

How to cite: Augustyn M., Jakubik-Bińczak K., Placek O., Jachym R., Tomik R. (2024). *Assessment and Comparison of the Attractiveness of the City of Katowice and Ustroń Health Resort in the Opinion of Tourists*, "Folia Turistica", 63, 11-29.
<https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0054.8810>

ASSESSMENT AND COMPARISON OF THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE CITY OF KATOWICE AND USTROŃ HEALTH RESORT IN THE OPINION OF TOURISTS

*Marcjanna Augustyn**, *Katarzyna Jakubik-Bińczak***,
*Oskar Placek****, *Ramona Jachym*****,
*Rajmund Tomik******


Abstract


Purpose. The objective of the study is to assess and compare tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness and their quality of experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions at two diverse tourism destinations (Katowice, an urban destination and Ustroń, a health resort).


Method. The diagnostic survey method as well as a questionnaire were used to collect the data. A total of 400 tourists were surveyed, 200 in Katowice and 200 in Ustroń. The Mann-Whitney U test was used for statistical analysis.


Findings. Higher ratings were observed in Ustroń (a health resort) than in Katowice (an urban destination) for all but one of the studied indicators. The only indicator in which Katowice scored higher than Ustroń was the destination's variety of attractions and facilities. Statistically significant differences between the two destinations were found for all indicators studied except for two: tourist satisfaction and behavioural intentions.


Research and conclusion limitations. The study was cross-sectional and only two diverse destinations were examined. Future longitudinal replication studies are needed for other types of tourism destinations.

*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8270-3839>, Prof., Bournemouth University Business School, Department for Marketing Strategy and Innovation, e-mail: maugustyn@bournemouth.ac.uk.

**  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3811-4540>, Ph.D., Jerzy Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice, Department of Tourism and Recreation, e-mail: k.jakubik@awf.katowice.pl.

***  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9374-2860>, MSc, Jerzy Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice, Department of Tourism and Recreation, e-mail: o.placek@awf.katowice.pl.

****  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-7064-1959>; MSc., Jerzy Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice, Department of Tourism and Recreation, e-mail: r.jachym@awf.katowice.pl.

*****  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9603-8828>; Ph.D., Assoc. Prof., Jerzy Kukuczka Academy of Physical Education in Katowice, Department of Tourism and Recreation, e-mail: r.tomik@awf.katowice.pl.

Practical implications. The research results may be useful in developing strategies for improving destination attractiveness and competitiveness.

Originality. This is the first study in which two tourism destinations with different characteristics are compared in order to establish whether the type of destination may determine tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness, in terms of destination quality, as well as tourists' perceptions regarding the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions. As such, the study contributes to extending knowledge on perceived destination attractiveness.

Type of paper. An article presenting the results of empirical research.

Keywords: destination attractiveness, Ustroń, Katowice, tourist experience, satisfaction, quality

Introduction

One of the most important issues of tourism geography and destination competitiveness is destination attractiveness, which refers to the features of an area, region, city or a single object that arouses tourists' interest and is mainly determined by destination characteristics, tourism development and transport accessibility [Kaczmarek, Stasiak and Włodarczyk 2005]. S. Page [1995] approached the issue of destination attractiveness differently and argued that the concept could be understood within three contexts, i.e. attractiveness defined by various classifications and categorisations (ideographic attractiveness), attractiveness resulting from the adoption of a specific evaluation technique and attractiveness resulting from subjective perception.

In prior studies, attempts were made to assess perceived destination attractiveness in order to determine any differences in relation to tourists' characteristics, motivations and attitudes, and such differences were established [e.g. Kim and Perdue 2011; Pompurová, Šimo ková and Rialti 2023]. Little is known, however, whether there are any differences in tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness depending on the type of tourism destination, based on resources, purposes and heritage, and whether any differences in such perceptions would require aligning tourism development strategies to enhance destination attractiveness and their competitiveness in relation to the specific type of a tourism destination. Furthermore, in prior research, it has been indicated that tourism destination quality is crucial for enhancing destination attractiveness and competitiveness [e.g. Blazeska, Milenkovski and Gramatnikovski 2015; Islam and Chaudhary 2020]. Nonetheless, there is not much information on tourists' perceptions of destination quality, in general and, particularly, in the context of destination attractiveness, and especially, regarding destinations of diverse types, based on their resources, purposes and heritage. Finally, although in prior studies links have been established between perceived destination attractiveness and tourists' perceptions of the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions [e.g. Chaudhary and Islam 2020; Vigolo 2015], little is known about these concepts within the context of destination quality as an aspect of diverse destination attractiveness.

The research presented in this paper addresses the research gaps identified above and aims to assess and compare tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness as well as quality of experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions at two diverse tourism destinations (Katowice, an urban destination and Ustroń, a health resort). To achieve this objective, the following research questions are examined in this study:

1. How do tourists perceive destination quality attractiveness at an urban destination and a health resort?
2. Are there any significant differences in tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness at the two diverse tourism destinations?
3. How do tourists evaluate the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions at an urban destination and a health resort?
4. Are there any significant differences in tourists' evaluations regarding the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the two diverse tourism destinations?

