Appalachian
STATE UNIVERSITY®
BOONE, NORTH CAROLINA

Heritage Site Visitation And Attitudes Toward African American Heritage Preservation: An Investigation Of North Carolina Residents

By: Stefanie Benjamin, **Carol Kline**, Derek Alderman, and Wilson Hoggard

Abstract
Understanding disparities in visitation rates to heritage sites and patterns in public support for preservation and remembrance of African American heritage could greatly inform decision-making and management philosophies of park/historic site operators, preservationists, and other entrepreneurs. Informed by critical theory, this study examined heritage site visitation and attitudes toward remembrance and preservation of African American heritage among North Carolina (NC) residents. Telephone interviews were completed by 843 residents investigating their heritage site visitation patterns and support for African American heritage. The results suggest that race, age, education, income, frequency of travel, and voting record impact variation in heritage site visitation among NC residents while race, age, education, the presence of retirees or children in the household, voting record, and identification as a Southerner influenced attitudes toward African American preservation. This study contributes to the critical analysis of how patterns in heritage site visitation and public support of preservation perpetuate racialization of the travel experience.

Heritage Site Visitation and Attitudes toward African American Heritage Preservation: An Investigation of North Carolina Residents

Stefanie Benjamin[1], Carol Kline[2], Derek Alderman[3], and Wilson Hoggard[4]

Abstract

Understanding disparities in visitation rates to heritage sites and patterns in public support for preservation and remembrance of African American heritage could greatly inform decision-making and management philosophies of park/historic site operators, preservationists, and other entrepreneurs. Informed by critical theory, this study examined heritage site visitation and attitudes toward remembrance and preservation of African American heritage among North Carolina (NC) residents. Telephone interviews were completed by 843 residents investigating their heritage site visitation patterns and support for African American heritage. The results suggest that race, age, education, income, frequency of travel, and voting record impact variation in heritage site visitation among NC residents while race, age, education, the presence of retirees or children in the household, voting record, and identification as a Southerner influenced attitudes toward African American preservation. This study contributes to the critical analysis of how patterns in heritage site visitation and public support of preservation perpetuate racialization of the travel experience.

Introduction

Heritage has been defined in numerous ways and represents a strong desire to understand who we are in order to share that knowledge with others. Canton and Santos (2007) posit that heritage tourism is an important and growing segment of tourism worldwide. Furthermore, Alderman and Inwood (2013) argue that, "Heritage has become a global industry that sells the past to promote tourism and development, feeding a rampant consumer appetite for things retro, restored, and re-enacted" (p. 187). While heritage has a global appeal, not all social groups participate in the heritage industry equally. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) suggest that heritage is inherently "dissonant" and characterized by a lack of consistency or agreement in the way people produce and consume the past in the present. Alderman (2013) states that "tourism shapes and is shaped by racial inequalities" (p. 376). And Schmalz and Mowatt (2014) call for more attention to the "complex and . . . discomforting lens" of oppression and privilege in parks, recreation, tourism and leisure (p. 245). While certain representations of heritage can evoke feelings of identity and belonging for some groups, those same representations can be a source of alienation and exclusion for others. For example, in analyzing the revitalization of the tourism industry post Hurricane Katrina, Thomas (2014) writes, "What is at stake in this battle over historical memory of Hurricane Katrina is the very future of black New Orleans and its place in the nation" (p. 128).

The landscape of American heritage tourism and preservation has long been defined by racial and class politics that define what and who is worthy of commemoration, traditionally sending a message that nonwhites matter less or in some

[1]Department of Retail, Hospitality & Tourism Management, College of Education, Health & Human Sciences, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA
[2]Department of Management, Walker College of Business, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA
[3]Department of Geography, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA
[4]Center for Sustainability: Tourism, Natural Resources, and the Built Environment, College of Engineering and Technology, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

Corresponding Author:
Stefanie Benjamin, Department of Retail, Hospitality & Tourism Management, College of Education, Health & Human Sciences, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, USA.
Email: stefkate@gmail.com

cases do not belong at all (Loewen 1999). Therefore, this landscape is characterized by racially and ethnically uneven engagement, and African Americans in particular develop travel patterns as a "defensive mechanism" against potential instances of racism (Lee and Scott 2015, 2). The limited participation of minorities at U.S. heritage sites, including national parks, has emerged as an important research theme and public policy issue over the past decade (Agarwal and Yochum 1999; Erickson, Johnson, and Kivel 2009; Floyd 1999; Lawton and Weaver 2008; Philipp 1994). Weber and Sultana (2013) provide a recent review of these theories, which emphasize socioeconomic constraints within the minority community, the different identities and upbringing of minorities, the legacy of discrimination and elitism at destinations, and the location of minority populations relative to attractions. However, proximity does not ensure visitation, a point that Lawton and Weaver (2008) made when finding that more than one-half of the local African American population in Columbia, South Carolina, had never stepped foot in the nearby Congaree National Park.

The National Park System is increasingly concerned with issues of diversity, and some parks have made greater moves toward addressing minority heritage themes, although the project is far from complete. Within the tourism industry more broadly, we are seeing growth in the number of preserved sites, memorials, and festivals dedicated to promoting the histories and identities of African Americans and other historically marginalized groups. This is due, in part, to the increasing market importance of the minority traveler, but it is also in reaction to a new model of social history interpretation that seeks to offer tourists, including white travelers, a view of the past from the perspective of women, the working class, and people of color. While these heritage tourism destinations were certainly built to spur economic development, they also originated out of a political activism to elevate the public identity of minority groups (Dwyer and Alderman 2008).

The contemporary heritage tourism industry in the United States consists of sites of historical and continuing racial and ethnic exclusion but also places of minority inclusion and expression. Arguably, no other region illustrates these complexities and contradictions more than the southeastern United States, where the political economy of tourism and hospitality is particularly racialized (Alderman and Modlin 2013). It is a region in which the Civil War battle sites and antebellum plantation house museums still have great iconic power, even as many of them continue to romanticize slave life or fail to mention it altogether. Yet, the region is also the host of growing numbers of memorials and museums dedicated to the Civil Rights Movement and stories of black freedom struggles during Jim Crow and slavery (e.g., the Underground Railroad). According to Dwyer, Butler, and Carter (2013), the southern heritage tourism landscape is undergoing significant change with respect to acknowledging the history of racial oppression and struggle, even at

some antebellum and Civil War sites. As they demonstrate, it is important to understand the characteristics of visitors to heritage sites and to recognize that the recasting of heritage tourism to include an African American presence is not a simple process; the public holds differing views about how much or little should be said about race and racism. These differing views do not simply signal variation in consumer preference but reflect and frame "the political environment within the tourism industry operates, as well as issues of planning and control" (Tribe 2008, 249).

Heritage site management and historic preservation are important sociocultural components of tourism. As such, they influence and are influenced by the social power, politics, and inequalities that characterize the travel experience. Indeed, recent work documents how African American travel patterns—particular to heritage tourism sites—continue to be influenced by a perceived fear of racial discrimination, realized and potential (Lee and Scott 2015). Although moved by the desire to understand the nature of heritage tourism management, we are chiefly concerned with gauging public support for preservation and remembrance of African American heritage and taking these attitudes into account when planning, designing, and managing tourist products and destinations. Kibby (2000) purports that heritage tourism can be defined as tourism that engages with the cultural tradition of a particular location. Consequently, this work contributes broadly to tourism studies by placing a focus on the understanding and management of heritage tourism as a social phenomenon.

Theoretical Context and Purpose of Paper

The study is informed by Critical Theory (CT), which offers a lens to explore issues of power, voice, domination, ideology, autonomy, and agency (Kincheloe and McLaren 2003). CT is not new to tourism research; however, it has gained significant traction only in the last decade, perhaps in part due to the biennial Critical Tourism Studies conference first organized in 2005. CT has informed issues of sexual harassment (Kensbock et al. 2015), volunteer tourism (McGehee 2012), post-conflict tourism (Causevic and Lynch 2011), disaster tourism (Gotham 2007), sex tourism (Hemming 2005), and climate change (Nilsen and Ellingsen 2015) to name a few. In 2008, Tribe outlined the importance of CT to both tourism research and management, and in modifying Kincheloe and McLaren's work (2003), identified 11 domains of CT. Our study seeps into several of these domains, primarily critical enlightenment, critique of technical rationality; ideology; discursive power; culture, power, and domination; and cultural pedagogy.

