



Comparing resident and tourist perceptions of an urban park: a latent profile analysis of perceived place value

Hwasung Song & Changsup Shim

To cite this article: Hwasung Song & Changsup Shim (2021) Comparing resident and tourist perceptions of an urban park: a latent profile analysis of perceived place value, Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 29:7, 1180-1192, DOI: [10.1080/09669582.2021.1872586](https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1872586)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2021.1872586>



Published online: 13 Feb 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 63



View related articles [↗](#)




View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)



Comparing resident and tourist perceptions of an urban park: a latent profile analysis of perceived place value

Hwasung Song^a and Changsup Shim^b 

^aResearch Fellow, Department of Urban Management, Suwon Research Institute, Suwon-si, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea; ^bDepartment of Tourism Management, Gachon University, Seongnam-si, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea

ABSTRACT

Sustainable management of cities is only attainable when urban spaces are understood as spaces where residents and tourists can coexist even with different interests and priorities. Urban parks are a prime example of urban spaces where residents and tourists mingle; they are only sustainable if the different perceptions of place of the two groups are understood. Therefore, the current study examines 652 visitors at Gwanggyo Lake Park (GLP) in South Korea to compare tourist and resident perceptions. Employing Latent Profile Analysis of perceived place value, the current study identified three valid profiles for visitors of GLP: Relationship Seekers, Activity Seekers, and Environment Seekers. This analysis also found significant differences between profiles of residents and tourists visiting GLP in terms of demographic and behavioral characteristics. Based on the differences between resident and tourist perceptions, theoretical and practical implications are offered for sustainable management of urban parks and other attractions.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 May 2020
Accepted 30 December 2020

KEYWORDS

Urban parks; perceived place value; latent profile analysis; sustainable development

Introduction

Urban areas are primarily spaces for residents to carry on their daily lives, although the growing popularity of urban tourism has shifted the focus of various urban spaces to increasingly serve as important tourist attractions (Novy & Colomb, 2017; UNWTO, 2012). Therefore, sustainable management of urban tourism now requires a deeper understanding than is required for non-urban settings of the interface between the urban setting, local residents, and tourists (Ashworth & Page, 2011; Beedie, 2005; Hinch, 1996). In particular, leisure spaces such as urban parks where residents and tourists closely mingle could not be sustainably managed without understanding the different use characteristics of residents and tourists (Bourdeau, De Coster & Paradis, 2001; Snepenger et al., 2003).

While the Boston Commons opened as the first open city space in 1634, and 16 other urban parks opened before 1800, including the National Mall in Washington, D.C., urban parks emerged in earnest in the 19th century and Central Park opened in New York City in 1857. Ever since, urban parks have been providing local residents natural spaces, so rare in cities, where residents can take walks in their spare time or enjoy recreational activities including sports, private social gatherings, or municipal events (Coley et al., 1997; Kaczynski, Potwarka & Saelens, 2008; Maas

et al., 2009). Urban parks have also begun to assume an important role as tourist attractions for visitors to urban areas. Urban parks as tourist attractions symbolize the image and lifestyle of the city for visitors who can temporarily experience the life of local residents (Archer, 2006; Gobster, 2007; Masberg & Jamieson, 1999). For example, Hyde Park in London, Central Park in New York City, and Park Guell in Barcelona are tourist attractions that show the charming characteristics of each city very well, attracting millions of tourists each year. Therefore, city governments have increasingly put more effort into sustainable development and management of urban parks to provide diverse value, be it environmental, socio-cultural, educational, or recreational, to local residents and tourists alike (Crompton, 2007; Deng et al., 2010; Li, 2020).

The value assigned by visitors to a particular place influences their attitudes and behaviors (Homer & Kahle, 1988). Hence, the value assigned to a place must be accounted for in visitor segmentation and management to achieve the economic, environmental, and socio-cultural sustainability of the location. Previous studies have applied the concept of perceived value and have examined its effects in various tourism settings (Chen & Chen, 2010; Peña, JAMILINA, & Molina, 2012). The perceived value of a place is not fixed or absolute but is relative: it is constructed based on individual and group characteristics or contextual factors (Relph, 1985; Tuan, 1977). This implies that different groups—for example, residents and tourists—may assign different value to urban parks. However, few empirical studies address the different values assigned to urban parks by the local residents and tourists who use them.

Accordingly, the current study examines the perceived place value of Gwanggyo Lake Park in South Korea and focuses on comparing tourist and resident perceptions. Located in a populated urban area (Suwon, South Korea), the park attracts over three million visitors annually, including both residents and tourists. Latent Profile Analysis, a novel classification procedure that is statistically more robust than cluster analysis, has been employed (Bergman & Trost, 2006; Magidson & Vermunt, 2002). More specifically, this study has the following three purposes. First, the study identifies sub-types of perceived place value assigned to the urban lake park both within the resident group and within the tourist group. Second, the study compares residents and tourists in the various sub-types by analyzing visit frequency, behavioral intentions, and demographic characteristics. Third and finally, theoretical and practical implications are offered for sustainable management of urban tourism space based on the differences between resident and tourist perceptions.

Literature review

Urban parks as tourist attractions

An urban park is a “bounded area of public open space that is maintained in a “natural” or semi-natural (landscaped) state and set aside for a designated purpose, usually to do with recreation” (Hilborn, 2009, p. 4). Urban parks are generally the result of planned urban development by a municipality or other governmental body. They are open to local residents and visitors alike, offering greenery, walking paths, and recreational as well as sporting facilities (Archer, 2006; Chiesura, 2004; Welch, 1991). Urban parks are perceived to be an essential part of urban planning in most developed countries, many of which have laws that provide for park space that is proportionate to the population (de Saz Salazar & Menéndez, 2007; Gobster, 1998; McCormack et al., 2010).

