

PICTURE



Pro-active management of the Impact of Cultural Tourism upon Urban Resources and Economies

Case-Study

Amiens

Task n°

Task Leader:

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Authors:

Mikel Asensio, Manuel Mortari, Juan Antonio Mogarra

Date: 25-01-2007



The PICTURE project is financed by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme of Research

Specific Programme: Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area

Activity: Specific activity covering policy-orientated research under "Policy support and anticipating scientific and technological needs"

Priority 3. Underpinning the economic potential and cohesion of a larger and more integrated European Union

Topic 3.6. The protection of cultural heritage and associated conservation strategies

Task 5: Cultural heritage and tourism. Contract n° SSP1-CT-2003-502491

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Case Study: Amiens	3
The whole city	3
Objective A – Real Visitor Profile	4
Conclusions	6
Objective B – Previous knowledge and image of the city among real and potential visitors	7
Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage	10
Conclusions	13
The cultural offer in detail	14
Case 1: The Musée de Picardie	15
Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit	15
Conclusions	17
Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit	17
Conclusions	18
Conclusions	19
Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication)	20
Conclusions	20
Objective E - Level of integration of the venue evaluated in the rest of the city's offer, both from the aesthetic and the cultural points of view	20
Conclusions	22
Case 2: Hortillonnages	23
Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit	23
Conclusions	24
Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit	25
Conclusions	26
Conclusions	27
Objective C – Level of comprehension of the information and knowledge offered at the venue evaluated	28
Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication)	29
Conclusions	29
Objective E - Level of integration of the venue evaluated in the rest of the city's offer, both from the aesthetic and the cultural points of view	30
Conclusions	31
General Conclusions	32
Suggestions	32
Acknowledgements	32

Case Study: Amiens

The main objective of this case study is to evaluate the quality of the cultural offer of the city of Amiens.

The team of the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid has structured the study on the whole city, and on some of the specific elements that constitute this offer: the Musée de Picardie and the Hortillonnages.

The surveys have been conducted between April and July, 2005.

There have been used 6 surveys.

We have worked with 7 techniques: questionnaires, self-distributed questionnaires, multiple answer questionnaires, in-deep interviews and scales of preferences.

The total sample was 404 subjects.

The whole city

The evaluation of the whole city's cultural offer quality aimed to the following objectives:

- A. Define a detailed real visitor profile, including his habits and preferences in terms of trips and visits to places of tourist interest.**
- B. Check the previous knowledge and the mental representation of the city, both in the case of real, actual visitors, and in the case of potential visitors.**
- C. Detect the link between residents and the tangible heritage of the city, to identify the elements that are regarded as most typical and representative of it.**

Objective A – Real Visitor Profile

Survey 1, Visitor Profile

Sample: 142 subjects

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the Conseil d'Architecture, d'urbanisme et de l'Environnement (CAUE) de L'Oise at the Amiens' Visitor Centre.

Profile: There is a 52,1% of adults of age comprised between 40 and 64 years; there is a 17,6% of adults between 25 and 39 year, and another 17,6% of people older than 64. There is only 6,3% of young people between 19 and 24 years old. Regarding the Instruction level, it is medium, with a 27,5% of subjects that have finished high school, 39,4% of people with 3-year university studies and 3,5% with 5-year university studies. Concerning the occupation, 40,8% of the subjects are employees, 17,6% are executives, and 20,4% are retired. Regarding the provenance, 42,2% of the sample are non-french: 13,4% from Belgium, 11,3% from Germany, 7% from England and another 7% from other European countries (Spain, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Denmark and Slovakia). There is a 3,5% coming from non-EU countries. Concerning french tourists, we have 17,6% from Paris, 12,7% from the Normandy region, 8,5% from the *Picardie* region and the remnant 17,6 from other parts of France.

Survey design: Eight open and semi-directed questions about different aspects of the visit to Amiens.

Know the city: 63% of the subjects is visiting Amiens for the first time.

Question 1: Reason of the visit

76,8% of the subjects visit Amiens for Tourism in general. More specific aspects, as Culture or Heritage, are not detected among the answers, or have been included in the category "Other reasons" (2,1%). There is a 4% that comes to Amiens for study reasons.

Question 2: Visit planning schedule

37,4% of the subjects have planned the visit since a week or less. 21,1% plan their trip since between three and four weeks. 12% plans the visit since between one and six months. 13,4% do not plan their trip with any advance.

Question 3: Visit organisation habits

30,3% of visitors doesn't need to organise the trip to Amiens. 22,5% prepares the visit using Internet, and 14,8% uses printed Tourist Guides. and 12,7% asks for help to friends and family.