Literature review

Tourism destination attractiveness

Destination attractiveness has been studied for several decades. It has been variously defined but the general consensus is that a destination is attractive if it is capable of satisfying tourists' needs [Dey, Mathew and Chee-Hua 2020; Hu and Ritchie 1993]. Since tourists needs vary, in prior studies, significant differences were examined and established in perceived destination attractiveness based on tourists' characteristics, motivations and attitudes. For example, D. Kim and R.R. Perdue [2011] found that cognitive and affective images impact perceptions of destination attractiveness. Meanwhile, D. Das, S.K. Sharma, P.K. Mohapatra and A. Sarkar [2007] noted that tourists' age, social class and region of origin determine their perceptions of destination attractiveness. In another study, K. Pompurová et al. [2023] found that there are significant differences in perceptions of destination attractiveness among tourists representing different generations – GenY and GenZ.

While the studies on the impact of tourists' characteristics, motivations and attitudes are important for enhancing our understanding of perceived destination attractiveness and designing effective marketing strategies, little is known about whether tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness may differ depending on the type of a tourism destination visited, based on destination resources, purposes and heritage. Studying these phenomena and establishing whether such differences exist is crucial to designing effective tourism development strategies aimed at enhancing destination attractiveness and competitiveness. Indeed, in earlier research, it

has been indicated that destinations can differentiate and compete with regard to their unique resources that make destinations attractive [e.g. Ariya, Wishitemi and Sitati, 2017; Islam, Hossain and Noor, 2017; Lee, Chen and Huang, 2014; Oliani, Rossi and Gervasoni, 2011; Raimkulov, Juraturgunov and Ahn, 2021]. However, in these studies, different attributes of destination attractiveness were used, owing to the uniqueness of their resources, making comparisons of destination attractiveness difficult.

One aspect of destination attractiveness that could be compared is destination quality. It is considered central to enhancing destination attractiveness and competitiveness [e.g. Blazeska, Milenkovski and Gramatnikovski, 2015; Islam and Chaudhary, 2020]. Nonetheless, there is not information on tourists' perceptions of destination quality, in general and in the context of destination attractiveness in particular, and especially in destinations of diverse types, based on their resources, purposes and heritage. This is mainly because, until recently, there has been a limited understanding of the concept of destination quality and how it should be measured. Nevertheless, in a recent empirical mixed methods study in which it was examined what tourists associate with destination quality [Seakhoa-King, Augustyn and Mason, 2020], solid foundations have been provided for conducting comparative research on destination quality as an aspect of destination attractiveness. A. Seakhoa-King et al. [2020, p. 207] defined tourism destination quality as the extent to which destinations meet tourists' requirements concerning "conditions suitable for pursuing tourist activities and interests", and identify 12 dimensions and 75 attributes of destination quality. A. Seakhoa-King et al. [2020] argued that fewer dimensions and indicators of destination quality may be needed, depending on the type and strategic goals of a tourism destination. For example, to improve destination quality attractiveness, dimensions such as "authentic", "informative", "relaxing", "safe", "varied" and "well-kept" place may suffice in assessing destination quality attractiveness.

In previous studies on destination attractiveness, links were established between perceived destination attractiveness and tourists' perception of the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions [e.g. Chaudhary and Islam, 2020; Vigolo, 2015]. Little is known, however, about tourists' perceptions of the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions within the context of destination quality attractiveness, and especially in the context of diverse destinations, based on their resources, purposes and heritage.

Tourist attractiveness of urban destinations

Urban agglomerations are characterised by apparent differences in the perception of their attractiveness by permanent residents [Kreżolek et al., 2017] and tourists. D. Kreżolek et al. [2017] argued that the perception of

a city's attractiveness is an individual issue mainly dependent on the subjective preferences of the evaluator. Nevertheless, several factors can be identified that influence this perception. The most important tourist attractions of urban areas include, among others, architectural monuments, historical sites, cultural and sports events, fairs, congresses, conferences, and shopping centres with a variety of cultural and entertainment offers [Kaczmar-ska, 2013]. To increase the number of tourists visiting urban areas, historic industrial facilities are being adapted and revitalised to assume new functions, often related to tourism and recreation. Technological monuments help create an extremely attractive tourist offer or diversify the already existing one, especially in urban centres, an excellent example of which are the cities of Poland's Upper Silesian Industrial District, including Katowice. As A. Kaczmar-ska [2013, p. 82] stated, "industrial tourism currently means a form of recreation, education and active leisure organised in areas of current or past economic activity based on construction materials and technological lines related to the production and manufacturing of material goods or broadly understood services".

Tourist attractiveness of health resorts

Health resorts are currently multifunctional tourist places that are also attractive spaces for various forms of tourism, including not only health tourism but also active, recreational, sightseeing or business tourism [Kruczek 2012]. Both domestic and foreign tourists visit these places as part of longer holiday trips or shorter weekend getaways. Health resorts have become a peculiar tourist attraction due to specific development elements, including mineral water pump rooms or spa parks, as well as cultural, entertainment and sports events held at them [*ibid*]. Interesting research on the attractiveness of Polish health resorts was conducted by A.R. Szromek [2013] who compared two health resorts in Poland (Polanica and Krynica) and found that the sense of security may have significant impact on the attractiveness of health resorts. This author also found that there are differences in the assessment of health resort attractiveness between tourists who chose to visit the place, and patients who visit health resorts because they are referred there by the Polish National Health Fund and who, therefore, do not have the right to choose the place to which they will go. In the research by the mentioned author, it was shown that in the case of Polanica, both the cleanliness of the health resort and assessment of hotel infrastructure quality were statistically significantly different in this respect depending on the tourist's affiliation to the group of decision-makers or non-decision-makers. Some studies are focused only on selected elements of health resorts, such as spa parks. Spa parks are an important element of every health resort. In research conducted in 2017 it was indicated that there are 84 spa parks in

Poland, most of them located within the “A” zone of health resorts [Bernat 2017]. As there can be more than one spa park at one health resort, their total number exceeds the number of health resorts. In his article, Bernat [2017] noted that there is no relationship between the size of a health resort and the number of spa parks. The health resort with the largest number of spa parks is Ustka with nine of them.