Power is a fundamental issue to be explored, and according to Tribe, a critical approach to tourism "would seek to expose whose interests are served and how power operates in particular formations of tourism as well as in the process

of research" (p. 246). Additionally, CT is a way to transform the way in which *people perceive the world*, and critical research is imperative to contribute to a more progressive management and governance of tourism. Essentially, Tribe posits that critical tourism aims for "understanding, belonging, being, emancipation, and accommodation in and with the world" (2008, 254). Using CT as a theoretical framework, our study explores how patterns in heritage site visitation and public support of preservation may perpetuate a racialization of the travel experience. Recognizing how travel experiences become racialized is important to understanding tourism's role in creating patterns of racial hierarchy and inequality, but also the industry's potential to become a platform for resisting racial exclusion and the normative power of white privilege.

Understanding disparities in visitation rates to heritage sites and patterns in public support for the preservation and remembrance of African American heritage would greatly inform the decision-making and management philosophies of park and historic site operators, preservationists, tourism marketers, and other entrepreneurs. These industry leaders and practitioners are under growing pressure, and rightly so, to be more sensitive to issues of diversity and socially responsible business practices. Moreover, equity, fairness, and social justice are of increasing interest among tourism scholars, some of whom assert that tourism has the potential to bring historically divided groups together, address ingrained racial divisions, and facilitate minority empowerment (Barton and Leonard 2010). It is out of this practical and political context that this study reports the results of a statewide telephone survey of North Carolina residents, recognizing that the tourism literatures have carried out few surveys that so explicitly address race and racial attitudes. The survey explores what types of heritage sites people typically visit, and people's feelings about African American heritage protection and remembrance, and analyzes the relationship of visitation and preservation attitudes to various personal and social characteristics of respondents, including race/ethnicity, generational cohort, and broader political views. Furthermore, the authors assert that heritage tourism falls under the sustainable tourism umbrella exploring the broader social implications of specific heritage sites. Specifically, the research questions are as follows:

1. How do demographic, household, and psychographic variables correlate with heritage site visitation?
2. How do demographic, household, and psychographic variables correlate with attitudes toward/interests in African American heritage preservation?

North Carolina (NC) is a major destination for the nation's minority tourists and serves as a "microcosm" of the broader shifts in heritage and racial power taking place in the South and the United States. NC is the home of a major civil rights museum and several destinations connected with the Underground Railroad. Tourism officials have heavily promoted the NC Civil War Sesquicentennial (2011–2015), and the state claims a multitude of plantation historic sites open for tours. In the case of some plantation house museums and Civil War anniversary activities, efforts have been made to include slavery and the African American experience, although it would be unfair to characterize these efforts as a watershed change; widely apparent inequities of the African American story within many state heritage sites still exist (Alderman and Modlin 2013).

Like much of the southeastern United States, NC has been engaged in debates about what it means to be a southerner and whether traditional expressions of southern heritage (e.g., Civil War, Confederacy, plantations) have tended to discriminate against African Americans. The state has also been embroiled in debates over same-sex marriages, leading to the passage of a constitutional amendment banning these unions. We believe that perceptions and valuations about heritage, especially with regard to minority identities and histories, are couched within broader political and ideological contexts and worldviews. Hence, this study examines heritage site visitation patterns and support for African American heritage in relation to respondents' identification as a "southerner," their level of religious engagement, and whether they voted for the state constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage.

Background

Shinew, Floyd, and Parry (2004) suggest that "understanding the relationship between constraints and race is important not only for furthering our knowledge of access, choice and enjoyment of leisure pursuits, but also for gaining greater insight into broader societal issues surrounding race" (p. 182). Even after the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, communities of color have remained "apprehensive" travelers and continue to avoid visiting certain heritage and park destinations (Carter 2008). Researchers have developed and employed a number of theories to understand why (Floyd 1999). Carter (2008) recognizes the powerful role that memory and socialization play in shaping travel patterns, in that the history of racism endures in the minds of some African Americans who perceive travel space in racialized and unwelcoming terms. Research has found that feelings of racial acceptance directly affect the tourism choices of African Americans (Philipp 1999).

This sense of acceptance does not exist simply in the minds of African Americans, but is something that heritage sites create through marketing and historical interpretation (Buzinde and Santos 2009). Plantation house museums, in particular, typically abridge the negativity of slavery with, "noble tales describing the lives of the plantation owners and the architectural intricacies of their homes" (Buzinde and Santos 2009, 439). Butler, Carter, and Dwyer (2008) examined Laura Plantation in Louisiana as a case study in order to

understand how the landscape and the stories were portrayed to tourists. They investigated visitor preferences and demographics through an exit survey that concluded the majority of visitors were white females with a high level of education and a gross income of $100,000 or more a year. White participants were most interested in architecture, but not interested in the topic of slavery. African American tourists showed a much greater interest in slavery. Case studies that specifically investigate plantation sites and visitor preferences solidify how dominant cultures, like the white elite class, have influenced historical narratives in order to silence "uncomfortable" truths and paint a romanticized picture of how they want to imagine plantation life, even if it may offend potential African Americans visitors (Buzinde and Santos 2009).

While some destinations have traditionally silenced a black sense of place, other heritage sites are being developed that offer a narration of African American heritage that appeals to minority visitors (Gotham 2011). For example, New Orleans instituted the Louisiana Black Culture Commission and the Division of Black Culture promoting African American Heritage (Gotham 2011). South Carolina created a heritage tourism industry promoting Gullah Geechee traditions. Alabama became the first state to market their Civil Rights history by creating a heritage trail that included a reenactment of the Edmund Pettus Bridge crossing as well as other African American Heritage activities (Eskew 2001). Alabama also built a Civil Rights Museum that, in its first year of operation, drew 200,000 visitors more than any other state Civil Rights Museum. As Goodman (2000, 1062) writes, "instead of focusing on why people from privileged groups don't support equity, I have been exploring what motivates people to do so. Why do some people from dominant groups act as allies, supporting the rights of an oppressed group of which they are not part?" It is our hope that the current study can shed light on the who and some of the why that dominant social groups visit African American heritage sites and support African American heritage preservation. Our interest in exploring feelings of North Carolinians about the preservation and remembrance of African American heritage accompanies a recognition that researchers have tended to study historic site preservation, with relatively less attention given to preservation attitudes of the public. The National Historic Preservation Act in 1966 helped more than 100 U.S. cities form preservation commissions. In the past, preservation was completed in order to maintain architectural history canons and fulfill what historical associations felt appropriate to save (Mason 2003). The majority of literature focusing on preservation attitudes has been physically located within cities as a result of old structures that are still intact (Barthel 1989; Mason 2003). However, the African American community has been directly affected from city preservation since their neighborhoods have been located in downtown districts that deteriorated. Barthel (1989) noted that what gets preserved and interpreted

"depends upon a class structure of society and the related social mapping of time and place" (p. 88). Landscapes have been physically changed by dominant cultures in order to make room for gentrification. Using CT as a lens, this study investigates how power influences certain groups to preserve specific spaces and places.

Preservationists, according to Mason (2003, 70), "will only act on what is valuable to them." Therefore, it is important to understand the attitudes of various stakeholders and what power they may hold in order to decide what should be preserved. Coeterier (2002) investigated this very question of whether residents should have a voice in deciding what should be preserved. He concluded that lay people should have an opinion and vote on preservation since their "value of these buildings goes beyond historiography" (p. 121). However, residents may differ from other stakeholders like developers or others who seek profits from preservation projects, whereas different "community advocates (wealthy or disadvantaged) attempt to block undesirable development" (Mason 2003, 64). It is important to recognize that historical preservation is a planning technique and it is difficult to separate preservation from the politics of shaping urban space and the power relations of defining whose histories matter most within cities. For this reason, we are exploring visitation patterns and preservation attitudes of residents, determining the overall sentiment of the sample, and examining the differences within. First, we must understand *who* is the driving force in regards to preservation decisions. There are varied theories as to *why* people deem certain objects or histories more important to preserve over others (Goodman 2000; Koziol 2008); however, it stands to reason that we cannot learn the *why* until we have a better grasp on the *who*.

Understanding the types of heritage sites visited by North Carolina residents arises out of a desire to examine racial disparities in heritage visitation patterns. Recently, scholars have turned their attention to the lack of visitation of people of color to heritage sites, with special attention on the lack of a minority presence at National Parks (Barton and Leonard 2010; Buzinde and Santos 2009; Erickson, Johson, and Kivel 2009; Weber and Sultana 2013). Approximately 91% of National Park visitors are white while minority populations, such as African Americans, constituted 3.8% (Erickson, Johnson, and Kivel 2009). This attendance pattern is emblematic of broader differences in leisure travel patterns. Carter (2008, 266) noted that African Americans tend not to deviate from their itineraries and are "more likely than Whites to limit their visits to destinations recommended to them by family members, friends and acquaintances," demonstrating how constrained travel preferences and patterns become entrenched and compounded over time and space.

The first four hypotheses of this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Sociodemographic variables such as gender, age, race, and education will not impact the respondent's African American heritage site visitation patterns.

