses he expected to see an old city.

On the opposite side, Mario and Robert expected to see modern city with new buildings while admitting they did not have much expectation about architecture in Copenhagen. Biljana also had no expectations about architecture explaining that her attitude is due to unplanned visit to Copenhagen, whereas she had no time to search for information about the city.

Elias and Lea both searched for information about Copenhagen which influenced on their perception. Elias expected to see typical European city with a lot of historical buildings while Lea expected to see both old and new architecture. She added she was curious to see how old and new are combined since she was skeptic and thought she will be disappointed when she visits Copenhagen.

Irina had different perception, expecting to see churches with high bell towers.

After their visit respondents had changed their opinion where 8 of them had positive opinion and 2 of them were disappointed. Stephanie said she was impressed by interesting modern buildings describing it to be innovative and of cutting edge. Vesna said she liked combination and contrast of old and new architecture, while Mario was of similar opinion as Vesna, adding he was

surprised that he saw so many historical buildings. Biljana explained her positive perception change with architecture of Copenhagen being different from other cities she has visited, describing it as unusual, like from a fairytale and that it stands out in her memory. Robert said he liked that city cherishes its historical spirit which is evident through architecture which is why he his opinion changed for better. Elias also noticed architecture showing history of the city while also saying that buildings with different colors make Copenhagen look more vibrant. Jordi said he saw what he expected to see but that he also saw more than he expected which is why his expectations were exceeded. Lea's perception of architecture in Copenhagen had changed for better: I thought old and new [architecture] cannot fit together but in most cases I think in Copenhagen it works great. That made quite a positive impression on me.

Elena and Irina were of opposite opinion. Elena said she thinks buildings look grey and dull while admitting that what might have influenced her perception is that all three times she has been to Copenhagen the weather was bad which also had influence on her mood. Irina said she was disappointed because old architecture is nothing spectacular.



Which building/s would you describe as main landmark/s of Copenhagen and why?

Stephanie said the main landmark for her is Nyhavn because every time she returns to the city she has a feeling it is a representative of the city: *its colorful houses are very appealing to look at and also they represent the history of the city, as being a port city.* Elena thinks that Nyhavn is a main landmark and she explains she would like Copenhagen much more if the whole city would look more like Nyhavn. Vesna also answered that main landmark for her is Nyhavn and those type of houses that can be seen throughout the city center because they represent the old spirit of Copenhagen.

Mario, Elias and Lea named Amalienborg, Rosenborg and Christiansborg as main landmarks because it is unusual and unique to have three palaces in a small area, while Lea also explained her reason is that 3 palaces are telling a story about the history of the city and nation.

Jordi is of different opinion. He thinks Copenhagen has many landmarks. He mentioned Nyhavn, Amalienborg, Rosenborg and Christiansborg as main representatives of the past and Royal Opera House, Black Diamond and Royal Playhouse as main representatives of present and future Copenhagen.

For Biljana, main landmarks are Round Tower and Rosenborg because they stand out as different from anything she has experienced before.

For Robert main landmark is Christiansborg because it made a strong impression on him and because it is also historically important.

Irina answered that main landmarks of Copenhagen for her are Black Diamond and Royal Opera House, because she likes modern architecture and these are the most famous modern buildings in Copenhagen. She also said: *I noticed the trend in Scandinavian countries of building new Opera Houses and presenting them as main landmarks, which is maybe why I feel that Royal Opera and Black Diamond are landmarks of Copenhagen.*



Please explain your general impression of old and new architecture in Copenhagen.

Respondents were asked to grade their impression on a scale from 1 to 10 (please refer to interview guide in Appendix) only to understand the level of their impression.

Vesna, Biljana and Lea graded their impression with old architecture in Copenhagen with 10. Vesna said she was fascinated by old architecture which was unexpectedly different. Biljana explained she liked the appearance of old architecture and that she has never seen such architectural solutions before which stands out. Lea said old architecture in Copenhagen is different from where she comes from, she liked the facades and there was no building she saw and disliked.

