University of Groningen

Warfare tourism experiences and national identity

Gieling, Joost; Chin-Ee Ong

Published in:
Tourism Management

DOI:
[10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.017)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gieling, J., & Chin-Ee Ong (2016). Warfare tourism experiences and national identity: The case of Airborne Museum 'Hartenstein' in Oosterbeek, the Netherlands. *Tourism Management*, 57, 45-55.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.017>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Warfare tourism experiences and national identity: The case of Airborne Museum ‘Hartenstein’ in Oosterbeek, the Netherlands

Joost Gieling^{a, *}, Chin-Ee Ong^{b, c}

^a Department of Cultural Geography, University of Groningen, Landleven 1, 9747AD Groningen, P.O. Box 800, The Netherlands

^b Department of Cultural Geography, Wageningen University, The Netherlands

^c Department of Geography, National University of Singapore, Singapore

HIGHLIGHTS

- Visitors who identified strongly as being Dutch, part of the ‘in-group’ represented, are more strongly motivated by self-enhancement motivations.
- There is a significant and positive relationship between visitors scoring high on ‘connectedness’ motives and feelings of arousal.
- Visitors seeking recognition by others by visiting sites tend to be dissatisfied while those who score high on connectedness report satisfaction with their visits.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 10 July 2015

Received in revised form

21 April 2016

Accepted 25 May 2016

Keywords:

Warfare tourism
Social identity theory
National identity
Experience
Second World War
Netherlands

ABSTRACT

This paper examines through an analysis of Dutch warfare tourism whether there is a relationship between the subjective perceived salience of Dutch identity and heritage tourists’ motives, emotions and overall satisfaction. Using a social identity theory framework, this study provides a view of motives for Dutch warfare heritage tourism and the ways in which this specific variant of heritage tourism evokes different emotions and satisfaction evaluations in visitors. Specifically, we found that visitors who identified strongly as ‘being Dutch’ (the ‘in-group’) have stronger self-enhancement motives compared to those who identify less strongly, and that edutainment features strongly in the museum experience. Visitors seeking initiative/recognition express feelings of disappointment suggesting that the museum’s symbolic function as a place of national in-group identity could be more highlighted. We demonstrate that an affirmative and engaged experience can manifest at nationally symbolic sites through positive historical narratives and entertainment, and through ‘in-group’ self-enhancement activities.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

It has been suggested in tourism studies that there is a link between an individual’s desire for identity construction and an individual’s urge to become involved in a variety of tourism practices (cf. Morgan & Pritchard, 1998). According to social identity theory (SIT), the social environment a person lives and interacts in is of key importance in understanding the subjective evaluation process which forms part of an individual’s construction of self-identity. SIT recognizes self-identity as part of a person’s social identity, encompassing an individual’s cognitive evaluation of salient group classifications. Such an evaluation might be

influenced by the existence of warfare heritage, and in particular warfare-related memorial sites, as these sites can function as catalysts, temporarily lending prominence to the social categories suggested by the heritage site. As a consequence, feelings of self-enhancement and self-esteem are boosted by a positive evaluation of the social group a person feels connected to. Analysing this process helps us to better understand the role memorial sites play in modern societies as places of national importance that people feel connected to and where they can reaffirm their social identity. Assessing this relationship also helps explain the role of warfare heritage in stimulating processes of national cohesion and national bonding.

Visiting warfare-related memorial sites and, for instance, battle re-enactments and battlefield tours, is a particular form of warfare tourism (Dunkley, Morgan, & Westwood, 2011). Warfare tourism is significant in the Netherlands. This is especially true of the Arnhem

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: j.a.gieling@rug.nl (J. Gieling), geooce@nus.edu.sg (C.-E. Ong).

and Nijmegen area, which in 1944 was the site of Operation Market Garden, which involved troops from many Allied nations including the UK, Poland, Canada and the US. However, memorials, particularly of the Second World War, can be found and visited throughout the Netherlands. There are two main foci for commemorating the Second World War in the Netherlands – the annual commemoration festivals and heritage routes (the Airborne Commemorations and the Liberation Route, for example) and the four permanent war museums (the National War and Resistance Museum at Overloon, the Resistance Museum or *Verzetmuseum* at Amsterdam, the National Liberation Museum at Groesbeek and the Airborne Museum at Oosterbeek, discussed in this study). Museum visitor numbers for 2014 are estimated as follows: 46,000 for Groesbeek, 87,106 for Amsterdam, 100,000 for Overloon and 114,000 for Oosterbeek. The total figure hovers around 300,000 (not necessarily unique) visitors, which is a strong increase on previous years according to various media. There are also other Dutch Second World War sites that speak about the war while offering hospitality (cf. Ong, Minca, & Felder, 2015) and which articulate connections with transit and concentration camps of those turbulent years (cf. Felder, Duineveld, & Van Assche, 2015).

The current research was conducted at the Airborne Museum 'Hartenstein' in the village of Oosterbeek, near Arnhem and Wageningen in the Netherlands. This museum is dedicated to the Battle of Arnhem, which took place during Operation Market Garden (September 1944), one of the largest military operations to take place in the Netherlands during the Second World War, during which Allied forces tried unsuccessfully to cross the river Rhine and secure key bridges and towns on the northern banks of the river. This museum allows visitors to experience the Battle of Arnhem very interactively, from the perspective of the soldiers fighting on both sides. The battle is portrayed in Richard Attenborough's famous movie *A Bridge Too Far* (1977). More recently, the museum has become part of the 'Liberation Route Europe'. It commemorates Dutch resistance during the Second World War, and is quite well known in the Netherlands. It aims to portray the Battle of Arnhem very respectfully and thoughtfully, yet the link with the Second World War makes the distinction between in-group and out-group explicit.

Social identity theory as proposed by Tajfel has been applied in a wide variety of research settings (Bergami & Bagozzi, 2000; Karasawa, 1991; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Mael & Ashforth, 1992). By integrating warfare tourism at a Dutch war museum into a social identity theory framework, this paper aims to obtain greater clarity about the function and *raison d'être* of warfare heritage in Western societies. Much research has been undertaken on the cultural, spatial and social value of warfare heritage (cf. Winter, 2004; Lehrer, 2010; Greenspan, 2005). However, the core question of why there is a need for various forms of warfare heritage in the first place is under-researched. The social psychological framework used in this study provides an alternative view of why people are motivated to visit warfare-related heritage sites, why this specific variant of heritage inspires specific emotions in visitors and why visitors tend to evaluate heritage sites differently. Therefore, this study aims to respond to the challenge set by Waterton and Watson's (2013; p. 558) argument that 'theory is needed to advance not only the study of heritage but the very nature of enquiry itself by reformulating our scope, looking beyond our field of study and reinvigorating our methods [...] to map its intensities in a wider cultural world'.

We will argue that warfare-related heritage sites play an important role in Western societies as tangible catalysts for an enhancement of an individual's social identity. Positive evaluation of the social groups that people feel emotionally connected to is essential to feelings of self-enhancement and collective self-

esteem. An examination of these processes simultaneously results in an improved understanding of the nature of the tourist experience at sites of warfare heritage and warfare-related atrocity. The importance of these processes has been suggested in essence by various authors, but it has not been empirically addressed. Therefore, this paper begins with a brief discussion of why people are motivated to visit warfare memorial sites and how they individually experience these sites. This is followed by an overview of current ideas about how an individual's social identity is affected by the existence of warfare memorials. We then explain how aspects of social identity theory were operationalized, along with a description of the measurement of the heritage experience. The latter is divided into three consecutive phases: perceived motives, emotions and satisfaction. Next, the paper reports an explorative case study of the experiences of 261 visitors to the Airborne Museum. Correlations and regressions are presented to verify the relationships between a person's social identity and individual heritage experience. Following the analysis, the paper concludes by reviewing the study's implications for researchers interested in tourism, heritage, behavioural motivations, social psychology and identity, as well as for those who market and preserve warfare-related heritage sites.

