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Introduction
Tourist attractions have shaped the development of urban tourist cities since the earliest developments in the field of tourism. The history of tourist attractions is captured in ancient archaeological sites, which are known for their economic contribution to modern-day cities. Tourist attractions stimulate the interest and curiosity of travellers and are often highlighted as “must-see” or “bucket-list” experiences. The aim of this chapter is to outline current perspectives on tourist attractions in terms of how they shape urban destination development, and to do so specifically through the lens of business tourists. We explore how historical and intellectual developments associated with tourist attractions have contributed (and continue to contribute) to the development of urban tourism destinations. An outline is given of the different types of tourist attractions and impacts, to support the main claims and developmental stages. Four factors are highlighted here, namely: (i) the range of tourist attractions, (ii) security at those attractions, (iii) their authenticity and (iv) the location of the tourist’s accommodation. These factors do not only impact people’s desires to visit tourist attractions, but have also proven to be crucial elements of destination attractiveness (Dimitrov, Stankova, Vasenska & Uzunova, 2017; Lee & Huang, 2014; Owusu-Frimpong, Nwankwo, Blankson & Taranidis, 2013) and destination competitiveness, except for the location of the tourist’s accommodation, (Bianchi, 2018). In addition, these factors impact leisure and bleisure experiences at a destination (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2019). This is clarified by aligning those factors with the principal contributions of, and major criticisms associated with, the development of tourist attractions at urban destinations. The chapter concludes with four proposals outlining how future research on tourist attractions can continue to spur sustainable development at urban tourism destinations.

Historical and intellectual developments related to tourist attractions
The history of tourist attractions can be traced from Egypt, where archaeologists found examples of visitors’ graffiti dating to 1244 BC, carved in the pyramid of Giza (Weaver & Lawton, 2009). It is nonetheless challenging to accurately trace the history of tourist attractions, mainly due to: (i) difficulties in determining whether a site was a tourist attraction during its early beginnings and (ii) the complexities presented by determining the purpose behind a visit to the site
(Swarbrooke, 1995). Figure 21.1 illustrates the historical development of tourist attractions by highlighting how visits to certain sites were the sole prerogative of specific elites/groups and determining the purpose of their visits.

From Figure 21.1, it is apparent that from the “earliest beginnings” until “the Renaissance”, visits to religious shrines and cultural sites were activities deemed exclusive to specific elites or groups. The resourceful Greeks and Romans utilised their resources to visit architectural and artistic sites during the period described as the “earliest beginnings” (Lubbe, 2003). Visits to religious shrines were a mandatory activity solely for pilgrims who went on pilgrimages during the “Medieval period” (Swarbrooke, 1995). “The Renaissance” elite comprised traders who travelled for the purpose of establishing trade routes, but ultimately ended up developing a desire to learn about other cultures and partake of some sightseeing in the process (Cook, Yale & Marqua, 2010). As Figure 21.1 indicates, in the “17th and 18th centuries”, the popularity of health-related benefits associated with spas and beaches meant that, for the majority of people, leisure was not their main motivation for visiting such sites. Visiting specific locations for leisure purposes was a luxury enjoyed only by the Greeks, Romans and “Renaissance” elite.

From the nineteenth century onwards, that reality was changed due to the broadening of the range of sites that could be visited for leisure purposes (Swarbrooke, 1995). This was a result of, among others, people of the nineteenth century recognising mountains as being ideally suited to mountaineering, and spas and beaches as ideal for leisure, with events gaining popularity in the twentieth century (Swarbrooke, 1995). The broadening of the range of sites that could be visited for leisure purposes grew significantly after World War II and resulted in recognition of the economic benefits of tourism (see Figure 21.1). Notably, prior to this realisation, this range of sites could have been referred to as “visitor attractions” as they seemed to attract visitors, rather than specifically tourists (Rosendahl, 2009; Swarbrooke, 2002). The evident economic benefits which tourism yielded post–World War II through to the millennium, spurred efforts to formulate a definition for a tourist attraction that would encapsulate a wide variety of sites/activities which lure visitors (see Lawton, 2005; Rosendahl, 2009; Weidenfeld, Butler & Williams, 2010). This posed a challenge, because “due to the complexity and diversity of the attractions sector, there is no accepted definition which embraces all attractions” (Swarbrooke, 2002: 4). According to Weidenfeld et al. (2010: 2), a tourist attraction is “a sole component, geographical area or independent locality which, based on a single primary element, is considered an attraction by tourists or visitors”. Alternatively, tourist attractions can be referred to as “features of a destination which influence a tourist’s tourism activities at the destination and the motivation of potential tourists” (Middleton & Clarke, 2001: 349). Tourist attractions include a destination’s natural or man-made attributes that attract tourists (Lawton, 2005). These definitions are consistent with Wall’s (1997) notion that a tourist attraction has three characteristics, namely a place/location, an attractive image and tourists who frequent it.