Mario, Robert, Elias and Jordi graded their impression with 9. Mario explained it is surprisingly beautiful in its simplicity, Robert and Jordi said they were able to perceive historical background of the city from its old architecture, while Elias said he was impressed with modest styles and a lot of colorful buildings that made the city more interesting.

Stephanie gave 7 to old architecture considering it to be quite high grade because she does think old architecture is different and unique but she is fonder of modern architecture.

Elena and Irina both say old architecture is nice but nothing impressive as they have seen cities with old architecture they liked more. Therefore, their grade was 6.

Irina and Jordi graded their impression with modern architecture in Copenhagen with 10. Irina said she noticed tendency toward modern architecture in Copenhagen explaining that what she saw in the city was eccentric and showed another side of Copenhagen. Jordi did not expect to see

modern buildings in Copenhagen and that it was a big surprise for him. He described it as bright, unique, bold and innovative while adding he really enjoyed it.

Stephanie gave a grade 9 to her impression of modern architecture. She said she was very impressed but that the grade is not 10 only because there are not that many modern buildings in her opinion as a person from a city with a lot of modern architecture.

Elena and Mario graded their impression of modern architecture with 8. Elena said she was very impressed but not all modern buildings are architectural masterpieces. Here is how Mario explained his opinion: *New architecture shows the city's welfare and style. It is fashionably simple, yet futuristic and daring. I cannot explain it, it is a feeling. I would give it a strong 8 because I have not seen a lot of modern buildings so I cannot be rational in giving it a grade. But I consider 8 to be high grade and I liked what I've seen.*

Elias and Lea graded their impression of modern architecture with 7. Both of them explained they are not interested in modern architecture and that in Copenhagen generally modern architecture is nice while there were some buildings they disliked. Lea elaborated she sees grade 7 to be high as she is not interested in modern architecture but she did generally liked it in Copenhagen.

Vesna gave the grade 6 to her impression of modern architecture as she is not interested in it but she did like something about it in Copenhagen which is why the grade is not lower.

Biljana and Robert did not give any grades because they didn't see any modern buildings explaining they simply ignore modern architecture and are not interested in it at all.



How would you describe architectural styles in Copenhagen?

Irina, Mario, Elias, Jordi and Lea had similar description of architectural styles in Copenhagen. It made an impression on them that there are many different architectural styles from different historical periods which are combined together very well. Some of them mentioned how history and present are reflected in architecture of the city. Irina added she noticed there is a tendency toward modern architecture in Copenhagen which she liked. Mario had an interesting description of his own impression: *In one moment I find myself in classy future, in the next one I am in a fairytale or in Harry Potter movie and in another moment I walk through history. To me, that is so different from where I come from.* Jordi's explanation also revealed interesting perception: *Copenhagen is like an architectural guidebook. So many styles combined together. [...] The tricky part is it is all combined so well that it makes me wonder how they did that.*

Robert explained that architecture styles in Copenhagen are a proof that something simple and elegant can be beautiful.

Biljana had lively description: *I have a feeling they [locals] were playing with different styles, as if children were creators. It is [architecture] like from a fairy tale.*

Vesna described architectural styles as cheerful, vivacious and classy. She added she was fascinated with combination of old and modern styles while she also noticed there were architectural sites as separate units which she hadn't seen anywhere else.

Stephanie said architecture was iconic, full of surprise, ahead of its time and she enjoyed watching it.

Elena had different description – depressive and nothing spectacular. She said bad weather during her visits in Copenhagen influenced her mood which also might have influenced her perception about architecture.



Have you participated in architectural tours or any other tours during your stay in Copenhagen and are you satisfied with information about architecture?

None of the respondents have participated in architecture tours, but all except 2 respondents said they would like to take part in architecture tours if they are comprehensive for laypeople.