2. Literature review

Studies focusing on heritage tourism and identity place a clear emphasis on the construction of national identity through heritage tourism (Winter, 2004). However, as Palmer (2005; p. 7–8) argues, 'not enough attention has been paid to the processes by which identities are formed, reformed, negotiated, and contested by those individuals who use and experience nationally symbolic sites'. The consumption of tourist experiences has become one of the wide variety of resources for expressing individual identity, national pride and self-expression (Morgan and Pritchard, 1998). This could be one of the reasons why the number of tourists visiting cultural heritage sites in general, and warfare heritage sites in particular, have recently shown year-on-year increases (cf. Iles, 2008; ; Prideaux, 2007; Richards, 1996; Su & Lin, 2014; Timothy & Boyd, 2003; Williams, 2007). Warfare heritage is therefore often used and abused by national institutions, governments and national and supranational organizations to create feelings of belongingness in individuals from the top down (cf. Henderson, 2000). By identifying certain heritage sites as official symbols of the nation, government institutions try to inspire feelings of national cohesion and national belonging and to bind people to the values and ideals shared by their national group. A possible explanation for governments' eagerness to label certain sites as 'national' is offered by Pretes (2003), who argues that 'the viewing of heritage sights by domestic tourists is a key aspect in the formation and maintenance of a national identity, especially when nationalism is understood as an "imagined community"'. Extending this argument, in the Netherlands alone more than 63,000 monuments have been labelled 'national' by the government.¹ Cultural heritage can be a powerful bonding catalyst to create feelings of national identity, particularly in recently independent nations, nations which did not come into being as a result of a natural historical process or nations containing multi-ethnic populations. Palmer (2005), Park (2010) and Soper (2007) all show how individual nations use heritage as a tool to promote national identity. Park for instance explains that domestic heritage tourism in Korea is at its core a symbolic mechanism through which Koreans communicate and reconstruct feelings of national belonging. Because its intrinsic symbolic

¹ <http://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/node/2198>. Accessed on: 12-11-2013, 17h.

function, heritage plays a fundamental role in maintaining national solidarity.

Warfare tourism has a particular ability to foster self-identity processes. Dunkley et al. (2011) show that warfare tours can be deeply meaningful to visitors. These tours offer an opportunity for remembrance and commemoration as they function as an activity to validate past events too intense to comprehend individually. Often, warfare literature proposes a dichotomy which distinguishes pilgrims from tourists. Walter (1993) for example argues that these two categories are conceptually different in orientation and behaviour. The first group is considered to be primarily motivated to visit warfare heritage site for activities of remembrance. They are in search of deep emotional and spiritual tourist experiences. Moreover, when visitors consider a particular warfare heritage site to be part of their own life story, there is a greater chance that they will be motivated to visit the site in order to undergo an emotional experience rather than for educational or entertainment-related interests (Poria, Biran, & Reichel, 2006). This contrasts with ordinary tourists who do not feel connected with the heritage site and who are mainly interested in education and entertainment. For this second group, education or simply a pleasant break from their daily routine are the most important reasons for visiting battlefield heritage sites (Winter, 2011). In reality, the distinction as explained here is not that clear and the motivations and onsite experiences of battlefield visitors can be quite blurred. It is better to understand these two categories as opposite ends of a continuum (McKercher & du Cros, 2003). The motives and experiences of visits can be very personal, intense and value-laden, especially when the actual battle has not yet passed out of living memory (McIntosh, 1999; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996).

2.1. Social identity theory

Individuals all move within larger social groups and structures. This can be implicit and conditional, but these groups and structures are of key importance in understanding the subjective evaluation process of an individual's self-identity. In social identity theory (SIT), self-identity is recognized as part of a person's social identity (Hogg, Terry, & White 1995; Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Owens, Robinson, & Smith-Lovin, 2010; Tajfel, 1978; Trepte, 2006). In addition to a personal identity, which encompasses personality traits, talents, competences and interests, social identity refers to an individual's cognitive evaluation of salient group classifications. People express their need for belonging from an early age through identification and participation with groups in the outside world. It is the norms and constraints imposed by these social groups that people feel connected to and which induce behaviour and perceptions of self in people. Tajfel (1978, p. 63) defines social identity as 'that part of an individual's idea of self which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership'.

In contrast with many other theoretical perspectives on the construction of identity, SIT starts with assumptions regarding a social group instead of assumptions regarding the individual. It attempts to explain cognitions and behaviour with the help of specific group processes. As with many theories of identity, SIT postulates that multiple identities will exist within a person and vary in salience depending on the person's immediate context and past experiences. SIT employs the idea that a social category (which can be anything from a nationality or a sports team to all the female students attending the same university) that an individual feels affiliated and connected to creates a definition of who that individual is in terms of the defining characteristics of a specific category. Because people normally fall into many different categories,

these social categories vary in importance for the construction of an idea of self. Depending on which social identity is salient in a given situation, self-perception and behaviour become in-group stereotypical and normative. People who do not fit or belong to the specific in-group form an out-group which is perceived stereotypically. The extent to which feelings of competition are experienced then depends on the nature of the relationship between the in-group and the out-group. Social identities are evaluative, which means that members of a particular group are strongly motivated to adopt behavioural strategies for maintaining in-group/out-group comparisons which favour the in-group and encourage feelings of self-esteem (Tanti, Stukas, Halloran, & Foddy, 2011).

SIT has not been without its critics (Abrams & Hogg, 2004; Brown, 2000). In fact, there is an ongoing debate among social identity researchers on the stability and fluidity of acquired and ascribed social groups. These latter groups are often assumed to be quite stable, but it has also been acknowledged that people have some agency in choosing the type of ascribed social groups they prefer to belong to (Huddy, 2001). Ascribed identities seem to be more flexible than SIT originally recognized. Palmer, Koenig-Lewis and Medi-Jones (2013) offer the example of Welsh nationality. They explain that having Welsh nationality does not necessarily mean that an individual feels emotionally engaged with the Welsh social group and might even feel more connected to other social groups, such as regional or supranational social groups such as the United Kingdom.

2.2. SIT and warfare heritage

Bond and Falk (2013; p. 439) argue that there is a relationship between individuals' core identity attributes and their reasons for visiting specific heritage sites, by pointing out that 'tourism can be conceived as a means of establishing, maintaining and at times recreating aspects of one's identity' and that all tourist experiences are to a certain extent motivated by the 'individual's self-perceived identity-related needs'. Nevertheless, the use of SIT is still considered novel in the field of tourism research (Palmer et al., 2013). SIT has only occasionally been applied by tourism researchers to explain the in-group behaviour of tourists attending a specific tourist event. For instance, Grappi and Montanari (2011; p. 1138) show that festival visitors patronize festivals 'to reinforce their individual self-image, communicate to others their desired identity, and signal allegiance to a desired social group' and Shipway and Jones (2007) have used a social identity framework to explain the behaviour of individual sports tourists involved in 'serious sport tourism'.

