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Cultural tourism is a rather new term that has been much discussed in recent years. Despite many empirical surveys dealing with the notion of cultural tourism, its definition remains elusive. The objective of this research is to investigate the presumably abundant differentiating experts’ views on how to define cultural tourism as well as to spot the appearing ‘subgroups’ that the theory classifies as being subtypes of cultural tourism. To reach this objective, recently published scientific papers will be explored in terms of extracting experts’ perspective on defining cultural tourism. The paper aims at finding similarities as well as discrepancies among the obtained definitions. It also focuses on extracting authors’ views on what subgroup types could still be defined as a part of cultural tourism.
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Introduction

With its rapid development and growth, tourism has specialised and spread into numerous subfields. Cultural tourism is just one of them, yet one of the most discussed and analysed, particularly since the 1990s. Even though the term started to be used only in recent years the idea of cultural tourism is not in any way new. According to Richards (2018), in the post-World War II period, cultural tourism began to emerge as a social phenomenon and as a relevant issue in academic studies.

Starting with the dilemma of objectively defining tourism, as well as culture as such, the interpretations of cultural tourism vary. A vast number of perspectives and ways exist to define the two main concepts, tourism and culture, inside the compound cultural tourism, which underlines the problem of providing one tangible all-purpose definition of cultural tourism. There are almost as many definitions and variations of definitions of cultural tourism as there are cultural tourists, McKercher and Du Cros (2002, p. 3) claim. The purpose of this work is to review the current definitions of cultural tourism appearing in academic work.

The theoretical part views cultural tourism from two angles. Firstly, it considers the definitions of the two concepts inside cultural tourism separately; secondly, it discusses the two appearing perspectives in defining cultural tourism as a lexical unit. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the definitions of tourism and culture separately do not just simply combine in defining cultural tourism. This is a much more complex concept in which tourism and culture interact and overlap.

The understanding and conceptualising of tourism, culture, and cultural tourism have undoubtedly undergone many major and minor changes in recent years, especially in the extent of cultural tourism con-
assumption, and the forms of culture being consumed by cultural tourists’ (Richards, 1996). Defining cultural tourism is therefore also a time-bound task. Hence, this paper examines the recent definitions of cultural tourism appearing in 2018 in academic texts with the purpose of exploring the recent perspectives on cultural tourism in the academic sphere.

**Two Main Concepts: Tourism and Culture**

If we base the definition of cultural tourism on the two key concepts – culture and tourism – we can define cultural tourism from the perspective of the definition of tourism or from the perspective of the definition of culture. This part of the paper examines the definitions of tourism and culture from the two separate perspectives. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that certain authors do not make a clear distinction between the two. As for MacCannell (1993) and Jamal and Robinson (2009, p. 3), all tourism is a cultural experience, or even further, for Urry (1990) ‘tourism is culture’. This aspect makes the definition of cultural tourism even more demanding as tourism as a whole is treated as an element of culture. This additionally blurs the understanding of the concept of cultural tourism and hinders the path of investigating its specific features, its unique types of expeditions, typical destinations, and the typology of cultural tourists (Rohrscheidt, 2008).

**Tourism**

In the previous six years, tourism has played a leading role in the global economy (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2017) and, as such, it has surpassed the oil, food and auto industries (UNWTO, 2017). In 2017 alone, the number of international arrivals grew by 7% to 1,322 million, which surpassed the previous trend of 4% annual growth, started in 2010 (UNWTO, 2018). These data show tourism to be a key developmental and research topic, but tourism is much more than statistical data on economic growth. It is the lens through which to look and give meaning to modern and postmodern reality (Bin Salim, Ibrahim, & Hassan, 2012, p. 137). Viewed as such, the definition of tourism remains problematic for those who analyse it (Lickorish & Jenkins, 1997, p. 1). Because tourism has shown massive development and growth in recent years, there are many players dealing with it from many different perspectives, which leads to a vast number of possible definitions that nevertheless also vary in time. Its definition thus varies on the perspective from which it is studied (Mason, 2015).