Question 4: Visits to other places

40,1% of Amiens visitors will visit only this city. Among them, 9,8% come from Normandy, 8,4% from Paris and 7% from the Picardie region. Regarding foreign visitors(42,2%), only 6,3% are not interested in visiting other places. Of this percentage, 37,7% proceeds from the area of Madrid, and 15% from the two Castillas, and the same from the northern regions.

The remnant 59,2% of tourists arrive to Amiens following a circuit through other cities. Of this partial percentage, 21,8% visit specifically *Picardie*, 16,9% go to *Baie de Somme* and the coast, 13,4% travel to *Nord-Pas-de-Calais* and 12,7% visit Normandy. It is frequent the combination of these destinations in several circuits. The most common include *Picardie* and *Nord-Pas-de-Calais*, or *Picardie* and *Baie de Somme*. It is also frequent the inclusion in these routes of the *Ardennes* and *Champagne* regions. Generally speaking, the tourist more eager to plan circuits are foreign visitors (42,2% of the sample), particularly the Germans (29,7% of them visit other places than Amiens) and the Belgian. We can say also that foreign visitors plan longer circuits than french ones.

Question 5: Transport

74,6% of visitors come to Ávila with their own vehicle, 16,2% uses train and 4,9% prefer bus.

Question 6: Length of stay

More than 2/3 of the subjects (69%) are going to spend only one day in the city (some of them, 21,1%, only few hours) but do not specify if they will spend the night in Amiens. Only 12% will spend two or three days in Amiens, and another

12% will spend between four days and a week. There is no evidence of a relation between a longer stay and following a circuit: actually, people staying more time in Amiens are those that visit fewer places elsewhere. 31,4% spend one night and 8,5% stay three days.

Question 7: Accommodation

50,7% of visitor will not spend the night in Amiens. 21,8% will stay in Hotels and hostels, and 11,3% will stay at friend's or relative's places. 8,5% will stay in camping, and 3,5% in other accommodation.

Question 8: Shopping

Half of visitors will buy something. Of this percentage, 17,6% will choose souvenirs and what they consider typical of the city, while 23,9% will buy regional food-products.

Conclusions

The main reason for visiting Amiens is tourism in general, without evidences of relevant cultural or Heritage aspects. The visit is usually planned, but mostly with less than one month before (and 36% of visitors prepare the visit in less than one week). 30% of the subjects haven't prepared the visit, while 1/5 prepares the trip using Internet. 59,2% of the visitors are following a circuit and will visit other places, particularly in *Picardie* and in *Baie de Somme*. Private vehicle is the preferred transport for 74% of visitors. Of all the visitors of Amiens, only 12% will spend one or two nights in the city, and another 12% will stay a little longer. Almost the half of the stays (48%) will be in Hotel or hostels, and ¼ in house of friends or relatives. Souvenirs and typical food are the favourite shopping items.

Objective B – Previous knowledge and image of the city among real and potential visitors

This objective was supported by a list of both built Heritage and intangible Heritage elements, shown to the sample in order to direct their answers and obtain more practical and operative results. This list is composed of the following attractors:

- Cathedrale Notre-Dame d'Amiens
- Jardin des Plantes
- Cirque Municipal
- Maison de Jules Verne
- Jardin Archéologique de Saint-Acheul
- Musée de Picardie
- Parc Zoologique
- Cimetière de la Madeleine
- Festival de Jazz
- Festival "La rue et le cirque"
- Spectacle de recoloration des portails de la Cathedrale
- Festival international du film
- Ambiance dans le quartier Saint-Leu

Survey 1, Visitor Profile, Question 10

The sample, technique and profile of this survey are the same as the previous section.

Survey Design: one open question about the image of the city among its real, actual visitors.

Question 9: Elements typical or representative of Amiens

Considering the answers of the subjects we can conclude that 80,3% of the tourists of Amiens believe that the most typical element of the city is its Cathedral. On the other hand, 4,2% think that the most representative feature of the city are the *Hortillonnages*, and 2,1% believe that the essence of the city can be found in its architecture.

Regarding the second element most typical or representative of Amiens, we have to remark that 27,4% didn't answer the question. The valid answers assign this position to the *Hortillonnages* (31%), the Cathedral (8,5%), the canals of *Saint Leu* (7,7%) and the Jules Verne character (6,8%). There are also 14% of

visitors that mention, in different proportions, particular places of the city or monuments in general.