Tourist attractions form a prominent sector of the tourism industry – even more so in recent years (Amir, Osman, Bachok & Ibrahim, 2015b; Deloitte, 2018; Human Sciences Research Council for South African Tourism and Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, 2001 (hereafter HSRC); Middleton & Clark, 2001). Around the early 2000s, tourists’ spending on tourist attractions was the fourth highest component of tourism expenditure (Amir et al., 2015b; HSRC, 2001) – and this has since increased to become the third largest component (Deloitte, 2018). It therefore should come as no surprise that tourism research highlights tourist attractions as one of the significant features motivating tourists to visit a destination (Hieda, 2015; Lepp & Gibson, 2011; Lo & Qu, 2014; Tanford, Montgomery & Nelson, 2012). In fact, tourism-related research acknowledges the availability of tourist attractions as a positive factor in contributing to a destination’s image (Jalivand, Samiei, Dini & Manzari, 2012; Ramkissoon,
**Earliest beginnings (between 2000BC and AD500)**
Architectural and artistic sites, i.e. pyramids of Giza, stimulated the Greeks’ and Romans’ visits

**The Medieval period**
Pilgrimages/pilgrims’ visits to religious shrines resulted in the growth of religion-based tourism

**The Renaissance (14th to 16th centuries)**
Visiting culture- and nature-based sites appeared to be an exclusive activity for the Renaissance elite

**17th and 18th centuries**
Spas and beaches became popular. The health benefits associated with mineral waters stimulated visits to mineral spas. The health benefits associated with seawater stimulated visits to beaches

**19th century**
Bathing grew from being a health-related activity to a leisure activity. Mountains were recognised for skiing and mountaineering. Casinos were established and broadened the scope of leisure activities

**20th century**
Events became popular during this era

**Post-World War II**
The significant growth in the variety of tourist attractions resulted in tourism being recognised for its economic role

*Figure 21.1* History of tourist attractions.
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Uysal & Brown, 2011). In this regard, Beppu City in Japan (Hieda, 2015), Cape Town (City of Cape Town, 2013), Hong Kong (Lo & Qu, 2014), Macau (McCartney, 2008; Wan, 2011) and Mauritius (Ramkissoon et al., 2011) are among the destinations that regard the availability of tourist attractions as a pull factor for tourists.

**Major claims and developments**

In this section, the major claims and developments relating to tourist attractions are discussed in the context of the types of attractions and the impact these have on the destination.

**Types of tourist attractions**

Existing definitions (see above) permit almost anything to be deemed a tourist attraction. These definitions are consistent with Lew’s (1987) view that tourist attractions include both sites/facilities and services. The classification of tourist attractions received particular attention from the 1980s, when destinations aimed to pinpoint and organise their portfolios of tourist attractions (Kušen, 2010). This was due to the responsible entities at those destinations realising the importance of tourist attractions to tourism (Lew, 1987). Even now, this much is clear: an absence of tourist attractions at a specific location results in an absence of tourists and thus there is no tourism to speak of (Ngwira & Kankhuni, 2018). Lew (1987) was among the first scholars who made an effort to classify tourist attractions, arguing that three categories exist, from an ideographic, cognitive and organisational perspective. According to Lew (1987), the ideographic perspective focuses on the unique elements of a tourist attraction; the cognitive pertains to tourists’ experiences at such an attraction, and the organisational concerns the location, capacity and temporary/permanent nature of said attraction. Lew’s (1987) classification was, however, a response to the need to establish tourist attraction categories to suit particular research orientations: the cognitive perspective serves studies which are oriented towards desired experiences, the idiographic aids studies oriented towards distinguishing between nature, nature–human and human-based tourist attractions, and the organisational serves studies which are oriented towards the attraction’s location, capacity and temporary/permanent nature.