The role of urban parks has evolved over time. In the late 19th century, the purpose of parks was to provide natural spaces to urban residents who were tired of rapid industrialization and urbanization (Clanz, 1989). Since the middle of the 20th century, urban residents have more and more spare time and have increasingly turned to urban parks as spaces where they can enjoy sports and other recreational activities (Archer, 2006; Coley et al., 1997; Hayward, 1989). More recently, urban parks are expanding their role to serve as the center of various community activities that showcase culture and art, host public gatherings, and offer opportunities for experiential education (Crompton, 2007; Peters, Elands & Buijs, 2010; Xu et al., 2019). With the

development of urban tourism, urban parks have broadened their appeal not only to urban residents, but also to all kinds of tourists and visitors to the city (Deng et al., 2010).

According to previous studies, tourists visit urban parks for several reasons. Most of all, urban parks are spaces where residents spend their spare time, and thus tourists can join the experience of a city's unique culture and forms of leisure. Hence, when visiting urban parks, tourists may enjoy feeling like city-dwellers, albeit only for a short while. In addition, as urban parks in world famous cities, like Central Park in New York City, have been represented by the media as symbols of the city in films, TV programs, and popular music, they are now perceived to be must-visit places. Urban parks are typically quite readily accessible to a large number of people since parks are generally centrally located; ready access and free entry are strong advantages of urban parks as tourist attractions since tourists can easily go there at little expense. The number of visitors to urban parks is also increasing because some offer leisure sports or other forms of outdoor recreation that are otherwise hard to find in the city (Donahue et al., 2018; Karanikola, Panagopoulos & Tampakis, 2017; Lee et al., 2017; Plunkett, Fulthorp & Paris, 2019; Qing, 2018; Wong & Domroes, 2005).

As urban parks have traditionally been perceived as spaces for residents to enjoy, studies related to urban parks have been conducted mainly in the fields of urban planning, leisure studies, and community studies rather than in tourism studies. Some studies on urban parks as tourist attractions have investigated urban ecotourism, pro-environmental behavior, the motivation to visit urban parks, and the effect of urban parks on the attractiveness of urban tourism (Deng et al., 2010; Lee, Quintal, & Phau, 2017). However, these previous studies have approached urban parks as one of many general tourist attractions, without specifically exploring the spatial context provided by cities for these parks. Moreover, each of these previous studies was conducted either on residents or tourists, largely ignoring differences between the two groups. Given the rapid development of urban tourism, a comparative analysis of the two groups is essential to examine sustainable development and future management of urban parks.

Perceived place value

Perceived value is an individual's overall assessment of the worth or merit of a particular product. Perceived value has been shown to affect services and tourist locations (waterparks, festivals) as well as goods, and has been shown to affect not only the price people are willing to pay for something, but also customer satisfaction, loyalty, and behavioral intention. (Chen & Chen, 2010; Cronin et al., 2000; Jin, Lee & Lee, 2015). Perceived value of a specific place is subjective and can be formed directly through the senses through past experiences and impressions of that place or indirectly through images, symbols, myths, and the arts (Relph, 1985; Tuan, 1977). Relph explained that people develop a sense of place through the interaction of physical setting, activity, and meaning that allows the place to be culturally recognized (Relph, 1976). In other words, a sense of place, its personality so to speak, is created through a multitude of human interactions with the physical entity, the place, and in this process, each individual assigns different value to the same place depending on individual needs, desires, and socio-cultural background.

In addition, the perceived value of a place is affected by time and the environment (Shim & Santos, 2014; Song & Kim, 2018; Stedman, 2003). For example, McCleary, Weaver, and Hsu (2007) analyzed tourists who visited Hong Kong from seven geographic origins and found that tourists from the East including Mainland China, Taiwan, Malaysia and Singapore placed a higher overall value on Hong Kong than those from the U.S., Australia, and Western Europe. Lee, Lee, and Yoon (2009) compared first-time visitors and returning visitors to a particular festival, showing that the two groups assigned different value to different aspects of the same festival.

A few studies have compared perceptions of residents versus tourists toward the same place. For example, Simpson (1999) compared the perceptions of tourists and residents visiting the Historic Centre in Prague and showed that the two groups expected the place to develop in

different directions according to their respective needs. In a study related to public beaches in South Carolina, USA, Oh, Draper, and Dixon (2010) found that tourists wanted to use public beaches for recreational purposes more than residents did. A study related to island tourism in Taiwan by Chao and Chao (2017) showed that tourists perceived the ecological value of the island to be high, while residents perceived its economic value to be high.

Perceived value is multi-dimensional and encompasses not only the intrinsic value of play, aesthetics, ethics, and spirituality, but also the extrinsic value of efficiency, excellence, status, and esteem (Holbrook, 1999). It has been suggested that the perception of place also assigns value based on a variety of aspects including the physical, ecological, and socio-cultural characteristics of particular places (Song & Kim, 2018; Yen & Teng, 2015). In addition, the value of a place to any particular individual or group of individuals is not fixed, but can be counted on to change since the value is affected by how the place is managed and consumed over time (Chen & Hu, 2010; Lee, Yoon & Lee, 2007; Peña et al., 2012). Previous studies have identified several dimensions according to which visitors perceive value in a place, including economic, educational, spiritual, cultural, aesthetic, biological, therapeutic, recreational, and existential values (Brown, 2004; Brown & Raymond, 2007; Rasoolimanesh, Dahalan & Jaafar, 2016).