Finally, concerning the third element most typical or representative of Amiens we find a confuse situation. This is in part due to the low rate of answers (only 37,3% are valid answers). Among the valid answers we find the *Hortillonnages* (7,7%), the canals of *Saint-Leu* (4,2%), the *Tour Perret* and the Historic downtown district, both with 3,5%.

Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer

Sample: 29 subjects.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the CAUE de L'Oise at the *Hortillonnages* and at the *Musée de Picardie*, indifferently at the beginning or at the end of the visit.

Profile: The visitors studied in this survey are real visitors, as those who answered to survey 1; however, while the subjects of survey 1 answered before visiting the city, the subjects of survey 4/B already had a direct contact with the streets, monuments and people of the city. Because of this circumstance it is expected to detect a more realistic image of Amiens. Of the 29 persons that answered to these questions there are an 81% of adults of age above 31 years old. 27% are between 30 and 39 years old, and 23,9% are between 50 and 59% years old. Regarding the Instruction level, it is medium, with a 48% of subjects with 3-year university studies and 52% of people that have finished high school. Concerning the occupation, 24% of the subjects are employees, 30,8% are executives, 13,8% are medium managers, 13,6% are students and another 13,6% are retired. Regarding the provenance, 37,6% of the sample is non-french: 10,3% from Belgium and 10,3% from Germany. Concerning french tourists, we have 20,4% from Paris, 10,2% from *Nord-Pas-de-Calais*, 6,8% from the Normandy region, another 6,8% from Conté and finally, 3,4% each, tourists from *Pays de l'Oise*, *Loire*, *Somme* et *Alsacie*.

Survey design: 5 open and semi-directive questions regarding some aspects of the visit to Amiens and the knowledge of the city's cultural and heritage offer.

Question 1: Knowledge of the tangible and non tangible Amien's Heritage

The best known elements of the cultural offer of this city are the Cathedral *Notre Dame d'Amiens* (41,4% have been there) and the *Hortillonnages* (15,5% have heard about it, and 26,5% have been there). The *Quartier Saint-Leu* follows (15,4% heard about it, 24% have been there). The *Musée de Picardie* is another renowned element (35,3% of actual visits, 1,7% just heard about it). The following positions of the *knowledge* ranking are occupied with similar percentages by the Jules Verne's house and by the show of colour projection on the façade of the Cathedral. The last positions go to the International Cinema Festival (known to just the 6,3% of tourists), to the *Saint-Acheul* Archaeological Garden and to the festival *La rue et le cirque*, almost unknown to more than 90% of the sample. Generally speaking, the knowledge of these elements is direct (people has been there) or indirect (people heard about them), depending on the case, and this does not consent us to draw a general tendency. However we can affirm that in the most popular elements the knowledge uses to be direct.

Question 2: Preferences (subjective Heritage valuation)

The most popular elements for this question are the *Notre Dame* cathedral (41,3%), the *Hortillonnages* (26%) and the *Musée de la Picardie* (25,5%). Regarding the reasons of preference, we can see that some Heritage elements, for instance the Cathedral, do not activate too many ideas or concepts, and those activated belong to the same category ("Heritage", "Beauty". On the other hand are other elements that are associated to many more categories, for instance the *Hortillonnages*, or the show of colour projection on the cathedral, associated to such concepts as "Typical", "Amusing", "Unique", "Rare"). It is also important to remark the presence of non-tangible as "Calm" or "Ambience", that seem to be associated the first to places, and the second to events. The latter can be a potential attractor for younger segments of audience.

Question 3: Positive surprises

The percentage of positive answers is medium-low, which suggests that visitors didn't look for new or surprising places or didn't find them. The subjects that have answered this question didn't give too many explanations, however we

can say that the two most surprising elements are the *Quartier Saint-Leu* and the *Musée de Picardie*. Regarding the reason for this surprise, they are so general that can be resumed as “the beauty of the place”.

Question 4: Deceiving experiences

There seems to be nothing particularly negative in the visit to Amiens. The few remarks indicate that the tourism information is perceived as insufficient for a good visiting experience.

Question 5: Amiens' typical and representative

The results are non-homogeneous, however we can make some remarks. 41,5% of answers say that the most typical and representative element of the city is the Cathedral, followed by the *Musée de Picardie* (37,4%) and the *Quartier Saint Leu* (11%). Other answers go to the Jules Verne's house and the *Hortillonnages*.