Stephanie, Irina and Lea have participated in channel tours while Lea has also participated in a bus tour. All three respondents said they learned a lot about architecture for beginning, among learning about other attractions of the city. Stephanie and Lea are satisfied with amount of information about architecture, while Irina is interested in learning more.

Jordi took part in a bus tour. He said he got insight in architectural styles which was enough for him for a beginning and he is ready to learn more.

Elena, Vesna, Biljana Mario, Robert and Elias did not participate in any city tours. Elena, Vesna, Mario and Robert would like to participate in any tours stating that they would, among other things, learn more about the architecture of Copenhagen. Elena said participating in city tours might improve her opinion about Copenhagen. Vesna said she obtained some information about architecture from tourist brochures and being relatively satisfied with what she learned she would like to know more. Biljana and Elias said they do not like being part of tour groups and that they feel more comfortable when they learn about architecture or other attractions before the trip and on site by themselves.

4.2 Discussion on empirical findings

In this chapter, author of the thesis will analyze results of empirical findings through theoretical background presented in earlier chapters. In respondents' answers certain similarities and patterns were noticed which will be grouped in this chapter. Also some gaps were found which will be discussed and argued.

4.2.1 Visual aspect of architecture

As presented in theoretical background in chapter 3, author will connect findings with theory (see page 20) and discuss what fits the theory and where are the missing links. Firstly, author will discuss respondents' motives for visiting architectural sites and connect to four attractors proposed in Ockman and Fausto (2005).

Authentic. In Ockman and Fausto (2005) it was suggested that one of the motives which draws tourists to architectural sites is their authenticity, but the term is not specifically defined. On the other hand in Vannini and Williams (2009) authenticity was generally defined as something genuine, real and not an imitation (see page 22). Some answers respondents gave about what attracted them to certain buildings in Copenhagen can fit in context of authentic. One respondent answered directly *it felt authentic*, which was a genuine experience specific for that particular place. What is specific about this motivator is that sometimes respondents might feel architectural site as authentic but they do not say it directly, while trying to explain the feeling they had or the reason they wanted to experience a building or a site. Some respondents mentioned that architecture represents *spirit of the city* which is why they were attracted to it. This can mean that the atmosphere in the city might be authentic for that city which respondents feel but cannot explain. Frequently mentioned was that respondent was attracted to a site or a building because it is a *representative of the city*. The question about landmarks (see Appendix) reflects that point which was also mentioned throughout interviews. Some respondents mentioned *uniqueness* as what attracted them to a site, but sometimes respondents cannot clearly express what they mean, which is why the question is if what actually attracted them is authenticity of a site. As previously mentioned, respondents used adjectives to explain what attracted them, such as *elegant, simple,*

cheerful, vivacious, classy, etc. But this does not prove that what attracted them was authenticity of a site, but rather its visual appearance.

The problem with this attracting factor is that it is not clearly defined and it is hardly understood. It cannot be definitively concluded that what respondents wanted to see is authentic architectural site. There are some indicators that authentic site attracts and motivates respondents to see it, but the whole concept is too vague and undefined therefore it is a subject of further debate.

Exotic. It is quite individual what is exotic and what is not, but some points were frequently and repeatedly mentioned by most respondents that can fit within the concept of exotic. Firstly noticed was that most respondents described their attraction to an architectural site as being *different*. There were three tendencies noticed: different undefined, different from home city/country and different from other cities visited. When respondents mentioned indefinitely that architecture or a building was different, he or she did not say specifically why they think it is different but they stated that was what attracted them. On the other hand, another two tendencies were specific, where respondents were interested to see a site that is different from what they have in their home cities/countries and where respondents answered that it is different from other cities they have visited.