Brown and Raymond (2007) examined differences in resident and tourist views concerning a particular tourist destination and showed that both groups ranked aesthetic and recreational value as very important; at the same time, they found economic value to be more important to residents while future value of the destination was more important to tourists. Zhu et al. (2010) found that residents primarily placed the highest value on aesthetic and recreational aspects of the destination while tourists highly valued wilderness and wildlife preservation features. On the other hand, Kim et al. (2015) studied visitors to Namhansanseong (i.e., mountain fortress), a UNESCO Cultural Heritage site in Korea, and found no differences in therapeutic, amenity, or atmosphere values although residents placed higher value than tourists on environmental factors including biological diversity, wilderness, and wildlife preservation.

Long ago, Tuan (1977) argued that tourism activities can create place recognition over a short period of time, resulting in various attempts to better understand place value. However, most studies have only focused on identification of the components of place value (e.g., Brown, 2004) or differences in the perception of place value based on differences in specific tourist destinations. Attempts to categorize various types of visitors according to their perceptions of place value have either simply divided groups based on differences in perception levels (e.g., Kaltenborn, 1998) or have created groups through an exploratory approach using qualitative methodologies (Hutson et al., 2010; Hutson & Montgomery, 2011; Wilson, 2005). However, the former approaches lump all aspects of sense of place together. Kaltenborn (1998), for example, relied on a previously identified sense of place index, classifying resident perceptions of sense of place as either at a high, middle, or low level on the sense of place index. Such an approach increases the risk that the results of the analysis of sense of place will be affected by variables with greater weight in the index. The limitation of this method is that it fails to differentiate various aspects of place value held by various groups within the population. In addition, although qualitative methods have the advantage of being able to show various relationships between places and users, they also have the primary weakness of being too dependent on subjective evaluation. A more comprehensive and holistic view of place value is needed, as well as a more realistic understanding of sense of place similarities and differences across different groups of visitors.

Research method

Study setting

Gwanggyo Lake Park (GLP), the setting of this study, houses South Korea's premier waterside and urban ecological park and is South Korea's largest lake park with a total area of 2,025,418 m²

and lake area of 653,003 m². The construction took place from June 2010 to April 2013 at a cost of approximately 120 billion won. Of note, Suwon City, where GLP is located, also contains a UNESCO cultural heritage site, the Suwon Hwaseong Fortress. As a result, tourists visit Suwon Hwaseong Fortress and GLP together, the latter serving as an important tourism resource offering diverse forms of tourism in Suwon, a center of history and cultural resources, while promoting relaxation and health as well as functioning as a downtown neighborhood park.

Currently, there are various sports facilities in the park, including recreation facilities including auto camping grounds, water playgrounds, lawned squares, cultural facilities such as libraries, theaters, and exhibition halls, bird watching platforms, observation decks, and other facilities providing various cultural, ecological, and physical programs for residents and tourists to enjoy. GLP not only provides facilities, but offers various experiences to visitors, such as promotion of health, outdoor activities, festivals, and other events; it is utilized as a place of rest and exercise for residents and as a leisure and tourism site and complex cultural space for tourists.

The site on which GLP is located was extremely popular as an excursion and water play park due to its operation of Woncheon Amusement Park on its premises until August 2009. GLP thus has special value in South Korea as a place that conjures memories of the past for many visitors, distinguishing it from other parks in that its mere existence holds high value for long-time residents of Suwon. In summary, for residents and tourists, GLP is a waterside ecological park that holds ecological value as a natural resource, offers health, recreational, and cultural values of a park, and reminds visitors of the unique local value of a place where a well-known tourist spot was previously located. Due to its many functions, GLP presents a suitable research setting to examine various aspects of place and the differences between residents and tourists in their perceived value of the place.

Data collection and measures

The study setting, GLP, has become a representative ecological green place as well as leisure place in Korea. GLP also evolving from an ordinary urban park to an eco-friendly leisure place through the provision of natural ecological and cultural programs. In this sense, based on prior studies (Beverly et al., 2008; Brown, 2004; Brown & Raymond, 2007; Park & Song, 2018; Zhu et al., 2010), questions about place value included eleven items addressing the value of human relationships, local culture, community, spirituality, diversity, wilderness, environmental learning, amenities, atmosphere, outdoor activities, and wellness (e.g., "GLP is valuable because I can learn about environment there") on a five-point Likert scale (1= not at all valuable, 3= moderately valuable, 5= very valuable) to judge the value of each item. Other questionnaire items included number of visits, intention to revisit (1= will not visit again, 3= moderately, 5= will visit again), and demographic characteristics (gender, age, place of residence, education, average monthly household income).

Data analysis

Subtypes (profiles) of visitor perceptions of the place value of GLP were obtained using Latent Profile Analysis (LPA). LPA is a mixture model that identifies diversity within a group by extracting subtypes, or latent profiles, from a broader sample (Magidson & Vermunt, 2002). This methodology allows for the identification of diverse and multidimensional needs of visitors. The advantage of LPA is its ability to analyze a wide range of heterogeneous needs within a homogenous broader population, such as distinct types of travel motivations among international students (Song & Bae, 2018). LPA has the advantage of determining subtypes according to statistical criteria including fit indices, entropy, and the Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test (LMR-LRT), unlike cluster analysis or a researcher's arbitrary interpretations (Bergman & Trost,

2006). In addition, LPA is useful in describing the implications of each subtype since characteristics are grouped together with subtype-specific influence variables (Magidson & Vermunt, 2002). Accordingly, LPA has been widely used in the leisure/tourism field to examine cultural tourists (Pulido-Fernández & Sánchez-Rivero, 2010; Van der Ark & Richards, 2006), park visitors (Park & Song, 2018), and residents of locations with tourist attractions (Ven, 2016). In this study, LPA was used to classify residents and tourists according to their perceptions of place value. Differences in visit frequency, revisit intentions, and demographic factors were then be examined for each LPA profile using cross tabulation and one-way ANOVA analyses.