Regarding the second part of the question, about what can be considered as the second element most representative of Amiens, the first remark is that only 61% of the sample answered. Cathedral and *Quartier Saint Leu* are still in the first positions (20,5% and 17,6% respectively); the remaining percentage is distributed between a wide spectrum of elements, without none of which stands out in a particularly relevant way.

Regarding the *third place* part of the question, there is only a 26,3% of valid answers, and the results are similar to the previous paragraph.

Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage

This objective was supported by a list of built Heritage elements, shown to the sample in order to direct their answers and obtain more practical and operative results. This list is composed of the following attractors:

- Cathédrale Notre-Dame d'Amiens
- Jardin des Plantes
- Cirque Municipal
- Maison de Jules Verne
- Jardin Archéologique de Saint-Acheul
- Musée de Picardie
- Parc Zoologique
- Cimetière de la Madeleine

Survey 4/A, Representativity, Cultural Identity

Sample: 28 subjects.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the CAUE de L'Oise at the *Musée de Picardie* and the *Hortillonnages* installations. The survey 4/B was distributed indifferently at the beginning or at the end of the visit.

Profile: The visitors studied in this survey are residents in Amiens. 29% are adults of age comprised between 40 and 49 years old. 26% are adults of age comprised between 20 and 39. Regarding the Instruction level, it is medium-low with a 17% of subjects with 5-year university studies, 14,8% of people with 3-year university studies, and 50% of subjects that have finished high school. Concerning the occupation, 52,8% are employees, and 17% medium managers. Almost half of the sample (42,8%) was born in the Amiens area, and the average time they have been living in this place is 20 years.

Survey design: 4 open and semi-directive questions about the knowledge, use and preferences regarding the tangible heritage in the city.

Question 1: Heritage knowledge

The sample shows a remarkably low level of knowledge of their town's heritage. The most visited element, the Cathedral, is known only to the 48% of the sample. It is followed by the Magdalena cemetery (43%). The other elements of the list are all known to a little more than 20% of the sample, except the Jules Verne's house (19,5%), the *Jardin des Plantes* (15,7%), the Archaeological Garden of *Saint-Acheul* (13,5%) and the *Quartier Saint Leu* (5,3%).

Question 2: Recent Visits (in the last year)

The ratio of recent visits to the monuments of Amiens, as could be expected, is related to the previous question's results. Beside the *Hortillonnages* and the *Musée de Picardie*, that can't be included in this result because the survey takes place there, the last year's visit to the heritage elements of the town are very few: the most frequently visited place is, again, the Cathedral (visited by only 36,5% of subjects). The less frequented places are the Magdalena cemetery (6,5%) and the *Jardin des Plantes* (3,5%).

Concerning the reasons for the visits, some of the most frequent are “visit with children”, “show friends/relatives”, “for the show” (in the case the heritage attractor has events associated), and “professional reasons”. The places associated to more categories of reasons are the Cathedral and the *Hortillonnages*.

Question 3: Preferences

The results suggest that the favourite built heritage element in Amiens is the Cathedral, which gathers 44,9% of preferences. The *Hortillonnages* and the *Musée de Picardie* are mentioned in second and third place, by respectively 37% and 21% of sample. There are some places that are almost absent in the answers to this question: the Magdalena Cemetery and the Jules Verne's house. On the other hand, there is an element which was not in the list proposed to the sample, which has been added spontaneously by the visitors, which is the *Quartier Saint-Leu*.

Concerning the reasons why visitors justify their preferences, we can remark the use of “Beauty”, “Calm”, “Interest”, and “Uniqueness”.

Question 4: Representativity

The most representative element of Amiens is, as predictable, the Cathedral (21,5%), followed by the *Hortillonnages* (6,5%) and by one of the elements that was not in the list shown to the sample, the *Quartier Saint- Leu* (1,7%).

Concerning Amiens' second and third most representative elements, on one hand we find that the percentage of answers decreases and on the other the answers are more and more scattered. Regarding the “Second most representative element” we find the *Maison de Culture* (3,7%) and the parks and gardens (1,7%). About the “third most representative element” the sample mentions the *Hortillonnages* (8,5%) and a long list of monuments and events, for instance the Jazz festival, the Universities and the *Musée de Picardie*.

Regarding the reasons of these preferences, the answers are very similar to those of the previous question, mostly “Interest” and “Charm”, but also “Representativity” and “Uniqueness”.

Conclusions

The residents do not seem to be particularly attached to their Built Heritage, nor the intangible Heritage. The Cathedral does not clearly appear as the most representative element of the town (only 21,5% believes it), and the opinions are even more different about what other elements are typical or characteristic of the town.