When respondents said an architectural site is *unusual* it meant both that they were attracted to it because of that as well as repulsed by it. In case when it was attractive it was connected to *never seen before*. It was noticed that when respondents' answered they have never seen such a building or a site before it was more interesting and appealing to them, which in turn made it attractive to them. What most respondents noticed, and what can be described as exotic, is contrast of old and new architecture in Copenhagen, which was described as specific for Copenhagen and stood out in their memory. That contrast was also described as both, *never seen before* and *unusual*, but it was what responded pointed out as attractive.

Another two concepts were mentioned as reasons for buildings being attractive, *eccentric* and *futuristic*. In both cases it was explained as something that is not part of everyday environment, and as such can be noted as exotic.

In case of this attraction factor, it can be said that respondents do notice elements of architecture that they find exotic from their point of view, which is attraction that motivates them to visit

those sights. But since only 10 respondents were interviewed, we cannot say definitely that exotic is attractive, but rather that exotic can be attractive.

Escapist. Respondents had very interesting answers which can fit quite well within the concept of escapism as explained in theoretical part of the thesis (see page 22). What was mentioned most of the time is that being present at a certain location with historical architectural sites *pulls back to the past*. Respondents with this answer described their feelings that were evoked by observing the buildings and their surroundings as being able to imagine past times, while some respondents even specifically mentioned they enjoyed that feeling. Another escapist context was mentioned as *pushing to the future*. Generally, respondents who mentioned this described their experience with modern architecture in Copenhagen as giving them a glance into the future. Since past was a reality and future is still not reality, this can be explained as a form of escapism that respondents experienced.

Another point was made about architecture in Copenhagen in general or about a specific architectural site in the city - *looking like from a fairytale*. It can be described as unreal, or a part of another reality which can mean it is also escapist. Respondents had different explanations, depending on the question, but in general it was described as reminder of stories or movies.

Here again author cannot draw definite conclusions whether escapist is attraction which motivates people to travel to places with architectural sites that can enable them to escape from their reality. Only thing that can be implied is that, *back to the past*, *trip to future* and *trip to world of fantasy* are possibilities which architecture can visually provide for its visitors.

Spectacular. This attracting factor is quite difficult to define, as explained in theoretical part (page 22). It can also be very individual what one finds spectacular or not. Nevertheless, respondents did mention points that can be described as spectacular for them. Some respondents mentioned they were *fascinated* by a building or architectural site while others said a building made a *strong impression* on them which might be put under the concept of spectacular. Some respondents used words such as *attractive* and *beautiful* to describe why they were attracted to architecture or a specific building, while others were more convincing in terms of spectacular, pointing out architecture or a specific building were *intriguing* and *surprising* which made those architectural sites *stand out*, from respondents point of view.

However, spectacular can be a very strong word to describe architecture, in general. There is no precise explanation to why in Ockman and Fausto (2005) spectacular was pointed as one of the attractors that motivate people to travel for architecture. The only conclusion that author can make is that architecture that fascinates tourist from their own perspective can be also one of the attractions that can motivate them to visit a place with such architecture.

Related to visual experience are motives for visiting cultural heritage sites (see pages 22 and 23) proposed by Poria, Butler and Airey (2011) and Chen (in Timothy and Boyd, 2003). Answers given by respondents are also fitting into these groups of motives.

Emotional experience. Respondents who had emotional implications with architecture in Copenhagen described how they *felt* when they experienced a building or architectural site. Also, when visually experiencing architecture some respondents got *drawn to the past* or *pushed to the future* while others described the experience as if it was *from a fairytale*. All those reasons were also previously mentioned within escapism as attracting factor, because those feelings were caused by visual encounter with architecture site or a specific building.

Recreational experience. Respondents experienced architecture in Copenhagen visually, where some of them had different explanations. Frequently mentioned was *enjoying beauty*, liking the *appearance of buildings*, *visiting main architectural sites*, etc. which is all a form of sightseeing as described in theoretical part of the thesis, which according to Poria, Butler and Airey (2011) fits under recreational experience. It can also be said that attractors mentioned under authentic, exotic and spectacular can fit within the frame of recreational experience.