Therefore, we believe that by introducing SIT into a warfare heritage tourism context, the role of warfare heritage in processes which enhance collective self-esteem and national bonding will become clearer. The stimuli which emphasize specific social categories ought to play a prominent role in activating the cognitive evaluation process of a certain social identity. Visiting specific warfare heritage sites could temporarily rouse the salience of a social category invoked by the heritage site. There will be an in-group of visitors who feel personally connected to the symbolic meaning of a specific warfare heritage site, which itself represents a part of the social group's identity, indicating clear group boundaries regarding ownership of a specific heritage site. Consider for instance the many First or Second World War sites which clearly indicate which groups are to be understood as the victims and which as the aggressors. The design and provision of information at a heritage site can mitigate the harshness of such messages and portray their content with balance and respect, but these management tools can only influence the cognitive interpretations of visitors to a certain degree (McDonald, 2006).

Furthermore, warfare heritage highlights the connections a person has with a certain group, making the cognitive links a person has with a group even more salient than under normal circumstances. This awareness intrinsically invites comparisons with other groups, the out-groups, who do not have such a direct connection with the warfare heritage. Warfare heritage normally unilaterally emphasizes the positive aspects and achievements of a certain group, and because visitors to warfare heritage sites evaluate their membership of a social group in opposition to a relevant out-group, warfare heritage can play a significant role in forming a positively valued social identity. Along with producing a positive outcome to this cognitive evaluation process, warfare heritage has the potential to cause an increase in an individual's self-esteem as individuals evaluate the in-group they belong to positively against a group of relevant others. Nevertheless, we should bear in mind that the perceived salience of a social categorization remains very subjective and will vary considerably among visitors.

2.3. Proposed hypothesis

From social identity theory as set out above we can derive a sequence of (1) social categorization (constructing in-groups and out-groups), (2) social comparison (with the tendency to favour in-groups), (3) a positive social identity and (4) self-esteem. We argue that the subjectively perceived salience of the social category suggested by the warfare heritage site (1) is connected to (2) and thus contributes to establishing (3) and (4). Warfare heritage can be regarded as a context in which cognitive processes of social categorization and social comparison occur and thus contribute to establishing a positive social identity and an associated increase in self-esteem. As argued before, visiting a warfare heritage site is a highly personal experience and visitors feel connected to the site to varying extents. People whose social identity is strongly affected by the salience of the social category evoked by a site will most likely be driven by distinct reasons for visiting the warfare heritage site, will experience a distinct set of emotions during the visit and evaluate their visit to the warfare heritage site distinctly. Following this line of reasoning, the hypotheses of this study are:

H₁=There is a relationship between the individually perceived salience of Dutch identity and an individual visitor's motives to visit the Airborne Museum.

H₂=There is a relationship between the individually perceived salience of Dutch identity and an individual visitor's emotional experience at the Airborne Museum.

H₃=There is a relationship between the individually perceived salience of Dutch identity and an individual visitor's overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum.

H₄=There is a relationship between an individual visitor's motives to visit the Airborne Museum and an individual visitor's emotional experience at the Airborne Museum.

H₅=There is a relationship between an individual visitor's emotional experience at the Airborne Museum and an individual visitor's overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum.

H₆=There is a relationship between an individual visitor's motives to visit the Airborne Museum and an individual visitor's overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum.

The first three hypotheses all measure the relationship between the subjective salience of the social category of Dutch nationality as part of the cognitive evaluation process of acquiring a positive social identity (abbreviated to the salience of Dutch nationality or SID), with the three pillars creating the heritage experience: motives, emotions and overall evaluation. These relationships are one-directional. The salience of Dutch nationality is often considered to

be a personal characteristic which remains fairly constant after having been established during childhood (Jenkins, 1996). Motives, emotions and overall evaluation are all states characterized by their existence at a particular time and in a particular context. Normally, these temporal conditions do not affect personality traits, while traits can affect states. The second set of hypotheses reflects the sequence of motives → emotions → overall evaluation in terms of satisfaction. This study investigates whether relationships exist between the three states and to what extent the antecedent state has any predictive value for later states.

3. Methods

Methodologically, our research is based on a visitor survey administered at the end of the museum's most experientially involving section, the underground Airborne Experience. The Airborne Museum can be divided roughly into two separate parts. In the first part, visitors can walk through exhibition rooms where the permanent collection is presented. The second part of the museum is a more intense experience, as the museum wants visitors to experience the Battle of Arnhem from the perspective of the civilians who were involuntarily part of the Allied attack in 1944. In order to recreate the experience of being involved in an actual battle, sound and light effects are used to create a sense of chaos and confusion. The two separate parts of the museum offer completely different levels of intensity of experience, meaning that it can be difficult for visitors clearly to recount their emotions during their visit overall. We therefore decided only to ask for the visitor's emotions after the underground Airborne Experience, as it is this second and final part of the museum, as well as being the part which is usually referred to in accounts of the experience. We expected that the intensity of the Airborne Experience would instil stronger feelings of valence and arousal than the first part of the museum. As it is not feasible to ask participants to complete a series of questionnaires regarding the whole range of potential social categories which might be involved in constructing a person's social identity, we focused on the category most prominently evoked by the Airborne Museum: Dutch identity.

Front view of the Airborne museum 'Hartenstein'. © Author's private collection.

We adopted Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale to measure how strongly respondents identified themselves with their national group. This scale consists of four subscales, addressing the theoretical constructs as they form an individual's social identity evaluation process: Private Collective Self-Esteem, Public Collective Self-Esteem, Importance to Identity and Membership Esteem. We consider the latter item redundant in this specific research context. Choosing to be a member of an ascribed social category seems to be inconsistent with our theory and this item will not be included in the questionnaire (Ethier & Deaux, 1990).

To our knowledge, the Collective Self-Esteem Scale has not been employed in tourism research before. However, in the field of social psychology, the scale has repeatedly proven to yield reliable and valid results (cf. Kropp, Lavack, & Silvera, 2005; Pedersen, Hsu, Neighbors, Paves, & Larimer, 2013; Sato & Cameron, 1999). Therefore, we believe that the statistical inferences produced by this scale are a valuable addition to the tourism research inventory and are helpful better to understand how strongly respondents' social identities are based on their affiliation with their national identity. The scale is believed to be universally applicable to measure the salience of any social category. This implicitly means that the individual items need to be altered according to the social category which needs to be measured, as the 3 × 4 remaining subscale items are formulated very unspecifically. In this research context the

items were translated into Dutch and simultaneously adjusted to the social category of Dutch identity. Not all the items could easily be translated from English into Dutch and some freedom in the translation process was necessary to convert the items into comprehensible Dutch.

We adapted [Pearce and Lee's \(2005\)](#) tourism motive scale to measure general heritage tourism motives ([Gnoth, 1997](#)). The original scale consists of fourteen motivational factors covering a total of 69 potential tourism motives. However, the motive scale needed to be adapted to the context of heritage tourism. Some of the items could be considered redundant as they are not applicable in a heritage tourism context. The factors 'nature', 'isolation', 'autonomy' and 'romance' were deleted from the scale because based on common sense, these items are not relevant motives for visiting heritage sites. Furthermore, in line with [Poria et al. \(2006\)](#) research, we added one factor to the list, namely 'connectedness'. To ensure that the questionnaire would not become too time-consuming to complete, only four items are addressed in the questionnaire to cover the remaining factors. We choose to include the items with the highest factor loadings, unless other items seemed to be better applicable in a heritage tourism context.

