

# Application of Cohen's Tourist Typology (Case Study: Mashhad Pilgrims)

Research Institute for [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Research Institute for [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

## Abstract:

### Introduction

There are a variety of categorizations for tourists in different fields of tourism studies on the basis of different criteria. Cohen's sociological typology categorizes tourists on institutionalization of tourist services. The current article which is based on Cohen's theory examines the typology of tourists in Mashhad. The degree of institutionalization is defined as how tourists meet their basic needs (accommodation, food and transportation) and how much they benefit from hospitality services.

### Materials and Methods

The data provided in a previously conducted research "A Survey of Iranian Pilgrims Accommodation and Preferences in Mashhad" were meta-analyzed. The research sample included 1600 Iranian pilgrims visiting Mashhad in 1389 and 1390 (2011).

### Discussion and Results

Based on Cohen's model, the tourists were classified into three categories of institutional, semi institutional and non-institutional categories. Findings indicate that around two-third of tourist (68.3%) had experienced institutional travel to Mashhad while a bit more than 20% and 10% had semi-institutional and non-institutional visits respectively. It was also found that the younger city dwellers and people with higher income and education utilize institutional tourist services more than the others.

### Conclusion

These findings can have implications for future planning of tourism development in private and public sectors.

**Keywords:** typology, tourist, pilgrim, Mashhad, Cohen's Model

### References:

1. Butler, R. (2000). Second home. In: Encyclopedia of Tourism, Jafar Jafari, London: Routledge: 522-523.
2. Cohen, B. (1385). The basics of sociology. Tehran: SAMT. ( in persian)
3. Coccossis, H. & Constantoglou, M. E.(2006).The use of typologies in tourism planning: problems and conflicts.46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association (ERSA). Enlargement, Southern Europe and the Mediterranean. August 30th-September 2006. University of Thessaly-Department of Planning and Regional Development.
4. Cohen, E. (2004) Contemporary tourism- diversity and change. London: Elsevier.
5. Cohen, E. (2003). Tourism and Religion: A Case Study—Visiting Students in Israeli Universities. Journal of Travel Research; 42(1): 36-47.
6. Dann, G. M .S.(2000). Pull-Push factors. In: Encyclopedia of Tourism, Jafar Jafari, Encyclopedia of tourism. London: Routledge, 2000. pp. 477.
7. Forughzadeh, S. (1390). Accomodation quality and preferences of Iranian pilgrims in Mashhad. Research Project for Central office of ACECR. (in persian)
8. Goeldner , C. R. and Brent Ritchie, J. R. (2009). Tourism: Principles, Practices, Philosophies. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
9. Kazemi, M. (1385). Tourism management. Tehran: SAMT. (in Persian)
10. Mehmetoglu, M. (2004). Tourist or traveler? A typological approach. Tourism Review, 59(3): 33-39.
11. Pourrameza, I. & Qasemi Vasmehjani, A. (1388). Rural tourism typology (case study: Langrud). Geographical Perspective, 4(8): 25-47. (in persian)
12. Robert, L. (1381). Tourism sociology. Tehran: Shahid Beheshti University. (in persian)
13. Statistical center for tourism(1391).Statistical survey of national tourists. Spring 1391.( in persian)
14. Tucker, H. (2003). First published Living with Tourism Close encounters Interactions between hosts and guests. London: Routledge.
15. Ziaee, M. & Salehi nasab, Z. (1387). Second home tourists typology and their physical effects on rural regions (case study: Qasran's Rudbar). Human geography studies, 40(66): 71-84. (in persian)
16. Zalatan, A. (2004). Tourist typology: an ex ante approach. Tourism Economics, 10(3): 329-343.

Commented [MR1]: نیازی به عدد نیست

WWW.IJTSIR