2.1 Definition.

A Tourism Attraction can be defined as anything that has the power to draw one towards it (Mill and Morrison: 1992). It is due to this drawing power that people feel compelled to go and visit the attraction. Attractions are the reason people travel and consume experiences of visiting attractions. Attractions are the focal point around which the destination develops. Destinations are constantly engaged in development of attractions in order to give a variety of experiences to the tourists and in the process increase inbound tourism to the destination.

Various authors have defined attractions. These definitions can be broadly classified into two types;

1. Organizational definitions
2. Experiential definitions

2.1 (a) Organisational definitions

Organizational definitions concentrate on the development of attractions using organizational skills and authors recognize the development process through human intervention either in the form of planned development or through individual organizational involvement. One of the earliest definitions was from Jeffries (1971) who stated that
"most of the destinations offer scenery, beaches, folklore, monuments, sports, etc., and these may be regarded as raw materials to be developed in quite different ways in answer to the needs in quite different markets. In other words they would be made into distinct tourism products and are therefore not in themselves products". This definition identifies the natural as well as man-made resources and gives importance to the organizational intervention to make them into tourism products. The distinction of resources such as culture, events, landscape, heritage etc., and the concept of "tourism product" is the focus of this definition. In effect what Jeffries (1971) says is that the gamut of resources at the disposal of the destination need to be worked upon to provide distinct tourism products to distinct tourism markets. It is interesting to note that this definition indicates that all the resources at any given destination/region/area are potential attractions waiting to be developed into full-fledged attractions for tourism experience consumption. The definition underlies the importance of organizational intervention to create an attraction out of the available resources at a destination.

Another definition of an attraction is given by MacCannell (1976). He proposes that a phenomenon has to have the following three components to be considered an attraction.
If one looks at this definition then one sees that there is a further qualification of Jeffries' definition in that, MacCannell has introduced the concept of a marker or an image at the site or near the site or away from the site which indicates the significance of the attraction. In that sense an attraction is one when it is acknowledged as an attraction. The acknowledgement may be either on-site or off-site through information. So here again one sees the human intervention for the qualification of an attraction. The marker acts as a significator of the attraction. He identifies two stages of human intervention before the attraction is made known through the markers. These stages according to him are

a) Naming: - when a site is considered worth preserving.

b) Framing and Elevation: - when a boundary is identified around the attraction and visitation is permitted.

Lew (1987) defines attractions as consisting of all those elements of a non-home place that draw discretionary travelers away from their homes. They usually include landscapes to observe, activities to participate in and experiences to remember.
Gunn (1988) identifies attractions as having tripartite structure with a Nucleus, an Inviolate Belt and a Zone of Closure. This structure is furthering MacCannell's Framing and Elevation stage by actually focusing on the planning of the attraction by creating a boundary around it and also organizing it so that a higher satisfaction is delivered to the visitors. He defines attractions further as "those developed locations that are planned and managed for visitor interest, activity, and enjoyment. Even though a destination may have an abundance of resources that are attractors, they are not functioning as true attractions until they are ready to receive visitors". Here one sees the planning and managerial approach in defining the attraction.

Middleton (1988) defines a Tourist attraction as "a designated permanent resource, which is controlled and managed for the enjoyment, amusement, entertainment and education of the visiting public". This definition focuses on the permanency of the resource and the managerial intervention. While the definition is concise it overlooks "Events" as attractions due to the focus on permanency of resources.

Leiper (1990) defines a Tourist attraction as a "system comprising of three elements: a tourist or a human element, a nucleus or a central element and a marker or an informative element. A tourist attraction comes into existence when these three elements are connected". This definition is
similar to MacCannell’s definition. Leiper further goes to identify a nuclear hierarchy for the nucleus element of his definition by dividing it into primary, secondary and tertiary nucleus. Here one can see the connectivity of the three elements as critical for the attraction to come into existence. The connectivity is ensured by organizational interventions. It could either be private or "market driven" or could be public or "Governmental".

Pearce (1991) gave an operational definition of Tourist attractions as "a named site with a specific human or natural feature which is the focus of visitor and management attention". This definition focuses on the managerial attention again and it is evident that an attraction to be called as a tourist attraction necessarily has to have a human intervention.