In general, tourism definitions are separated into conceptual and statistical (technical or operational) definitions (Lickorish & Jenkins, 1997; Vanhove, 2005; Gilbert, 1990). Statistical or technical definitions view tourism as an economic sector and thus evaluate and measure the value of tourism, which is particularly variable in different countries, whereas the conceptual definitions see tourism as a broader activity affecting many other aspects of reality and deal with the core meaning of tourism. UNWTO (1993) defines tourism as ‘the activities of persons during their travel and stay in a place outside their usual place of residence, for a continuous period of less than one year, for leisure, business or other purposes’. These kinds of definitions arise from the need to statistically measure the standards inside tourism (Miezczkowski, 1990, in Vanhove, 2005). Conceptual definitions, on the other hand, view tourism as a broader phenomenon. One of the conceptual definitions, proposed by Kaspar (1996, pp. 15–16, in Planina & Mihalić, 2002), views tourism as the whole of relations and phenomena that are a consequence of travelling to less known places and communities for a shorter time with the intent to satisfy certain needs.

Inside the realm of tourism-related definitions of cultural tourism, one open difficulty is the criterion for distinguishing cultural tourism within the overall phenomenon of tourism (Rohrscheidt, 2008). The author places the essence of the problem in the question of ‘what importance should be given to culture-related goals during a touring event and/or what intensity should culture-related contents appear during a trip so that it may be classified as a cultural travel’ (p. 47). Further to this dilemma, the next question arises, concerning the understanding of the types of attractions and trips. More specifically, which attractions or trips are considered cultural and which are not?

Rohrscheidt (2008), who investigated many different approaches to defining the concept of cultural tourism with a specific goal of providing a holistic
functional definition of cultural tourism, proposed a definition that is based on the holistic definition of tourism, acknowledging its superiority, by conceptualising cultural tourism as one of the forms in which tourism appears. After examining the definitions, the author proposed a definition that ‘will not only present academic approach to significant features of cultural tourism but will also make it possible to practically distinguish its catalogue of products from options on offer from other branches of tourism’ (Rohrscheidt, 2008). His definition takes into account cultural tourism from phenomenological and economics aspects and defines cultural tourism in the following way (Rohrscheidt, 2008, p. 58):

The term ‘cultural tourism’ may relate to all tourist expeditions taken by groups or individuals, where encounters with sites, events and other assets of high culture or popular culture, or effort aimed at improving one’s knowledge of the surrounding world organized by man are the essential part/aspect of the traveller’s itinerary or are a clinching argument for individuals’ decision on whether or not to take up such a journey/participate in such a trip.

Culture

‘Culture’ is another all-embracing term appearing in many possible forms, thus comprising many possible definitions. Tomlinson (1991, p. 4) notes that all these definitions either prove that there is confusion in this area or that the term itself is so broad that it can actually account for all the described forms. Instead of trying to define what culture is, Tomlinson (1991) proposes focusing on how the term is used. Two possible ways of perceiving culture are seen as a process (process-based) or as a product (product-based). The view on culture as a process is derived from anthropology and sociology, ‘which regard culture mainly as codes of conduct embedded in a specific social group’ (Richards, 1996, p. 229), whereas culture as a product approach regards culture as the product of ‘individual or group activities to which certain meanings are attached’ (p. 229). Richards (1996) adds that the two terms rarely overlap, however in tourism there exists a certain level of integration. Culture as process is transformed through tourism (as well as through other social mechanisms) into culture as product. Culture is the aim of tourist arrivals whereas the presence of tourists also leads to creating cultural manifestations.

The first, classic definition of culture by Tylor (1871) is rather broad and (still) widely used among social science researchers. He defined culture as ‘that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society’ (Bennett, 2015, p. 547), although in general discourse culture was often understood in more narrow terms. The perception of culture has also been changing through time. Up until 1970, the general scope of culture was often limited to what is generally described as ‘high culture’ (literature, arts, music, etc.). However, the 1980s proposed a new general understanding of the culture that also touches upon tangible artefacts (sites) and intangible components (behaviour, customs, etc.), which were generally described as a part of the ‘low culture’ (Richards, 1996, p. 25), popular or daily culture. Hofstede added an additional perspective that stresses the aspect of constant contact and interaction between cultures: ‘culture refers to the cumulative deposit of knowledge, experience, beliefs, values, attitudes, meanings, hierarchies, religion, notions of time, roles, spatial relations, concepts of the universe, and material objects and possessions acquired by a group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving’ (Hofstede, 1997).

