

**Bartosz Szczechowicz**

University School of Physical Education in Kraków  
Department of Tourism Policy  
bartosz.szczechowicz@awf.krakow.pl

## USE OF THE CONCEPT OF 'PRODUCT' TO ANALYZE THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TOURISM AND PHYSICAL CULTURE<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** The purpose of this article is to present opportunities for research which show the common ground between tourism and physical culture using approaches and methods worked out and applied in economics. Attention has been concentrated on the category of 'product', treated here as a theoretical concept by means of which it is possible to present a structure of tourism trip. This will include the part that refers to those values and human activities related to physical culture. An attempt to identify the social perception of the attributes that describe a tourism trip was made by an empirical study using *conjoint analysis* on students in higher education in Kraków. The results show that those who participate in tourism enriched by physical activity, prefer trips saturated with attributes such as the required level of courage, the testing of psychological and physical abilities, rivalry with others or nature, an element of adventure, a high level of physical activity, access to sports and leisure facilities, and contact with nature. But at the same time they prefer a low level of risk to health or life. It was noted, however, that related to the latter female and male preferences vary.

**Keywords:** tourism, physical culture, tourism product, preferences, higher education students, *conjoint analysis*.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Reports of institutions monitoring the market for leisure have indicated increasing interest in tourists from developed countries who take part in trips centred on physical activity. Their programme will include various types of physical activity, give an opportunity for sport and related events, and promote regeneration of health and fitness (*Tourism Trends for Europe 2006*, p. 3, *Panorama on Tourism 2008*, p. 16, ALEJZIAK 2000, p. 191). These trends reveal the growing popularity of tourism characterized by 'psychological care for the body' and known as 'physical culture' (TATARKIEWICZ 1978, p. 80, see also OSIŃSKI 2002, p. 33, DEMEL 1998, p. 9), and which in the English-language literature is also described by terms such as 'sport', 'leisure', 'health & fitness' and 'recreation'.

Thus, tourism and physical culture have some common ground on which the values assigned and the human activities connected are intertwined. A contribution analysing the links between these two components of culture (as broadly defined) might come from a number of different fields and academic disciplines. This paper attempts to approach the issue from an economics perspective, including microeconomics and marketing. It was assumed that the

category of 'product', and more specifically a 'tourism product', can be particularly useful in an analysis of relationships between tourism and physical culture. The notion of a 'tourism product', from a marketing perspective, is understood as anything which satisfies the needs of a consumer who is also a tourist (see STOBIECKA 2010, p. 17-24). Therefore, a 'tourism product' may exist as goods or services, conditions, places, and people as well as its combination i.e. 'tourism package'.

Justification for the proposed research perspective is based on two premises. Firstly, a 'product' may be regarded as a theoretical concept (not just an object of exchange on the market) which reflects an actual tourism trip. In consequence, an analysis of the composition of a tourism trip through marketing concepts gives an opportunity to consider tourism activities based on the values of physical culture. In other words, the question is how physical culture – particularly in its structured forms which include sport, physical recreation and physical rehabilitation – may form part of a tourism trip. Secondly, acceptance of the assumptions of the microeconomic theory of consumer behaviour, based on the rational choice of market participants, makes it possible to use a number

of approaches, methods and tools to identify the attitudes and preferences of consumers. Such a use of methodology from economics should also be valuable for identifying the real significance of those elements from physical culture – i.e. its values, types of activity, and also goods and services – in creating a tourism experience.

## 2. A PHYSICAL CULTURE TOURISM PRODUCT: ESSENCE, STRUCTURE, VALUE

M. Blaug, one of the most respectable methodologists in economics, describes as an ‘old idea’ the notion that buyers perceive and evaluate products as a bundle of specific attributes (BLAUG 1995, p. 225). According to this view it may be assumed that the buyers analyze a product by evaluating those attributes, i.e. taking into consideration the ability of a product composition to meet consumer expectations. Therefore, if a consumer wanted to satisfy needs or desires related to physical culture, those attributes would play a leading role in a product and thus meet the specific requirements of the consumer.