Following Lew (1987), Swarbrooke (1995) introduced the following four types of tourist attractions:

- Natural, i.e. wildlife;
- Man-made, but not originally designed primarily to attract visitors, e.g. churches;
- Man-made and purpose-built to attract tourists, e.g. museums; and
- Special events, e.g. festivals.

In addition to these four types, tourism-related facilities such as renowned restaurants and accommodation establishments can be regarded as tourist attractions (Swarbrooke, 1995). Swarbrooke’s (1995) typology can be linked to Lew’s (1987) idiographic perspective/category, which distinguishes tourist attractions on the basis of whether they are natural, combine natural and human elements or mainly comprise a human element. Special events can be linked to Lew’s (1987) organisational perspective/category, which distinguishes tourist attractions on the basis of, among others, whether they are temporary or permanent. Unlike Lew’s (1987) classification, which aligns tourist attractions with diverse research orientations, Swarbrooke’s (1995) typology is oriented towards the management of those attractions.
Taking into account Lew’s (1987) classification and Swarbrooke’s (1995) typology, Wall (1997) introduced a rather unique classification that is limited to tourist attractions whose economic potential and vulnerability due to excessive use are of concern. Wall (1997) suggests that these attractions be categorised – based on their physical attributes – into the following three types:

- Point, which refers to tourist attractions that require a small location/area, i.e. waterfalls, to be visited by a significant number of individuals;
- Linear, which refers to tourist attractions such as trails, rivers and coastlines;
- Areas, which refer to places such as parks which are attractive to many and have the capacity to attract even more people.

Of the three approaches discussed here, Lew’s (1987) idiographic and organisational perspective/categories and Swarbrooke’s (1995) typology in particular are endorsed by a number of scholars (Deng, King & Bauer, 2002; Kušen, 2010; Pearce & Benkendorff, 2006). Based on physical characteristics, Deng et al. (2002) highlight waterways, scenery and wildlife as categories resorting under natural tourist attractions. Similarly, Kušen’s (2010) list of 16 categories used for managing the functionality of tourist attractions, includes flora, spas, trails and events. Pearce and Benkendorff’s (2006) classification resulted in 18 categories of various types of tourist attractions, which include casinos, farms, theme parks and museums.

**Impact of tourist attractions on the destination**

Tourists’ motivation for visiting a specific destination is likely to include reasons such as the desire to visit its tourist attractions (Bar-Kołelis & Wiskulski, 2012; Reisinger, Mavondo & Crotts, 2009; Tanford et al., 2012; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2012). Notably, tourists from different cultural backgrounds prefer different tourist attractions (Reisinger et al., 2009). This is consistent with Bar-Kołelis and Wiskulski’s (2012) observation that tourists’ needs and interests play a significant role. This implies that destinations that seek to attract a significant number of tourists need to respond to both their needs and their interests (Bar-Kołelis & Wiskulski, 2012), and cater for people from diverse cultural backgrounds (Reisinger et al., 2009). Thus, a destination with a variety of tourist attractions is likely to be perceived as attractive (Dimitrov et al., 2017; Lee & Huang, 2014) and competitive (Bianchi, 2018; Edward & George, 2008). The significance of leading leisure, business and bleisure destinations, e.g. Tokyo and Sydney, is attributed to having a variety of tourist attractions (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2019).