The definition if cultural tourism can, therefore, be based on a broad understanding of culture, for example, Dreyer’s definition that defines cultural tourism as ‘any journey focusing on (broadly understood) “culture.” Hence, the term refers to a specific (new) segment of tourism. Educational and study tours constitute special forms within this segment’ (Dreyer, 2000, p. 21). In this manner, cultural tourism could be any kind of tourism involving educational or entertaining components (Rohrscheidt, 2008). Considering this broader comprehension of culture, it offers a limitless list of what could be considered as cultural, comprising almost all aspects of human life. An example of this
view on defining cultural tourism could be found in the additional part of Dreyer’s aforementioned definition: ‘In broader meaning, the term of cultural tourism contains the element of “culture in tourism.” Hence, each form of tourism with integral cultural features is understood as cultural tourism’ (Dreyer, 2000).

Cultural Tourism: Definitions
In 2013, The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Tourism (Smith & Richards, 2013) was one of the first works to offer a broader insight into many perspectives on cultural tourism. The introduction explains that cultural tourism is more in the discourse of academics and policymakers than in the minds of those who visit cultural attractions and attend cultural events (p. 1). The mentioned work comprises 50 chapters that shed light on many perspectives from which to examine the idea of cultural tourism. There are three main themes to understanding the book’s key messages. Firstly, the truth in cultural tourism lays in contemporary events and not from an eternal true perspective. Secondly, cultural tourism should be considered a global issue and, thirdly, the understanding of cultural tourism asks for a critical analysis of the social dynamics inside attractions or destinations.

Bonik (1992, in Richards, 1996) reviewed the existing definitions of cultural tourism and established two main approaches: the sites and monuments approach or descriptive approach and the conceptual approach. The two approaches are clearly different in the aspect that the first, more technical, focuses on the types of cultural tourism attractions and the numbers of cultural tourists, whereas the second is stating the motives and activities of cultural tourists. The first approach is strongly tied to the understanding of culture as a product and tries to identify all the sites and other attractions that cultural tourists visit. By narrowing the possible sites and providing typologies of cultural tourism attractions, these kinds of definitions see cultural tourism from a technical perspective and fail to explore the activities and motives behind the visits of cultural tourists. The conceptual approach, in contrast, aims to define the motives and meanings attached to cultural tourism activities and is hence more process-based. McIntosh and Goeldner (1986), for example, define cultural tourism as comprising ‘all aspects of travel, whereby travellers learn about the history and heritage of others or about their contemporary ways of life or thought.’

Similarly, Atlas (see http://www.tram-research.com/atlas/presentation.htm) also distinguishes between the conceptual and technical definition of cultural tourism: the first focuses more on the motives of cultural visits, whereas the second establishes the cultural sites and attractions cultural tourists might visit. The latter two could be considered more holistic definitions of tourism as they contain a more comprehensive presentation of the phenomenon. They give more focus on culture itself as the goal for tourism and also pay more attention to the individual characteristics of travellers inside this type of tourism.

McKercher and Du Cros (2002) also observed definitions of cultural tourism and put them in four categories: tourism-derived, motivational, experiential, and operational. Tourism-derived definitions put the concept of cultural tourism inside the framework of tourism and tourism management theory. They, therefore, recognise cultural tourism as special interest tourism, in which culture stands as a basis for tourist attraction or motivation to travel (McIntosh & Goeldner, 1986; Zeppel, 1992; Ap, 1995; in McKercher and Du Cros, 2002; Dreyer, 2000), or as involving interrelationships between people, places, and cultural heritage (Zeppel & Hall, 1991, in McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). Motivational definitions consider motivation to be the key factor in defining cultural tourism. They state that cultural tourists are motivated to travel for different reasons than other tourists. UNWTO states that cultural tourists travel for study tours, performing arts and cultural tours, travel to festivals and other events, visit sites and monuments, travel to study nature, folklore or art, and pilgrimages (UNWTO, 1985, p. 6, in McKercher & Du Cros, 2002). Experiential or aspirational definitions consider cultural tourism to be an experiential activity that involves experiencing or being in contact with the unique social fabric, heritage, and special character of places (Blackwell, 1997; Schweitzer, 1999, in McKercher & Du Cross, 2002). The last, operational definitions, which are the most common, try to define the places, services, activities,
etc. people visit inside cultural tourism. Nevertheless, it is difficult to state clear parameters to what activity is considered cultural tourism and what is not. Therefore, McKercher and Du Cros (2002) propose using the term cultural tourism as an umbrella term comprising many related activities, such as historical, ethnic, arts, museum tourism, etc.