Emotional and recreational experience are both related to what Chen (in Timothy and Boyd, 2003) defined as *other more personal motives* (see page 22)

4.2.2 Learning aspect of architecture

One link here is clearly missing. Respondents' answers indicated that in case of Copenhagen they were also interested to learn about architecture, specific buildings, historical background and even architects. Visual experience was clearly important to all respondents but most of them also expressed desire for knowledge which will be discussed in this part of the chapter.

Poria, Butler and Airey (2011) and Chen (in Timothy and Boyd, 2003) each defined one more group of motives that is missing in Ockman and Fausto (2005) – *learning history / pursuit of knowledge*.

Learning history / pursuit of knowledge. When respondents were asked *what they can gain from architecture as visitors* answers included that architecture represents history, culture, tradition and art of a place. It was indicated that is what it can be learned through architecture. Some questions showed couple of tendencies in gaining knowledge. Couple of respondents already began reading about architecture before their visit to Copenhagen, others were learning during the visit on their own or on city tours, while most of them were interested to expand their knowledge after visit. Most of respondents emphasized they are not interested in learning about technical aspect of architecture, and half of the respondents said they are interested to know more about historical, cultural, and arts background of architecture in Copenhagen. One of the respondents said that *architecture is wonderful learning and cultural experience*, other said architecture in Copenhagen was *like a history lesson*, while another respondent said she likes the idea of *knowing about architects*. How much respondents are willing to learn varies from *interesting facts* to *understanding architectural styles and history*.

All respondents have higher educational level which also influenced on their interest in learning about architecture.

4.2.3 Concluding discussion on empirical findings

To answer a research question aim of the thesis was set with two more questions:



What is the importance of architecture in tourism from visitors' perspective?



In what way can architecture contribute to tourists' experience?

Here the author of the thesis will connect the results and the analysis in order to come to a conclusion and describe how the research question was answered.

The level of importance of architecture to tourist experience varied from medium to high, depending on the question and a respondent. In case of Copenhagen, respondents' answers showed two main aspects of architecture which indicated the importance of architecture in

tourism – visual and learning experience, which can also contribute to overall tourists' experience.

Visual experience mainly refers to experiencing and observing architectural site or a specific building which respondents described with various adjectives and also familiarizing with local environment. Authentic, exotic, escapist and spectacular as mainly visual attracting factors fit in other personal benefits / emotional experience / recreational experience and are all achieved through visual aspect of architecture in tourism. Most of the respondents expressed their visual experience prior to learning experience.

Learning experience is second aspect that represents importance of architecture in tourism and contribution to tourists'. Three main tendencies were noticed during investigation for this research – learning before the visit to understand more what will be seen at a destination (in this case Copenhagen); learning on site where respondents either familiarized themselves with architecture on city tours or by themselves; and becoming interested to learn after the visit. Learning experience generally included learning about the architectural styles and historical background of architecture, knowing about architects, and learning about local culture through architecture.

Another aspect can be noticed – **tourists' expectations**. According to respondents' answers to various questions but specifically to question 1 (see Appendix), expectations can be exceeded, answered, but also be below expectations. Whether expectations are answered, exceeded or not, they influenced respondents' perspective about the city to a certain degree.

Main architectural contributors to tourism experience however are still visual and learning aspect of architecture, previously described.

According to this research in case of Copenhagen - generally said, 1.) importance of architecture in tourism from visitors' perspective and 2.) contribution of architecture to tourists' experience can be high or low mainly depending on what kind of visual and learning experience can architecture offer.

5. Conclusion

Architecture and tourism have always had a close relationship. As architecture is a part of our everyday environment it is impossible to ignore it, especially if it has historical, cultural and artistic meaning. Early travelers admired wonders of their ancient world, Grand Tour travelers traveled the world for knowledge as well as to see architectural masterpieces, and today tourists became more demanding, traveling for something refreshing and new. Recently tourism faced a new phenomenon – architourism, where tourist travel to see architecture not only as a part of a destination but as a reason to travel. Phenomenon is very new and still under vast research, which is why it was a challenge for author of this thesis to do a research on her own about influence that architecture has on tourists and their tourist experience.