Katowice as an urban tourism destination

Katowice, the capital of the Silesian Voivodeship in Poland, covers an area of approximately 165 km², a significant part of which is forested. Katowice is located in Upper Silesia, the region most associated with several hundred years of industrial heritage, based mainly on mining. It should be noted, though, that despite the high concentration of industrial facilities, the city of Katowice offers both its residents and tourists many opportunities for recreation and active leisure. Among such attractions are the Three Ponds Valley in Katowice, Tadeusz Kościuszko City Park and the Murckowski Forest Reserve. Other numerous attractions of Katowice include museums, cinemas, theatres and sports centres. A symbol of Katowice is the “Spodek” sports and entertainment hall and the nearby modern space known as the Culture Zone, which includes the International Congress Centre, the building of the National Polish Radio Symphony Orchestra, and the Silesian Museum on the site of the former Katowice coal mine [Miszta 2015]. Other anthropogenic attractions of the city include the Stanisław Wyspiański Theatre, the Archcathedral of Christ the King or St. Mary’s Church and Mariacka Street, where all kinds of gastronomic facilities such as cafes, pubs and restaurants are clustered. Also worth mentioning is the Katowice Route of Modernism¹, with its recognised modern architecture constructed between World War 1 and 2. The objects found on the route are the city showcase, introducing visitors to 17 examples of modernist architecture from the interwar period. Accordingly, there are good conditions for the development of urban tourism in Katowice due to several favourable factors, such as convenient access to transportation, a rich cultural and entertainment offer and modern infrastructure. It can therefore be concluded that the city of Katowice has significant tourist potential, also in terms of international tourism.

Ustroń as a health resort

The municipality of Ustroń is located in the southern part of the Silesian Voivodeship in Poland, at the foothills of the Silesian Beskids and occupying an area of approximately 59 km². The natural therapeutic resource-

¹ https://www.katowice.eu/Foldery%20o%20miecie/Katowice_moderna/folder%20moderna_pl.pdf [accessed: 10 Apr. 2023].

es that earned Ustroń the status of a health resort are primarily thermal chloride-sodium-lime, bromine and iodine waters, as well as medicinal peat [Jankowski et al., 2007]. The plethora of spa assets allows for a variety of therapeutic profiles, among which are orthopaedics and trauma, rheumatology, nervous system and upper respiratory tract treatment, cardiology, peripheral vascular and obesity treatment or climatotherapy. The undeniable therapeutic qualities are further enhanced by the extensive mountain scenery, numerous forest and protected areas such as the Silesian Beskids Landscape Park or the “Czantoria” nature reserve [Jankowski et al., 2007]. Ustroń has changed from an old, traditional industrial settlement into a modern health resort, holiday centre and popular winter sports destination. Alike other spa destinations, Ustroń is of typical spa and treatment infrastructure, an attraction not found at other tourist spots. Examples include mineral water pump rooms, natural treatment facilities, thermal pools, brine graduation towers and walking paths within representative spa parks. The numerous health and recreational advantages of Ustroń, combined with the city’s intensive development, make it popular among tourists.

Prior studies assessing destination attractiveness in Poland

Katowice and Ustroń are located in the Silesian Voivodeship. As research based on data from 2013 proves, the Silesian Voivodeship was second in terms of its attractiveness (0.3547); second only to the Pomeranian Voivodeship (0.4313) [Bąk and Szczecińska 2015, pp. 5-16]. This makes Katowice and Ustroń extremely important tourist centres across the country. If we focus on cities alone, research conducted on 2,863 people in 2016 in the Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship allowed to show that respondents consider Kraków (71%), Warsaw (34%), Wrocław (34%), Gdańsk (28%) and Zakopane (12%) to be the most attractive cities in Poland. Katowice and Ustroń were not featured in the results of that study [Zieliński and Dziarmaga, 2017]. In another study, the attractiveness of Przemyśl was considered [Cichocka and Krupa, 2017], and it was established that tourists visiting Przemyśl in Poland considered the city attractive (53% responded “definitely yes” to the question “In your opinion, is Przemyśl a city attractive for tourists?”). Positive responses from tourists also concerned nature and green areas in the city (90.6%), city atmosphere (83.2%), city cleanliness and aesthetics (79.7%), as well as safety (76.6%) [Cichocka and Krupa 2017, pp. 115-132]. In A.R. Szromek’s [2013] research, cleanliness (4.41 for Krynica and 4.01 for Polanica) and safety (4.43 for Krynica and 4.17 for Polanica) were clearly important to tourists. therein this research, a correlation was also noted between knowledge of regular events and the perception of city attractiveness among tourists (0.13) [Szubert, Warcholik and Zemła 2022]. In their research, a high correlation was observed between attractions known to tourists and the perception of the city as attractive to tourists (0.89).