Hypothesis 2: Sociodemographic variables such as gender, age, race, and education will not impact the respondent's attitudes about African American heritage preservation.

Hypothesis 3: Household characteristics such as household income, residential setting, and household composition will not impact the respondent's African American heritage site visitation patterns.

Hypothesis 4: Household characteristics such as household income, residential setting, and household composition will not impact the respondent's attitudes about African American heritage preservation.

World View

The term *world view* derives from the German word *Weltanschauung* which refers to the scaffold of ideas and beliefs through which an individual, group or culture interprets and interacts with the world. While Guba and Lincoln (1994, 109) were referring to a researcher's ontology when they wrote that through a CT lens a "virtual reality [is] shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values [and] crystallized over time," we adopt this premise about the sample as well. Within this study, we examine voting activity, religious service attendance, travel experience, and self-identification as a "Southerner" as proxy indicators of world view. Each of these measures is part of a profile that we might use to understand who values African American heritage sites and heritage preservation. We recognize that even most seemingly innocent and rational consumption decision is embedded within the politics of identity and ideology.

Being a "Southerner" is a concept both geographically and culturally important to comprehend since living in the South might refer to speech, traditional cooking and lifestyles in the geographical region below the Mason Dixon Line. Geographically the word "Southerner" refers to people who reside for at least one-third of their life in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, or Virginia. The University of North Carolina administered the Southern Focus Poll from 1991 to 2001 in order to understand how Southern residents identify with the region. Griffin and Thompson (2003) found that "Hispanic, black and white, male and female, young and old—all discernibly identify with the region less in 2001 than 1991" (p. 58) and argue that being a Southerner is not as popular as it was in the past. Additionally, 95% of people polled that lived in the region with southern accents claim to be a Southerner. Consequently, new residents to the region will identify with the South less so than those individuals who have lived in the region their whole life. Abramowitz and Saunders (2006) give insight into how different races view themselves within different political groups. Southerners have identified themselves with the Republican platform and that "Democratic identification of Blacks, party identification is much more strongly related to voters' ideological orientations than to their

social identities as defined by their group membership" (Abramowitz and Saunders 2006, 176).

People often identify being a Southerner if they lived in the region for the duration of their life. However, being a Southerner is also living in a culture that elicits several stereotypes, while also being connected with certain ideological and political dispositions that are arguably important to understanding visitation behaviors and attitudes toward remembrance and preservation of minority heritage.

Voting activity and preferences might also correlate with political activism and attitudes towards a liberal versus conservative agenda. On May 8, 2012, North Carolina voted on the subject of same-sex marriage. It marked the 30th state to adopt a ban on gay marriage, through an Amendment on the state constitution, stating that marriage is strictly between a man and a woman. More than 500,000 early voters cast ballots in defense of the sanctity of marriage by banning any other "domestic legal union" such as civil unions and domestic partnerships in North Carolina. The final percentage of votes came to 61.0% for Amendment One (banning same-sex marriage) and 39.0% against (Waggoner 2012). Some speculate that the vote was generationally driven, where older voters, who tend to be more reliable voters, had greater attendance at the polls in order to back the amendment (Waggoner 2012). Voting activity is one measure of ideological predisposition and/or activism, and those who voted against Amendment One would be seen as having more liberal political views. Therefore, the authors wished to explore the relationship between respondents' political opinion, voting activity and heritage site visitation.

Religion is another variable that has been known to influence our behavior as consumers and travellers (Portia, Butler, and Arley 2003). Portia, Butler, and Arley (2003) suggest that the perception of a heritage sites should be based on a tourist's perception of the site in relation to their own heritage. They argue that that the tourists' religion and the level of their religious beliefs are linked to the meaning associated to the heritage site and their visitation patterns to that site. Religion of the tourist essentially acts as an indicator that may help to understand the meaning and value placed on a specific heritage site). Moreover, Portia, Butler, and Arley (2003) note, "It is the culture in which participants live that constructs the meaning associated with the site, and this lies at the core of the tourists' experience" (p. 358). Therefore, this article will investigate whether religious attributes have an influence within visitation at heritage sites along with other factors.

Hypothesis 5: Psychographic variables such as voting behavior, travel frequency, and attendance to religious services will not impact the respondent's African American heritage site visitation patterns.

Hypothesis 6: Psychographic variables such as voting behavior, travel frequency, and attendance to religious services will not impact the respondent's attitudes about African American heritage preservation.

Methods

Our study was designed to examine heritage site visitation and attitudes toward the remembrance and preservation of African American heritage among the populace of NC. The data for the survey was collected from May 15th to June 20th, 2012. The survey questions were designed by the Sociology Department and the Center for Sustainable Tourism (CST) at East Carolina University. The landline telephone numbers for residents were purchased from a national survey research company, who provided 3,400 numbers; cell phone numbers were not used because the cost exceeded the project budget, responding on a cell phone has complications for both respondent and interviewer (i.e., the first question must be "Are you in a safe place to talk?") and in 2012 there was not as much concern about access to people who *only* used cell phones. The sample included both urban and rural residents from the 15 urban and 85 rural counties. Admittedly, while this rural/urban classification is current, gray area may exist in the counties that are classified as "rural" but are juxtaposed to urban counties.

The respondents were surveyed via a 10- to 30-minute telephone interview in the afternoon from 1:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. using two shifts of interviewers. Out of 4,400 telephone calls, 843 surveys were completed successfully (19.2% of the total phone calls made). Those refusing to participate numbered 1,343 people, or 30.5%, and those who could not be reached made up 47.7% (2,100 potential informants did not answer the phone or whose numbers were not in service or were fax numbers). The data were directly loaded onto Qualtrics after each interview to minimize the risk of human error. There were 32 questions, the majority being close-ended.

Sociodemographic, household and world view questions covered gender, education, marital status, age (generational cohort), household income and composition, religious affiliation, frequency of attending religious services, place of birth (inside or outside the US), race/ethnicity, self-identification as a "Southerner," and voting status on Amendment One were also catalogued. Tourist activity questions covered the general frequency of overnight travel (for any purpose) in the last two years and whether (yes/no) respondents had visited a Civil Rights memorial (*CRM*), a Civil War museum (*CWM*), a Southern plantation (*SP*), a festival celebrating African American heritage or culture (*AAF*), and an Underground Railroad site (*URS*). Questions about attitudes toward African American preservation and commemoration focused on asking respondents about their level of (dis)agreement on whether more should be done to protect African American sites (*Site Protection*), whether the history of slavery should be forgotten (*Best Forgotten*), whether they prefer to visit African American landmarks in person (*Visit in Person*), whether it is interesting to visit places where famous African Americans once lived (*Famous Lived*), and whether too much emphasis is placed on Civil Rights heritage (Too *Much Heritage*). The data were analyzed in SPSS 20.0. The Yates Continuity Correction (YCC) statistic was reported in all 2×2 chi-square tables to provide a conservative interpretation of the results.

Results

A majority of the respondents were female (66.3%), higher than the percentage of females in the state overall (51.3%). Compared to state demographic patterns, we had an overrepresentation of whites (78.3% of respondents vs. 71.9% of state) and an underrepresentation of African Americans (16.3% vs. 22%), Asians (0.6% vs. 1.5%), Hispanics (1.5% vs. 8.7%), and people born outside the United States (3.9% vs. 7.5%). Just over one-third of respondents (34.5%) were classified as Baby Boomers. While the generational cohort categories used here lend themselves to the spirit of the analysis, they are U.S.-centric and arguably do not fully capture the way attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors vary by age rather than generation. Almost half reported household incomes of less than US$50,000, and four-fifths (42.5%) were college educated.

More than half of the respondents (52.9%) had at least one retired adult living in the household, and 28.3% had at least one child in the household. The majority of respondents (71.3%) reported that they attend religious services at least once a week, and about the same amount (73.5%) identified themselves as a Southerner. Around half of the sample, 52.4% who voted and 47.8% who did not, were in favor of Amendment One. More than half (53.2%) of respondents traveled overnight at least once a month over the past two years.

Site Visitation and Sociodemographic, Household, and Psychographic Variables

Sociodemographics. Chi-square analysis was used to examine differences in site visitation across numerous sociodemographic, household, and psychographic variables. Respondents were asked about their visitation to Civil Rights memorials (*CRM*), Civil War museums (*CWM*), Southern plantations (*SP*), African American festivals (*AAF*), and Underground Railroad sites (*URS*). Two-thirds of the respondents overall (66.3%) were female; however, visitors to *CWM* were more likely (than expected) to be male, $\chi^2(1, N = 843) = 5.310$, $p = .021$ (Table 1). Visitation differences in gender to *CRM, SP, AAF*, and *URS* was not significant. The examination of generational cohort yielded significant results for visitation to *CRM*, $\chi^2(4, N = 827) = 28.308$, $p = .000$; *CWM*, $\chi^2(4, N = 827) = 20.660$, $p = .000$; *AAF*, $\chi^2(4, N = 827) = 10.371$, $p = .035$; and *URS*, $\chi^2(4, N = 827) = 10.323$, $p = .035$, but not for *SP*.