For decades, tourist attractions have predominantly been associated with leisure tourists (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Jun, Vogt & MacKay, 2007; Kim & Brown, 2012; Swarbrooke, 1995; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2012). From the early 1990s, however, tourist attractions became associated with, among others, business tourists (Davidson, 2003; McCartney, 2008; Nelson & Rys, 2000; Rittichainuwat & Mair, 2012; Robinson & Callan, 2002; Witt, Gammon & White, 1992). This prompted Davidson’s (2003) call for leisure activities to be included in business tourism – a call received with enthusiasm by a number of tourism scholars (i.e. McCartney, 2008; Rittichainuwat & Mair, 2012; Tanford et al., 2012; Wan, 2011). In 2008, the possibility of Macau becoming a business tourism destination was explored (McCartney, 2008), but a lack of sufficient tourist attractions was found to be among the factors impeding it from becoming a business tourism destination (McCartney, 2008; Wan, 2011). In the United Kingdom (UK), Robinson and Callan (2005) found that the availability of tourist attractions enhances the attractiveness of the location of an events venue. Rittichainuwat and Mair (2012) and Tanford et al.
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(2012) concluded that the availability of tourist attractions motivates business tourists to visit a destination. Despite these findings, tourists’ cultural backgrounds have an impact on their preferences when it comes to what passes for a tourist attraction (Bar-Kolelis & Wiskulski, 2012; Reisinger et al., 2009): tourists from Northern Europe prefer natural attractions, those from the United States of America (USA) prefer heritage attractions and those from Asia prefer entertainment (Reisinger et al., 2009). Lastly, shopping seems to be the preferred leisure activity of Ukrainians and Russians (Bar-Kolelis & Wiskulski, 2012).

Principal contributions

Leisure tourists’ significant spending on tourist attractions is well recognised in this industry (Amir et al., 2015b; HSR.C, 2001). Although business tourists have displayed a willingness to spend money on tourist attractions (Amir et al., 2015b; Jones & Li, 2015), certain factors determine their interest in visiting such sites, and consequently spending their money there. Such factors include (i) the range of tourist attractions (Elston & Draper, 2012; Shin, 2009; Whitfield & Webber, 2011), (ii) security at those sites (Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2012), (iii) their authenticity (Fawzy, 2010; Shin, 2009; Yankholmes & McKercher, 2015) and (iv) the location of their hotel/accommodation (Fawzy, 2010; Visser, 2007; Zhou, Ye, Pearce & Wu, 2014). It is worthwhile investigating what principally contributes to business tourists’ interest in tourist attractions, in the context of the impact of the aforementioned four factors.

Range of tourist attractions

The availability of a range of tourist attractions is crucial for destinations wishing to attract business tourists (Crouch & Louviere, 2004; Elston & Draper, 2012). Destinations that lack a range of tourist attractions should consider investing in such attractions, in order to draw business tourists (Wan, 2011). Table 21.1 provides examples of various types of attractions that are of interest to business tourists, with the attractions classified by type on the basis of their physical attributes (first column, Table 21.1). The second column provides examples of categories and the third column references studies that revealed business tourists’ interest in the respective tourist attractions (see Table 21.1).

Nthebe (2017) adopted the outline in Table 21.1 to investigate domestic business tourists’ interest in a range of tourist attractions in Pretoria, the capital city of South Africa. That study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourist attraction types</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>Chiang et al., 2016; Fawzy, 2010; Shin, 2009; Nelson &amp; Rys, 2000; Ramkissoon et al., 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>Elston &amp; Draper, 2012; Whitfield, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>Elston &amp; Draper, 2012; Terzi et al., 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>Nightlife</td>
<td>Nelson &amp; Rys, 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events</td>
<td>Lin et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports events</td>
<td>Donaldson &amp; Ferreira, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>Shopping malls</td>
<td>Luo &amp; Lu, 2011; Xue &amp; Cox, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famous restaurants</td>
<td>Franchises</td>
<td>Visser, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own compilation.
revealed that the majority of domestic business tourists are more likely to visit shopping malls and view wildlife, and less likely to visit sports-related attractions such as golf courses.

**Security at tourist attractions**

Just as security is vital for the success of a destination (Amir, Ismail & See, 2015a; George, 2003), so it is for the success of tourist attractions (Boakye, 2010; George & Mawby, 2013). Leisure and business tourists alike are unlikely to visit tourist attractions when they perceive the destination to be unsafe (Amir et al., 2015a). Following George’s (2003) findings on the impact which a perceived low level of security has on leisure and business tourists’ freedom to explore Cape Town, the City of Cape Town (2013) announced that it had taken measures to address safety and security. As far as could be determined, no studies have been conducted to determine whether or not the measures taken in fact improved tourists’ perceptions in this regard. Additional impacts of security on the destination are highlighted in destination attractiveness research (Lee & Huang, 2014) and destination competiveness research (Bianchi, 2018). Tourists’ perceptions regarding a destination as a safe destination boosts destination’s competiveness, e.g. Taiwan’s (Lee & Huang, 2014), and destination’s attractiveness, e.g. Chile’s (Bianchi, 2018). Furthermore, Singapore has proven to be very attractive to leisure, business and bleisure tourists due to its perceived high level of security (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2019).