Richards (2003) divided the above-mentioned definitional approaches into two axes: (1) experiential/conceptual vs operational/measurement and (2) tourism-derived/supply vs motivational/demand (Figure 1). The first one is differentiated in terms of purpose, meaning that we either try to conceptualise the term as well as its meaning for (cultural) tourists or merely count the number of people participating. The second one is differentiated in terms of interest in the knowledge about the market for the tourism industry on the one hand and in understanding the existence of demand on the other. In his recent study Richards (2018) identified some additional challenges with regard to the definition of the concept of cultural tourism in the future. He highlights that more focus should be put on studying the practices of cultural tourism. The main problem of the above-presented approach is that it fails to measure the meaning of the phenomenon (experiential/conceptual) on the one hand and the integration of supply (tourism-derived definition) and demand (motivational) on the other. He, therefore, proposes studying mainly practices of cultural system which form a system compound of (a) resources (tangible and intangible heritage, contemporary culture, creative industries, lifestyles etc.); (b) competences (ways of doing cultural tourism, increased cultural capital, reading and interpreting cultural resources, development of cultural routes); and (c) meanings (learning, identity, citizenship), which are interrelated and mutually dependent (Richards, 2018).

Research
The present research aimed at extracting current definitions of cultural tourism in research articles. To find relevant scientific articles, we used the key term ‘cultural tourism’ that appeared in the title, among the keywords, or in the abstract of articles. For the term ‘extraction’, we used the Science Direct, SAGE, Wiley, and Taylor & Francis databases. As for the publishing date, we were solely interested in recently published papers, and thus reduced the number of research elements to journal articles published in 2018. In total, 43 scientific articles were selected. Further context-based selection, however, revealed that some were not dealing with cultural tourism at all or the term ‘cultural tourism’ was mentioned in a different context than that of tourism research (for example, in the context of mathematics, computer studies, etc.) and were hence excluded. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 30 scientific articles.

The aim of our research was twofold: (a) to explore how cultural tourism is currently defined within the scientific language of tourism in the present year and (b) to identify the main ‘subgroups’ of cultural tourism as presented within articles.

Findings
The definitions of cultural tourism within the articles we researched reflect the diversity of cultural tourism research and the width of this broad field. Richards (2003) explains that it is not possible to adopt only one universal definition of cultural tourism since the definition depends on the perspective taken and the objectives aimed at when defining cultural tourism. According to Richards (2018), the definition of cul-

---

**Figure 1** Cultural Tourism Definitional Field
(adapted from Richards, 2003)
Cultural tourism has also made a journey from the original very broad UNWTO definition, including practically all tourism experiences, through more narrow definitions that attempt to provide support in understanding and measuring cultural tourism, back to the new UNWTO definition, which is again much broader as it is defined as ‘a type of tourism activity in which the visitor’s essential motivation is to learn, discover, experience and consume the tangible and intangible cultural attractions/products in a tourism destination. These attractions/products relate to a set of distinctive material, intellectual, spiritual and emotional features of a society that encompasses arts and architecture, historical and cultural heritage, culinary heritage, literature, music, creative industries and the living cultures with their lifestyles, value systems, beliefs and traditions.’ (UNWTO, 2018, p. 18).

Motivation for Travel
While most definitions of cultural tourism used within the researched articles were not necessarily very broad, they often focus on the activity of tourists and culture as a main motivation for their travel. Therefore, we can claim that the definitions mostly fell into the realm of motivational definitions. Frequently, they also emphasise the experience aspect (Chen & Rahman, 2018) and information/knowledge gain (Chiao, Chen, & Huang, 2018). The ATLAS (see http://www.tram-research.com/atlas/presentation.htm) conceptual definition that joins both aspects, is also sometimes used as a starting point for the article: ‘the movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs’ (ex. Su & Teng, 2018). In one case, the 1985 UNWTO cultural tourism definition that falls into this domain was used: ‘cultural tourism includes movements of persons for essentially cultural motivations such as study tours, performing arts and other cultural tours, travel to festivals and other cultural events, visits to sites and monuments and travel to study nature folklore or art or pilgrimages’ (UNWTO, 1985, in Vinodan & Meera, 2018, p. 76). As presented above, the 2018 UNWTO definition used in the article of Richards (2018) can also be characterised as a motivational one.