Results

Sample characteristics

The sample of 652 respondents included more women ($n = 383$, 58.7%) than men ($n = 269$, 41.3%). The average age of participants was 46.2 years ($SD = 12.45$). There were more visitors who were older than 50 ($n = 238$, 36.5%) than those who were in their 40s ($n = 201$, 30.8%) or 30s ($n = 166$, 25.5%). College attendance/graduation was the most common educational level ($n = 359$, 61.4%), and the average household income was seven thousand dollars a month, which indicated that a high proportion of participants were highly educated high-income visitors. The number of residents of Suwon who visited GLP was 301 (46.2%), whereas the number of tourists from outside of Suwon was 351 (53.8%).

Selection of the latent profile model

The optimal model of latent profiles in LPA was selected based on statistical fitness, quality of classification, statistical significance, and classification ratio. The criteria to assess the explanatory power and parsimony of the model were the BIC (Bayesian information criteria) and AIC (Akaike information criteria), with lower values indicating a better model (Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén, 2007). In addition, the quality of latent profile classification was based on an entropy value between 0 and 1, with values closer to 1 indicating greater accuracy of the latent profiles. However, statistical criteria from BIC, AIC, entropy, and p-values did not serve as absolute criteria dictating the final model to be used, but rather consideration of model parsimony, theoretical and practical interpretability, and variety of patterns were all considered in model selection (Magidson & Vermunt, 2002).

In order to obtain latent profiles of GLP visitors according to perceived place value, all 11 place value perception variables were included in the LPA for the entire sample. The same 11 variables were then included in a LPA of residents and tourists separately. Table 1 shows the AIC, BIC, entropy, and p-values for each model.

Characteristics of the profiles

Table 2 shows the profiles obtained from LPA according to the perceptions of place value of all visitors. Values were based on the average of each profile on a five-point scale and the t-score value obtained from a comparison of profiles. The first profile consisted of 11.6% of all visitors, and the average obtained for this profile was generally below the average of all values, but the human relationship value was relatively high, and thus the profile was labeled Relationship Seekers (RS). The second profile, with 45.6% of the visitors, was labeled Activity Seekers (AS), and consisted of those who assigned high value to outdoor activities and wellness. The third profile, with 42.6% of the visitors, had the highest perceived value of the park of all three groups. This profile was labeled Environment Seekers (ES) because these visitors perceived urban parks to

Table 1. Goodness of fit model for LPA according to perceived place value.

	Number of profiles (k)	AIC	BIC	Entropy	p-value
<i>Total</i>	2	20660.100	20812.422	0.867	0.000
	3	19454.549	19660.631	0.897	0.000
	4	19146.667	19406.51	0.859	0.079
<i>Residents</i>	2	9584.66	9710.70	0.878	0.005
	3	8966.91	9137.44	0.916	0.001
	4	8855.53	9070.54	0.924	0.199
<i>Tourists</i>	2	11102.339	11233.605	0.863	0.001
	3	10526.601	10704.197	0.884	0.006
	4	10313.192	10537.118	0.889	0.059

Notes: AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin; LRT = Likelihood Ratio Test (comparison with a (k-1) class model).

Table 2. GLP visitor latent profiles by perceived place value.

Group	profile	Place Value (Item)										
		HR	LC	CO	SP	DI	WI	EL	AM	AT	OA	TH
<i>AllVisitors</i>	RS (11.9%)	3.40	2.92	2.69	2.64	2.87	2.62	2.65	2.08	2.06	1.99	2.19
	AS (45.6%)	2.17	2.52	2.84	2.85	2.86	3.25	3.16	4.07	4.07	4.19	4.33
	ES (42.6%)	3.61	4.09	4.14	4.21	4.16	4.38	4.51	4.82	4.67	4.67	4.84
Average		3.06	3.18	3.22	3.23	3.30	3.41	3.44	3.65	3.60	3.62	3.79

Notes: RS = Relationship Seekers; AS = Activity Seekers; ES = Environment Seekers; HR = Human relationship, LC = Local culture; CM = Community; SP = Spirituality; DI = Diversity; WI = Wilderness; EL = Environmental learning; AM = Amenity; AT = Atmosphere; OA = Outdoor activity; TH = Therapeutic.

Table 3. Comparison between residents and tourists by profile rates.

Number of profiles	<i>Residents (%)</i>	<i>Tourists (%)</i>
Relationship Seekers	11.6	12.0
Activity Seekers	43.2	49.3
Environment Seekers	45.2	38.7

offer high value in terms of wellness, amenities, atmosphere, outdoor activity, environmental learning, and wilderness.

Visitors were then divided into two groups, residents and tourists, depending on whether they lived in or outside of Suwon where GLP is located. Each of the two groups was then subjected to LPA and, as shown in Table 3, the LPA for both groups indicated that there were fewer people who fit the RS profile than any other profile. Of the remaining two profiles, more residents fit into the ES profile (45.2%) whereas more tourists fit into the AS profile (49.3%).