To answer the question about the attributes of physical culture in a tourism product, the well-known marketing concept of ‘product structure’, proposed by T. Levitt and developed by his followers, is useful. According to this concept, the ‘core’ level of a product is that which meets consumer needs, the ‘actual’ level includes those elements necessary to meet those needs, and the ‘augmented’ level consists of elements which are not necessary but which may increase consumer satisfaction (KOTLER & KELLER 2006, p. 372). This means tourism and physical culture intertwine at all three product levels (see SZCZECZOWICZ 2010, p. 121). The core of a tourism product should be filled with those values which are a result of a tourist’s reflection on physical culture, health and fitness, and also include experiences accompanying various forms of recreational and sport activities (i.e. ‘ludic’ and ‘agonistic’, an atmosphere of concentration, rivalry and courage) (LIPIEC 2007b, p. 20). Consumer attention may be additionally focused on testing the physical and psychological limits essential in any sports performance (LIPIEC 2007b, p. 17). Finally, the tourist experience may arise from aesthetic sensations – when the tourist considers the beauty of the human body engaged in a physical activity, the beauty of human actions and the beauty of a sports event (LIPIEC 2007a, p. 34).

At both ‘actual’ and ‘augmented’ levels of a tourism product, the relationships between different aspects of culture are perceived in the presence in a tourism

product of a set of components typical for any aspect of physical culture. It is especially visible in the case of the most specific offer on the market – i.e. a tourism package – this kind of product includes the goods and services necessary to meet a tourist’s needs and desires associated with the human body and physical activity. However, physical culture may be experienced by a tourist not only in using the goods and services which are available for market exchange – it is also possible as a result of the relationship between the tourist and representatives of a local community (distinctness of values, attitudes and life styles, tradition and customs), or as a result of participating in different types of physical activity including sports events as a spectator. Physical culture can find importance in places, sites, monuments, paintings, fashion and specialist equipment, as well as in books and documents, texts of songs, dances etc., tourist agency catalogues, forms of advertising, on postcards and souvenirs (SZCZECZOWICZ 2010, p. 121-122). Although these features show the potential links between tourism and physical culture, the recognition of their nature and significance requires disclosing whether (using the language of marketing) the attributes of physical culture presented in the composition of tourism product create for the consumer certain value. What does the ‘value’ of tourist product mean, however, when even the efforts of axiologists to define this term are considered not fully satisfactory (see TATARKIEWICZ 1978)?

Although in the 1770s Adam Smith in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* had already explained that the ‘value’ of a product either determines utility i.e. the ability to meet the needs of a consumer (value in use), or the opportunity for the owner to buy other goods (value in exchange) (SMITH 2007, p. 36-37). In economics, since marginalism (introduced 100 years later) the value of a product began to be commonly identified with the benefits that it provides to the consumer (SAGAN, ed. 2011, p. 21-22). From a user perspective, at present it is better to say that the consumer does not take advantage from value previously ‘programmed in’ by a manufacturer, but that value is released from a certain potential but this should not be considered an inherent characteristic of the good or service. Thus, in economics, management sciences and marketing, the value of the product for a consumer is interpreted in terms of a product’s ability to meet the needs and desires of a consumer. It has already been emphasized by T. Levitt who defined a ‘product’ as a tool used to solve specific problems or to realize specific intentions (see LEVITT 2008, p. 120), and at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. Ph. Kotler explained that “Today, smart companies do not sell products, they sell packages of benefits” (KOTLER 1999, p. 191).

Thus, it is a category specific to a consumer and it is easy to demonstrate that the capability of a product to meet the expectations of different people can vary widely. However, this does not mean that the specific composition of attributes which constitute a product will be evaluated similarly even by the same user each time. In different situational contexts the consumer's needs (e.g. concerning health) may change. Moreover, since G.S. Becker published the results of his research, consumer preferences are no longer recognized as a constant in economics (see BECKER 1990). For a proper interpretation it should be mentioned that 'value for use' is susceptible to exterior factors and to time, so its definition is in accordance with the assumptions of axiological subjectivism. Moreover, PRAHALAD & RAMASWAMY (2005) convincingly demonstrate that it is also sensitive to the level of customer involvement in the process of product consumption. This last point seems especially important in the context of the products discussed here. The satisfaction of an active tourist – i.e. on a tourism trip that requires physical effort – depends not only on the 'ingenious' combination of its elements, but also requires the tourist to be physically, psychologically, technically, intellectually prepared (SZCZECZOWICZ 2010, pp. 119-120).