The cultural offer in detail

The evaluation of the quality of the specific cultural offer of Amiens has considered two elements: the **Musée de Picardie** and the **Hortillonnages**. This study has evaluated the individual visitors of the venues, and focuses on five main objectives:

- A. Level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience regarding the venue evaluated, before the visit.**
- B. Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation of the audience about the venue evaluated, after the visit.**
- C. Level of comprehension of the information and knowledge offered at the venue evaluated.**
- D. Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication).**
- E. Level of integration of the venue evaluated in the rest of the city's offer, both from the aesthetic and the cultural points of view.**

Case 1: The Musée de Picardie

Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit.

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part

Sample: 38 subjects.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the CAUE de L'Oise staff at the facilities of the museum. The first part evaluates expectations and previous knowledge, it is offered to visitors at the entrance and they are asked to answer it before beginning the visit. The second part of this survey, on the second page, evaluates the impact after the visit, and has to be answered at the end. The personnel conduct this part of the interview, or collect the questionnaires, at the exit of the Museum.

Profile: There is a 31,6% of adults of age between 40 and 64 years old, a 15,8% of young people of age comprised between 19 and 24, and 7,9% of subjects older than 64 years old. The instruction level is high, with 21,1% of people with 5-year university studies, 18,4% of subjects with post-university studies (masters, ph), and 15,8% of people that has finished secondary education. Concerning occupation, the results are non-homogeneous: 15,8% are retired people, 13,2% are executives, 10,5% are employees and 13,2% are students. Almost 1/3 of the subjects (31,6%) are French (*Picardie* 15,8%, *Alsace* and *Lorraine* 10,5%, and *Paris* 5,3%). Foreign tourists are English (13,2%), German (10,5%) and from other European (2,6%) and non-European countries (another 2,6%).

Survey design: 6 open and semi-directive questions about the expectations and knowledge of Musée de Picardie before the visit.

Question 1: Previous knowledge.

The most remarkable result is to see how little is known this place, because 55,2% of visitors didn't answer to the question, and 18,4% declared to ignore everything about it. 7,9% knows only what has just read on the guide of Amiens. Concerning subjects that do have some previous knowledge, there is 5,3% that knows it is the first museum of France, 7,9% are familiar with the exhibited

painting and sculpture collections, and 5,3% knows about the archaeology collections.

Question 2: Learning expectations.

There learning expectations of the subjects are basically to learn about art: it can be a period, a style or a particular painting (21,1%), or different kinds of art (regional art, 10,5%; African Art, 2,6%, religious/medieval/polychrome 5,3%).

Question 3: Ideal visitor.

The audience that answered to this question is divided between considering the museum appealing for all kinds of audience (21,1%), or oriented to visitors with specific interest in Art and Culture (23,7%).

Question 4: Reasons of the visit

A little more than ¼ of the sample (26,3%) justifies the visit as part of their tourist activities in Amiens. The remaining visitors offers more specific reasons, such as to improve their knowledge about a particular painting style (7,9%), interest in Art museums (5,3%), curiosity for the good reputation of the museum (5,3%) and curiosity or simple pleasure (5,3%).

Question 5: Depth of knowledge

The sample has a good preparation on the subject: 34,2% say they have read something about the museum, 13,2% claims to have some general knowledge and only 7,9% admits to ignore anything about the place.

Question 6: Content expectations

This question caused some confusion on the visitors. Some expectations are very predictable: 31,6 expect to find works of art (15,8% expect some particular painting or sculpture; 10,5% expect an interesting work of art; 5,3 expect simply a nice variety of artworks). Other answers have more to do with question 4 (reasons of the visit), such as those 7,9% who expect only to spend a nice and relaxing time.

Conclusions

The visitors to the Musée de Picardie have a good previous knowledge of the museum. They expect to learn more about art (specific periods and styles). The museum offers a rather specialist-oriented image. The content expectations are not too original, they are limited to paintings and sculptures.

Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit.

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, second part

The sample, technique and profile of the survey are the same as in survey 2 /Expectations

Survey design: 4 open and semi-directive questions about the Museum and its impact, after the visit.

Question 7: Valuation of the visit, in general and in particular

In a scale from 0 (very bad) to 3 (very good), the visit in general gets an average valuation of 2,4. Regarding some specific aspects, the most satisfactory are the collection and the access to the museum (both with 2,4), followed by the hanging and museographic features (2,3). The less popular aspect is the entrance fee, though it is still acceptable (2,1).