We assessed the visitor's emotions using a valence and arousal scale. According to [Feldman-Barrett \(1998\)](#), both valence and arousal can be defined as 'subjective experiences [...] valence is a subjective feeling of pleasantness or unpleasantness; arousal is a subjective state of feeling activated or deactivated' (p. 580). Multiple valence and arousal scales have been developed over time, yet the one which will be employed in this study was originally devised by [Mehrabian and Russell \(1974\)](#) and is called the Pleasure, Arousal and Dominance scale (PAD). The PAD scale consists of 3×6 bipolar pairs of adjectives rated on a 7-point Likert scale. However, the dominance dimension has been removed in this research due to its unconvincing discriminant validity ([Jacobs, Fehres, & Campbell, 2012](#)).

The measurement of the visitor's overall evaluation of their visit in terms of satisfaction requires a minimum of respondent effort ([Reisinger & Turner, 2003](#)) and has been performed frequently in the tourists studies literature (cf. [Chi & Qu, 2008](#); [Kozak, 2001](#)). Most of the studies opted for a single overall measure for the satisfaction variable on a 7-point Likert scale, which will also be included in this study.

Collage of photos taken at the Airborne Experience. © Author's private collection.

4. Results

4.1. Sample characteristics

The questionnaires were administrated in thirteen days between 13 February 2014 and 2 March 2014. Only adult respondents of Dutch nationality were included in the research. A total of 991 adult visitors visited the Airborne Museum on the days the researcher distributed the questionnaires. Museum representatives informed us that they estimate that roughly one third of their visitors are foreign. This results in a target population of approximately 660 potential participants visiting the museum on days the researcher was there. At the point visitors purchased their tickets to enter the museum, the cashier informed them of our request that they could complete a questionnaire at the end of their visit. Around 39.5 percent of the visitors agreed and completed the questionnaire. We collected a non-random sample of 261 completed questionnaires out of a total population of 660 visitors.

However, some questionnaires were incomplete, contained internal inconsistencies or were completed by respondents who did not met the study's sampling criteria. Thirteen questionnaires

ultimately had to be removed, leaving $N = 248$ completed questionnaires for inclusion in the SPSS analysis. Because responses for some questions were missing, a smaller number of cases were used in the actual analyses, ranging between 241 and 247, depending on which variables were entered into the model. The data did not always meet the normality criteria. However, in accordance with central limit theory, the large sample size qualifies the data to be normally distributed and can thus be used in approximately valid procedures ([Field, 2009](#); [Nolan, 2005](#)). The 248 respondents who were included in the analyses had an average age of 51 years. The sample includes a larger proportion of males (55.1% male and 44.9% female). The descriptive scores for the items and factors were captured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from -3 (very unimportant/very unsatisfied) to $+3$ (very important/very satisfied).

4.2. Factor analysis of scale

The different contexts in which [Pearce and Lee's \(2005\)](#) motives scale have been employed invites exploratory factor analysis on the 40 items with orthogonal varimax rotation. Ultimately, 36 items comprising 8 heritage tourism motive factors were included in the further analyses ([Table 1](#)). Four items were excluded due to insufficient factor loadings. Some items were also moved to other factors than those indicated by the factor analyses, mostly based on common sense. The eight heritage motive factors computed by the exploratory factor analysis show encouraging results for reliability and practical utility. The lowest reliability score was 0.68 (Factor 6 'Connectedness'), which was nonetheless above the lowest acceptable value for adequate reliability ([Field, 2009](#)). The first three factors have good reliability scores, since $\alpha \geq 0.80$. 'Connectedness' and 'Learning' appear to be the most important factors for visiting the Airborne Museum, as their overall means are the highest. Moreover, all the item total correlations scored above the 0.30, and no individual item's deletion substantially improve the corresponding overall factor alpha. Because there is no relevant literature available to compare our results with, these newly computed heritage motive factors will direct the rest of this study.

The reliability of the valence scale is considered very good, while the reliability of the arousal scale can only be considered acceptable ([Table 2](#)). An exploratory factor analysis (varimax) of the twelve valence and arousal scale items yielded a similar result, namely that the valence items have on average higher factor loadings than the items measuring arousal. Nevertheless, all the items scored adequately above the cut-off point of 0.40 and can be retained. Configuring SPSS only to compute a fixed number of two factors yielded the same distribution for the twelve items as reported in the original literature ([Mehrabian & Russell, 1974](#)). The two indices, valence and arousal, will be used in the rest of this study. The next item of interest is the correlation between the overall valence scale and the overall arousal scale. A correlation coefficient of $r = 0.25$, $p < 0.01$ was found. According to [Vaske \(2008; p. 108\)](#), correlation coefficients of around 0.30 indicate a typical (also termed medium by other authors) relationship.

Visitor's overall evaluation is measured by asking visitors of the Airborne Museum about their overall satisfaction regarding their visit. Visitors grade their visit to the Airborne museum very positively with a mean of 2.27 on a scale from -3 (very unsatisfied) to $+3$ (very satisfied) ($SD = 0.71$).

The reliability scores of the three individual indices measuring the salience of Dutch identity can be considered good. The overall index reliability can even be regarded as excellent ([Field, 2009](#)). All the individual items correlate well (≥ 0.30) with the overall scale score. Furthermore, deleting any of the individual items does not significantly increase the alpha of the corresponding scale, indicating that all the individual items can be retained ([Table 3](#)). The

Table 1
Reliability analysis for heritage motive factors after factor analysis (varimax).

Motive factors	Items	Item total correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Factor loading
1 Initiative/Recognition ($\alpha = 0.88$) (<i>Mean</i> = -1.08)	Being recognized by other people	0.81	0.83	0.86
	Leading others	0.73	0.85	0.76
	Having others know that I have been there	0.56	0.89	0.63
	Following current events	0.79	0.83	0.85
	Being spontaneous	0.69	0.86	0.78
2 Self-actualize ($\alpha = 0.84$) (<i>Mean</i> = -0.49)	Gaining a new perspective on life	0.59	0.82	0.59
	Gaining a sense of self-confidence	0.66	0.81	0.60
	Feeling that I belong	0.69	0.80	0.82
	Working on my personal/spiritual values	0.62	0.81	0.62
	Understanding more about myself	0.62	0.81	0.52
	Gaining a sense of accomplishment			
	Gaining a new perspective on life	0.52	0.83	0.40
3 Escape/relax ($\alpha = 0.87$) (<i>Mean</i> = -0.30)	Resting and relaxing	0.77	0.82	0.85
	Not worrying about time	0.77	0.82	0.84
	Feeling personally safe and secure	0.58	0.86	0.54
	Being away from daily routine	0.64	0.85	0.67
	Getting away from the everyday psychological stress/pressure	0.69	0.84	0.80
4 Learning ($\alpha = 0.75$) (<i>Mean</i> = 1.40)	Exploring the unknown	0.54	0.69	0.79
	Experiencing something different	0.54	0.69	0.74
	Learning new things	0.58	0.68	0.76
	Developing my personal interest	0.40	0.74	0.68
	Developing my knowledge of the content of the museum	0.52	0.70	0.50
5 Meeting/being with peers ($\alpha = 0.77$) (<i>Mean</i> = -0.16)	Being with others who enjoy the same things as I do	0.55	0.73	0.71
	Meeting new and varied people	0.58	0.71	0.52
	Meeting people with similar values/interests	0.68	0.65	0.54
	Sharing skills and knowledge with others	0.48	0.76	0.54
	Visiting places related to my personal interest	0.47	0.59	0.73
6 Connectedness ($\alpha = 0.67$) (<i>Mean</i> = 1.22)	The site has symbolic meaning for you	0.49	0.56	0.69
	Feeling emotionally connected to the heritage site	0.51	0.54	0.66
	Feeling the special atmosphere of the destination	0.34	0.65	0.61
	Feeling excitement	0.47	0.62	0.43
	Thinking about good times I have had in the past	0.59	0.54	0.54
7 Stimulation/fun ($\alpha = 0.69$) (<i>Mean</i> = -0.12)	Having fun	0.37	0.69	0.49
	Having unpredictable experiences	0.46	0.63	0.43
	Strengthening relationships with my family/friends	0.46	0.64	0.77
	Doing something with my family/friends	0.64	0.43	0.77
	Doing things with my acquaintances	0.41	0.70	0.44

Note: 63.1% of the variance was explained, and motive items with factor loading <0.40 were discarded. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measurement of sampling adequacy: 0.90.