Research methods

The diagnostic survey method was used in the study. The research tool was a survey questionnaire. The anonymous survey questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section A comprised a series of three questions about the respondent's stay at the destination under evaluation. Section B comprised two sets of statements evaluated by respondents using a 7-point Likert scale to specify their levels of agreement with given statements, from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (7). Implementation of the scale was aimed at examining a respondent's perceptions of the following: (a) destination quality attractiveness (the tourism destination quality scale, containing 25 items derived from A. Seakhwa-King et al. [2020], and representing the following destination quality dimensions: authentic, informative, relaxing, safe, varied, well-kept); (b) the respondent's perceptions of destination quality (the perceived quality scale, containing three items based on A. Seakhwa-King et al. [2020]); (c) quality of the respondents' own experience (the quality of tourist experience scale, containing three items taken from J.E. Otto and J.R.B. Ritchie [1996]); (d) satisfaction (the tourist satisfaction scale, containing five items proposed by Zabkar et al. [2010]), and (e) behavioural intentions (the tourist behavioural intentions scale, containing four items on the basis of V. Zabkar et al. [2010] and D.A. Baker and J.L. Crompton [2000]). The specific indicators (scale items) are included in Table 2. Section C included questions concerning the respondents socio-demographic characteristics. Preliminary data analysis in this study indicated internal consistency of the scales used, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Internal consistency of the study scales

Scale	No. of items	Cronbach alpha		
		Katowice, N=200	Ustroń, N=200	Katowice + Ustroń, N =400
Tourism Destination Quality – TDQ	25	0.823	0.901	0.854
Perceived quality – PQ	3	0.736	0.497	0.609
TDQ + PQ	28	0.849	0.905	0.868
Quality of Tourist Experience – QTE	3	0.848	0.769	0.801
Tourist Satisfaction – TS	5	0.873	0.726	0.798
Tourist Behavioural Intentions – TBI	4	0.891	0.708	0.794
QTE+TS+TBI	12	0.942	0.834	0.897
WHOLE SCALE	40	0.910	0.948	0.924

Source: Own elaboration.

The survey was conducted between July and October 2022 by the authors and students of Tourism and Recreation at the Academy of Physical Education in Katowice. The survey was carried out at two diverse destinations of the Silesian Voivodeship, i.e. Katowice (an urban destination) and Ustroń (a health resort). The two destinations with different characteristics (an urban destination and a health resort) were deliberately selected to address the research gap identified in the 'Introduction' section of the present work, i.e. to determine whether there are any differences in tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness depending on the type of tourism destination, based on their resources, purposes and heritage. Accessibility of the destinations for data collection was also a criterion for selecting the study destinations. For each destination, 200 correctly and fully completed questionnaires were obtained. It was decided to collect a similar number of responses due to the high tourist potential of both surveyed cities. The total sample size was 400 respondents, comprising 200 randomly selected tourists at each destination. Thanks to the collection of 400 respondents' responses, the study is characterised by high reliability. The sample size is adequate for this analysis, based on a ratio of 5-10 indicators per scale item, as recommended by Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson [2019], and this study's scale containing 40 items (Table 2). The researchers chose to conduct the research between July and October to enhance comparability of data, in view of the fact that the health resort of Ustroń is also a ski resort and collecting data during the winter season could impact comparability of the results across destinations. The research was carried out in areas with high tourist traffic concentrations (market square and Spa Park in Ustroń, and in the area of the market square and Spodek in Katowice).

Preliminary data analysis revealed that the data is not normally distributed, as both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk tests are significant for all items measured in this study (Table 2).

Table 2. Normality testing

SCALE, DIMENSIONS, Items	Kolmogorov-Smirno'a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
TOURISM DESTINATION QUALITY						
INFORMATIVE						
X has easily available tourist information	.162	343	<.001	.900	343	<.001
X has tour guides who know the area well	.207	188	<.001	.835	188	<.001
X has local area maps that are easy to understand	.227	341	<.001	.813	341	<.001
X has accurate tourist information	.163	322	<.001	.908	322	<.001

VARIED						
X has the required variety of accommodation facilities	.209	356	<.001	.856	356	<.001
X has the required variety of public transport	.215	289	<.001	.882	289	<.001
X has the required variety of restaurants	.201	374	<.001	.851	374	<.001
X has the required variety of tourist attractions	.168	344	<.001	.911	344	<.001
WELL-KEPT						
X appears tidy	.217	390	<.001	.870	390	<.001
X has clean streets	.184	383	<.001	.892	383	<.001
X has clean public toilets	.173	209	<.001	.910	209	<.001
X has clean tourist attractions	.210	368	<.001	.869	368	<.001
SAFE						
There is no danger of physical harm in X	.157	323	<.001	.926	323	<.001
There is no risk of getting mugged in X	.144	249	<.001	.906	249	<.001
There is adequate security for my personal belongings in X	.226	346	<.001	.845	346	<.001
There is no danger of verbal abuse in X	.227	273	<.001	.854	273	<.001
AUTHENTIC						
X has plenty of undisturbed natural beauty	.306	376	<.001	.770	376	<.001
X is not too commercialised	.123	333	<.001	.937	333	<.001
X is not overcrowded	.120	389	<.001	.925	389	<.001
There is no visual pollution in X	.141	362	<.001	.914	362	<.001
There are opportunities to see the true character of X	.247	340	<.001	.839	340	<.001
RELAXING						
X has a relaxing atmosphere	.242	392	<.001	.829	392	<.001
X has an enjoyable atmosphere	.230	390	<.001	.813	390	<.001
X has a restful atmosphere	.232	379	<.001	.829	379	<.001
X has a stress free atmosphere	.211	388	<.001	.842	388	<.001
PERCEIVED QUALITY						
X is of high overall standard	.151	376	<.001	.920	376	<.001
X fully meets my tourist requirements	.160	348	<.001	.915	348	<.001
X is an excellent tourism destination	.200	380	<.001	.872	380	<.001
QUALITY OF TOURIST EXPERIENCE						
I am having an excellent tourist experience in X	.261	388	<.001	.779	388	<.001
I feel happy in X	.235	391	<.001	.792	391	<.001
I feel safe in X	.276	394	<.001	.797	394	<.001