To set the aims of this research was quite a demanding task since theoretical background from the field of architecture and tourism which is needed to support the research is very scarce and in process of development. However, to understand importance of architecture in tourism from visitors' perspective, current findings were enough. The aim of the thesis to study a phenomenon of architecture as an attraction factor in tourism was set in order to answer a research question: *what is the influence of architecture on tourists and their overall tourist experience?* To achieve this aim two more questions were proposed: *What is the importance of architecture in tourism?* and *In what way can architecture contribute to tourists' experience?*

Idea was to understand this phenomenon and answer research questions in case of Copenhagen and its visitors, which was a personal preference of the author. To find out what was the experience of visitors of Copenhagen with architecture and how it contributed to their overall perception of the city, author has interviewed 10 people that have recently visited Copenhagen. All of the respondents were chosen based on their educational level since the more educated people are, better are the chances that cultural and historical aspect of a place, such as architecture, will be more or less important to them.

Questions in the interview guide were created to answer aims of the thesis and therefore the research question. Important to note is that all questions were constructed in a way to make respondents answer about their experience with architecture, what have they noticed and what is important to them regarding architecture. Author expected to find a pattern that would reveal, in

case of Copenhagen, what can generally be influence of architecture on tourists' overall perception of a place.

Starting point was to understand whether architecture is important or not to respondents when they travel, and results have showed that for 8 of them it was important when they are making a decision to travel. All of them said it has an influence on their perception of a place, where 8 respondents said it has a high influence on their perception and 2 respondents did not specify the level of influence. It was clear that for them as tourists, architecture was important, but the question was what kind of influence does architecture have on their tourist perception and experience.

When connecting empirical findings to selected theory about tourist motivation for visiting architectural and heritage sites, the pattern was immediately noticed. According to this research, two main architectural aspects that influence on tourist perception of a place are – visual and learning aspect of architecture. Interesting was that most respondents showed interest in learning about architecture of a destination if they firstly like it visually. One respondent said she likes learning about architecture, but as she did not like architecture of Copenhagen she saw no point in learning about it, while other respondents showed more or less interest.

However, in architourism literature which is made of number of case studies, 4 main attracting factors of architecture were pointed out – authenticity, exotic, escapist and spectacular, described as main aspects that attract tourists to architecture. But the missing link was learning experience. Answering various questions, each respondent showed more or less interest in learning about architecture of Copenhagen, which means that those four attracting factors previously mentioned are more of a visual experience which was proven to be not the only aspect of architecture that respondents recognized.

This research has showed, based on empirical findings, that importance of architecture in tourism from visitors' perspective can be high or low depending on what kind of visual and learning experience architecture of a place can offer to visitors, while architecture can contribute to tourists' experience visually and with gaining knowledge, depending on their expectations. Therefore, architecture can have an influence on tourists' overall experience visually and educationally which answers the research question.

5.1 Contributions and limitations

This research contributed to better understanding on how important can architecture be to tourists' experience. It should be clearer that main importance and contribution of architecture to tourists' experience is learning and visual experience.

Not a lot of researches of this kind have been done, which makes this research a small base for further, wider researches on the topic of architecture in tourism from visitors perspective. It should encourage other interested researchers to accept the challenge and continue the chain of researchers which will eventually lead to better understanding of the architecture tourism phenomenon itself.

Empirical data collected for this research has high volume and is a very good source for further researches on importance of architecture in tourism from tourists' perspective.

Main limitations of this research are lack of literature in the field of architecture tourism and number of interviewed respondents.