Question 8: Preferences

There is not a specific element preferred to the others, some prefer in general the painting collection (13,2%) and some prefer the sculptures (10,5%). Some adore specific paintings (10,5) and some like specific sculptures (another 10,5%). On the other hand there is also the Archaeology collection, preferred by 15,8%.

Question 9: Problems

57,8% of visitors didn't answer this question, and 18,4% declare they don't see any problem with this museum. However, 7,9% would appreciate more

paintings of a specific period or style, and 5,3% misses more regional art. The remnant 10,5% miss other things, but of very different kind to represent a category.

Question 10: Fidelisation

39,4% of the sample didn't answer this question. 47,4% is visiting the museum for the first time. 5,3% has visited the place at least one, two, three or four times more, and for another 5,3% this is the seventh, eighth, ninth or tenth visit. The remaining 2,6% has come even more times. One of the reasons to repeat the visit (for 7,9% visitors) is to recall other visits. Other reasons are "to relax", or to "see the Museum's evolution" (both 2,6%)

Conclusions

The visit is satisfactory, without any remarkable problem or deviation from the previous expectations. Most visitors are visiting the museum for the first time, but there are many that repeat the visit more than once.

Survey 5, Absolute valuation

Sample: 19 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the Centre at the exit.

Profile: there is a reduced 5% of the sample composed of young people of an age comprised between 15 and 19 years old. The remnant sample is quite distributed among all the ranges of age, with a particular predominance of older than 50 years (40% of the sample). Concerning the instruction level, it is high, with a 79% of people with 5-year university studies, and a 5% with high school studies. Regarding occupation, almost half of the sample is medium managers, 15% are employees and there are also many retired people (35%). The greatest part of visitors comes from France, and 31% from Amiens, followed by tourists from Paris. The remnant visitors are distributed between different regions of France (*Pays de Loire 5%, Alsacie 5%...*).

Survey design: A scale of preferences from 1 to 10, in which the visitor has to place the *Musée de Picardie* and other similar venues in the position that each of them deserves (between 1-very bad, and 10-very good).

Position of the Centre:

The *Musée de Picardie* appears only once in the highest position (10), two times in position 9, six in position 8, three in position 7, two in 6, one in 5 and one in 2. The average position is 7,2 (maximum is 10). The subjects that place it in the highest position justify their decision because the importance and beauty of collections, for the architecture of the building and for the long history of the museum.

Position of similar venues:

Visitors mentioned a lot of other venues, 62, of which 95% are located in France. The average position of these museums is 6,5, that is below the *Musée de Picardie*. Some of these museums are mentioned more times. The most frequently mentioned are the *Musée des Beaus Arts de Lille* (mentioned five times, with an average position of 9,2, because of the importance and beauty of its collections and for its temporary exhibitions), the *Musée d'Art Nouveau* of Nancy (mentioned three times, with an average position of 9, for its collection), and the *Musée d'Unterlinden* of Colmar ((mentioned three times, with an average position of 7,7 for its collection). There are also cited two times the museums of Toulouse and Lyon (both with an average position of 10, the first for its architecture and the second for its collections and its architecture), the Museum of Besançon (average position 8,5, for its collections), the *Musée Condé* of Chantilly (average position 6,5 for museographic aspects and for its collection) and the Museum of Valenciennes (average position 3, for its poor collection).

Conclusions

Visitors answered this questions with a lot of details, providing an elevate number of museums to be compared with the *Musée de Picardie*. Though the average position of these museums is lower than the *Musée de Picardie*'s one, we have to mention that, of a total of 62 there are 23 positioned above the

Amiens' one (among them we remark Lille, Nancy, Lyon, Toulouse and Colmar) and 39 below.

Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication)

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, Question 10

The sample, technique and profile of this survey are the same as Survey 2.

Survey design: one semi-directive question about how did the visitors know the existence of the Museum.

Question 10: Awareness of the *Musée de Picardie*

36% of the sample knows the Museum by the printed tourist guides of Amiens. The family and friends are also important since they bring 15,8% of visitors. Leaflets are responsible of 13,2% visits. And finally, the Tourism Office attracts 7,8% visitors. It is interesting that none of the visitors answered "Internet".

Conclusions

The promotion of the *Musée de Picardie* is acceptable, though it should be intensified its presence in Internet and in local printed media and radio.

Objective E - Level of integration of the venue evaluated in the rest of the city's offer, both from the aesthetic and the cultural points of view.

Survey 7, Integration in city

Sample: 34 subjects.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the Museum at the exit.