TOURIST SATISFACTION						
I am delighted about my visit to X	.326	395	<.001	.722	395	<.001
My visit to X has exceeded my expectations	.125	390	<.001	.925	390	<.001
I did the right thing by visiting X	.318	391	<.001	.704	391	<.001
Overall, I am impressed with X	.183	394	<.001	.881	394	<.001
Overall, I am satisfied with my tourist experience in X	.265	397	<.001	.759	397	<.001
TOURIST BEHAVIOURAL INTENTIONS						
I would choose to visit X again	.250	391	<.001	.787	391	<.001
I will encourage my friends and relatives to visit X	.185	379	<.001	.866	379	<.001
I would pay more for my stay in X	.128	378	<.001	.913	378	<.001
I will speak highly of X to friends and relatives	.183	392	<.001	.882	392	<.001

X = name of studied destination

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: Own elaboration.

Mean values were used to analyse and compare the respondent's perceptions. Given that the data is not normally distributed, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was applied to determine any significant differences between the two study populations: Katowice and Ustroń.

Research results

There were 71 male and 129 female respondents in Ustroń, relative to 110 male and 90 female respondents in Katowice. Respondent groups differed regarding their age. In Ustroń, older people aged 65+ (35.5%) and 55-64 years (29.5%) predominated, while in Katowice, the majority of respondents

Table 3. Socio-demographic profile of the respondents

	Ustroń (N=200)		Katowice (N=200)	
	Male		Male	
Sex				
	Female		Female	
Age	N	%	N	%
16-24	10	5%	44	22%
25-34	17	8.5%	74	37%
35-44	20	10%	58	29%

45-54	22	11%	8	4%
55-64	59	29.5%	10	5%
65+	71	35.5%	6	3%
Education	N	%	N	%
Primary	3	1.5%	3	1.5%
Secondary	75	37.5%	42	21%
Vocational diploma	46	23%	2	1%
Incomplete higher education	12	6%	16	8%
Higher education	64	32%	137	68.5%

Source: Own elaboration.

were aged 25-34 (37%) and 35-44 years (29%). One person from the group surveyed in Ustroń refused to disclose their age. Respondents from Ustroń mainly had secondary (37.5%) or higher education (32%). In Katowice, the highest proportion declared having a university degree (68.5%). The characteristics of the study population are presented in Table 3.

The combined results for both samples in this study indicate that the respondents (N=400) considered the destinations attractive, based on their quality. Indeed, all dimensions of destination quality as well as the perceived quality scored above the scale's theoretical mean value of 4.0. The highest scoring dimension of destination quality was "Relaxing" (5.75), followed by "Informative" (5.50), "Well-kept" (5.37), "Varied" (5.32), "Authentic" (4.80) and "Safe" (4.75). Likewise, the overall perceived quality also scored high (5.31), as shown in Table 4.

Ustroń scored higher in almost all analysed dimensions of tourism destination quality. "Varied" was the only dimension for which the mean value was higher among respondents surveyed in Katowice. For Ustroń, the highest scores for destination quality were given to the place for being "Relaxing" (6.24), "Informative" (5.71), and "Well-kept" (5.70), while the lowest scores were given to the following dimensions: "Authentic" (5.05), "Safe" (5.10) and "Varied" (5.20). The overall perception of quality for Ustroń was higher than the average for the sample (5.58 relative to 5.31, respectively) (Table 4).

In the case of Katowice, the highest score was given to the "Varied" (5.43) dimension. The respondents perceived the destination equally as "Relaxing" (5.29) and "Informative" (5.29). The lowest scores were given to the following dimensions of Katowice's quality: "Safe" (4.40), "Authentic" (4.55) and "Well-kept" (5.04). The overall perception of Katowice's quality was lower than the average for the sample (5.04 for Katowice relative to 5.31 for the study sample), albeit, it was above the theoretical mean value of 4.0 (Table 4).

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test indicate statistically significant differences between Ustroń and Katowice in all dimensions (Table 4).

Table 4. Destination quality attractiveness for Katowice and Ustroń (N=400)

	Total N=400		Katowice N=200		Ustroń N=200		Mann-Whitney U Test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value
Relaxing	5.77	1.07	5.29	0.96	6.24	0.96	p<0.05*
Informative	5.50	0.85	5.29	0.75	5.71	0.90	p<0.05*
Well-kept	5.37	0.97	5.04	0.94	5.70	0.88	p<0.05*
Varied	5.32	0.81	5.43	0.83	5.20	0.77	p<0.05*
Authentic	4.80	0.89	4.55	0.75	5.05	0.96	p<0.05*
Safe	4.75	1.04	4.40	0.85	5.10	1.09	p<0.05*
Perceived Quality	5.31	0.94	5.04	0.89	5.58	0.91	p<0.05*

Source: Own study.