Beyond these explanations it is also important that the benefits achieved by a tourist, as a result of consumption, do not only meet basic human needs, but also those needs and desires which are the result of social interaction between consumers (SAGAN 2003, p. 66). This is especially important in discussion on consumption in countries where such basic needs are, to a high degree, met. For these people – as VEBLEN (2008) has written – the search is for ways of achieving expectations which are situated high in the hierarchy of human needs and desires. It is natural that they should aim at the consumption of products connected with leisure activities offered both on the tourism market and that for physical culture (and with some parts in common). A product created for tourists gives a particular opportunity to meet non-fundamental human needs because of its complexity and the characteristic that its services have no single meaning. According to WIECZORKIEWICZ (2008, p. 58), a cultural anthropologist, a tourism product has many meanings which vary with changing social context and interpretation. It is worth mentioning here that the contemporary marketing literature strongly points to a variety of meanings for products. Thus, it can be used for the study of tourism offers saturated with physical culture and should contribute to demonstrating how a tourist perceives and evaluates a trip enriched by attributes associated with the human body and physicality<sup>2</sup>.

In neoclassical economics, which is the mainstream today, the benefits resulting from the consumption of

a product are described by the general term 'utility'. More precisely, this concept represents a level of consumer satisfaction which is the result of the consumption of a good (or set of goods) and in addition shows how a person determines the order in which he/she would be willing to consume such products (ordinal utility). However, a description of a product only in terms of utility does not satisfactorily reflect how market offers are perceived by buyers. Although it shows the benefits provided by a product to a consumer, it ignores the fact that the consumer bears various costs because of the necessity to search, to choose, to buy and to consume the good or service. These costs should not only be understood as expenditure, but as the 'sacrifices' and 'disutilities' essential for searching, choosing and consuming the product. Therefore many complex categories are introduced into research on product perception and evaluation by consumers, and the most significant at present is 'value for customer'. This term is interpreted as a surplus of benefits over costs as perceived by the consumer and related to the purchasing and making use of the product (SZYMURA-TYC 2005, p. 74).

This argument is important because physical culture – in addition to generating certain benefits for the consumer (functional, emotional, symbolic) – brings with it some specific costs. An example is the purchase of the equipment necessary for the planned physical activity, the costs of physical and technical preparation for the planned trip, and the emotional costs resulting from specific, and often dangerous, types of physical activity. Costs incurred after returning from the trip may involve the need to recover health – this cost can be financial, as well as psychological, the length of time, and sometimes social (SZCZECZOWICZ 2010, p. 125).

### 3. IDENTIFICATION OF THE SOCIAL EXPECTATIONS OF PHYSICAL CULTURE ON A TOURISM TRIP THROUGH A STUDY OF CONSUMER PREFERENCES

The assumption that a product may be described as a 'bundle of its characteristics' is the basis of any number of methods and tools designed for the study of consumer attitudes and preferences. Nowadays, multi-attribute methods occupy a special position (e.g. *Simultaneous Multi Attribute Level Trade Off, Quality Function Deployment, Conjoint Analysis*) which are distinguished from traditional scales and models used to identify attitudes and preferences by the fact that a product presented to respondents for evaluation is characterised simultaneously by many attributes<sup>3</sup>.

This procedure allows information (depending on the methods used) to be obtained about a consumer's assessment of a product being tested relative to alternative proposals, consumers' expectations about the saturation of a product by its attributes, and finally the extent to which the presence of those attributes (and their level) helps to build utility and value for the customer. Thus it can be assumed that using multi-attribute methods should not only reveal social expectations about a tourism product as a whole, but also, additionally valuable, the attributes of physical culture found in a product.

For analysing the research issues described here *conjoint analysis* was selected. The method is implemented by presenting either real or hypothetical products to respondents, known as 'profiles', each of which is described by a set of variables, i.e. attributes (with values assigned to them) measured on a certain scale. Referring to utility theory it is assumed that respondents are able to assess the profiles in such a way that they indicate which are preferred i.e. which should bring the greatest benefit (WALESIAK & BAŁ 2000, p. 9, 18). The respondents' assessments are usually obtained through surveys, and the key stage in their analysis is known as 'decomposition' according to which the information on the relative importance of the preferred variables, and to what extent (their level), is disclosed.