Mill and Morrison (1992) define attraction as... “Attractions, by definition, have the ability to draw people to them. Although attractions for the tourist concern the satisfactions perceived from various experiences, the task for the developer and designer is to create an environment made up in part of “attractions” that will provide an opportunity for the tourist to enjoy a visit. The addition at a site of factors other than attractions (services, transportation, and hospitality) will help ensure that enjoyment".
If one looks at the above definitions of tourism attractions one sees that there is a steady emphasis on the organization of resources to create an attraction thereby emphasizing the importance of organizational intervention.

2.1 (b) Experiential definitions.

Boorstein (1992) states that the tourist is less interested in experiencing another culture than experiencing his idea of it. Boorstein also states that the tourist desires contrived events and is satisfied by them. A look at this definition indicates that the focus has been on the creation of experiences to satisfy the tourists. The experience in this case would be a contrived one.

Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert and Wanhill (1993) identify attractions as a focus for recreational and, in part, educational activity undertaken by both day and stay visitors. The emphasis in this definition is on the recreational and educational activity undertaken by the tourist. These activities, undoubtedly involve experiences for the tourists, which is the focus of the attraction.

Another definition has been that of (Holloway: 1994). He states that, "perhaps it is easiest just to accept that any site that appeals to people
sufficiently to encourage them to travel there in order to visit it can be judged as a visitor attraction". He also quotes that "the attraction of a trip by car through the countryside is the scenery, but this will be heightened for some by the occasional stop at a village for a walk around and visit to a pub...". This definition of an attraction is interesting in the sense that it does not look at the creation of an experience of visiting an attraction but rather emphasizes the interaction of the visitor with the resources that creates an attraction for that tourist. The emphasis on the efforts to create an experience rests with the tourist who has the capability to interact with the resources available at a destination and create an attraction experience for herself.

Pretes (1995) says, "In post-modern society tourism becomes increasingly concerned with spectacle. Tourism sites, natural or man-made are "spectacular". In a land that has no natural spectacle, man-made ones must be created". He discusses the creation of the Santa Claus industry in Lapland in this context. Here again the focus or emphasis has been to create the "spectacle" in the sense of the attraction's ability to create an experience for the tourists. In fact Smith and Hinch (1996) go on to indicate that Casinos are manufacturing these experiences. They say that casinos are increasingly manufacturing an experience and an environment that is transportable. Saarinen (1999) states, "Attractions are
situated in a specified place and time and they have an "authentic" or "staged" history of their own. Both attractions and destinations are historically contingent processes in which the meanings and representations manifesting time and space, are attached through local and global institutional practices. Socio-spatial representations are mediated and become touristic experiences. From this point of view attractions are semiotic or textual meaning structures, which are connected reciprocally to larger cultural discourses. All these post-modern "categories" have a place bound history and meanings that are produced both locally and globally through the movement of Capital and the process of time-space compression".

When one looks at the above statements on attractions by Pretes, Hinch and Saarinen, one can see the emphasis on the creation of experiences at an attraction. Over a period of time attractions have been looked at from an experiential point of view rather than as mere objects. This has led to the increasing "management" of attractions to create these experiences. Given this one can define an attraction as basically any place or site, either man-made, natural or a combination of both, which involves the creation and consumption of experiences, both pleasurable and educative for the tourists and which is the focus for management, either private or public.
2.2 Classification.

Attractions have been classified in different ways. Most authors classify tourism attractions on the basis of their scope, ownership, permanency and drawing power, capacity and type. While looking at the scope of a tourism attraction Mill and Morrison (1992) distinguish between a primary attraction and a secondary attraction. They classify an attraction as a primary attraction if it has the potential to satisfy tourists for "several days or longer". They state, “Attractions at a primary destination have to have sufficient breadth of appeal to entice tourists to stay for many days. There have to be sufficient things to do and see to keep all members of the party occupied". A stopover or secondary attraction is defined as an interesting or necessary place to visit on the way to the primary destination. In terms of ownership Mill and Morrison (1992), Gunn (1994), Cooper, Fletcher, Gilbert and Wanhill (1993), identify the attractions as being owned either by the government and its agencies, or by non-profit organizations or by private organizations. Mill and Morrison (1992) indicate that the form of ownership has implications for tourism in terms of influencing the decisions relating to tourism. They say that the Federal Government owns approximately 85 percent of all outdoor recreation lands in the U.S. This huge ownership factor will definitely influence the recreation and tourism attraction decisions apart from influencing the
tourism developmental decisions at the destination. They also conclude that the non-profit organizations that are involved in work for social good such as historical site preservation have the potential to influence tourism in that region.