The data presented in Table 5 allow to state that respondents in Ustroń evaluated the quality of their experience higher than the respondents in Katowice, and the difference was statistically significant. However, the differences in tourist satisfaction and tourist behavioural intentions did not demonstrate statistical significance for Katowice or Ustroń ($p=0.3816$ and $p=0.1209$, respectively).

Table 5. Tourist experience quality, satisfaction and behavioural intentions for Katowice and Ustroń (N=400)

	Total N=400		Katowice N=200		Ustroń N=200		Mann-Whitney U Test
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	p-value
Quality of Tourist Experience	5.97	1.04	5.76	1.04	6.18	0.99	p<0.05*
Tourist Satisfaction	5.70	1.01	5.68	0.99	5.72	1.04	p=0.3816
Tourist Behavioural Intentions	4.99	1.30	4.91	1.29	5.06	1.30	p=0.1209

Source: Own study.

Discussion

Although the results of this study allow to indicate that there are significant differences in tourists' perceptions of the various dimensions of destination quality attractiveness in Katowice (an urban destination) and Ustroń (a health resort), overall, tourists perceive these destinations to be highly attractive as all dimensions exceed the scale's theoretical mean value of 4.0. Katowice is an urban destination, primarily fulfilling administrative functions but, at the same time, historically burdened as a mining and industrial city. Higher ratings for Ustroń may therefore result from the broader potential of this health resort, offering a diversified tourist offer, including spa tourism, cultural tourism and active forms of tourism such as cycling, mountain tourism, skiing, snowboarding. Ustroń is principally a tourism destination that uses its advantages very effectively – its location among the mountains and climate that is very beneficial to health. It is probably these advantages that made Ustroń be rated highest by respondents for the “Relaxing” dimension. In the case of Katowice, the highest score was achieved by the “Varied” dimension, which was related to the large variety of available types of accommodation facilities, means of transport, restaurants and attractions, which is understandable in the case of a large city.

When compared to the results of prior studies on destination attractiveness in Poland, there is a noticeable similarity between the results of the present study results and those obtained by I. Cichocka and J. Krupa [2017], who also found that, overall, Przemyśl (a cultural city) was an attractive destination. However, the highest scoring aspects of destination attractiveness differed for Przemyśl compared to those for Katowice and Ustroń, as the score for Przemyśl was the highest for some aspects of the “Authentic” dimension, in contrast to Katowice and Ustroń, which obtained the highest scores for “Relaxing” and “Varied”, respectively. In the study conducted by I. Cichocka and J. Krupa [2017] in Przemyśl, as well as that by A.R. Szromek [2013] in Krynica and Polanica (health resorts), it was found that cleanliness and safety were evaluated highly for those destinations, which corresponds with the results of the present study, as the dimensions of “Well-kept” and “Safe” obtained high scores both in Katowice and Ustroń. It should be noted, however, that the studies conducted by I. Cichocka and J. Krupa [2017] and A.R. Szromek [2013] had fewer indicators of destination attractiveness and methods of data collection relative to the present study, so any comparisons of study results are indicative of potential trends only. Future replication studies are therefore needed for other urban destinations and health resorts, as well as at other types of tourism destinations, to establish patterns in tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness.

In terms of tourists' evaluations of the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions, the scores were also high, exceed-

ing the scale's theoretical mean value of 4.0, which is consistent with prior studies on the links between destination attractiveness and tourist satisfaction as well as behavioural intentions [e.g. Chaudhary and Islam, 2020; Vigolo, 2015]. However, significant differences between Katowice and Ustroń have been found only in the case of tourists' evaluation of the quality of their experience. Since there were no significant differences concerning tourist satisfaction and behavioural intentions in Katowice and Ustroń, the study results may imply that the significant differences in tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness found in this study may explain the significant differences in tourists' perceptions of the quality of their experience at the different destinations. Since these phenomena have not been examined in any prior trials, future replication studies are thus needed for other urban destinations and health resorts, as well as at other types of tourism destinations, to establish patterns in tourists' perceptions of the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions, in relation to their perceptions of destination quality attractiveness.

Conclusions

Tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness, their quality of experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions at two diverse tourism destinations (Katowice, an urban destination and Ustroń, a health resort) were assessed and compared in the present study. In relation to the posed research questions, it has been established that:

- (1) Tourists perceived both destinations to be highly attractive as all dimensions exceed the scale's theoretical mean value of 4.0;
- (2) There are significant differences in tourists' perceptions regarding the various dimensions of destination quality attractiveness in Katowice (an urban destination) and Ustroń (a health resort);
- (3) Tourists rated the quality of their experience, satisfaction and behavioural intentions highly at both destinations as the scores exceeded the scale's theoretical mean value of 4.0;
- (4) Significant differences between Katowice and Ustroń have been found only in the case of tourists' evaluation of the quality of their experience. There were no significant differences concerning tourist satisfaction or behavioural intentions for Katowice and Ustroń.