The analysis regarding race was performed twice: first, between *White* and *Nonwhite* respondents, and second,

Table 1. Chi-square Analysis of Site Visitation and Demographic Variables.

Variable	Civil rights Memorial		Civil War Museum		Southern Plantation		African American Festival		Underground Railroad Site	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Gender										
Female (n = 559)	122	70.1	127	59.6	103	66.5	68	60.7	34	59.6
Male (n = 284)	52	29.9	86	40.4	52	33.5	44	39.3	23	40.4
χ^2(df)	1.214 (1)		5.310 (1)*		0.000 (1)		1.533 (1)		0.916 (1)	
Race/ethnicity										
White (n = 660)	126	72.4	181	85.0	134	86.5	49	43.8	37	64.9
Nonwhite (n = 183)	48	27.6	32	15.0	21	13.5	63	56.2	20	35.1
χ^2(df)	4.032 (1)*		6.977 (1)**		6.864 (1)**		88.345 (1)**		5.622 (1)*	
Black (n = 137)	40	23.0	24	11.3	17	11.0	55	49.1	16	28.1
Nonblack (n = 706)	134	77.0	189	88.7	138	89.0	57	50.9	41	71.9
χ^2(df)	6.701 (1)**		4.723 (1)*		3.435 (1)		99.677 (1)**		5.377 (1)*	
Age										
GI Generation (n = 20)	0	0.0	3	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.9	1	1.8
Silent Generation (n = 255)	38	22.4	48	23.2	38	25.7	26	23.9	10	17.9
Baby Boomer (n = 343)	75	44.1	94	45.4	62	41.9	42	38.5	22	39.3
Generation X (n = 159)	52	30.6	56	27.1	39	26.4	29	26.6	19	33.9
Millennials (n = 50)	5	2.9	6	2.9	8	5.4	11	10.1	4	7.1
χ^2(df)	28.308 (4)**		20.660 (4)**		8.709 (4)		10.371 (4)*		10.323 (4)*	
Education										
High school or some high school (n = 238)	24	13.8	31	14.6	22	14.2	19	17.0	11	19.3
Some college/ associate's degree (n = 243)	48	27.6	58	27.4	41	26.5	30	26.8	13	22.8
College degree (n = 223)	62	35.6	75	35.4	57	36.8	39	34.8	20	35.1
Advanced degree (n = 135)	40	23.0	48	22.6	35	22.6	24	21.4	13	22.8
χ^2(df)	29.842 (3)**		34.971 (3)**		26.290 (3)**		11.729 (3)**		5.953 (3)	
Household income										
<$50,000 (n = 329)	56	36.4	60	32.1	42	31.1	44	45.4	15	30.6
$50,000–$99,999 (n = 266)	64	41.6	81	43.3	59	43.7	36	37.1	28	57.1
>$100,000 (n = 116)	34	22.1	46	24.6	34	25.2	17	17.5	6	12.2
χ^2(df)	9.076 (2)*		24.073 (2)**		18.078 (2)**		0.124 (2)		8.800 (2)*	

**p < .01, *p < .05.

between *Black* and *Nonblack* respondents. The reason for this was conceptual as well as practical. Racial tension surrounding heritage tourism sites can be attributed to how a particular narrative and portrayal of the site is presented; therefore, the authors felt this could best be captured by splitting the sample in this manner. However, on a practical note, because of the low response rate of the Nonwhite and Nonblack races/ethnicities, they were combined within the "non" category of respondents. Statistically significant differences were found between *White* and *Nonwhite* respondents in their visitation to *CRM*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 4.032, p = .035; *CWM*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 6.977, p = .006; *SP*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 6.864, p = .006; *AAF*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 88.345, p = .000; and *URS*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 5.622, p = .011. *Nonwhites* were more likely than expected to visit a *CRM, AAF,* and *URS*, but less likely than expected to visit a *CWM* or *SP*. Conversely, *White* respondents were more likely than expected to visit a *CWM* or *SP*, and less likely to visit a *CRM, AAF,* and *URS*. Similar patterns were

found with the *Black* and *Nonblack* respondents in that black respondents were more likely than expected to visit a *CRM*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 6.701, p = .010, or *AAF*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 99.677, p = .000, but less likely to visit a *CWM*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 4.723, p = .030, or *URS*, χ^2(1, N = 843) = 5.377, p = .020; there was no statistically significant different in *SP* visitation.

Differences in education level were correlated with site visitation; statistically significant differences were found in *CRM*, χ^2(3, N = 839) = 29.842, p = .000; *CWM*, χ^2(3, N = 839) = 34.971, p = .000; *SP*, χ^2(3, N = 839) = 26.290, p = .000; and *AAF*, χ^2(3, N = 839) = 11.729, p = .008. The variable of *Income* correlated with site visitation in *CRM*, χ^2(2, N = 711) = 9.076, p = .011; *CWM*, χ^2(2, N = 711) = 724.073, p = .000; *SP*, χ^2(2, N = 711) = 18.078, p = .000; and *URS*, χ^2(2, N = 711) = 8.800, p = .012, but not in *AAF*. There were no statistically significant differences found in site visitation patterns between urban respondents and their rural counterparts.

Table 2. Chi-Square Analysis of Site Visitation and Household and Psychographic Variables.

	Type of Site									
	Civil Rights Memorial		Civil War Museum		Southern Plantation		African American Festival		Underground Railroad Site	
Variable	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Retired adults in household?										
Yes (*n* = 443)	77	44.8	93	44.3	70	45.8	58	52.7	23	40.4
No (*n* = 394)	95	55.2	117	55.7	83	54.2	52	47.3	34	59.6
χ^2(df)	5.380 (1)*		7.946 (1)**		3.525 (1)		0.000 (1)		3.360 (1)	
Children in household?										
Yes (*n* = 238)	65	37.6	71	33.5	47	30.5	37	33.0	21	36.8
No (*n* = 603)	108	62.4	141	66.5	107	69.5	75	67.0	36	63.2
χ^2(df)	8.663 (1)**		3.430 (1)		0.34 (1)		1.172 (1)		1.771 (1)	
Frequency of attendance to religious services										
Never/infrequently (*n* = 121)	18	10.5	31	14.8	22	14.5	8	7.3	9	16.1
Once a month (*n* = 116)	27	15.7	26	12.4	14	9.2	13	11.8	5	8.9
Weekly (*n* = 588)	127	73.8	153	72.9	116	76.3	89	80.9	42	75
χ^2(df)	3.230 (2)		0.666 (2)		3.787 (2)		6.839 (2)*		1.323 (2)	
Frequency of travel overnight										
Never (*n* = 158)	12	6.9	13	6.1	5	3.2	14	12.5	<5	7.0
Infrequently (*n* = 170)	21	12.1	29	13.7	28	18.1	11	9.8	5	8.8
Once a month (*n* = 446)	120	69.4	149	70.3	110	71.0	75	67.0	41	71.9
Weekly (*n* = 64)	20	11.6	21	9.9	12	7.7	12	10.7	7	12.3
χ^2(df)	38.625 (3)**		47.903 (3)**		36.355 (3)**		15.938 (3)**		14.291 (3)**	
Self-identification as Southerner?										
Yes (*n* = 620)	114	67.1	145	69.0	112	74.2	78	69.6	39	73.6
No (*n* = 210)	56	32.9	65	31.0	39	25.8	34	30.4	14	26.4
χ^2(df)	6.104 (1)*		4.359 (1)*		0.004 (1)		1.456 (1)		0.001 (1)	
Did you vote on Amendment One?										
Yes (*n* = 519)	123	71.5	155	73.8	111	72.5	81	75.7	28	51.9
No (*n* = 303)	49	28.5	55	26.2	42	27.5	26	24.3	26	48.1
χ^2(df)	6.105 (1)*		13.191 (1)**		6.665 (1)**		7.732 (1)**		2.666 (1)	
Did/would you vote for/against Amendment One?										
For (*n* = 314)	62	45.6	90	53.9	60	48.0	30	36.6	21	52.5
Against (*n* = 297)	74	54.4	77	46.1	65	52.0	52	63.4%	19	47.5
χ^2(df)	2.069 (1)		0.446 (1)		0.563 (1)		7.641 (1)**		0.000 (1)	

**p* < .01, **p* < .05.

Household characteristics. More than half (52.9%) had at least one retired individual living in the household. Visitation to CRM, χ^2 (1, N = 837) = 5.380, p = .020, and CWM, χ^2(1, N = 837) = 7.946, p = .004, were less likely by respondents with a retiree in their household (Table 2). Visitation to *SP, AAF,* and *URS* by households containing a retiree was not significant (or was *as expected*). The households containing children were more likely to visit *CRM*, χ^2(1, N = 841) = 8.663, p = .003. None of the other types of sites yielded statistically significant results.