Profile: There is a 55,9% of adults of age comprised between 40 and 64 years, 11,8% of adults between 25 and 39 years old, and another 11,8% of older than 64 years old. The instruction level is medium, with 20% of people with high school

studies, 26% of subjects with 3-year university studies, 8,8% of people with 5-year university studies, and another 8,8% of subjects with post-university studies. Concerning occupation, 32,4% are executives, 26,5% employees and 14,7% retired people. More than ¼ of the sample (26,5%) comes from *Picardie*, 14,7% come from Paris and 11,8% from the Normandy region. Regarding foreign visitors, 17,6% of the sample are English, 5,9% German and 2,6% Belgians. Other European countries sum up 2,9% of visitors, and non-EU countries represent 5,9%.

Survey design: 7 open and semi-directive questions regarding the integration of the *Musée de Picardie* in the urban, cultural and aesthetic context of the city.

Question 1: Signposts to get there

The sample agrees that it is easy to get to the *Musée de Picardie* (64,7%), but there are some comments as "it is difficult to recognise the museum for the shape of the building" or people that misses more signals to get there.

Question 2: Transport

More than half of the visitors (55,9%) get to the Museum by foot, the remaining sample does it by car (29,4%).

Question 3: The surrounding area

In a scale from 0 to 3 (0 very bad, 3 very good), the judgement of visitors about the security sensation in the area is quite good (with an average value of 2,6), a little more than the impression of cleanliness of the streets and façades (2,4). The opinion about traffic is not so good (but still acceptable: 2,1), and also that about parking areas (1,8).

Question 4: Preferences or problems

44,1% of the sample didn't do any remark, however some visitors evidenced the advantage of the proximity to the Library and the Cathedral. On the other hand, some miss better services (toilets).

Question 5: Aesthetical Integration

91,2% of the sample considers that the architecture is well integrated with that of the surrounding buildings.

Question 6: Cultural Integration

The greatest part of visitors (70,6%) thinks that the cultural offer of this Museum is an important component of the city's cultural offer.

Question 7: Urban Integration

73,5% of the subjects are not resident in Amiens, so they can't give any opinion about the importance and relevance of the centre in the urban tissue. The remnant part of the sample does not answer.

Conclusions

The area of the museum is perceived positively, but the signposts to get there could be improved. The integration with the city is good, both at cultural and aesthetic level.

Case 2: Hortillonnages

Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit.

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part

Sample: 50 subjects.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the CAUE de L'Oise staff at the access facilities of the *Hortillonnages*. The first part evaluates expectations and previous knowledge, it is offered to visitors at the entrance and they are asked to answer it before beginning the visit. The second part of this survey, on the second page, evaluates the impact after the visit, and has to be answered at the end. The personnel conduct this part of the interview, or collect the questionnaires, at the exit of the visit.

Profile: There are a 56% of adults of age between 40 and 64 years old, a 16% of subjects of age comprised between 25 and 39, and 12% of young people between 19 and 24 years old. The instruction level is medium, with 34% of people with 3-year university studies, and another 34% that has finished secondary education (high school). Concerning occupation, 40% of the sample is employees, 22% are retired people, 14% are students, and 6% are executives. More than 1/3 of the subjects (32%) are French from *Picardie*, followed by tourists from Paris (16%). Other French regions well represented are Normandy (12%), *Alsace* and *Lorraine* (6%) and *Aquitaine* (6%). Concerning European tourists, 12% of the sample are English, 6% German and 4% Belgian. Other European tourists sum up 2% of the sample, and non-EU represent another 2%.

Survey design: 6 open and semi-directive questions about the expectations and knowledge of the *Hortillonnages* before the visit.

Question 1: Previous knowledge.

The greatest part of the sample knows something about this place. Only 36% declared to ignore everything about it. 4% knows only what has just read on the

guide of Amiens, 28% know that *Hortillonages* are the vegetable gardens of the city, and the remnant part of the sample does not have a general knowledge but is aware of some aspects of the place.

Question 2: Learning expectations.

There learning expectations of the subjects are basically about the gardens (40%) and about the fauna (10%). There is also an 8% that comes with a contemplative attitude, and 14% that does not answer the question.

Question 3: Ideal visitor.

40% of the sample thinks this place is appealing for all kinds of audience, and 18% consider is particularly interesting for tourists. On the other hand, 24% believes the *Hortillonages* are more oriented to people with specific interests in environment and fauna.

Question 4: Reasons of the visit

Half of the sample justifies the visit as part of their general tourist activities in Amiens. The remaining visitors are curious to hear the explanations (16%), have heard excellent things about the place (12%), come for pleasure (6%) or just to have a walk (another 6%).