T a b l e 1. Attributes and possible levels in a tourism package

Attributes ( $j$ )		Levels ( $l_j$ )	
1	Required level of courage	1	low
		2	high
2	Testing psychological and physical abilities	1	no
		2	yes
3	Rivalry with others or nature	1	no
		2	yes
4	Element of adventure	1	no
		2	yes
5	Level of physical activity	1	low
		2	medium
		3	high
6	Access to sports and leisure facilities	1	limited
		2	substantial
7	Level of risk to health or life	1	low
		2	medium
		3	high
8	Contact with nature	1	limited
		2	substantial

Symbols:  $j$  - number of attribute ( $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 8\}$ );  $l_j$  - level of attribute  $Z_j$  ( $l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4, l_6, l_8 \in \{1, 2\}$ ;  $l_5, l_7 \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ).

S o u r c e: author.

The subject of research is a 'tourism package'. It was described using eight physical culture variables selected on the basis of a study of the literature. Each

of them was assigned two or three levels of strength (table 1).

The empirical data was collected using the 'full-profile' method. This means that respondents were requested to evaluate tourism packages, each of which was characterized by all eight variables simultaneously, but the variables are assigned different levels of intensity. Using the *SPSS Conjoint* module (the *SPSS 11.5 for Windows* statistical package) the number of profiles presented was reduced to sixteen, but this would still ensure statistical reliability in the results. The profiles were presented on a questionnaire and the respondents were asked to analyze each one and assign a number from a set  $\{1, 2, \dots, 100\}$ , representing the probability of their participation on a particular trip. To avoid a situation where the sequence of profiles in the questionnaire would influence research results, five versions were prepared - distinguished only by the order in which the profiles occurred (see PULLMAN, DODSON & MOORE 1999).

The population of Polish higher education students was defined as one having a high participation level in tourism, especially in its active forms, and at the same time a well-developed system of views and beliefs. The research was carried out among full-time college students in state higher education institutions located in Małopolska Voivodeship, and the total number of respondents was 1050. The selection of the target group out of the general population was by stratified sampling. Seven strata were identified equivalent to the following academic fields: natural sciences, engineering and technology, medical and health sciences, agricultural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the arts - the decision was motivated by the desire include a wide variety of values and interests in the sample. There were 150 respondents within each stratum to ensure the reliability of the results for the method applied (WALESIAK & BAŁ 2000, p. 31). The empirical data was collected by the questionnaire technique in the period December 2009 - March 2010.

The empirical data obtained confirms that the sample was characterized by a high level of participation in tourism ( $N=946$ , 90%), including physical activity ( $N=680$ , 72%). In the latter group two sub-groups were distinguished by taking into account the nature of the physical activity undertaken: whether it was an inherent component, as in the case of specialised tourism or sports camps, or whether it was an option, only a spare-time possibility for a tourist, such as sport or recreational games, walking, jogging, cycling, swimming, etc. The first sub-group consisted of 482 individuals, 46% of all respondents and 71% of all active tourists, and the second - 397 individuals, 38% of all respondents and 58% of all active tourists (table 2)<sup>4</sup>.

Table 2. Participation in tourism (N = 946)

Respondents		Total number	Percentage
Participating in physical activity-based tourism:		680	72
a	Exclusively in tourism with inherent physical activity	283	30
b	Exclusively in tourism with optional physical activity	198	21
c	Tourism with both inherent and optional physical activity	199	21
Not participating in physical activity-based tourism		266	28

Source: own research based on empirical results.

As a result of the implementation of the *conjoint analysis* procedure for each sub-group, two types of conclusion were reached. Firstly relative importance, i.e. the significance of each of the eight attributes in creating the total utility of a tourism package, and secondly, the part-worth utilities revealing preferences based on the level of each attribute. The figures on levels will demonstrate the range from the most to the least preferred. In consequence, the information about the part-worth utilities of the variables reveals the highest rated tourism package profile in the group of respondents.

This data was generated for both the total sample and the selected sub-groups of respondents. Table 3 presents this data for college students for whom

physical activity in tourism is an integral component, and those for whom it is optional<sup>5</sup>.