Psychographic variables. When examining the relationship between attendance to religious services and visitation to sites, only *AAF* was significant, χ^2(2, N = 825) = 6.839, p = .033, whereby those respondents who attended religious ceremonies on a weekly basis (*Weekly*) were more likely to visit *AAF* than expected. The *Infrequent* religious attendance group was far less likely to visit *AAF*. However, the variable *Frequency of Overnight Travel* yielded significant results in all types of heritage site visitation: *CRM*, χ^2(3, N = 838) = 38.625, p = .000; *CWM*, χ^2(3, N = 838) = 47.903, p = .000; *SP*, χ^2(3, N = 838) = 36.355, p = .000; *AAF*, χ^2(3, N = 838) = 15.938, p = .001; and *URS*, χ^2(3, N = 838) = 14.291, p = .003.

In each case, the groups that travelled most often (the *Once a Month* and *Weekly* groups) were more likely than expected to visit all types of sites.

Regarding the notion of being a "Southerner," statistically significant differences were found for visitation to *CRM*, χ^2(1, N = 830) = 6.104, p = .013, and *CWM*, χ^2(1, N = 830) = 4.359, p = .037. In each case, the "non-Southerners" were more likely than expected to visit the sites.

A final set of questions asked respondents to report on their voting record related to Amendment One. Statistically significant relationships were found between *Voting* and *Non-voting* respondents who visited *CRM*, χ^2(1, N = 822) = 6.105, p = .013; *CWM*, χ^2(1, N = 822) = 13.191, p = .000; *SP*, χ^2(1, N = 822) = 6.665, p = .010; and *AAF*, χ^2(1, N = 822) = 7.732, p = .005, but not for *URS*. Overall, with only one exception, there was no difference between those who did/would vote (or who expressed support) for Amendment One and those who did or would not express support. Those who voted against Amendment One (for gay marriage rights) were more likely than expected to visit *AAF*, χ^2(1, N = 611) = 7.641, p = .006.

Attitudes about African American heritage and sociodemographic, household, and psychographic variables. Respondents were

Table 3. African American Heritage Items and Key Significant Variables.

	Site Protection, M (SD)	Best Forgotten, M (SD)	Visit in Person, M (SD)	Famous Lived, M (SD)	Too Much Heritage, M (SD)
Age					
Greatest Generation /GI Generation (born 1900–1926) (*n* = 16)	2.31 (0.704)	3.00 (1.000)	2.75 (0.931)	2.50 (0.816)	2.73 (1.100)
Silent Generation (born 1927–1945) (*n* = 235)	2.37 (0.880)	3.58 (1.088)	2.98 (0.955)	2.59 (0.941)	3.10 (1.104)
Baby Boomer (born 1946–1964) (*n* = 334)	2.34 (0.958)	3.91 (0.989)	2.72 (0.914)	2.41 (0.896)	3.39 (1.083)
Generation X (born 1965–1980) (*n* = 155)	2.11 (0.786)	4.11 (0.928)	2.52 (0.852)	2.15 (0.729)	3.82 (0.888)
Millennials (born 1981–1994) (*n* = 50)	2.06 (0.843)	3.88 (1.092)	2.45 (0.843)	2.24 (1.011)	3.49 (1.019)
F(df)	3.805 (4, 256.0)[a]**	10.144 (4, 203.8)[a]**	7.931 (4, 789) **	6.220 (4, 191.3)[a]**	12.646 (4, 145.8)[a]**
Education					
High School (*n* = 219)	2.32 (0.817)	3.30 (1.106)	2.90 (0.959)	2.59 (0.922)	3.09 (1.070)
Some College (*n* = 236)	2.24 (0.957)	3.87 (1.013)	2.67 (0.958)	2.37 (0.970)	3.42 (1.110)
College Graduate (*n* = 215)	2.33 (0.901)	4.09 (0.895)	2.78 (0.888)	2.35 (0.843)	3.49 (1.061)
Advanced Degree (*n* = 131)	2.26 (0.899)	4.22 (0.762)	2.56 (0.830)	2.27 (0.773)	3.61 (0.987)
F(df)	0.505 (3, 797)	37.823 (3, 801.9)[a]**	4.520 (3, 768.5)[a]**	4.726 (3, 784.1)[a]**	8.431 (3, 759.4)[a]**
Household income					
<$50,000 (*n* = 316)	2.16 (0.847)	3.70 (1.112)	2.67 (0.946)	2.40 (0.942)	3.41 (1.085)
$50,000–$99,999 (*n* = 257)	2.38 (0.907)	3.92 (0.906)	2.73 (0.887)	2.37 (0.860)	3.36 (1.087)
>$100,000 (*n* = 113)	2.35 (0.944)	4.24 (0.765)	2.84 (0.902)	2.36 (0.840)	3.54 (1.054)
F(df)	4.683 (2, 419.4)[a]**	15.716 (2, 624.2)[a]**	1.449 (2, 682)	0.166 (2, 690)	1.118 (2, 687)
Frequency of travel overnight					
Never (less than once/year) (*n* = 148)	2.27 (0.870)	3.39 (1.099)	2.85 (0.999)	2.50 (0.984)	3.15 (1.095)
Infrequently (once or twice a year) (*n* = 162)	2.34 (0.913)	3.60 (1.103)	2.75 (0.972)	2.52 (0.910)	3.28 (1.095)
Once a month (several times a year and once a month) (*n* = 429)	2.28 (0.914)	4.03 (0.927)	2.71 (0.892)	2.32 (0.850)	3.50 (1.044)
Weekly (nearly every week and weekly) (*n* = 61)	2.34 (0.834)	3.98 (0.975)	2.73 (0.877)	2.44 (0.934)	3.28 (1.185)
F(df)	0.298 (3, 796)	17.681 (3, 417.1)[a]**	0.811 (3, 429.1)[a]	2.569 (3, 377.3)[a]	4.339 (3, 337.2)[a]**

Note: Site protection = More should be done to protect African American historical sites and landmarks; Best forgotten = The history of slavery in America is best left forgotten; Visit in person = I prefer to visit African American historical sites and landmarks in person; Famous lived = It is interesting to visit places where famous African Americans lived; Too much heritage = Too much emphasis is currently placed on the importance of civil rights heritage.
[a]Adjusted *F* was used; ** *p* < .01, **p* < .05.

also asked a series of questions to determine their attitudes toward the remembrance and preservation of stories and sites related to African American heritage. A *t*-test or analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for attitudinal differences among sociodemographic, household, and psychographic variables. The Brown-Forsythe test was performed to find the adjusted *F* statistic for the groups that did not meet the assumption of homogeneity. Post hoc comparisons used the Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test to investigate the differences for the dimensions that met the assumption of homogeneity as equal variances were assumed, and the Games-Howell test to investigate when equal variances were not assumed.

There were no distinct patterns among the generational cohorts regarding their attitude on remembering and protecting African American heritage (Table 3). The mean score for Gen X respondents was higher than Millennials, Baby Boomers, Silent Generation, and GI Generation respondents on *Visit in Person*, indicating that Gen X'ers enjoyed visiting places where famous African Americans lived more than the

other groups. On the *Site Protection* item, the Silent Generation felt most strongly about protecting African American historical sites and landmarks, followed by Baby Boomers and GI Generation, Gen X, and Millennials. When asked their level of agreement on *Best Forgotten*, it was Gen X who disagreed the strongest. Regarding *Too much heritage*, Generation X again disagreed most. The Silent Generation and the GI Generation enjoyed visiting where famous African Americans had lived, followed by Boomers, Millennials, and Gen X respondents.

The mean score for the *Best Forgotten* attitude item decreased with educational level. On the item regarding visiting places where famous African Americans lived, the *Advanced Degree* group agreed the most, followed by college graduates. A similar pattern ensued with *Too Much Heritage*, the *Advanced Degree* group disagreed the most, followed by college graduates, respondents with some college, and respondents with a high school education or less. The *Visit in Person* item showed a difference between the *Advanced Degree* group and the *High School* group, while

Table 4. African American Heritage Protection and Remembrance Items and Key Significant Variables.