Cultural Consumption and Experience
The term cultural tourism is also used to explain the consumption of, for example, art, heritage, movies, etc. In this context, the definition is sometimes somewhat narrowed to the understanding of tourism as a specific cultural manifestation, like for example ethnic tourism in Lugu Lake in China in the article of Wei, Qian and Sun (2018), where tourists are interested in the ‘matriarchal’ social organisation and the distinct marriage practice of Mosuo. In this case, for example, authors confine cultural tourism to ethnic tourism. Chen and Rahman (2018) further explore the behavioural intention of arts festival tourists. They stress an important concept of MTE (memorable tourism experiences) that is ‘a tourism experience remembered and recalled after the event has occurred’ (Kim, Lee, Uysal, Lim, & Ahn, 2015, p. 2). According to Chen and Rahman (2018) view, this concept is often overlooked when researching cultural tourism. In defining cultural tourism, they, hence, follow the typology by which cultural tourism is used as an activity and visitation by the tourists to cultural destinations (Silberg, 1995; Richards, 1996; Reisinger, 1994, in Chen and Rahman, 2018) where the emphasis is on the experience of the tourist during the visit. One of the rather narrower definitions in this context is that of Libang, Wenjuan, and Jinghui (2018) who define cultural tourism as ‘a kind of tourism where travellers are engaged in entertainment and local culture’ (Fu, Gao, & Chai, 2014, in Libang, Wenjuan, & Jinghui, 2018).

Structural Characteristics of Cultural Tourism
In relation to the definition of cultural tourism, Hernández-Mogollón, Duarte, and Folgado-Fernández (2018) highlight the importance of its structural elements, i.e., elements that cannot be transferred from one location to another and are derived from ‘local traditions, cultural heritage, historical sites and buildings, museums, food-related heritage and other types of natural and manufactured resources permanently present in specific places’ (Hernández-Mogollón et al., 2018, p. 171).

In their study about the tourist experience of management of a heritage tourism product, Wijayanti and Damanik (2018) emphasise the tangible and intangi-
ble structural aspect of cultural tourism and define it as: ‘Cultural tourism offers both tangible and intangible cultural attractions, living culture, and cultural heritage’.

Subfields of Cultural Tourism?
As a part of our research, we attempted to identify the sub-fields of cultural tourism. Here, it has to be mentioned that our keyword in searching for articles was only ‘cultural tourism’; if we had searched specifically for the phrases that define the ‘emerging niches’ in which, according to Richards (2018), cultural tourism has been fragmenting, such as gastronomic tourism, film tourism, arts tourism etc., we would have probably identified more articles with these topics. Richards (2018), identified the following well-developed subsectors of cultural tourism: cultural heritage tourism, film-induced tourism, and literary tourism. These three themes also emerged within our article search (Barber, 2018; Domínguez-Quintero, González-Rodríguez, & Paddison, 2018; Gymóthy, 2018; Io, 2018; Vinodan & Meera, 2018, Yu & Xu, 2018;) however, sometimes the above-mentioned terms were used interchangeably with the term ‘cultural tourism’ and not as a subgroup. For example, Yu and Xu (2018, p. 392) examine ‘the moral aspect of literature and literary/cultural tourism’; in this case, literary tourism is equated with cultural tourism.

Similarly, Gymóthy (2018, p. 392) explores Bollywood-related film tourism in the Swiss Alps and, at the beginning, states that it ‘reviews the phenomenon of non-western popular cultural tourism.’ We identified the subfield of cultural heritage tourism within the research of Domínguez-Quintero et al. (2018) and that of Barber (2018) in which heritage and its presentation are seen as a part of cultural tourism. The latter is focused on heritage-themed tours and trails, while the former analyses the aspects of authenticity and satisfaction within cultural – heritage tourism.