Analysis of the data demonstrates that in both groups of respondents the greatest importance was attached to the variable described as 'level of physical activity' (almost 20%), and the second to 'level of risk to health or life' (about 16-18%). Relatively high importance was assigned to 'contact with nature', 'required level of courage', and 'element of adventure' (about 10-15%), while the others - 'testing psychological and physical abilities', 'access to sports and leisure facilities' and 'rivalry with others or nature' did not exceed 10%. The most important for the evaluation of the utility of a tourism package are those attributes creating its actual level, and of lesser importance are those which directly relate to consumer experience.

It is noteworthy that the tourism package profile preferred by both sub-groups is the same - i.e. tourism saturated with 'inherent' and 'optional' physical culture - with a high level of all variables except the component of risk. Respondents stated that they would achieve the greatest satisfaction when the experiences and emotions emerging as a result of physical activity are accompanied by a feeling of total safety. Therefore, respondents expect trips to create favourable conditions for physical activity (access to the appropriate goods and services), preferably in contact with nature, as well as experiences not available in everyday life

Table 3. The relative importance and part-worth utilities of attributes for respondents participating in physical activity-based tourism by type of trip (N = 680)

Attributes	Levels	Tourism in which a physical activity is									
		inherent (N = 482)			optional (N = 397)						
		W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.	W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.				
1	Required level of courage	12.18	-3.30	low	11.46	-2.22	high				
	1							low	2	high	
2	Testing psychological and physical abilities	9.56	-2.70	yes	9.38	-2.55	yes				
	1							no	2	yes	
3	Rivalry with others or nature	8.93	-1.46	yes	9.10	-1.08	yes				
	1							no	2	yes	
4	Element of adventure	10.78	-3.90	yes	10.28	-4.45	yes				
	1							no	2	yes	
5	Level of physical activity	18.20	-4.91	high	19.23	-4.22	high				
								1	low	2	medium
								2	medium	3	high
6	Access to sports and leisure facilities	9.24	-2.55	substantial	9.65	-3.18	substantial				
	1							limited	2	substantial	
7	Level of risk to health or life	16.17	1.84	low	18.34	2.62	low				
								1	low	2	medium
								2	medium	3	high
8	Contact with nature	14.93	-5.66	substantial	12.58	-4.95	substantial				
								1	limited	2	substantial

Symbols: W - relative importance [%]; U<sub>c</sub> - part-worth utility; Pref. - preferred level.

Source: own research based on empirical results.

T a b l e 4. The relative importance and part-worth utilities of attributes for respondents in tourism with inherent physical activity by gender (N=482)

Attributes		Levels		women (N = 305)			men (N = 177)		
				W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.	W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.
1	Required level of courage	1	low	10.55	-2.45	high	13.78	-4.75	high
		2	high		2.45			4.75	
2	Testing psychological and physical abilities	1	no	10.17	-3.02	yes	8.80	-2.14	yes
		2	yes		3.02			2.14	
3	Rivalry with others or nature	1	no	8.76	-1.26	yes	8.49	-1.79	yes
		2	yes		1.26			1.79	
4	Element of adventure	1	no	10.11	-3.92	yes	10.64	-3.86	yes
		2	yes		3.92			3.86	
5	Level of physical activity	1	low	18.15	-4.68	high	19.27	-5.31	high
		2	medium		-0.24			-0.75	
		3	high		4.92			6.06	
6	Access to sports and leisure facilities	1	limited	9.52	-2.77	substantial	8.72	-2.17	substantial
		2	substantial		2.77			2.17	
7	Level of risk to health or life	1	low	18.20	3.79	low	17.20	-1.52	medium
		2	medium		1.72			1.40	
		3	high		-5.51			0.12	
8	Contact with nature	1	limited	14.54	-5.84	substantial	13.09	-5.35	substantial
		2	substantial		5.84			5.35	

Symbols: *W* - relative importance [%]; *U<sub>c</sub>* - part-worth utility; *Pref.* - preferred level.  
 S o u r c e: own research based on the empirical results.