	Site Protection, M (SD)	Best Forgotten, M (SD)	Visit in Person, M (SD)	Famous Lived, M (SD)	Too Much Heritage, M (SD)
Gender					
Male (n = 273)	2.33 (0.896)	3.72 (1.052)	2.82 (0.955)	2.56 (0.950)	3.24 (1.107)
Female (n = 532)	2.27 (0.897)	3.88 (1.023)	2.71 (0.908)	2.33 (0.861)	3.45 (1.059)
t(df)	0.855 (803)	−1.971 (546.8)[a],*	1.589 (808)	3.294 (501.3)[a],**	−2.568 (798) **
Race, White					
White (n = 623)	2.40 (0.907)	3.83 (1.016)	2.88 (0.917)	2.49 (0.904)	3.28 (1.098)
Nonwhite (n = 182)	1.92 (0.750)	3.82 (1.103)	2.29 (0.805)	2.12 (0.816)	3.73 (0.932)
t(df)	7.284 (350.2)[a],**	0.093 (822)	8.287 (317.9)[a],**	5.179 (314.7)[a],**	−5.394 (327.7)[a],**
Race, Black					
Black (n = 137)	1.82 (0.580)	3.81 (1.115)	2.18 (0.722)	2.03 (0.717)	3.81 (0.874)
Nonblack (n = 668)	2.39 (0.920)	3.83 (1.019)	2.86 (0.920)	2.48 (0.912)	3.29 (1.096)
t(df)	−9.223 (296.3)[a],**	−0.171 (822)	−9.504 (233.0)[a],**	−6.441 (234.7)[a],**	6.036 (228.5)[a],**
Retired adults in household?					
Yes (n = 412)	2.30 (0.911)	3.67 (1.089)	2.84 (0.958)	2.48 (0.935)	3.26 (1.109)
No (n = 388)	2.28 (0.878)	4.01 (0.929)	2.64 (0.877)	2.33 (0.848)	3.51 (1.031)
t(df)	0.355 (798)	−4.848 (815.5)[a],**	3.109 (802.9)[a],**	2.513 (805.4)[a],*	−3.412 (794.0)[a],**
Children in household?					
Yes (n = 233)	2.28 (0.902)	3.98 (0.996)	2.64 (0.915)	2.30 (0.877)	3.66 (0.954)
No (n = 570)	2.30 (0.895)	3.76 (1.045)	2.79 (0.928)	2.45 (0.902)	3.27 (1.108)
t(df)	−0.301 (801)	2.818 (454.0)[a],**	−2.092 (806) *	−2.185 (443.0)[a],*	5.054 (495.6)[a],**
Residence setting					
Rural (n = 444)	2.32 (0.913)	3.79 (1.052)	2.78 (0.928)	2.46 (0.934)	3.31 (1.090)
Urban (n = 361)	2.25 (0.876)	3.86 (1.014)	2.71 (0.922)	2.34 (0.847)	3.47 (1.061)
t(df)	1.058 (803)	−0.969 (822)	.941 (808)	1.987 (802.5)[a],*	−2.058 (798) *
Self-identification as Southerner?					
Yes (n = 587)	2.34 (0.920)	3.72 (1.057)	2.82 (0.947)	2.46 (0.923)	3.29 (1.102)
No (n = 205)	2.15 (0.811)	4.13 (0.910)	2.56 (0.847)	2.25 (0.810)	3.64 (0.978)
t(df)	2.778 (400.2)[a],**	−5.390 (413.4)[a],**	3.604 (393.0)[a],**	3.120 (403.3)[a],**	−4.345 (399.2)[a],**
Did you vote on Amendment One?					
Yes (n = 498)	2.34 (0.931)	3.91 (1.006)	2.78 (0.927)	2.41 (0.899)	3.40 (1.109)
No (n = 287)	2.22 (0.844)	3.71 (1.065)	2.68 (0.919)	2.37 (0.874)	3.36 (1.031)
t(df)	1.729 (645.3)[a]	2.652 (591.8)[a],**	1.389 (788)	0.699 (792)	0.530 (778)
Did/would you vote for/against Amendment One?					
For (n = 299)	2.55 (0.956)	3.68 (1.027)	2.87 (0.973)	2.59 (0.942)	3.09 (1.085)
Against (288)	2.07 (0.846)	4.16 (0.940)	2.62 (0.862)	2.17 (0.826)	3.77 (1.008)
t(df)	6.345 (580.9)[a],**	−6.057 (600.4) **	3.332 (589.5) **	5.757 (586.5) **	−7.816 (581.9) **

[a]Equal variances not assumed; ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

the *Site Protection* attitude item was not statistically significant across education levels. Among income groups, the two higher brackets held stronger remembrance and preservation views than the group making less than $50,000/year, with one exception. On the item *Too Much Heritage*, the highest income group disagreed the most, followed by the lowest income group.

Two psychographic variables were tested to determine group differences on the various items related to attitudes toward remembering and preserving African American heritage: *Frequency of Overnight Travel (FOT)*, and *Frequency of Attendance to Religious Services (FARS)*. Those who travel *Once a Month* had the strongest disagreement with the items *Best Forgotten* and *Too Much Heritage*, followed by *Weekly* and *Infrequent* travelers, with those who never travel holding the weakest views on remembrance and historic preservation. *FARS* was not significant on any attitude-related question.

An independent samples *t*-test was also used to compare the attitudes item means between various groups of respondents. Significant results are displayed in Table 4. Results were an interesting mix of significance. Females tended to have stronger remembrance and preservation perspectives, as did *Nonwhite* and *Black* respondents. Households with retirees and with children tended to have a stronger remembrance and preservation attitudes toward African American heritage, as did those who did not identify themselves as a *Southerner*. Only two attitude items were significant among rural and urban respondents; urbanites disagreed more than their rural counterparts on the *Too Much Heritage* statement. Urbanites also enjoyed visiting places where famous African Americans had lived more than rural residents. Amendment One *Voters* and *Non-voters* differed on only one attitude item; voters disagreed more than nonvoters on *Best forgotten*. Respondents who did or would vote against Amendment

Table 5. Significant Differences in Site Visitation across All Variables.

Variables	CRM	CWM	SP	AAF	URS
Gender		S			
Race/ethnicity white	S	S	S	M	S
Race/ethnicity black	S	S		M	S
Age	SM	S		S	S
Education	SM	SM	SM	S	
Household income	S	SM	S		S
Residence setting					
Retired adults in household?		S			
Children in household?	S				
Frequency of attendance to religious services				S	
Frequency of travel overnight	SM	SM	SM	S	S
Self-identification as Southerner?	S	S			
Did you vote on Amendment One?	S	S	S	S	
Did you vote for/against Amendment One?				S	

Note: For Cramer's V, S = small effect size ($V = 0.10$); SM = small to medium effect size ($V = 0.2$); M = medium effect size ($V = 0.30$). For Cohen's d, S = small effect size ($d = 0.20$); M = medium effect size ($d = 0.50$); L = large effect size ($d = 0.80$).

One (supporting gay marital rights) held stronger preservation opinions across all five attitude items.

Results summary. Tables 5 and 6 provide a summary of each of the significant differences. Cramer's V was used to determine the effect size of all the statistically significant chi-square analyses, and Cohen's d was used to determine the effect size of each t-test and ANOVA. Cohen's d (1998) was used to classify the outcome as small, medium or large; because of space constraints, the effect size is summarized in subsequent tables. Effect size is the strength or magnitude of the relationship between variables, which facilitates the comparative interpretation of research results.

In general, the results offer some support for each of the hypotheses. For hypothesis 1—sociodemographic variables such as gender, age, race, and education will not impact the respondent's African American heritage site visitation patterns—we saw that age, race, and education had more impact on site visitation than gender. The same pattern was found with hypothesis 2—sociodemographic variables such as gender, age, race, and education will not impact the respondent's attitudes toward African American heritage preservation. This agrees with the findings of Floyd (1999), and Dwyer and Alderman (2008) in that gender does not have that strong of an influence on travel patterns whereas education levels, age, and race influences how people travel and place value on preservation sites.

Regarding hypothesis 3—household characteristics such as household income, residential setting, and household composition will not impact the respondent's African American heritage site visitation patterns—an interesting pattern emerged. The only variable not affected by household income was visitation to *AAF*. Residential setting had no impact on sites visited, nor did household composition. The hypothesis was fully supported in this instance. However,

attitudes about African American heritage preservation were affected by residential setting and household income; therefore, for hypothesis 4—household characteristics such as household income, residential setting, and household composition will not impact the respondent's attitudes about African American heritage preservation—African American was only partially supported.