Almost all the above-mentioned authors classify attractions based on permanency. They classify them as sites and events, the former being permanent in nature and the latter being temporary in terms of their currency.

The classification of attractions by the type of attraction is quite varied. Swarbrooke (1995) categorizes attractions into four types, namely, Natural, Man-made but not originally designed primarily to attract tourists, Man-made and purpose-built to attract tourists and Special events. Cooper, Wanhill, Fletcher and Gilbert (1993), Peters (1969) and Holloway (1994) also classify types as man-made and natural, with Cooper (1993) further classifying the man-made ones as reproducible and non-reproducible. They argue that the reproducible attractions will ease the pressure off the non-reproducible attractions giving the example of “Foamhenge” to ease the pressure off “Stonehenge”. This could be used in situations where the destination has non-reproducible attractions that need to be protected from the ever-increasing tourism to maintain the quality of the experience at the attraction. Clawson and
Knetsch (1966) have classified attractions on the basis of the focus/emphasis on user/resources.

They have come up with this tri-partite classification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Oriented</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Resource based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on whatever resources are available.</td>
<td>Best resources available within accessible distance to users.</td>
<td>Outstanding resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often manmade/artificial developments (pools, zoos, parks etc). Highly intensive developments close to users in large population centres. Focus on user pressure. Activities include, golf, tennis, picnicking, walking, riding, etc. Often highly seasonal activities closing off-peak.</td>
<td>Access very important. More natural resources than user-oriented facilities but experience a high degree of pressure and wear. Activities include swimming, camping, hiking etc.</td>
<td>Primary focus is resource quality with low intensity development and man-made facilities at minimum. Often distant from users, the resource determines the activity. Mountain climbing, fishing, Hunting, Scientific and historic interest are some of the activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This classification polarizes the attractions on a continuum based on emphasis of activity to resource, of artificiality to naturalness and of high intensity of development to low intensity of development. User oriented
attractions are more activity emphatic, have more artificiality in terms of human intervention at the attraction and have a high intensity of development. This is in stark contrast to the resource-based attractions that are resource quality emphatic, have more naturalness and have very low intensity of development.

Inskeep (1991) identifies a three-point typology, Natural attractions (based on features of the natural environment), Cultural attractions (based on man’s activities) and Special types of attractions that are artificially created.

Finally attractions are classified on the basis of spatiality. Wall (1997) and Holloway (1994) have classified attractions on the basis of their geographical location at a destination. Holloway (1994) identifies attractions as either Nodal or Linear referring to the nodal attractions to a city or a nodal point and liner to a set of attractions dispersed along a line / tour. Wall (1997) has further classified them into Points, Lines and Areas referring to the geographical location of the attraction. He identifies points as those attractions that are largely concentrated in if a small area. He suggests that there is a danger of congestion in such situations. He also identifies Lines as attractions that have linear properties to help some dispersion of tourists along a line. He also suggests that there could be a danger to resources in this type of attraction dispersal along a line. He classifies areas as attractions with spatial extent that permit larger
dispersal limits added with the ability to attract large number of tourists. Attractions in the long run will favour "areas".

2.3 Peripherality
Another classification of attraction on the basis of geography is in terms of attractions located in core areas and attractions located in peripheral areas. The concept of "periphery" is identified by Dybedal (1998) and Wanhill (1997) as being located away from densely populated areas of a destination. Wanhill (1997) in fact gives a very clear definition of peripheral locations as being distant from the core and having difficult and / or costly access, sparsely populated in rural or coastal locations that are relatively isolated. He further says, "Geographically, peripherality is associated with distance from the core. In tourism terms, this is about distance from gateways and, given that leisure tourism is paid out of discretionary income, the cost of access". He further states that peripheral areas either lack modern transportation links with the core or are facing internal restrictive monopoly practices inhibiting competition. An analysis of the above classifications gives an idea of the problems of attractions located in such areas due to the aspects of higher costs of access and the resultant drag on the "pull factor" that is so vital for the success of any attraction in the peripheral areas.