Demographic differences between residents and tourists

For a closer examination of the profiles of visitors to GLP, differences in demographic characteristics of the profiles of both residents and tourists were analyzed. There were no statistically significant differences in gender. In terms of marital status, although more residents were married than tourists, there were no statistically significant differences in perceived place value of married versus unmarried tourists between the various profiles.

On the other hand, there were statistically significant age differences for resident profiles: the RS profile consisted of residents with an average age of 47.51, with the highest proportion of individuals in their 40s (48.6%); residents in the AS profile were an average of 42.80 years old, with the highest proportion of individuals in their 30s (36.3%); and residents in the ES profile were an average of 50.38 years old, with the highest proportion of individuals in their 50s (50.7%). The LPA for tourists also showed statistically significant age differences. The average age of RS tourists was 50.40, with the highest proportion of individuals in their 50s (45.2%); the

Table 4. Demographic differences between residents and tourists.

Socio-demographic		Residents				Tourists			
		Latent Profile			χ^2/F	Latent Profile			χ^2/F
		RS	AS	ES		RS	AS	ES	
Age(years)		47.5	42.8	50.4	14.089*	50.4	42.1	48.6	14.537*
Gender(%)	Male	31.4	46.9	38.2	3.631	45.2	43.9	37.0	1.805
	Female	68.6	53.1	61.8		54.8	56.1	63.0	
Marital status(%)	Single	6.5	11.8	8.0	1.377	6.4	61.7	31.9	4.079
	Married	93.5	88.2	92.0		13.1	46.7	40.1	
Income/mo (Thousand dollars)		4.5	8.9	9.2	0.55	4.1	8.1	7.0	0.894

* $p < .01$.
 ** $p < .05$.

Table 5. Behavioral differences between residents and tourists.

Behavior Pattern		Residents				Tourists			
		Latent Profile			χ^2/F	Latent Profile			χ^2/F
		RS	AS	ES		RS	AS	ES	
Visit frequency	First visit, < 2 times/yr	9.40%	9.80%	14.40%	16.141*	10.40%	9.60%	16.00%	15.042*
	< 3 times/mo	37.70%	59.80%	36.40%		53.00%	32.90%	53.00%	
	< 3 times/wk	52.80%	30.40%	49.20%		36.60%	57.50%	31.00%	
Revisit intention		4.43	4.53	4.76	3.761**	4.00	4.60	4.75	17.439*

* $p < .01$.
 ** $p < .05$.

average age of AS tourists was 42.05, with the highest proportion of individuals in their 30s (36.3%); and the average age of ES tourists was 48.57, with the highest proportion in their 50s (47.8%). Overall, residents in the ES profile were oldest, whereas tourists in the RS profile were the oldest (see Table 4).

Behavioral differences between residents and tourists

Table 5 shows differences in the number of visits and behavioral intentions of those in different perceived place value profiles. As to frequency of visits, the difference between residents and tourists was statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 65.158$), with 48.7% of tourists having visited the park for the first time or having visited two times per year, with only 17.8% of residents having done so. Comparisons across profiles indicated that the RS profile of residents ($\chi^2 = 16.141$) and the AS profile of tourists reflected the highest number of visits ($\chi^2 = 15.042$).

An analysis of the differences in revisit intentions between the various GLP visitor profiles indicated that all profiles had high scores, with an average score of 4 or higher, with the score for RS < AS < ES. The RS profile showed the biggest difference between residents and tourists in terms of revisit intentions, with lower scores for tourists.

Conclusion

Discussion

In the era of the visitor economy (Law, 2002), sustainable management of cities is only attainable when urban spaces are understood as spaces where residents and tourists can coexist while fulfilling their own purposes. In particular, urban parks are a prime example of urban spaces where residents and tourists mingle, and the sustainability of these parks can improve if the different perceptions of place of the two groups are understood. Employing Latent Profile Analysis of perceived place value, the current study identified three valid profiles for visitors of GLP, namely

Relationship Seekers, Activity Seekers, and Environment Seekers. This analysis also found significant differences between residents and tourists in these profiles in terms of demographic and behavioral characteristics while visiting GLP. The current findings have several implications for sustainable development and management of urban parks.

First, GLP visitors were classified into Relationship Seekers, Activity Seekers, and Environment Seekers using LPA. Existing place value research has classified groups into high, middle, and low on an index that averaged sense of place components (e.g., Kaltenborn, 1998), or has taken an exploratory approach using place Q methodology to create groups (Hutson et al., 2010; Hutson & Montgomery, 2011; Wilson, 2005). These attempts are limited in that they overlook various aspects of place value or lead to the subjective evaluation that is inherent in qualitative research. By contrast, the present study used LPA to identify groups that reflect the various aspects of place value, providing a more meaningful analysis than Kaltenborn (1998)'s classification of high, middle, and low groups in the population based solely on overall averages of place value. The present study also extends Hutson et al. (2010)'s qualitative research that identified various aspects of place value by increasing the objectivity of the obtained groups by applying quantitative methods. Thus, LPA allowed an examination of the diverse aspects within each of two groups, residents and tourists, as well as a classification based on both specific statistical criteria and on sample-specific characteristics.

Second, urban parks in South Korea are currently perceived to be spaces with environmental and recreational value rather than spaces with socio-cultural value. In the history of urban parks, early urban parks were created to provide bleak cities with green spaces, which have since been utilized as spaces for various recreational activities and more recently have begun to be promoted as socio-cultural spaces for the community (Archer, 2006; Coley et al., 1997, Hayward, 1989). In this study, GLP was perceived to be low in socio-cultural value by both residents and tourists, with approximately 90% of the respondents classified as either Environment Seekers or Activity Seekers. This result may be attributed to the short history of the recently created GLP. Indeed, the use and popularity of urban parks is generally a more recent phenomenon in South Korea than in other developed countries, and South Korea appears to be progressing through the same developmental stages as those counterparts.