The last two hypotheses addressed psychographic variables. For hypothesis 5—psychographic variables such as voting behavior, travel frequency and attendance to religious services will not impact the respondent's site visitation patterns—there was stronger correlation between travel frequency and voting activity with site visitation, than identification as a Southerner and religious service attendance. For hypothesis 6—psychographic variables such as voting behavior, travel frequency and attendance to religious services will not impact the respondent's attitudes about African American heritage preservation—voting behavior indeed had an impact on attitudes. Frequency of travel did not impact the respondents' attitude toward African American preservation in the variables *Site Protection, Visit in Person*, and *Famous Lived* but did impact attitudes about *Too Much Heritage* and *Best Forgotten*. The hypothesis was fully supported regarding the relationship between religious service attendance and attitudes toward African American heritage preservation.

Conclusion

Heritage is, as noted earlier, an intrinsically dissonant phenomenon and a central segment of tourism worldwide (Canton and Santos 2007). There are multiple, and often contesting, uses of the past as people engage in the politics of fashioning and asserting cultural, political, and racial identities. Heritage has proven to be an especially contested

Table 6. Significant Differences in Heritage Attitudes across All Variables.

Variables	Site Protection	Best Forgotten	Visit in Person	Famous Lived	Too Much Heritage
Gender		VS		S	VS
Race/Ethnicity White	M		M	SM	SM
Race/Ethnicity Black	ML		ML	SM	SM
Age	SM	M	M	S	M
Education		L	S	S	S
Household Income	SM	SM			
Residence setting				VS	VS
Retired adults in household?		S	S	VS	S
Children in household?		VS	VS	VS	SM
Frequency of attendance to religious services					
Frequency of travel overnight		M			S
Self-identification as Southerner?	VS	SM	S	S	S
Did you vote on Amendment One?		VS			
Did you vote for/against Amendment One?	M	M	S	M	ML

Note: VS = very small effect size; S = small effect size; SM = small to medium effect size; M = medium effect size; ML = medium to large effect size; L = large effect size; S: $d = 0.20$; M: $d = 0.50$; L: $d = 0.80$.

terrain in the United States as the nation comes to terms with the racialized ways in which heritage sites have traditionally been preserved, interpreted, and visited. Site visits are especially important since the sustainability and social responsibility of heritage tourism development, including but not limited to National Parks, is dependent on increasing the visitation of communities of color. At the same time, the expanding landscape of heritage sites devoted to remembering and preserving African American heritage requires the moral and financial investment of the same dominant white society that historically marginalized black history and travelers. The complex relationship between race and U.S. heritage tourism is highly charged in the Southeast, where these issues intersect with political conservatism, southern identity, and a history of Jim Crow discrimination and segregation.

In light of the dissonant nature of American and southern heritage tourism, it is surprising that we have seen limited research that surveys the public about their patterns and preferences in visiting heritage sites and their attitudes toward and support for remembering and preserving African American heritage. As stated by Alderman (2013), tourism shapes and is shaped by the dominant white male gaze that is perpetuating racist stereotypes. This study has certainly paid attention to the role of race in shaping these visitation patterns and heritage attitudes, but it has examined public opinion and travel behavior in relation to an assortment of demographic, psychographic, and household characteristics—including religious engagement, regional identification, and political views about a state constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage. To repeat a point made in the introduction of the paper, perceptions and valuations about heritage, especially with regard to minority identities and histories, are couched within broader cultural and ideological contexts that may appear at first to have nothing to do with heritage tourism, but nevertheless shape the social milieu of remembering the past.

Sustainable tourism planning requires understanding the types of tourists visiting various heritage sites, especially those sites that can embody very different social memories. This study's results suggest that a number of factors impact variation in heritage site visitation among North Carolina residents and their attitudes toward African American preservation. Thirteen demographic, psychographic, and household variables were examined across heritage site visitation to see if there were differences between/among groups. Of the 85 analyses performed, 37 statistically significant differences were found between/among groups, although most of them were deemed small. The variables that showed the most differences regarding site visitation were race (both *White/Nonwhite* and *Black/Nonblack*), *Age, Education, Income, Frequency of Overnight Travel,* and if the respondent voted during the state referendum for Amendment One, regardless of how they voted. The latter variable is arguably a measure of political activism, and such activism might shape one's predisposition toward visiting more heritage sites and perhaps certain sites over others. Studies have shown that Black leisure travelers' behaviors are similar to ones developed during Jim Crow, avoiding the unfamiliar and adhering strictly to their vacation itineraries (Carter 2008; Lee and Scott 2015). Furthermore, Carter (2008) posited that previous racial discrimination and anxieties shown to African Americans in leisure travel are not a function of marginal socioeconomic status but more of a legacy of past racial discrimination affecting contemporary racism.

Especially important to this study and its interest in racial disparities in heritage site visitation, *Nonwhites* were more likely than expected to visit a civil rights memorial, African American festival, and an Underground Railroad site and less likely than expected to visit a Civil War

museum or a southern plantation. *White* respondents were more likely than expected to visit a Civil War museum or a southern plantation and less likely to visit the sites patronized more by *Nonwhites*. These findings align with what Shinew et al. (2006) argued stating that leisure patterns are not just based on contemporary issues but at historical factors as well. For instance, the authors posited that African Americans developed an aversion for wild lands, including Civil War sites and southern plantations sites, due to past associations with slavery, plantation agriculture, lynching, and compulsive work in the forest industry. Lastly, these findings indicate that some U.S. tourism promoters continue to downplay or romanticize the struggles of the black community at heritage tourism sites, possibly contributing to this issue (Alderman 2013).

Because the growing legitimacy of public citizens as stakeholders in historical preservation planning and decisions and the fact that heritage travel decision-making visitation occurs in the context of wider valuations of memory and heritage, our study examined the feelings of NC residents toward remembering and protecting African American heritage. Thirteen demographic, psychographic, and household variables were examined across heritage preservation attitudes to see if there were differences between/among groups. Of the 85 analyses performed, 45 statistically significant differences were found between/among groups, with size effects or relationship magnitudes ranging from very small to large (Cohen 1988). Most were on the small end of the spectrum. The variables that showed the most differences in preservation attitudes were race (both *White/Nonwhite* and *Black/Nonblack*), *Age, Education, Retired Adults in the household, Children in the household*, self-identification as a Southerner, and how respondents voted on Amendment One. The variables which showed the largest effect size were race (both *White/Nonwhite and Black/Nonblack*), *Age*, and how respondents voted.

As one might expect, when compared to white respondents, black respondents show a greater level of agreement about doing more to protect African American landmarks and a greater degree of disagreement with the ideas that slavery is best left forgotten and that too much emphasis is currently placed on civil rights heritage. When compared to respondents who voted against Amendment One, those voting for the same-sex marriage ban exhibited a lower level of agreement about the need to protect African American landmarks, preference to visit African American sites in person, and interest in visiting places where famous African Americans lived. Voters supporting Amendment One showed a greater level of agreement with the notions that the history of slavery is best left forgotten and that too much emphasis is currently placed on civil rights heritage. Although self-identification as a Southerner generally displayed a small effect size with heritage attitudes, those not identifying themselves in this way regionally tended to show a greater predisposition toward remembering, protecting, and visiting African American heritage.

Many people are uncomfortable talking about race, or claim that we live in a postracial, colorblind society. African American heritage has traditionally been silenced, romanticized, and homogenized by an Anglo-Saxon narrative, consequently creating a racially unjust view of American heritage sites and their public value. This study provides data that can inform the critical analysis of how patterns in heritage site visitation and public support of preservation perpetuate a racialization of the travel experience, while also recognizing that a change in that racialization requires leveraging that data in progressive ways. Additional public surveys across wider geographic areas and political contexts, as well as supplementary qualitative studies, would flush out a fuller picture of racialized tourism.

We feel that our analysis contributes to a critical discussion to the ethical management, governance, and coexistence with the wider world (Tribe 2008) and calls attention to the complex relationship between race and heritage tourism (Schmalz and Mowatt 2014). Tribe (2008) argues for a critical exploration of the tourism industry in order for the survival of tourism; he notes if we are to "make genuine and deep progress in sustainable tourism," then management practices must be informed by the "current configurations of power and the operation of dominant ideological practices" (p. 253) that work through heritage tourism and preservation. Awareness and accountability of how politics, power, and race help shape the tourism industry can contribute towards a holistic, honest conversation around what stories were forgotten and what narratives need to be told. Informed by CT, a space can be created for crucial discussion of racial and social justice issues that have been silent for too long within the travel research literature.

References

Abramowitz, Alan, and Kyle Saunders. 2006. "Exploring the Bases of Partisanship in the American Electorate: Social Identity vs. Ideology." *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (2): 175–87.

Alderman, Derek H. 2013. "Introduction to the Special Issue: African Americans and Tourism." *Tourism Geographies* 15 (3): 375–79.

Alderman, Derek H., and Joshua Inwood. 2013. "Landscapes of Memory and Socially Just Futures." In *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Cultural Geography*, edited by N. Johnson, R. Schein, and J. Winders, 186–97. Walden, MA: Wiley.