Concerning tourist attractions, the crowds of tourists who are attracted to specific attractions are largely exposed to crimes such as cell phone theft (Boakye, 2010). The security concerns which (over)crowding at tourist attractions raises may be addressed by employing more staff (Jin & Pearce, 2011). Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty (2012) add that the visibility of security personnel at tourist attractions is important for business tourists. Their stance is supported by Nthebe (2017), who found that the presence of security personnel at tourist attractions was important for domestic business tourists in Pretoria.

**Authenticity**

The importance of managing and protecting a destination’s heritage tourist attractions has long been acknowledged by tourism planners, as a measure of safeguarding the destination’s competitiveness (Jamieson & Jamieson, 2014). This is because heritage tourist attractions are expected to exhibit the destination’s real history and culture (Chhabra, 2012). While a destination’s history is mainly exhibited by museums (Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Lacher, Oh, Jodice & Norman, 2013), its culture is embodied in its communities (Ashworth & Page, 2011; Brown, 2013). In summary, heritage is constituted by both the destination’s history and culture (Meskell & Scheermeyer, 2008).

To achieve authenticity, heritage tourist attractions should depict the destination’s real heritage (Bryce, Curran, O’Gorman & Taheri, 2015; Chhabra, 2010; Cohen, 1988; Meskell & Scheermeyer, 2008; Taylor, 2001). This will satisfy tourists whose motivation to travel is a chance to experience something of the heritage and history of the destination (Hieda, 2015). This desire motivates leisure tourists to travel (Ramkisson & Uysal, 2011; Yousefi & Marzuki, 2012), but it is a secondary motivation for business tourists (Fawzy, 2010; Shin, 2009; Yankholmes & McKercher, 2015). Fawzy (2010) found that the availability of cultural tourist attractions in the proximity of their hotel was important to business tourists, whereas Shin (2009) highlights enjoying heritage as one of business tourists’ motives for visiting a destination. Yankholmes and McKercher (2015) confirm that business tourists seeking to experience a destination’s heritage will be attracted to heritage sites. Thus, the availability of heritage sites within a destination
enhances the destination’s attractiveness, e.g. Ghana’s (Owusu-Frimpong et al., 2013) and destination’s competitiveness, e.g. Chile’s (Bianchi, 2018). The lack of heritage sites can be attributed to Adelaide and Brisbane’s inability to surpass leading destinations, e.g. Sydney and Melbourne, in attracting significant numbers of leisure, business and bleisure tourists (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2019).

**Hotel locations**

The impact of a hotel’s location on tourists’ movement within a destination has attracted research attention over the years (Lew & McKercher, 2006; Shoval, McKercher, Ng & Birenboim, 2011; Visser, 2007). This is attributed to tourists’ consideration of the distance between the location of their hotel and a tourist attraction, when deciding whether or not to visit that site (Lew & McKercher, 2006). For example, Visser (2007) highlights that tourist attractions that are not located within the hotel’s proximity are unlikely to be visited by leisure tourists. Shoval et al. (2011) concur, noting that unless tourist attractions located outside the hotel location’s proximity are prominent features of a destination, they are unlikely to merit a visit. Nthebe (2017) confirms this finding in respect of domestic business tourists in Pretoria. Thus, it can be argued that the attractiveness of the location where a tourist intends to stay is enhanced by the availability of nearby attractions (Fawzy, 2010; Yang, Tang, Luo & Law, 2015; Xue & Cox, 2008). However, the option for bleisure (Expedia Group, 2018), leisure and business tourists to utilise public transport facilities (George, 2003) makes the accessibility of tourist attractions beyond the proximity of the hotel more convenient (Lew & McKercher, 2006). After all, accessibility is not only determined by distance, but also by the availability of public transport (Lockwood & Medlik, 2001; Witt et al. 1992). Given the benefits of such facilities, Issahaku and Amuquandoh (2013), Xue and Cox (2008) and Yang et al. (2015) found that the availability of public transport facilities near the hotel’s location is a crucial requirement for business tourists. Consequently, hotels that are located within the proximity of tourist attractions and public transport facilities further enhance the destination’s attractiveness (Owusu-Frimpong et al., 2013).