Third, residents assign the most value to the environmental aspects of urban parks while the highest proportion of tourists assign the most value to urban parks as spaces for recreational activities. Environment Seekers accounted for the highest proportion (45.2%) among residents, and the analysis of their age revealed that Environment Seekers were the oldest group (50.4 years old). This result shows that urban parks play a strong role as rare green spaces for urban residents, and in particular as green spaces that older people can easily find and use near their residences at a time in their lives when they may have more impediments to traveling away from home than younger people. On the other hand, Activity Seekers accounted for the highest proportion (49.3%) of tourists, and they were shown to be the youngest group (42.1 years old). In addition, the proportion of Environment Seekers among tourists (38.7%) was considerably lower than that of Environment Seekers (45.2%) among residents. This implies that the environmental value of urban parks is most attractive at the local level, but may not be attractive enough to lure visits by tourists from outside the city compared to the lure of natural resources such as mountains, rivers, lakes, or the ocean coastline, all of which would no doubt result in higher perceived environmental and ecological value.

Fourth, sustainable use of urban parks will require strengthening the role of urban parks as spaces for residents to spend time with friends and family and for tourists to promote their health and engage in recreational activities, both valued by Activity Seekers. Activity Seekers not only accounted for the highest proportion of tourists at 49.3%, but they were also the most frequent visitors to GLP. Among residents, Relationship Seekers accounted for only 11.6% of all residents and yet showed the highest frequency of visits compared to other groups of residents. This result shows that urban parks need to provide special activities to attract more tourists to those

seeking social contact. If a park provides opportunities to experience activities that are not available in their nearby local park, tourists may readily visit the park despite the physical distance. On the other hand, residents will find increased utility in urban parks that are readily accessible, spaces where they can routinely spend time with friends and family. In other words, it is necessary that urban parks be perceived as a part of the everyday lives of residents so that locals feel free to visit even if there is no special purpose in terms of outdoor activities or wellness.

Together, these results indicate that there are strategies that can be used for GLP and urban parks throughout South Korea to achieve sustainable development while being used harmoniously by both residents and tourists. First, parks can be molded to emphasize different characteristics of the space: on weekdays they can be used mostly by residents, and on weekends they can be made inviting to tourists. On weekdays, it appears that urban parks need to faithfully play a role as green spaces desirable to residents, selling simple food and beverage and offering mellow music to help residents enjoy time with friends and family. On weekends, the same parks should offer an environment that enables various recreational activities that are not found elsewhere so that even tourists from other regions will be encouraged to come to the park. In the long term, given the developmental stages of urban parks, those in South Korea need to step up as spaces for residents to routinely visit and take advantage of community activities there. In this way, a virtuous circle of sustainable development can be achieved, one where urban parks also appeal to tourists as spaces for recreational activities as well as for socio-cultural activities that offer tourists a taste of culture, art, performances, and exhibitions and allow them to experience the unique local identity of a city.

Limitations and future research

This study is subject to some limitations that may warrant future empirical research on urban parks as tourist attractions. First, the current study examined only one particular site, GLP in South Korea, and thus did not sufficiently consider the various types of urban parks (e.g., lake parks, playing fields, playgrounds) and other contextual factors affecting visitor perceptions of urban parks. Therefore, to understand urban parks more generally, future studies need to analyze more cases involving urban parks in many countries and their physical and historical characteristics. Second, the current results are limited because there is insufficient theoretical background upon which to define residents and tourists as park visitors. Tourists may not be adequately defined by simply determining that they live outside the administrative district where the attraction is located, but the definition of tourists may also need to take into account many other factors including travel distance, purposes, and behaviors. Therefore, more conceptual and scientific efforts should be given to defining tourists at various urban attractions in order to provide more practical implications for sustainable management of urban tourism.

ORCID

Changsup Shim  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8000-863X>

References

- Archer, D. (2006). Research note: urban parks and tourism. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 9(3-4), 277–282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/11745398.2006.10816434>
- Ashworth, G., & Page, S. J. (2011). Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes. *Tourism Management*, 32(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.02.002>
- Beedie, P. (2005). The adventure of urban tourism. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 18(3):37–48.
- Bergman, L. R., & Trost, K. (2006). The person-oriented versus the variable-oriented approach: Are they complementary, opposites, or exploring different worlds? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 52(3), 601–632. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2006.0023>