Table 2
Reliability analysis for emotion dimensions after factor analysis (varimax).

Item	Item total correlation	Alpha if item deleted	Factor loading
<i>Valence</i> ($\alpha = 0.85$)			
Unhappy – Happy	0.67	0.81	0.77
Unsatisfied – Satisfied	0.54	0.84	0.65
Despair – Hopeful	0.65	0.81	0.75
Annoyed – Pleased	0.61	0.82	0.68
Bored – Relaxed	0.59	0.83	0.72
Melancholic – Contented	0.71	0.80	0.81
<i>Arousal</i> ($\alpha = 0.68$)			
Relaxed – Stimulated	0.36	0.64	0.66
Sluggish – Wild	0.40	0.62	0.54
Unaroused – Aroused	0.41	0.61	0.72
Calm – Excited	0.40	0.61	0.60
Sleepy – Wide awake	0.37	0.62	0.51
Dull – Jittery	0.46	0.59	0.57

three indices forming the Collective Self-Esteem scale also correlate very substantially (Table 4).

4.3. Regressions, correlations and testing the hypotheses

The ultimate goal of this study is to examine whether there are relationships between the subjective perceived salience of Dutch identity and heritage tourist motives, emotions and overall

evaluation. First, multiple regression analyses are carried out to investigate whether there are significant relationships between motives, emotions and overall evaluation. Logically, the cognitive state which occurs later in time is regarded the dependent variable, as the effect is one-directional. The strength of the relationship between any given predictor and an outcome is represented by the β value. Relationships are only considered valid if significant at the $p \leq 0.05$ level. Note that only findings of significant relationships

Table 3

Reliability analysis for collective self-esteem scale.

Item	Item total correlation	Alpha if item deleted
Public acceptance of Dutch identity ($\alpha = 0.83$)		
Most foreign people consider my Dutch identity to be more effective than other national identities	0.68	0.77
My Dutch identity is considered good by foreign people	0.55	0.83
Foreign people have respect for my Dutch identity	0.72	0.75
Foreign people consider my Dutch identity as worthy	0.67	0.77
Private acceptance of Dutch identity ($\alpha = 0.77$)		
I'm glad to be Dutch	0.56	0.71
I often feel relieved that I belong to the Dutch identity I am part of	0.44	0.77
I feel good about my Dutch identity	0.65	0.65
I often feel that my Dutch identity is worthwhile	0.62	0.66
Salience of Dutch identity as part of social identity ($\alpha = 0.87$)		
My Dutch identity is an important reflection of who I am	0.62	0.87
My Dutch identity has much to do with how I feel about myself	0.75	0.82
My Dutch identity is an important part of my self-image	0.81	0.80
My Dutch identity is important to my sense of what kind of person I am	0.71	0.84

Total score subjective salience of the social category of Dutch identity as part of the cognitive evaluation process to acquire a positive social identity (SID) ($\alpha = .91$).**Table 4**

Correlations between collective self-esteem scale indices.

Indices	Correlation ^a (r)
Public acceptance of Dutch identity $\times$ private acceptance of Dutch identity	0.81*
Public acceptance of Dutch identity $\times$ Salience of Dutch identity	0.68*
Private acceptance of Dutch identity $\times$ Salience of Dutch identity	0.82*

* = significant $p \leq 0.001$.^a effect size according to Vaske (2008): .10 = minimal, .30 = typical, .50 = substantial.

are reported below.

A few significant relationships were found between heritage tourism motives as predictors for the emotions encountered after visiting the intense underground Airborne Experience. Visitors motivated by 'escape/relax' and 'stimulation/fun' were most likely to score positively on the valence scale. The other motive predictors were insignificant. Visitors who were motivated by 'stimulation/fun' or by feeling connected to the Airborne Museum were predicted to score positively on arousal. The motive factors combined can also explain approximately 10 percent of the variability of the valence dimension and 4 percent of the variability of the arousal dimension (Table 5).

'Initiative/recognition' and 'connectedness' were found to be significant in predicting an individual's overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum in terms of satisfaction. The relationship between 'recognition' and overall evaluation is negative, meaning that one standard deviation increase in 'recognition' leads to a 0.30 standard deviation decrease in predicted satisfaction, with the other variables holding constant. The opposite effect holds true for the relationship between 'connectedness' and overall evaluation.

Table 5

Regression motive factors (independent variable) and emotion dimensions (dependent variable).

Motive factor	Valence β value	Arousal β value
Initiative/Recognition	-0.06	-0.01
Learning	0.04	0.14
Connectedness	-0.10	0.14*
Self-actualization	-0.22	-0.07
Escape/relax	0.22*	0.02
Stimulation/fun	0.23*	0.19*
Relationship (strengthening)	0.06	0.03
Meeting/being with peers	-0.07	-0.16
Adjusted R ²	0.10	0.04

* = significant $p \leq 0.05$.

We predict that visitors scoring high on the 'connectedness' motive factor will evaluate the overall museum visit positively in terms of satisfaction. All the motive factors combined can also explain approximately 6 percent of the post-visit evaluation of visitors in terms of satisfaction (Table 6).

The relationship between the two emotion dimensions and the overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum in terms of satisfaction is not significant.

A correlation analysis was employed to examine the relationship between the eight heritage motive factors and the subjective salience of the visitors' Dutch identity (Table 7). All the correlations between the salience of a person's Dutch identity and motive factors vary from minimal ($r = 0.10$) to typical ($r = 0.30$). Motive factors 'initiative/recognition' and 'self-actualization' correlate most substantially with an individual's perceived salience of Dutch identity. This indicates that visitors to the Airborne Museum who score high on heritage tourism motives related to 'initiative/recognition' and 'self-actualization' connect more strongly with their Dutch identity on average than visitors who have other motives for visiting the museum.

Table 6

Regression motive factors (independent variable) and overall evaluation (dependent variable).

Motive factor	Overall evaluation β value
Initiative/Recognition	-0.33*
Learning	-0.00
Connectedness	0.20*
Self-actualization	0.20
Escape/relax	-0.11
Stimulation/fun	0.11
Relationship (strengthening)	0.06
Meeting/being with peers	0.01
Adjusted R ²	0.06

* = significant $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 7
Correlations between heritage tourism motive factors and collective self-esteem scale.