**Main criticism**

As discussed, business tourists are willing to spend money and time on tourist attractions. Their willingness to increase this spending is, however, affected by: (i) a range of tourist attractions, (ii) security at those sites, (iii) the authenticity of an attraction and (iv) their hotel’s location. Although tourism-related literature highlights how these factors impact business tourists’ interest in visiting tourist attractions, there are research gaps that still need to be explored. The main criticism relating to business tourists’ interest in tourist attractions is discussed in the context of these four factors.

**Range of tourist attractions**

Although research by Fawzy (2010), Nelson and Rys (2000) and Nthebe (2017) shows that business tourists are drawn to different attractions, these results need to be interpreted with caution. In a study exploring the factors influencing the UK’s attractiveness as a business tourism destination, Nelson and Rys (2000) found that the availability of golf courses, historical attractions and nightlife were important. Nelson and Rys (2000) did not explore a broader range of tourist attractions, or the impact of other attractions such as wildlife sanctuaries and shopping malls. Fawzy (2010), who investigated the importance of a hotel’s location for business tourists
in Cairo, highlights the availability of nearby historical attractions as an important attribute, but did not look into a broader range of attractions (e.g., shopping malls and golf courses). Nthebe (2017) explored the likelihood of domestic business tourists visiting attractions in Pretoria and found that the majority were very likely to visit shopping malls and wildlife sanctuaries or parks. The unavailability of a casino prior to 2017, in Pretoria and not the City of Tshwane, made it less likely that domestic business tourists in Pretoria would visit such venues, therefore this was excluded from this chapter (Nthebe, 2017).

Based on the above, it appears that there is a lack of research exploring business tourists’ interest in a broader range of tourist attractions. This can be attributed to, among others, the destination’s portfolio of such attractions (Nthebe & Swart, 2017).

Security at tourist attractions

Given business tourists’ likelihood of visiting attractions, ensuring a high level of security at those locations is important (Boakye, 2012). A study by George (2003) highlights the impact which security has on business tourists. In Cape Town, George (2003) found that business tourists are unlikely to visit tourist attractions, irrespective of whether it is during the day or at night, when they perceive a destination to be unsafe. Thus, ensuring a high level of security at tourist attractions can contribute towards creating a safe destination for tourists (George & Swart, 2012). Security measures such as ensuring the presence of security personnel may result in business tourists perceiving a particular tourist attraction as safe (Rittichainuwat & Chakraborty, 2012). Nthebe (2017) found that the same applies to domestic business tourists in Pretoria. In the context of leisure tourism, the presence of (i) public policing personnel in the streets and (ii) security personnel at major tourist attractions resulted in tourists feeling safe in Cape Town during the 2010 FIFA World Cup (George & Swart, 2012). However, creating a perception of a safe tourist attraction should be pursued with caution, as a high number of security personnel can either (i) make tourists feel safe or (ii) raise concerns about the tourist attraction’s level of safety (Amir et al., 2015a).

Nthebe (2017) and Rittichainuwat and Chakraborty (2012) investigated the importance business tourists attach to security personnel being present at tourist attractions, but not whether their presence raised concerns about safety levels – an issue which George and Swart (2012) also neglected to investigate. As far as could be determined, there is a lack of research into business tourists’ concerns about a high number of security personnel at a site.

Authenticity

Business tourists have shown an interest in visiting heritage attractions (Fawzy, 2010; Nelson & Rys, 2000; Shin, 2009; Yankholmes & McKercher, 2015). Nonetheless, the representation of a destination’s genuine heritage has been the subject of numerous debates around authenticity (Bryce et al., 2015; Chhabra, 2010; Cohen, 1988; Cohen & Cohen, 2012; Meskell & Scheermeyer, 2008). Despite these debates, there is consensus that a crucial attribute of authenticity is the representation of genuine heritage (Bjerregaard, 2015; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006; Taylor, 2001).