Literature that author has used for this thesis is written in the form of case studies, as phenomenon of architecture tourism is quite new. There are no definitions and strong theoretical support which is why author had to approach this topic from perspective of cultural and heritage tourism. Theoretical part with architecture tourism was more descriptive only because all existing literature on the topic was also more descriptive in character. Without closely defining what is architecture tourism, who are architecture tourists and understanding their motives to travel, this research could not go further from where it now stands. Even though author of the thesis did come to answers of a research question and aims, lack of literature limited the span of results. Some answers could not be analyzed because of lack of theoretical support.

Interviewing only 10 respondents cannot guarantee strong arguments but can rather create a pilot research with guidelines for a wider research with higher number of respondents. Most interviewees are of a similar age which also might influence on results to a certain degree.

Also, this was a research based on one city which may have influenced and limited the results, but on the other hand it was more focused and easier for respondents to answer based on one city and one case instead of answering broadly and about influence of architecture on their tourist experience in general.

Author's recommendation for further research project related to this thesis is to do a wider research with more respondents about motivation of people visiting architectural sites, which can be one step closer in defining architecture tourists. Since architecture tourism is a new phenomenon, there are a lot of areas that have to be researched. Therefore every new research, as well as this one, is valuable in understanding this phenomenon.

5.2 Personal reflection

Collecting empirical data for this research was a very interesting and inspiring process. I did not expect that most of my respondents will be very observant toward architecture. Perceiving that, I realized how important it is that more researches are done about this topic. It was interesting to understand that most respondents think about architecture of places they visit which made interviewing much easier. Understanding their opinions and how they explained them was a very valuable aspect of this research because it helped me expand my own views on architecture as well as tourism experiences.

During results presentation I have noticed certain similarities in respondents' answers which I was able to group and put under certain theoretical framework. But analyzing results was the harder part. I was very limited with the amount of literature which made the job of fitting findings into theory harder than I expected. It was truly a challenge which I accepted because I found myself in a role of a student researcher working within the area of new phenomenon and I am honored to give my small but significant contribution with this research.

6. Selected bibliography

Literature:

1. Bailey, D. K. (1994) *Methods of social research*. 4th Edition. The Free Press. 588pp
2. Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press. 540pp
3. Datz, C. and Kullmann C. (2005) *Copenhagen: Architecture and Design*. Kempen :teNeues. 191pp
4. Faber, T. (1978) *History of Danish Architecture*. Det Danske Selskab. 316pp
5. Hall, M. and Cooper, C. (2008) *Contemporary Tourism: An International Approach*. Butterworth-Heinemann/Elsevier. 377pp
6. Hudman, L. and Jackson R. (2002) *Geography of Travel and Tourism*. 4rd edition. Delmar Publishers. 541pp
7. Ingels, B. (2009) *Yes is more : an archicomic on architectural evolution*. Taschen, 397p. Ed.
8. Ivanović, M. (2008) *Cultural Tourism*. Juta & Company, Ltd. 326pp
9. Jafari, J. (2000) *Encyclopedia of Tourism*. Routledge. 683pp. Ed.
10. Lasansky, M. and McLaren, B. (2004) *Architecture and Tourism: Perception, Performance and Place*. Berg Publishers. 275pp
11. Lind, O. and Lund, A. (2005) *Copenhagen Architecture Guide*. Arkitektens forlag. 456pp

12. May, T. (1997) *Social research, issues, methods and process*. 2nd edition. Open University Press. 227pp
13. McKercher, B. and Du Cros, H. (2002) *Cultural Tourism: The Partnership Between Tourism and Cultural Heritage Management*. The Haworth Hospitality Press. 262pp
14. Morgan, M., Lugosi, P. and Ritchie, J.R. B. (2010) *The Tourism and Leisure Experience: Consumer and Managerial Perspectives*. Channel View Publications. 237pp. Ed.
15. Ockman, J. and Frausto, S. (2005) *Architourism: Authentic, Escapist, Exotic, Spectacular*. Prestel. 191pp. Ed.
16. Silverman, D. (2011) *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*. 3rd edition. Sage. 450pp
17. Stensgaard, P. (2002) *Copenhagen: People and Places*. Gyldendal. 189pp
18. Theobald, W. (2005) *Global Tourism*. 3rd edition. Butterworth-Heinemann. 561pp. Ed.
19. Timothy, J. D. and Boyd W. S. (2003) *Heritage Tourism*. Pearson Education. 327pp
20. Tuan, Y. (2000) *Escapism*. JHU Press. 264pp.
21. Vannini, P. and Williams, P. (2009) *Authenticity in culture, self, and society*. Ashgate Publishing Limited. 283pp. Ed.