T a b l e 5. The relative importance and part-worth utilities of attributes for respondents in tourism with optional physical activity by gender (N = 397)

Attributes		Levels		women (N=282)			men (N=115)		
				W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.	W	U <sub>c</sub>	Pref.
1	Required level of courage	1	low	11.07	-1.68	high	12.39	-3.54	high
		2	high		1.68			3.54	
2	Testing psychological and physical abilities	1	no	9.37	-2.69	yes	9.41	-2.18	yes
		2	yes		2.69			2.18	
3	Rivalry with others or nature	1	no	9.57	-0.86	yes	7.93	-1.61	yes
		2	yes		0.86			1.61	
4	Element of adventure	1	no	10.40	-4.68	yes	9.98	-3.90	yes
		2	yes		4.68			3.90	
5	Level of physical activity	1	low	19.12	-3.69	high	19.48	-5.50	high
		2	medium		0.14			-0.24	
		3	high		3.55			5.74	
6	Access to sports and leisure facilities	1	limited	9.60	-3.32	substantial	9.76	-2.83	substantial
		2	substantial		3.32			2.83	
7	Level of risk to health or life	1	low	17.91	3.68	low	19.38	0.02	medium
		2	medium		2.30			1.80	
		3	high		-5.98			-1.82	
8	Contact with nature	1	limited	12.95	-5.12	substantial	11.66	-4.53	substantial
		2	substantial		5.12			4.53	

Symbols: *W* - relative importance [%]; *U<sub>c</sub>* - part-worth utility; *Pref.* - preferred level.  
 S o u r c e: own research based on empirical results.

(adventure), the opportunity to test psychological and physical abilities, and the necessity to demonstrate courage. It is interesting that their attitude is positive even to those types of activity which are saturated with 'rivalry with others or nature', a characteristic peculiar to sports activity. In consequence, the interests of respondents are also aroused – apart from various types of active or specialised tourism – by sports tourism packages and adventure tourism. However, expectations are not all sufficiently met by trips whose composition includes an element of risk, for instance poorly-prepared or actively dangerous, or that the programme includes some extreme or highly specialized forms of activity which often turn out to be a risk to the tourist's health or life (see BENTLEY, PAGE & MACKAY 2007, CATER 2006).

As gender is the primary demographic feature which seems to differentiate preferences for physical culture, *conjoint analysis* was undertaken separately for women and men for all tourism packages. The empirical data obtained – concerning tourism with inherent physical activity – is summarized in table 4.

Analysis discloses differences in relative importance for each gender group. Among the variables (with scores above 13%) it can be seen that women indicate the risk factor ( $W_7=18.20$ ), the level of physical activity ( $W_5=18.15$ ) and contact with nature ( $W_8=14.54$ ) as essential features; while men rank the level of physical activity ( $W_5=19.27$ ), the risk factor ( $W_7=17.20$ ), the element of courage ( $W_1=13.78$ ) and contact with nature ( $W_8=13.09$ ). It thus appears that women rank risk more highly but courage less highly than men ( $W_1$  is 10.55% for women and 13.78% for men).

It should be noted that the tourism package preferred by women is exactly the same as for the whole population of active tourists (see table 3), while for men it differs in terms only of the variable 'level of risk to health or life'. While women prefer a feeling of safety to a sense of danger, men move acceptable risk a little further by declaring that risk level should be 'medium'. To analyze this issue more precisely, empirical data concerning part-worth utilities for women and men were also generated, excluding those individuals who aside from the trips discussed here are also involved in tourism in which physical activity is undertaken as optional. Analysis is then limited to describing the preferences of those who may be considered 'pure' tourists by going in for trips without the chance to withdraw from physical activity ( $N = 283$ ). Results here show a greater variation between women's and men's expectations than before. Although the tourism package profile preferred by women still assumes a 'low' level of risk to health or life, the one preferred by men indicates a willingness to take a 'high' level of risk<sup>6</sup>.

The empirical data on preferences for optional physical activity according to gender is presented in table 5.

By analyzing this data it is noted that although women and men rank the variables to some extent differently, these differences do not relate to attributes which are ranked by both groups in the first two positions: level of physical activity and risk factor. This time, differences between preferences mainly concern the level of the latter variable: for women – low, and men – medium. Nevertheless, the part-worth utilities, excluding those for whom physical activity was optional, as well as those in which it was integral, show that among those who participate only in the first ( $N = 198$ ) both men and women prefer a low level of risk. It turns out that men on trips saturated with obligatory physical effort display a willingness to put their own health or life in danger – but that men who participate in tourism with optional physical activity do not show it. Women, however, always expect a high level of safety.