- Beverly, J. L., Uto, K., Wilkes, J., & Bothwell, P. (2008). Assessing spatial attributes of forest landscape values: an internet-based participatory mapping approach. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research*, 38(2), 289–303. <https://doi.org/10.1139/X07-149>
- Bourdeau, L., De Coster, L., & Paradis, S. (2001). Measuring satisfaction among festivalgoers: Differences between tourists and residents as visitors to a music festival in an urban environment. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 3(2), 40–50.
- Brown, G. (2004). Mapping spatial attributes in survey research for natural resource management: methods and applications. *Society & Natural Resources*, 18(1), 17–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920590881853>
- Brown, G., & Raymond, C. (2007). The relationship between place attachment and landscape values: Toward mapping place attachment. *Applied Geography*, 27(2), 89–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2006.11.002>
- Chao, Y. L., & Chao, S. Y. (2017). Resident and visitor perceptions of island tourism: green sea turtle ecotourism in Penghu Archipelago. *Island Studies Journal*, 12(2), 213–228. <https://doi.org/10.24043/isj.27>
- Chen, C. F., & Chen, F. S. (2010). Experience quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions for heritage tourists. *Tourism Management*, 31(1), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2009.02.008>
- Chen, P. T., & Hu, H. H. (2010). How determinant attributes of service quality influence customer-perceived value. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 22(4), 535–551. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09596111011042730>
- Chiesura, A. (2004). The role of urban parks for the sustainable city. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 68(1), 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2003.08.003>
- Coley, R. L., Kuo, F. E., & Sullivan, W. C. (1997). Where does community grow? The social context created by nature in urban public housing. *Environment and Behavior*, 29(4), 468–494. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001391659702900402>
- Cranz, G. (1989). *The politics of park design: A history of urban parks in America*. The MIT Press.
- Crompton, J. L. (2007). The role of the proximate principle in the emergence of urban parks in the United Kingdom and in the United States. *Leisure Studies*, 26(2), 213–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360500521457>
- Cronin, J. J., Jr, Brady, M. K., & Hult, G. T. M. (2000). Assessing the effects of quality, value, and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioral intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing*, 76(2), 193–218. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359\(00\)00028-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4359(00)00028-2)
- del Saz Salazar, S., & Menéndez, L. G. (2007). Estimating the non-market benefits of an urban park: Does proximity matter? *Land Use Policy*, 24(1), 296–305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2005.05.011>
- Deng, J., Arano, K. G., Pierskalla, C., & McNeel, J. (2010). Linking urban forests and urban tourism: a case of Savannah, Georgia. *Tourism Analysis*, 15(2), 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354210X12724863327641>
- Donahue, M. L., Keeler, B. L., Wood, S. A., Fisher, D. M., Hamstead, Z. A., & McPhearson, T. (2018). Using social media to understand drivers of urban park visitation in the Twin Cities. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 175, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.02.006>
- Gobster, P. H. (1998). Urban parks as green walls or green magnets? Interracial relations in neighborhood boundary parks. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 41(1), 43–55. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046\(98\)00045-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2046(98)00045-0)
- Gobster, P. H. (2007). Urban park restoration and the "museumification" of nature. *Nature and Culture*, 2(2), 95–114. <https://doi.org/10.3167/nc.2007.020201>
- Hayward, J. (1989). Urban parks: research, planning and social change. In I. Altman & E. Zube (Eds.), *Public places and spaces*. Plenum Press.
- Hilborn, J. (2009). *Dealing with crime and disorder in urban parks (No. 9)*. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Hinch, T. D. (1996). Urban tourism: perspectives on sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 4(2), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669589608667261>
- Holbrook, M. B. (1999). *Consumer value. A framework for analysis and research*. Routledge.
- Homer, P. M., & Kahle, L. R. (1988). A structural equation test of the value-attitude-behavior hierarchy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(4), 638–646. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.4.638>
- Hutson, G., Montgomery, D., & Caneday, L. (2010). Perceptions of outdoor recreation professionals toward place meanings in natural environments: A Q-method inquiry. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(3), 417–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2010.11950212>
- Hutson, G., & Montgomery, D. (2011). Demonstrating the value of extending qualitative research strategies into Q. *Operant Subjectivity*, 34(4), 234–246.
- Jin, N., Lee, S., & Lee, H. (2015). The effect of experience quality on perceived value, satisfaction, image and behavioral intention of water park patrons: New versus repeat visitors. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(1), 82–95. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1968>
- Kaczynski, A. T., Potwarka, L. R., & Saelens, B. E. (2008). Association of park size, distance, and features with physical activity in neighborhood parks. *American Journal of Public Health*, 98(8), 1451–1456. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2007.129064>
- Kaltenborn, B. P. (1998). Effects of sense of place on responses to environmental impacts: A study among residents in Svalbard in the Norwegian high Arctic. *Applied Geography*, 18(2), 169–189. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-6228\(98\)00002-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0143-6228(98)00002-2)