Motive factor	Correlation with SID (r) ^{a,b}
1 Initiative/Recognition	0.33*
2 Self-actualize	0.35*
3 Escape/relax	0.18
4 Learning	0.09
5 Meeting/being with Peers	0.21*
6 Connectedness	0.13
7 Stimulation/fun	0.20
8 Relationship (strengthening)	0.19

* = significant $p \leq 0.001$.

^a effect size according to Vaske (2008): .10 = minimal, .30 = typical, .50 = substantial.

^b after Bonferroni-correction, correlations are considered significant at $p \leq .001$.

There are no significant correlations between the level of valence and arousal and an individual's perceived salience of Dutch identity. Visitors' emotions as measured directly after leaving the underground Airborne Experience are not influenced by how salient they subjectively perceive their Dutch identity, as the correlations turned out to be very insignificant.

A visitor's overall evaluation correlates with between minimal and typical effect with a visitor's subjective evaluation of Dutch identity ($r = 0.20$, $p \leq 0.001$).

5. Discussion

The first set of hypotheses assesses the relationship between subjectively perceived salience of Dutch identity and a warfare heritage visitor's motives, emotions and overall evaluation. A few interesting and significant relationships were found. Heritage tourism motive factors 'initiative/recognition' and 'self-actualization' correlate typically, while 'stimulation/fun' and 'meeting/being with peers' correlate as minimal to typical effects with subjectively perceived salience of Dutch identity. It is remarkable that the two heritage motive factors ('initiative/recognition' and 'self-actualization') in which self-enhancement plays an important role correlate most closely with the subjectively perceived salience of Dutch identity. Visitors who feel somehow connected to the subjectively experienced in-group of 'being Dutch' are motivated more strongly by these self-enhancement motives to visit the Airborne Museum compared to those for whom Dutch identity is not such a salient social category. An integral part of the social comparison process is the idea that people like to see themselves in a positive light in relation to relevant others. Individuals' need for self-enhancement can be satisfied by positively evaluating their own group, in contrast to a relevant out-group. Visiting the Airborne Museum can therefore be regarded as a part of this process. The museum can provide a stimulus for cognitive processes of social comparison between the in-group (Dutch visitors) and any relevant out-group. Visitors recognizing their Dutch identity as an important social category in the subjective construction of a positive social identity can enhance their collective self-esteem in places like the Airborne Museum due to the (unintended) incentive of favouring the in-group against any relevant out-group. The representation of the site as a symbol of Dutch history makes it a suitable location for enhancing social identity and collective self-esteem.

As a result, our first hypothesis (H_1) can be accepted. However, this is not true of the second hypothesis. No significant relationship was found between subjectively perceived salience of Dutch identity and the visitor's emotions, so the relevant hypothesis (H_2) is rejected. Conversely, a minimal to typical relationship was found between the two variables representing the relationship between

SID and a visitor's overall evaluation. This indicates that visitors scoring high on salience of Dutch identity are moderately likely to evaluate their visit positively in terms of satisfaction. In other words, an association exists between the two variables, meaning that the third hypothesis (H_3) is accepted. In sum, the validity of H_1 and H_3 indicates that heritage tourist's motives and overall evaluation are influenced by the salience of Dutch identity. There is thus a relationship between heritage tourism motives, overall evaluation and the salience of a person's Dutch identity. However, these relationships do not exceed the criteria of what can be regarded a 'typical' relationship; the fact that significant relationships are found shows the potential of social identity theory as a framework for explaining the individual heritage experience better.

Heritage tourism motives seem to have some value in predicting a visitor's emotions. There is a significant and positive linear relationship between heritage visitors scoring high on 'escape/relax' and 'stimulation/fun' related motives, and how enjoyable this specific group of visitors found their visit to the underground Airborne Experience. This makes sense, as these visitors simply found at the Airborne Museum what they sought in going to the museum in the first place. More interesting is the significant and positive linear relationship between the 'connectedness' motive factor and the experienced level of arousal. Therefore, people who are motivated to visit the museum because they feel connected to it are predicted to have a more intense experience after visiting the underground Airborne Experience than visitors who are motivated by other motives. This corresponds with Poria et al. (2006) argument that the more visitors perceive a site as part of their own heritage, the greater the odds are of having an emotional experience. It can be concluded, based on these results, that there is a relationship between tourist motives and remembered emotions of valence and arousal. Heritage tourist motives are partially able to explain heritage visitor's emotions. Accordingly, the hypothesis (H_4) indicating this relationship is accepted.

Not only does the motive factor 'connectedness' predict visitors' emotional responses, it can also predict how visitors evaluate their visit to the Airborne Museum in terms of overall satisfaction. Two significant relationships were found, one positive and one negative. Based on the results of this study, visitors scoring high on 'initiative/recognition' tend to evaluate their visit to the museum most negatively. Apparently, their experiences at the Airborne Museum are not always fully consistent with their prior expectations, resulting in a more negative overall evaluation of the museum in terms of satisfaction. In contrast to this are visitors scoring high on the 'connectedness' heritage motive factor. The more strongly visitors feel connected to a heritage site, the more they tend to evaluate their visit positively. The hypothesis (H_6) reflecting this relationship is accepted. However, we have to remark that heritage visitor motives can only explain six percent of the overall satisfaction of visitors at the Airborne Museum. Other factors in the establishment of a visitor's overall satisfaction account for the remaining 94 percent.

The final relationship between a heritage visitor's emotions and a heritage visitor's overall evaluation in terms of satisfaction is not significant. In other words, visitor's emotions do not predict how visitors evaluate their visit to the Airborne Museum and the corresponding hypothesis (H_5) indicating this relationship is rejected. In conclusion, although the relations between visitors' motives, emotions and overall evaluation are small, visitors' motives do partially predict their emotions and their overall evaluation of the Airborne Museum. Furthermore, the percentage of heritage tourists' emotions and evaluations in terms of satisfaction explained by heritage tourist motives range from 4 to 10 percent (adjusted R^2). This does not seem to be a high explanatory value for heritage tourist emotions and evaluations. However, considering the complexity of the human

brain, the fact that there are significant relationships between motives and emotions and overall evaluation is quite remarkable.

5.1. Limitations

A general remark about the use of questionnaires is the possibility of receiving socially desirable responses. Some of the questions could be understood as intrusively personal, resulting in some answers not reflecting the respondent's actual opinion. For example, the overall evaluation of the museum in terms of satisfaction (with a mean of 2.27) is remarkably high. However, this is an inevitable complication of any survey research and it is very hard to determine whether this has significantly biased the data (Ryan, 1995). Another potential limitation is that some respondents had difficulties comprehending the sometimes subtle differences between the items as stated in the questionnaire. Some items need the respondents to engage considerable linguistic skill to discern the conceptual differences in, for instance, the valence and arousal scale and the Collective Self-Esteem Scale. The Cronbach's alphas of these indices are nevertheless high enough to conclude that the scales really do measure what they are supposed to measure. Furthermore – and this might be a more fundamentally loaded limitation – we must also consider that visitors may not be completely aware of their motives and emotions before and during their visit. Many decisions are made unconsciously, meaning that participants do not always recognize their own decision-making processes (Krippendorff, 1987). We could therefore argue that the motives and valence and arousal scales do not measure motives and emotions for tourism, but should actually be considered as measurement tools for retrospective justifications of a visit.