The results of this study provide original insights concerning destination attractiveness and extend knowledge in this area by:

- (1) focusing on destination quality as an aspect of destination attractiveness;

- (2) providing empirical evidence that there are differences in tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness depending on the type of tourism destination, based on resources, purposes and heritage;
- (3) providing empirical evidence that the differences in tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness may explain the differences in the tourists' perception of the quality of their experience at the two different destinations, while no significant differences could be observed in relation to tourist satisfaction and behavioural intentions.

However, the results of the present study need to be considered with regard to its limitations. Firstly, only two diverse destinations were examined. Secondly, the study was cross-sectional, using data collected at a single point in time. Future longitudinal replication studies are therefore needed at various types of tourism destinations, based on resources, purposes and heritage, to validate the emergent patterns in tourists' perceptions of destination quality attractiveness, the quality of their experience, as well as satisfaction and behavioural intentions. In such replication studies, the same scales should be used as the ones applied in the present study to reduce any variations in study results that may occur due to the use of different scales, and thus, making the results comparable.

The results of the present study have several practical implications for destination managers. Firstly, since tourists' perceptions of destination attractiveness depend on the type of tourism destination, destination managers need to systematically evaluate such perceptions to identify the competitive aspects of destination attractiveness and invest in areas requiring improvement. Secondly, destination managers need to systematically examine the impact of destination quality attractiveness on tourist satisfaction, behavioural intention and quality of tourist experience. This will help establish a destination's priorities for improving destination attractiveness and competitiveness. Thirdly, given the specific focus of the present study on two tourism destinations (Katowice and Ustroń in the Silesian Voivodeship, Poland), the research results presented in this study can be used when developing the voivodeship's tourism attractiveness and competitiveness strategy. The knowledge obtained from the research allows to indicate that both Katowice and Ustroń should focus more on building tourists' sense of safety and authenticity of their experiences. At the same time, despite the fact that Ustroń was rated higher than Katowice in almost every aspect, Ustroń has also room for improvement and development in the area of diversifying its offer. It should also focus on the rich culture of the Silesian Beskids in addition to its current tourism offer related to health and physical activity.

References

- Ariya G., Wishitemi B., Sitati N. (2017). *Tourism destination attractiveness as perceived by tourists visiting Lake Nakuru National Park, Kenya*. "International Journal of Research in Tourism and Hospitality", Vol. 3(4), pp. 1–13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2455-0043.0304001>
- Baker D.A., Crompton, J.L. (2000). *Quality, satisfaction and behavioural intentions*. "Annals of Tourism Research", Vol. 27, pp. 785–804. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(99\)00108-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(99)00108-5)
- Bąk I., Szczecińska B. (2015). *Ocena atrakcyjności turystycznej województw w Polsce [Evaluation of Polish Voivodeships' Tourism Attractiveness]*, "Folia Pomeranae Universitatis Technologiae Stetinensis", "Oeconomica", Vol. 317 (78)1, pp. 5–16 (in Polish).
- Bernat S., (2017). *Potencjał parków uzdrowiskowych w Polsce dla rozwoju turystyki [Potential of Health Resort Parks in Poland for the Development of Tourism]*, "Turystyka w lasach i na obszarach przyrodniczo cennych", Vol. 52/3, pp. 41–42 (in Polish).
- Blazeska D., Milenkovski A., Gramatnikovski S. (2015). *The quality of the tourist destinations a key factor for increasing their attractiveness*. "UTMS Journal of Economics", Vol. 6(2), pp. 341–353.
- Chaudhary M., Islam N.U. (2020). *Influence of destination attractiveness on tourist satisfaction and future travel intentions: A study of Kashmir valley*. "Journal of Tourism", Vol. 21(1), pp. 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150921103627>.
- Cichocka I., Krupa J., (2017). *Atrakcyjność turystyczna miasta Przemysła w opinii mieszkańców oraz turystów [Tourist Attractiveness of the City of Przemyśl in the Opinion of Residents and Tourists]*, "Ekonomiczne Problemy Turystyki", Vol. 2(38), pp. 115–132 (in Polish). <https://doi.org/10.18276/ept.2017.2.38-10>
- Das D., Sharma, S.K., Mohapatra P.K., Sarkar A. (2007). *Factors influencing the attractiveness of a tourist destination: A case study*. "Journal of Services Research", Vol. 7(1), pp. 103–134.
- Dey B., Mathew J., Chee-Hua C. (2020). *Influence of destination attractiveness factors and travel motivations on rural homestay choice: the moderating role of need for uniqueness*. "International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research", Vol. 14(4), pp. 639–666. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-08-2019-0138>
- Hair J.F., Black W.C., Babin B.J., Anderson R.E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). London, Unites Kingdom: Cengage Learning.
- Hu Y., Ritchie, J.B. (1993). *Measuring destination attractiveness: A contextual approach*. "Journal of Travel Research", Vol. 32(2), pp. 25–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/004728759303200204>