Alderman, Derek H., and Arnold E. Modlin, Jr. 2013. "Southern Hospitality and the Politics of African-American Belonging: An Analysis of North Carolina Tourism Brochure Photographs." *Journal of Cultural Geography* 30 (1): 6–31.

Agarwal, Vinod B., and Gilbert Yochum. 1999. "Tourist Spending and Race of Visitors." *Journal of Travel Research* 38 (2): 173–76.

Barthel, Diane. 1989. "Historic Preservation: A Comparative Analyses." *Sociological Forum* 4 (1): 87–105.

Barton, Alan W., and Sarah Leonard. 2010. "Incorporating Social Justice in Tourism Planning: Racial Reconciliation and Sustainable Community Development in the Deep South." *Journal of the Community Development Society* 41 (3): 298–322.

Buzinde, Christine N., and Carla A. Santos. 2009. "Interpreting Slavery Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research* 36 (3): 439–58.

Butler, David L., Perry L. Carter, and Owen J. Dwyer. 2008. "Imagining Plantations: Slavery, Dominant Narratives, and the Foreign Born." *Southeastern Geographer* 48 (3): 288–302.

Canton, Kellee, and Carla A. Santos. 2007. "Heritage Tourism on Route 66: Deconstructing Nostalgia." *Journal of Travel Research* 45 (4): 371–86.

Carter, Perry L. 2008. "Coloured Places and Pigmented Holidays: Racialized Leisure Travel." *Tourism Geographies* 10 (3): 265–84.

Causevic, Senija, and Paul Lynch. 2011. "Phoenix Tourism: Post-conflict Tourism Role." *Annals of Tourism Research* 38 (3): 780–800.

Coeterier, J. F. 2002. "Lay People's Evaluation of Historic Sites." *Landscape and Urban Planning* 59 (2): 111–23.

Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dwyer, Owen, and Derek H. Alderman. 2008. "Memorial Landscapes: Analytic Questions and Metaphors." *GeoJournal* 73:165–78.

Dwyer, Owen, Butler, David, and Carter, Perry L. 2013. "Commemorative Surrogation and the American South's Changing Heritage Landscape." *Tourism Geographies* 15 (3): 424–443.

Erickson, Brian, Corey W. Johnson, and Beth D. Kivel. 2009. "Rocky Mountain National Park: History and Culture as Factors in African-American Park Visitation." *Journal of Leisure Research* 41 (4): 529–45.

Eskew, Glenn T. 2001. "From Civil War to Civil Rights." *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration* 2 (3-4): 201–14.

Floyd, Myron. 1999. "Race, Ethnicity and Use of the National Park System." *Social Science Research Review* 1 (2): 1–24.

Goodman, Diane. 2000. "Motivating People from Privileged Groups to Support Social Justice." *Journal of Teachers College Record* 102 (6): 1061–85.

Gotham, Kevin F. 2007. "Critical Theory and Katrina." *City* 11 (1): 81–99.

Gotham, Kevin F. 2011. "Reconstructing the Big Easy: Racial Heritage Tourism in New Orleans." *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 3 (2): 109–20.

Griffin, Larry J., and Ashley B. Thompson. 2003. "Enough about the Disappearing South: What about the Disappearing Southerner?" *Southern Cultures* 9 (3): 51–65.

Guba, Egon G., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. "Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, 105–17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hemming, Judy. 2005. "National Security, Securitisation and the Thai Sex Industry: Is There a Link?" *Conference Papers—International Studies Association*, 1–22.

Loewen, James. 1999. *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites Get Wrong*. New York, NY: The New Press.

Kensbock, Sandra, Janis Bailey, Gayle Jennings, and Anoop Patiar. 2015. "Sexual Harassment of Women Working as Room Attendants within 5-Star Hotels." *Gender, Work & Organization* 22 (1): 36–50.

Kibby, M. 2000. "Tourists on the Mother Road and the Information Superhighway." In *Expressions of Culture, Identity, and Meaning in Tourism: Reflections on International Tourism*, edited by M. Robinson, P. Long, N. Evans, R. Sharpley, and J. Swarbrooke, 139–49. Newcastle: University of Northumbria.

Kincheloe, Joe, and Peter McLaren. 2003. "Rethinking Critical Theory and Qualitative Research." In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. Denzin and S. Lincoln, 279–313. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Koziol, Christopher. 2008. "Historic Preservation Ideology: A Critical Mapping of Contemporary Heritage Policy Discourse." *Preservation Education and Research* 1 (1): 41–50.

Lawton, Laura J., and David B. Weaver. 2008. "Factors Associated with Non-visitation by Area Residents to Congaree National Park, South Carolina." *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration* 26 (4): 66–82.

Lee, KangJae Jerry, and David Scott. 2015. "Racial Discrimination and African Americans' Travel Behavior: The Utility of Habitus and Vignette Technique." Presentation at the 2015 *Tourism Travel and Research Association* conference on June 15, Portland, Oregon.

Mason, Randall. 2003. "Fixing Historic Preservation: A Constructive Critique of 'Significance.'" *Places-Massachusetts* 16 (1): 64–71.

McGehee Nancy. 2012. "Oppression, Emancipation, and Volunteer Tourism: Research Propositions." *Annals of Tourism Research* 39 (1): 84–107.

Nilsen, Heidi, and May-Britt Ellingsen. 2015. "The Power of Environmental Indifference. A Critical Discourse Analysis of a Collaboration of Tourism Firms." *Ecological Economics* 109:26–33.

Philipp, Steven F. 1994. "Race and Tourism Choice: A Legacy of Discrimination?" *Annals of Tourism Research* 21 (3): 479–488.

Philipp, Steven F. 1999. "Are We Welcome? African American Racial Acceptance in Leisure Activties and the Importance Given to Children's Lesiure." *Journal of Leisure Research* 31 (4): 385–403.

Portia, Yaniv, Richard Butler, and David Arley. 2003. "Religion and Religiosity: A Holy Mess." *Current Issues in Tourism* 6 (4): 340–63.

Schmalz, Dorothy L., and Rasul A. Mowatt. 2014. "The Unsettling Nature of Prejudice: An Introduction to the Special Issue." *Journal of Leisure Research* 46 (3): 245.

Shinew, Kimberly J., Myron F. Floyd, and Diana Parry. 2004. "Understanding the Relationship between Race and Leisure Activities and Constraints: Exploring an Alternative Framework." *Leisure Sciences* 26 (2): 181–99.

Shinew, Kimberly J., Stodoiska, Monika, Floyd, Myron, Hibbler, Maria A., Johnson, Cassandra, and Santos, Carla. 2006. "Race

and Ethnicity in Leisure Behavior: Where Have We Been and Where Do We Need to Go?" *Leisure Sciences* 28 (4): 403–408.

Thomas, Lynnell L. 2014. *Desire and Disaster in New Orleans: Tourism, Race, and Historical Memory*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Tribe, John. 2008. "Tourism: A Critical Business." *Journal of Travel Research* 46:245–55.

Tunbridge, J. E., and Gregory J. Ashworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the Past as a Resource in Conflict*. New York: John Wiley.

Waggoner, Martha. 2012. "Amendment One, North Carolina Marriage Ban, Passes Vote." *Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/08/amendment-one-north-carolina_n_1501308.html (accessed May 29, 2013).

Weber, Joe, and Selima Sultana. 2013. "Why Do So Few Minority People Visit National Parks? Visitation and the Accessibility of 'America's Best Idea.'" *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103 (3): 437–64.

Author Biographies

Stefanie Benjamin is an Assistant Professor of Retail, Hospitality and Tourism Management at the University of Tennessee. Her research interests include cultural and historical landscapes regarding heritage tourism in the American South with special attention devoted to collective memory and visual representation. Additionally, she is devoted to sustainable tourism through planning, education, and development.

Carol Kline is an Associate Professor of Hospitality and Tourism Management at Appalachian State University in the Department of Management. Her research interests focus broadly on tourism planning and development and tourism sustainability, but cover a range of topics such as foodie segmentation, craft beverages, agritourism, wildlife-based tourism, animal welfare in tourism, tourism entrepreneurship, niche tourism markets, and tourism impacts to communities.

Derek Alderman is Professor and Department Head in Geography at the University of Tennessee. Dr. Alderman's interests are in public memory, heritage tourism, and the African American experience. He is a founder and co-coordinator of RESET Initiative (Race, Ethnicity, and Social Equity in Tourism).

Wilson Hoggard is a graduate of the Sustainable Tourism program at East Carolina University. He is currently a high school history teacher who enjoys teaching foreign and domestic cultures. Having a passion for history, he also serves on the Board of Historic Hope Plantation.