6. Conclusion

In this study we have examined whether there are relationships between the subjectively perceived salience of Dutch identity and heritage tourism motives, emotions and overall evaluation of a visit to the Airborne Museum. Many warfare heritage sites are themed around specific national identities and place considerable emphasis on the positive histories of a particular national in-group. This makes them suitable avenues for bringing about processes of social comparison, resulting in cognitive processes of personal social identity enhancement and increase in the collective self-esteem of an in-group of people who feel connected to the heritage site based on national identity. In doing so we have highlighted the role of memorial sites and war museums in modern societies as places of national importance that people feel connected to and as places which act as tangible symbols where 'in-group' visitors commonly reaffirm their national identities within an existing corpus of work on national identity construction through heritage (Pretes, 2003; Winter, 2004; Palmer, 2005; Soper, 2007 and Park, 2010) and warfare tourism (Walter, 1993; Henderson, 2000; Dunkley et al., 2011; Winter, 2011). Therefore, while Operation Market Garden had involved a broader range of British, American, Canadian, Polish and Dutch troops and that such an Allied narrative appears to have the potential to appeal to a range of North American and European tourists, warfare heritage at the Airborne Museum is also found to be significant for a Dutch national audience as it stimulates processes of national cohesion and national bonding.

Care therefore has to be taken to ensure that sufficient interpretive and site-presentation resources are put into explaining the Dutch experiences and interpretations of the War. Studies of tourism sites of various amusement, heritage and cultural elements have tended to draw on grander and more sweeping theories (for example, Urry's 'tourist gaze' and MacCannell's 'modernist tourist') which work well in narrating the key drivers of tourism as a social

phenomenon but are less useful in informing us of in-group and other smaller group dynamics and identifications. The reaffirmation motivations and processes in in-group visits are vital to a small warfare heritage attractions such as the Airborne Museum and are likely to play significant and interesting (and contradictory) roles for larger and more global sites and attractions. Moreover, this insight is a useful reminder of the overall appeal of warfare and battlefield-related sites beyond a more narrowly defined but seemingly increasingly fashionable and popular 'dark tourism' – that there should be more to the gore, pain and shame of such sites for academics, scientists and tourism attraction and site managers and promoters (Butler & Sontikul, 2013; Causevic & Lynch, 2011; Miles, 2014; Yankholmes & Mc Kercher, 2015). Accordingly, our study illustrates the utility of SIT for tourism research as an alternative framework beyond an often-used dark tourism approach.

Thus, the functions of warfare heritage in affluent Western societies are manifold: a place to learn something about history, a place of commemoration and 'living memory' to which visitors feel strongly attached and connected, and a place of national solidarity and national in-group identity. The first two are in congruence with the findings of Walter (1993) and Winter (2011), both of whom proposed a distinction between pilgrims and regular tourists. The latter function of warfare heritage offers an additional insight into why individuals want to visit warfare heritage: it can work on a more personal level to enhance an individual's social identity. Visitors to the Airborne Museum do not report ego-enhancement motives as being important; however, the positive relationship between the salience of Dutch identity and ego-enhancement motives suggests that, perhaps unconsciously, visitors visit the Airborne Museum to reaffirm their Dutch identity, to meet like-minded people and to communicate their salient Dutch identity to the outside world. The symbolic value of the Airborne Museum as a prominent icon of Dutch identity is thus a more important reason for visiting than the content, message and objects on display at the museum. This function of warfare heritage is not frequently considered in the literature regarding battlefield tourism motives (cf. Laderman, 2013; Isaak & Çakmak, 2014; Nawijn & Fricke, 2015) and is therefore an interesting pathway to further explore.

While there has been a recent shift in studies of memory in warfare spaces from the collective to the individual (Muzaini, 2015), we have shown in this study the continued relevance of collective or group dynamics for the ways in which one make sense of warfare related memories. Specifically, we have deployed social identity theory (SIT) to help us understand individual's cognitions and behaviours and how desires to maintain in-group (being Dutch) or out-group (not being Dutch) comparisons that privileges the in-group (being Dutch) and encourage feelings of self-esteem within the toured spaces of the Airborne Museum – a facility that commemorates Dutch resistances during the Second World War. Visiting the Airborne Museum has temporarily roused the salience of Dutch identity amongst Dutch visitors as the museum and its warfare heritage presented heightened collective self-esteem and national bonding.

In our examination of the role of Dutch identity in warfare tourism, we arguably made a quantitative contribution to a largely qualitative exploration of warfare and battlefield heritage sites in tourism management. Specifically, we have drawn on Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale to measure how strongly respondents identified themselves with their national group. Using the clearly defined site of the Airborne Museum, we were able to examine the applicability of this scale for warfare tourism sites for a specific segment of visitors and demonstrated the usefulness of such a quantitative approach to warfare tourism sites. Other sites articulating nationalism and evoking collective memory may benefit from further studies on national or cultural

identification using such a statistical technique and quantitative framework as well. Such quantitative and statistical methods help augment an existing and growing pool of qualitative research on identities and/in tourism spaces by defining the ‘strength’ of identification while qualitative techniques illustrate the myriad ways in which identification manifest.

In time, it is likely that most warfare heritage sites will evolve into sites of national solidarity and places to reaffirm national identity. This would be especially true once living memory of the actual battle fades and people begin to feel less closely connected to the Airborne Museum and the massive airborne operation it narrates. In such a possible future scenario, visitor motives may change to favour education, entertainment and recognition-related motives, suggesting a role for edutainment at a site dedicated to exceptional histories and narratives of violence, suffering and aggression. This has already happened at many nineteenth-century battlefield sites (e.g. those where Napoleon fought his campaigns). Until that time, museum management needs to be aware of the different needs and desires that different groups of visitors have when visiting the museum. In all, we demonstrate that a reaffirmative and engaged experience can manifest in nationally symbolic sites through positive historical narratives and entertainment and the self-enhancement activities of the ‘in-group’.

Acknowledgement

The authors appreciate the constructive comments from the anonymous referees. We would like to thank Hamzah Muzaini, Wantanee Suntikul and Maarten Jacobs for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Also, the authors wish to thank the staff of the Airborne Museum “Hartenstein” for facilitating the research.