- Karanikola, P., Panagopoulos, T., & Tampakis, S. (2017). Weekend visitors' views and perceptions at an urban national forest park of Cyprus during summertime. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 17, 112–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2016.10.002>
- Kim, H., & Song, H. (2017). Measuring hiking specialization and identification of latent profiles of hikers. *Landscape and Ecological Engineering*, 13(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11355-016-0301-y>
- Kim, Y., Kim, H., & Paek, N. (2015). Comparison between hiker and non-hiker's sense of place value at Namhansanseong provincial park. *Journal of Korean Society of Rural Planning*, 21(4), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.7851/ksrp.2015.21.4.127>
- Law, C. M. (2002). *Urban tourism: The visitor economy and the growth of large cities*. Continuum.
- Lee, J. S., Lee, C. K., & Yoon, Y. (2009). Investigating differences in antecedents to value between first-time and repeat festival-goers. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 26(7), 688–702.
- Lee, C. K., Yoon, Y. S., & Lee, S. K. (2007). Investigating the relationships among perceived value, satisfaction, and recommendations: The case of the Korean DMZ. *Tourism Management*, 28(1), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2005.12.017>
- Lee, S., Quintal, V., & Phau, I. (2017). Investigating the push and pull factors between visitors' motivations of fringe and urban parks. *Tourism Analysis*, 22(3), 389–406. <https://doi.org/10.3727/108354217X14955605216122>
- Li, C. L. (2020). Quality of life: The perspective of urban park recreation in three Asian cities. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 29, 100260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2019.100260>
- Maas, J., Van Dillen, S. M., Verheij, R. A., & Groenewegen, P. P. (2009). Social contacts as a possible mechanism behind the relation between green space and health. *Health & Place*, 15(2), 586–595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2008.09.006>
- Magidson, J., & Vermunt, J. (2002). Latent class models for clustering: A comparison with K-means. *Canadian Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(1), 36–43.
- Masberg, B., & Jamieson, L. (1999). The visibility of public park and recreation facilities in tourism collateral materials: An exploratory study. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 5(2), 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135676679900500204>
- McCleary, K. W., Weaver, P. A., & Hsu, C. H. (2007). The relationship between international leisure travelers' origin country and product satisfaction, value, service quality, and intent to return. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 21(2-3), 117–130.
- McCormack, G. R., Rock, M., Toohey, A. M., & Hignell, D. (2010). Characteristics of urban parks associated with park use and physical activity: a review of qualitative research. *Health & Place*, 16(4), 712–726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.03.003>
- Novy, J., & Colomb, C. (2017). Urban tourism and its discontents: An introduction. In C. Colomb, & J. Novy (Eds.). *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 1–30). Routledge.
- Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. O. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 14(4), 535–569. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510701575396>
- Oh, C. O., Draper, J., & Dixon, A. W. (2010). Comparing resident and tourist preferences for public beach access and related amenities. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 53(5-6), 245–251.
- Park, C., & Song, H. (2018). Visitors' perceived place value and the willingness to pay in an urban lake park. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(11), 2518. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15112518>
- Peña, A. I. P., Jamilena, D. M. F., & Molina, M. Á. R. (2012). The perceived value of the rural tourism stay and its effect on rural tourist behaviour. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(8), 1045–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2012.667108>
- Peters, K., Elands, B., & Buijs, A. (2010). Social interactions in urban parks: Stimulating social cohesion? *Urban Forestry & Urban Greening*, 9, 93–100.
- Plunkett, D., Fulthorp, K., & Paris, C. M. (2019). Examining the relationship between place attachment and behavioral loyalty in an urban park setting. *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism*, 25, 36–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jort.2018.11.006>
- Pulido-Fernández, J. I., & Sánchez-Rivero, M. (2010). Attitudes of the cultural tourist: A latent segmentation approach. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 34(2), 111–129. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10824-010-9115-1>
- Qing, W. U. (2018). Tourist satisfaction with urban parks: A case study of memorial Archway Park in Zhaoqing. *Journal of Landscape Research*, 10(6), 86–90.
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Dahalan, N., & Jaafar, M. (2016). Tourists' perceived value and satisfaction in a community-based homestay in the Lenggong Valley World Heritage Site. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 26, 72–81.
- Relph, E. (1976). Place and placelessness. Pion.
- Relph, E. (1985). Geographical experiences and being-in-the-world: The phenomenological origins of geography. In D. Seamon & R. Mugerauer (Eds.), *Dwelling, place and environment: Toward a phenomenology of person and world*. Columbia University Press.

- Shim, C., & Santos, C. A. (2014). Tourism, place and placelessness in the phenomenological experience of shopping malls in Seoul. *Tourism Management*, 45, 106–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2014.03.001>
- Simpson, F. (1999). Tourist impact in the historic centre of Prague: Resident and visitor perceptions of the historic built environment. *The Geographical Journal*, 165(2), 173–183. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3060415>
- Snepenger, D. J., Murphy, L., O'Connell, R., & Gregg, E. (2003). Tourists and residents use of a shopping space. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(3), 567–580. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(03\)00026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(03)00026-4)
- Song, H., & Bae, S. Y. (2018). Understanding the travel motivation and patterns of international students in Korea: Using the theory of travel career pattern. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2017.1410193>
- Song, H., & Kim, H. (2018). Value-based profiles of visitors to a world heritage site: The case of Suwon Hwaseong fortress. *Sustainability*, 11(1), 132–119. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11010132>
- Stedman, R. C. (2003). Is it really just a social construction?: The contribution of the physical environment to sense of place. *Society & Natural Resources*, 16(8), 671–685. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920309189>
- Tuan, Y. F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. University of Minnesota.
- UNWTO. (2012). *Global report on city tourism. AM Reports: Volume Six*. UNWTO.
- Van der Ark, L. A., & Richards, G. (2006). Attractiveness of cultural activities in European cities: A latent class approach. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1408–1413.
- Ven, S. (2016). Residents' participation, perceived impacts, and support for community-based ecotourism in Cambodia: A latent profile analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 21(8), 836–861. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10941665.2015.1075565>
- Welch, D. (1991). *The management of urban parks*. Longman Group UK Limited.
- Wilson, I. (2005). *Person-place engagement among recreation visitors: A Q-method inquiry* [Unpublished dissertation]. Oklahoma State University.
- Wong, K. K., & Domroes, M. (2005). The visual quality of urban park scenes of Kowloon Park, Hong Kong: Likeability, affective appraisal, and cross-cultural perspectives. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 32(4), 617–632. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b31028>
- Xu, Y., Matarrita-Cascante, D., Lee, J. H., & Luloff, A. E. (2019). Incorporating Physical Environment-Related Factors in an Assessment of Community Attachment: Understanding Urban Park Contributions. *Sustainability*, 11(20), 5603. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205603>
- Yen, C. H., & Teng, H. Y. (2015). Celebrity involvement, perceived value, and behavioral intentions in popular media-induced tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 39(2), 225–244.
- Zhu, X., Pfueller, S., Whitelaw, P., & Winter, C. (2010). Spatial differentiation of landscape values in the Murray River region of Victoria, Australia. *Environmental Management*, 45(5), 896–911. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-010-9462-x>