Additionally, Su and Teng (2018) discuss museum tourism as a part of cultural tourism, while Chianeh, Del Chiappa, and Ghasemi (2018) research religious tourism and connect it with the concept of cultural tourism and throughout the article discuss the development of ‘cultural and religious’ tourism. Chen, King, and Lee (2018) similarly discuss ‘arts and cultural tourism.’ Therefore, it seems it is not represented as a subgroup of cultural tourism, but its equivalent.

Some of the definitions offered an extended view of cultural tourism. They did not in a literary sense provide subgroups of cultural tourism but a sort of extended versions of cultural tourism. Firstly, the term ‘creative tourism’ was found to be an extension of cultural tourism, in which tourists co-create the experience and they are important actors in, for example, museum activities (Richards & Wilson, 2006, in Camarero, José Garrido, & Vicente, 2018). Similarly, the concept of ‘eco-cultural tourism’, which appeared in two articles by Tiberghien, Bremer, and Milne (2018) and Tiberghien et al. (2018), according to Wallace and Russel (2004, in Tiberghien et al., 2018, p. 309), combines the ecological and cultural aspects of landscape to create experiences for tourists.

Conclusion
Our research reveals the expected diversity of uses of the term ‘cultural tourism.’ Through the selection process of the articles, confined only to the keywords and abstracts in which the term appeared, it was obvious that the term cultural tourism is used in very different contexts as well as researched within different disciplines. The article search also confirmed the trend, observed by Richards (2018), that recently there has been a shift in research focus towards researching cultural tourism topic in Asia, where the connection between tourism and culture is being redefined as we identified many types of research that were implemented in this context (for example., Chen et al., 2018; Chiao et al., 2018; Chianeh et al. 2018; Io, 2018; Libang et al., 2018; Tiberghien, 2018; Tiberghien et al., 2018; Vinodan & Meera, 2018; Yang, 2018; Yu et al., 2018; Wei, Qian, & Sun, 2018, Wijayanti & Damanik, 2018). The aim of the research was mainly to identify the definitions of cultural tourism as they appear in the most recent publications in this field, to see what the prevailing definitions of cultural tourism are, and to explore whether any older definitions occur in these articles. The scope of this research is limited in the sense that it focuses merely on recent publications, unable to provide a wholesome perspective on such a
broad term as ‘cultural tourism’. However, looking at the dilemma from another perspective, we managed to obtain insight into fresh cultural tourism perspectives.

It has to be noted, however, that a definition of the term ‘cultural tourism’ was not provided in many cases. It was used in the context of research as if its meaning was self-explanatory. Those authors who did explain the term provided definitions from many possible angles. Some were placed in the context of tourism management, while the prevailing ones were approached from the perspective of culture. On the one hand, this can be assigned to the fact that cultural tourism is indeed a broad and multi-faced concept, but on the other hand, the reason for this might be that most of the research papers in our survey were site-specific, allowing cultural tourism to appear in its many taxonomies. Since currently there is no adequate or universally accepted definition of this term and the field of cultural tourism is expected to continue to expand (UNWTO, 2018), the definitional challenges are also bound to continue. Specifically, the interest in tourism has been growing since the 1980s due to the general growth in travel, the heritage boom (Hewison, 1987; in Richards, 2018) and the identification of cultural tourism as a form of tourism that can help conserving culture as well as contribute to economic growth. Since the 1990s, cultural tourism has been orienting itself towards mass markets and has begun to fragment into many niches (Richards, 2018); there has also been intense growth in academic research.

However, how do the continuous growth of research and the diversity of definitions affect the field of cultural tourism? A number of articles with the keyword ‘cultural tourism’ were actually dealing with its subfields and sometimes a term defining of the subfield, such as ‘heritage tourism’ was used interchangeably with the term ‘cultural tourism’.

Might both the further growth and the fragmentation affect the understanding of the concept of cultural tourism as an umbrella term? Due to this multi-faced characteristic of cultural tourism, we also encountered authors who listed the term cultural tourism in keywords but failed to define it. This could also be assigned to the fact that cultural tourism has become a buzzword among tourism academics that is perhaps no longer needed to be specifically defined, even though there has not yet been a universally accepted definition of it (Dolničar, 2002).
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