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. (2004). Metatheory: lessons from social identity research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8–2, 98–106.
- Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R. P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39–4, 555–577.
- Bond, N., & Falk, J. (2013). Tourism and identity-related motivations: why am I here (and not there)? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 430–442.
- Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: past achievements, current problems and future challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 745–778.
- Butler, R., & Suntikul, W. (2013). Tourism and war: an ill wind? In R. Butler, & W. Suntikul (Eds.), *Tourism and war* (pp. 1–11). London & New York: Routledge.
- Causevic, S., & Lynch, P. (2011). Phoenix tourism: post-conflict tourism role. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38–3, 780–800.
- Chi, C., & Qu, H. (2008). Examining the Structural Relationships of destination image, tourist satisfaction and destination loyalty: an integrated Approach. *Tourism Management*, 29–4, 624–636.
- Dunkley, R., Morgan, N., & Westwood, S. (2011). Visiting the trenches: exploring meanings and motivations in battlefield tourism. *Tourism Management*, 32, 860–868.
- Ethier, K., & Deaux, K. (1990). Hispanics in ivy: assessing identity and perceived threat. *Sex Roles*, 22, 427–440.
- Felder, M., Duineveld, M., & Van Assche, K. (2015). Absence/Presence and the ontological politics of heritage: the case of barrack 57. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21–5, 460–475.
- Feldman-Barrett, L. (1998). Discrete emotions or dimensions? the role of valence focus and arousal focus. *Cognition and Emotion*, 12–4, 579–599.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS. Third edition*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gnoth, J. (1997). Tourism motivation and expectation formation. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 283–304.
- Grappi, S., & Montanari, F. (2011). The role of social identification and hedonism in affecting tourist Re-patronizing behaviours: the case of an Italian festival. *Tourism Management*, 32, 1128–1140.
- Greenspan, E. (2005). A global site of heritage? constructing spaces of memory at the world trade centre site. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11–5, 371–384.
- Henderson, J. (2000). War as a tourist attraction: the case of Vietnam. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2, 269–280.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. (1995). A tale of two theories: a critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58–4, 255–269.
- Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: a critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22–1, 127–156.
- Iles, J. (2008). Encounters in the fields – tourism to the battlefields of the western front. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 6–2, 138–154.
- Isaak, R. H., & Çakmak, E. (2014). Understanding Visitor's motivation at sites of death and disaster: the case of former transit camp Westerbork, the Netherlands. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17–2, 164–179.
- Jacobs, M. H., Fehres, P., & Campbell, M. (2012). Measuring emotions toward wildlife: a review of generic methods and instruments. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife: An International Journal*, 17–4, 233–247.
- Jenkins, R. (1996). *Social identity*. London: Routledge.
- Karasawa, M. (1991). Toward an assessment of social identity: the structure of group identification and its effects on in-group evaluations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 293–307.
- Kozak, M. (2001). ‘Repeaters’ behavior at two distinct destinations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 28–3, 784–807.
- Krippendorf, J. (1987). *The holiday makers: Understanding the impact of leisure and travel*. Oxford: Heinemann Professional Publishing Ltd.
- Kropp, F., Lavack, A. M., & Silvera, D. H. (2005). Values and collective self-esteem as predictors of consumer susceptibility to interpersonal influence among university students. *International Marketing Review*, 22–1, 7–33.
- Laderman, S. (2013). From the Vietnam war to the “war on terror”: tourism and the martial fascination. In R. Butler, & W. Suntikul (Eds.), *Tourism and war* (pp. 26–36). London & New York: Routledge.
- Lehrer, E. (2010). Can there be reconciliatory heritage? *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16–4, 269–288.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). Collective self-esteem scale: self-evaluation of One's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18–1, 302–318.
- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: a partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13–2, 103–123.
- McDonald, S. (2006). Undesirable heritage: fascist material culture and historical consciousness in Nuremberg. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12–1, 9–28.
- McIntosh, A. J. (1999). Into the Tourist's mind: understanding the value of the heritage experience. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 8–1, 41–64.
- McKercher, B., & du Cros, H. (2003). Testing a cultural tourism typology. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 5, 45–58.
- Mehrabian, A., & Russell, J. A. (1974). *An approach to environmental psychology*. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.
- Miles, S. (2014). Battlefield sites as dark tourism attractions: an analysis of experience. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9–2, 134–147.
- Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (1998). *Tourism promotion and power. Creating images, creating identities*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Muzaini, H. (2015). On the matter of forgetting and ‘memory returns’. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 40–1, 102–112.
- Nawijn, J., & Fricke, M. (2015). Visitor emotions and behavioral intentions: the case of concentration camp memorial Neuengamme. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17, 221–228.
- Nolan, D. (2005). Central limit theory. In *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics*, 1.
- Ong, C. E., Minca, C., & Felder, M. (2015). The historic hotel as ‘Quasi-Freedom machine’: negotiating utopian visions and dark histories at Amsterdam's Lloyd hotel and ‘cultural embassy’. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10–2, 167–183.
- Owens, T. J., Robinson, D. T., & Smith-Lovin, L. (2010). Three faces of identity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36–1, 477–499.
- Palmer, C. (2005). An ethnography of Englishness, experiencing identity through tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32–1, 7–27.
- Palmer, A., Koenig-Lewis, N., & Medi-Jones, L. (2013). The effects of residents' social identity and involvement on their advocacy of incoming tourism. *Tourism Management*, 38, 142–151.
- Park, H. (2010). Heritage tourism: emotional journeys into nationhood. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37–1, 116–135.
- Pearce, P. L., & Lee, U. (2005). Developing the travel career approach to tourist motivation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43, 226–237.
- Pedersen, E. R., Hsu, S. H., Neighbors, C., Paves, A. P., & Larimer, M. E. (2013). Exploring relationships between facets of self-esteem and drinking behavior among diverse groups of young adults. *Addictive Behaviors*, 38, 2581–2585.
- Poria, Y., Reichel, A., & Biran, A. (2006). Heritage site management. Motivations and expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33–1, 162–178.
- Pretes, M. (2003). Tourism and nationalism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30–1, 125–142.
- Prideaux, B. (2007). Echoes of war: battlefield tourism. In C. Ryan (Ed.), *Battlefield tourism. History, place and interpretation* (pp. 17–27). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Reisinger, Y., & Turner, L. W. (2003). *Cross-cultural behaviour in tourism. Concepts and analysis*. Burlington: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Richards, G. (1996). Production and consumption of European cultural tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23–2, 261–283.
- Ryan, C. (1995). *Researching tourist satisfaction. Issues, concepts, problems*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Sato, T., & Cameron, J. E. (1999). The relationship between collective self-esteem and self-construal in Japan and Canada. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 139–4, 426–435.
- Shipway, R., & Jones, I. (2007). Running away from home: understanding visitor

- experiences and behaviour at sport tourism events. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 9, 373–383.
- Soper, A. K. (2007). Developing mauritianness: national identity, cultural heritage values and tourism. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2–2, 94–109.
- Su, Y., & Lin, H. (2014). Analysis of international tourism arrivals worldwide: the role of world heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 40, 46–58.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social Groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Tanti, C., Stukas, A. A., Halloran, M. J., & Foddy, M. (2011). Social identity change: shifts in social identity during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 555–567.
- Timothy, D. J., & Boyd, S. W. (2003). *Heritage tourism*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Trepte, S. (2006). Social identity theory. In J. Bryant, & P. Vorderer (Eds.), *Psychology of entertainment* (pp. 255–271). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tunbridge, J., & Ashworth, G. (1996). *Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Vaske, J. J. (2008). *Survey research and analysis. Applications in parks, recreation and human dimensions*. State College, Pennsylvania: Venture Publishing, Inc.
- Walter, T. (1993). War grave pilgrimage. In I. Reader, & T. Walter (Eds.), *Pilgrimage in popular culture* (pp. 63–89). London, UK: Macmillan.
- Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2013). Framing theory: towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 19–6, 546–561.
- Williams, P. (2007). *Memorial Museums: The Global Rush to Commemorate Atrocities*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Winter, T. (2004). Landscape, memory and heritage: new year celebrations at angkor, Cambodia. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 7–4, 330–345.
- Winter, C. (2011). Battlefield visitor motivations: explorations in the great war town of ieper, Belgium. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13, 164–176.
- Yankholmes, A., & McKercher, B. (2015). Rethinking slavery heritage tourism. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 10–3, 233–247.

Joost A. Gieling MSc is currently a PhD candidate in the department of Cultural Geography at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands. This study is part of his MSc project, completed in 2014 at Wageningen University. Joost's research interests include heritage tourism, historical geography, livability and identity.

Dr Chin Ee Ong is currently Lecturer in Human Geography at the Department of Geography at National University of Singapore. This research was done during the time Chin Ee was based in the Cultural Geography Group in Wageningen University. Chin Ee's research focus on power and governance in heritage, urban and tourism spaces.