Articles:

1. Buncl, T. (2010) Destination Brand Architecture: Combined Strength or Constrained Image? *Tourism Insights Website*

2. Cambie, S. (2009) Iconic Buildings and Tourism: Where to next? *Tourism Insights Website*
3. Chang, T. C. (2008) Bungalows, Mansions and Shophouses: Encounters in Architourism. *Geoforum*, Vol. 41: 963-971
4. Gruen., P. (2006) Architectural Tourism: More Complexity Than Meets the Gaze. *H-Urban*
5. Jelinek, R. (2008) Tourismus und Architektur. *Ober Oesterreich Tourismus Website*
6. McIntosh, J. A. (1999) Into the Tourist's Mind: Understanding the Value of the Heritage Experience. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol. 8: 41-64
7. Pla'tou (2007) Architektur macht Gäste: über den Zusammenhang zwischen Architektur und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Tourismus. *Pla'tou Website*
8. Poria, Y., Butler, R. and Airey, D. (2004) Links Between Tourists, Heritage and Reasons for Visiting Heritage Sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol. 43: 19-28

Web pages

1. Ober Oesterreich Tourismus (2011) <http://www.oberoesterreich-tourismus.at/> (26.03.2011)
2. Pla'tou (2011) <http://www.platou.at/> (25.03.2011)
3. Points of View by Architeam (2011) <http://www.architravel.com> (12.05.2011)
4. Tourism Insights (2011) <http://www.insights.org.uk> (25.03.2011)
5. Visit Copenhagen (2011) <http://www.visitcopenhagen.com/> (24.03.2011)

Appendix

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name:

Age:

Gender:

Education:

Country of origin:

General Questions:

- 1. How important is architectural aspect of a place to you when you make a decision to visit a destination?**
 - a. What does architecture tell you and what can you get from it?
 - b. How much influence does architecture have on your perception of a place?

Questions about architecture in Copenhagen:

- 1. How would you describe your perceptions about architecture in Copenhagen before and after your visit? Has your opinion changed?**
- 2. Please name the architectural site that you knew of before your visit that you wanted to see (if there is one), and why did it attract you?**
- 3. Which building or buildings would you describe as main landmark/s of Copenhagen and why? Is it the one that associates you of Copenhagen?**
- 4. Please explain your general impression of old and new architecture in Copenhagen?**
(on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is „a very bad impression“ and 10 is „highly rated impression“)
- 5. How would you describe the architectural styles in Copenhagen? How would you elaborate on your opinion?**

6. **Have you participated in architectural tours or any other tours during your stay in Copenhagen?** (if no, would you like to?) Are you satisfied with information you received about architecture?
7. **Are you familiar with some Danish or foreign architects that have worked in Copenhagen, and how did you find out about them?**
8. **How much are you willing to explore about architecture in Copenhagen?** (question does not refer to professional understanding of architecture, but to educational and cultural experiences and perceptions)
9. **In your opinion, is Copenhagen architectural mecca or does it have a future of architectural mecca?** How would you elaborate your opinion?
10. **Would you recommend Copenhagen as an architecture tourism destination?** (on a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 stands for “absolutely not” and 10 stands for “yes, without a doubt”)

Interview notes are of too large volume to be presented in the Appendix, therefore are available on request.