A destination’s heritage is exhibited by historical tourist attractions such as museums, as well as tours of cultural attractions such as townships (also known as informal settlements). Fawzy (2010) highlighted the availability of nearby historical tourist attractions as an important determinant when business tourists chose the location of a hotel in Cairo. Nelson and Rys (2000) found that the availability of historical tourist attractions had an influence on the UK’s
attractiveness as a business tourism destination, but their study did not explore the influence of cultural attractions. In Gwangju, Korea, Shin (2009) found that business tourists are motivated by the opportunity to explore the destination’s history and culture. Nthebe (2017) concurs, having found that domestic business tourists were interested in experiencing the history and culture of Pretoria. The studies by Fawzy (2010), Nelson and Rys (2000) and Nthebe (2017) did not investigate business tourists’ perceptions of the degree of authenticity required of a heritage attraction’s representation of the destination’s history or culture. Arguably, that can only be investigated through in-depth research at a heritage tourist attraction (Bjerregaard, 2015; Chhabra, 2010).

**Hotel locations**

The location of a hotel/tourist accommodation will determine a business tourist’s decision whether or not to visit certain attractions (Lew & McKercher, 2006). This is attributed to the proximity of the hotel to tourist attraction(s) (Fawzy, 2010; Xue & Cox, 2008; Zhou et al., 2014) and public transport facilities (Issahaku & Amuquandoh, 2013; Xue & Cox, 2008; Yang et al., 2015). It has been established that business tourists prefer hotels that are situated close to attractions (Fawzy, 2010; Zhou et al., 2014), but as far as could be determined, no studies have sought to determine whether business tourists in fact visit nearby tourist attractions. Shoval et al. (2011) confirm that most leisure tourists in Hong Kong visited nearby tourist attractions, rather than sites situated further afield.

Furthermore, while business tourists’ likelihood of using public transport facilities to visit tourist attractions is acknowledged (George, 2003; Lew & McKercher, 2006), the literature is largely silent on whether business tourists actually make use of public transport facilities to visit such attractions. Gutiérrez and Miravet (2016) found that both business and leisure tourists utilised public transport facilities while visiting Costa Daurada, but that study did not indicate whether business tourists used public transport to visit tourist attractions in particular.

**Importance of area/perspective and anticipated future development**

Business tourists’ interest in visiting tourist attractions is crucial for destinations that seek to attract visitors to their shores and retain them (City of Cape Town, 2013; McCartney, 2008; Wan, 2011). Destinations such as Cape Town (City of Cape Town, 2013) and Macau (McCartney, 2008; Wan, 2011) have identified the lack of sufficient tourist attractions as an impediment to attracting business tourists. The present chapter has discussed which factors have an impact on business tourists’ interest in visiting tourist attractions, and while these factors have attracted the attention of researchers, further research is required to lay a foundation for developing strategies that will result in destinations becoming more attractive to this group of tourists. Below, four future developments are anticipated and outlined.

First, with destinations’ continuing investment in developing a broader portfolio of tourist attractions (City of Cape Town, 2013; Wan, 2011), it is anticipated that the lack of research exploring business tourists’ interests in a broader range of tourist attractions will be addressed. Second, future studies are likely to address the paucity of research exploring whether the presence of a high number of security personnel raises business tourists’ concerns about a site’s security. Third, future studies are expected to address the dearth of research into business tourists’ perceptions of the degree of authenticity of a heritage tourist attraction’s representation of history or culture. Finally, it is anticipated that future studies will investigate whether business tourists prefer to visit nearby tourist attractions and/or use public transport facilities to visit such sites.
Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was to outline current perspectives on tourist attractions, in shaping urban destination development. This was mainly done from the perspective of business tourists. Evidence was provided on how historical and intellectual developments over centuries supported the development of urban tourism destinations. The different types of tourist attractions were confirmed as major stimuli in the development of tourism destinations in urban areas. Principal contributions to, and major criticism associated with, the development of tourist attractions at urban destinations were supported by four factors: investment in tourist attractions at urban destinations, the presence or absence of security personnel as custodians of safety at the destination, the degree of authenticity of a heritage tourist attraction’s representation of history or culture, and the preference of business tourists to visit attractions by making use of public transport – all of which provide an array of future research opportunities.
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