#### 4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TOURISM AND PHYSICAL CULTURE THROUGH THE 'PRISM' OF A PRODUCT – ASSESSMENT OF THE ISSUE AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The search for relationships between tourism and physical culture from the perspective of a product is an interesting and a cognitively useful approach. It reveals significant opportunities for using the theoretical and methodological ideas from economics to recognize the extent to which values related to physical culture are sought and perceived by tourists on trip offers accessible to them. As emphasised, a product is understood here not only as an object of market exchange, but first and foremost as a concept reflecting a structure of tourism activity regardless of who is the initiator of a trip.

Acceptance of the assumptions of neoclassical economics leads to the recognition of a consumer as the entity making the choice of how to meet his/ her own needs and desires in a rational way. In the situation considered here, it means that in making a decision on a tourism trip the consumer chooses from among those accessible the ones for which the ability to meet expectations seem to be the greatest. These expectations are revealed not so much in the trip evaluated as a whole, but to the characteristics that make it up. Thus, the act of choosing a tourism product enriched by attributes related to physical

culture is a consequence of the individual perception of the common ground between tourism and physical culture (an individual aspect) and of the social perception of relationships that exist between these two aspects of culture (the market aspect). Knowledge of this common ground, or at least a reduction in ignorance, may be carried out by using the methods developed in marketing research for finding the meanings ascribed to products and for identifying the attitudes or preferences of consumers.

In this paper examining the social expectations of the presence of attributes describing the physical culture on a trip was demonstrated by empirical research using the multi-attribute method, *conjoint analysis*. In the light of the results, the sample of Kraków's higher education students were distinguished by a high level of participation in physical activity-based tourism, the kind of tourism trips in which the value of physical culture attributes (excepting the risk factor) is high, were preferred. However, it should be noted that the most important were those which relate to the actual level of product, rather than to physical culture experiences. This raises the question of whether responses resulting from the perception of individual attributes were really desirable, or just attractive and creating positive associations. The latter doubt suggests continuing the research using approaches designed to identify explicit and implicit consumer attitudes. It is worth emphasizing that research results so far have revealed a difference between women's and men's preferences in terms of danger to health or life.

Even though the empirical approach presented can be improved, the results show two justified directions of further research. Firstly, the current results should be verified by qualitative methods leading to a better understanding through the analysis and interpretation of the expressions, reactions or the behaviour of respondents, and therefore to help resolve the uncertainties that have arisen. Secondly, for both quantitative and qualitative analysis a more detailed approach is justified, and this may be achieved, for example, through the classification of tourism types (active tourism, specialized tourism; adventure tourism, active sports tourism, passive sports tourism, and educational tourism in the area of sport and physical culture). All these, in addition to achieving cognitive aims may help to reveal socially desirable directions for the development of tourism packages, and directions in terms of participation matching health and recreation motivations as well as in being competitive in free time, compared with offers which promote their absence.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> The study was financed from a grant from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education in 2009-10 as the research project: 'The role of physical culture in the value creation of a tourism product' (no. N N112 018636).

<sup>2</sup> For example Sagan, based on literature research, distinguishes six classes of product dimension: utilitarian, psychological, conformist, ostentatious and distinctive, snobbish, and cultural (SAGAN 2003, p. 74-75). SZCZECHOWICZ (2008, p. 213-222) presented an analysis in the context of tourism products connected with physical culture.

<sup>3</sup> Measures and models of consumer attitudes and preference identification are presented by Sagan in 2004, and the multi-attribute methods are described in the following works: (MAZUREK-ŁOPACIŃSKA, ed. 2005, OBORA 2000, WALESIAK & BĄK 2000).

<sup>4</sup> This result does not add up to 100% because - as already pointed out in Table 2 - 199 respondents declared that they took part in both types of trip

<sup>5</sup> The data obtained for all respondents along with discussion are presented in SZCZECHOWICZ (2012).