- Islam N.U., Chaudhary M. (2020). *Index of destination attractiveness: A quantitative approach for measuring tourism attractiveness*. "Turizam", 25(1), pp. 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.5937/turizam25-27235>
- Islam S., Hossain M.K., Noor M.E. (2017). *Determining drivers of destination attractiveness: The Case of nature-based tourism of Bangladesh*. "International Journal of Marketing Studies", Vol. 9(3), pp. 10–23. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijms.v9n3p10>
- Jankowski G., Jankowski A.T., Nitkiewicz-Jankowska A. (2007). *Baza noclegowa jako element zagospodarowania turystycznego Ustronia – śląskiego uzdrowiska statutowego* [Accommodation as an Element of the Tourist Development of Ustroń – the Silesian Statutory Health Resort], "Ekonomiczne Problemy Turystyki", N. 2, pp. 101–107 (in Polish).
- Kaczmarek J., Stasiak A., Włodarczyk B. (2002). *Produkt turystyczny* [Tourism Product], „Turystyka i hotelarstwo”, Vol. 1, pp. 33–50 (in Polish).
- Kaczmarek A. (2013). *Tereny przemysłowe i zurbanizowane jako czynniki rozwoju turystyki miejskiej* [Industrial and Urbanised Areas as Factors in the Development of Urban Tourism], "Studia Ekonomiczne", Vol. 147, pp. 81–93 (in Polish).
- Kim D., Perdue R.R. (2011). *The influence of image on destination attractiveness*. "Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing", Vol. 28(3), pp. 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10548408.2011.562850>
- Krężolek D., Cibis A., Staszczyszyn I., Pastecki M., Dargiewicz G., Skrzydło M., Kiermasz R. (2017). *Atrakcyjność miasta Katowice – podejście wizualne* [Attractiveness of the City of Katowice – a Visual Approach], "Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach", No. 344, Katowice, pp. 39–57 (in Polish).
- Kruczek Z. (2012). *Atrakcyjność turystyczna uzdrowisk karpaccich* [Tourist Attractiveness of Carpathian Health Resorts] [in:] *Uzdrowiska i ich funkcja turystyczno-lecznicza*, ed. A.R. Szromek, Proksenia, Kraków, pp. 59–71 (in Poland).
- Lee C.F., Chen P.T., Huang H.I. (2014). *Attributes of destination attractiveness in Taiwanese bicycle tourism: The perspective of active experienced bicycle tourists*. "International journal of hospitality & tourism administration", Vol. 15(3), pp. 275–297. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15256480.2014.925726>
- Miszta A. (2015). *Serce Górnego Śląska* [The Heart of Upper Silesia] [in:] *Śląskie. Przewodnik pozytywny*, Śląska Organizacja Turystyczna, 3rd ed. revised, Katowice, pp. 92–106 (in Polish).
- Miszta A. (2015). *Katowice* [in:] *Metropolia Silesia i okolice. Informator turystyczny* [Metropolis Silesia and the Surrounding Area. A Tourist Guide], Śląska Organizacja Turystyczna, 2nd ed., Katowice, pp. 11–14 (in Polish).
- Oliani L.G.N., Rossi G.B., Gervasoni V.C. (2011). *What are the attractiveness factors that influence the choice of a tourist destination-A study of Bra-*

- zilian tourist consumer*. "Chinese Business Review", Vol. 10(4), pp. 286–293. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1537-1506/2011.04.005>
- Otto J.E. Ritchie J.R.B. (1996). *The service experience in tourism*. "Tourism Management", Vol. 17, pp. 165–174. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177\(96\)00003-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(96)00003-9)
- Page S. (1995). *Urban tourism*, Routledge, London – New York. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135676679600300110>
- Pompurová K., Šimočková I., Rialti R. (2023). *Defining domestic destination attractiveness: Gen-Y and Gen-Z perceptions*. "Current Issues in Tourism", Vol. 27(4), pp. 1–19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30892/gtg.53232-1244>
- Raimkulov M., Juraturgunov H., Ahn Y.J. (2021). *Destination attractiveness and memorable travel experiences in silk road tourism in Uzbekistan*. "Sustainability", Vol. 13(4), pp. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042252>
- Seakhoa-King A., Augustyn M.M., Mason P. (2020). *Tourism Destination Quality: Attributes and Dimensions*, Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/9781839095580>
- Szromek A.R. (2013). *Cechy atrakcyjności polskich uzdrowisk [Attractiveness Features of Polish Spas]*, "Zeszyty Naukowe. Organizacja i Zarządzanie", Wydawnictwo Politechniki Śląskiej, Vol. 64, pp. 251–264 (in Polish).
- Szubert M., Warcholik W., Żemła M. (2022). *Destination Familiarity and Perceived Attractiveness of Four Polish Tourism Cities*, "Sustainability", Vol. 14, 128. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14010128>
- Vigolo V. (2015). *Investigating the attractiveness of an emerging long-haul destination: Implications for loyalty*. "International Journal of Tourism Research", Vol. 17(6), pp. 564–576. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2024>
- Zabkar V., Brencic M.M., Dmitrovic T. (2010). *Modelling perceived quality, visitor satisfaction and behavioural intentions at the destination level*. "Tourism Management", Vol. 31, pp. 537–546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.06.005>
- Zieliński A., Dziarmaga D. (2017). *Atrakcyjność turystyczna miast w opinii turystów [Tourist Attractiveness of Cities in the Opinion of Tourists]*, "Zeszyty Naukowe. Turystyka i Rekreacja", Wyższa Szkoła Turystyki i Języków Obcych, Vol. 2(20), pp. 131–139 (in Polish).

Netography

https://www.katowice.eu/Foldery%20o%20miecie/Katowice_moderna/folder%20moderna__pl.pdf [accessed: 10 Apr. 2023].