<sup>6</sup> Preferences relating to other variables, in this sub-group of respondents, are the same, so they are not included in the presentation of detailed figures about the relative importance of variables and part-worth utilities.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEJZIAK W., 2000, *Turystyka w obliczu wyzwań XXI wieku*, Albis, Kraków.
- BECKER G.S., 1990, *Ekonomiczna teoria zachowań ludzkich*, PWN, Warszawa.
- BENTLEY T.A., PAGE S.J., MACKY K.A., 2007, Adventure tourism and adventure sports injury: The New Zealand experience, *Applied Ergonomics*, 38, pp. 791-796.
- BLAUG M., 1995, *Metodologia ekonomii*, PWN, Warszawa.
- CATER C.I., 2006, Playing with risk? Participant perceptions of risk and management implications in adventure tourism, *Tourism Management*, 27, pp. 317-325.
- DEMEL M., 1998, *Szkice krytyczne o kulturze fizycznej*, AWF, Kraków.
- KOTLER Ph., 1999, *Kotler o marketingu. Jak kreować i opanowywać rynki*, Wyd. Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu, Kraków.
- KOTLER PH., KELLER K.L., 2006, *Marketing Management*, Twelfth Edition, Pearson, Prentice Hall.
- LEVITT T., 2008, Produkcyjne podejście do usług, [in:] *Marketing według Teda Levitta*, Harvard Business School Press, Wyd. Helion, Gliwice.
- LIPIEC J., 2007a, Fizyczność ludzka w świetle nauki i filozofii, [in:] *Pożegnanie z Olimpią*, Wyd. FALL, Kraków, pp. 23-40.
- LIPIEC J., 2007b, Sport jako wartość, [w:] *Pożegnanie z Olimpią*, FALL, Kraków, s. 15-22.
- MAZUREK-ŁOPACIŃSKA K. (ed.), 2005, *Badania marketingowe. Teoria i praktyka*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- OBORA H., 2000, QFD - metoda zaawansowanego planowania jakości, „Zeszyty Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej w Krakowie”, 534, s. 111-121.
- OSIŃSKI W., 2002, *Zarys teorii wychowania fizycznego*, AWF, Poznań.

- Panorama on Tourism*, 2008, Eurostat.
- PRAHALAD C.K., RAMASWAMY V., 2005, *Przyszłość konkurencji*, PWE, Warszawa.
- PULLMAN M.E., DODSON K.J., MOORE W.L., 1999, A Comparison of Conjoint Methods When There Are Many Attributes, *Marketing Letters*, 10, 2, p. 129.
- SAGAN A., 2003, *Symbolika produktu w systemie komunikacji marketingowej. Studium teoretyczno-metodologiczne*, AE, Kraków.
- SAGAN A. (ed.), 2011, *Wartość dla klienta w układach rynkowych. Aspekty metodologiczne*, UEK, Kraków.
- SMITH A., 2007, *Badania nad naturą i przyczynami bogactwa narodów, part 1*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- STOBIECKA J., 2010, *Modele pomiaru jakości marketingowej produktów*, UEK, Kraków.
- SZCZECHOWICZ B., 2012, *Kultura fizyczna jako źródło wartości produktu turystycznego*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf, Warszawa.
- SZCZECHOWICZ B., 2008, Symboliczna sfera kultury fizycznej jako czynnik wartości produktu turystycznego, [in:] W.W. Gaworecki, Z. Mroczynski (eds), *Turystyka i sport dla wszystkich w promocji zdrowego stylu życia*, Gdańsk, s. 213-222.
- SZCZECHOWICZ B., 2010, Znaczenie kultury fizycznej w ocenie wartości produktu turystycznego – perspektywa konsumenta, *Folia Turistica*, 23, pp. 115-134.
- SZYMURA-TYC M., 2005, *Marketing we współczesnych procesach tworzenia wartości dla klienta i przedsiębiorstwa*, AE w Katowicach, Katowice.
- TATARKIEWICZ W., 1978, *Parerga*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Tourism Trends for Europe*, 2006, European Travel Commission.
- VEBLEN T., 2008, *Teoria klasy próżniaczej*, Warszawskie Wydawnictwo Literackie „Muza” SA, Warszawa.
- WALESIAK M., BĄK A., 2000, *Conjoint analysis w badaniach marketingowych*, AE we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.
- WIECZORKIEWICZ A., 2008, *Apetyt turysty. O doświadczeniu świata w podróży*, Universitas, Kraków.