Question 5: Content expectations

Almost 1/3 of the sample (28%) didn't answer this question. Beside this part, 12% wish to discover an atypical place, strange and unknown. 10% seem to expect to be able to go ashore on the gardens, because they expect a nice walk. 12% expect explanations, a guided tour about the *Hortillonages* and the city. The remaining part of the sample provides answers more pertinent to question 4 (reason of the visit): for instance 18% say they expect to find rest, calm and pleasure by the contemplation of the beauty of the gardens.

Conclusions

The visitors of the *Hortillonages* are aware of what they are going to visit. The image of the attractor, though, is still a little bit attached to researchers or people interested specifically in environment, or to just relax: the explanations

are not seen as something that can interest anybody previous knowledge of the museum.

Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit.

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, second part

The sample, technique and profile of the survey are the same as in survey 2 /Expectations

Survey design: 4 open and semi-directive questions about the *Hortillonnages* and its impact, after the visit.

Question 6: Valuation of the visit, in general and in particular

In a scale from 0 (very bad) to 3 (very good), the visit in general gets an excellent average valuation: 2,8. Regarding some specific aspects, the most satisfactory is the information provided by the guide (2,8) and the trip on boat (2,7). The length gets an average valuation a little bit inferior, 2,4, which is quite good. The opening hours timetable gets a 2,3, which is the lower valuation but is still above the "good" level.

Question 7: Preferences

We find again in this section some of the answers given on the first part of the survey: 32% of the survey declare that what they have preferred of the visit are the flowers, plants, and the Nature environment in general, while 30% prefer the calm and the restful atmosphere. The guide and his explanations obtain the 6% of preferences, and another particularly appreciated aspect (by 12% of the sample) is the boat trip and how it is organised.

Question 8: Problems

26% of visitors didn't answer this question, and 32% declare they didn't miss anything in this attractor. On the other hand, 10% would have liked to find more information about the vegetable gardens and the city in general. There is also a 6% that would be interested in explanations in English. Other suggestions or remarks are to foster some kind of contact with people living on the gardens

(4%), to go ashore in at least one garden (4%), to have more animals to see (4%) or to install benches to rest while waiting the boats (2%).

Question 9: Fidelisation

72% is visiting the *Hortillonnages* for the first time while 24% has visited the place once before. If we consider only people from Picardie then it turns out that 54% have repeated the visit. One of the most frequent reasons to repeat the visit is the "pleasure" of the experience.

Conclusions

The visit is very satisfactory, maybe the opening hour's timetable could be improved. The guide is one of the most satisfactory elements of the visit, which contrast with the fear (detected in the previous section) that the visit may be oriented to a specialists audience. Despite the satisfaction the visitors do not tend to repeat the visit: only the half of the visitors from Picardie does it.

Survey 5, Absolute valuation

Sample: 18 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the CAUE de L'Oise at the exit of the *Hortillonnages*.

Profile: The greatest part of the sample is composed of adults of age comprised between 50 and 79 years old (65,5%). There is only a 5,5% of subjects of an age comprised between 20 and 29 years old. Concerning the instruction level, 27% of the sample didn't answer the question. Beside this, the level is medium, with 29% of people with just primary school studies. Regarding occupation, half of the sample is retired people, consequently with the age of the greatest part of the subjects. The remnant part is composed of employees (16%), executives (16%) and medium managers (11%). In this occasion no information about the provenance was collected.

Survey design: A scale of preferences from 1 to 10, in which the visitor has to position the *Hortillonnages* and other similar places in the level that each of them deserves (between 1-very bad, and 10-very good).

Position of the Centre:

Before commenting this point, it is important to remark that 77,7% of subjects could not compare the *Hortillonnages* to any other floating garden or similar natural attractor because they don't know any other examples. Having said this, the *Hortillonnages* appear three times in the highest position (10) and one in position 9. Therefore the average position results 9,7 (maximum is 10). The subjects that place it in the highest position justify their decision because of the beauty of the place, the plants and gardens and the well done maintenance work needed to preserve the place. The ninth position is consequence of the *Hortillonnages* being smaller than the *Marais Poitevin*.

Position of similar venues:

Visitors mentioned only two other places similar to the *Hortillonnages*: the above cited *Marais Poitevin* and the St. Omer Gardens . The first appear one time in the highest position (10) and two times in the second highest position (9), while the St. Omer Gardens are mentioned once in position 9 and once in position 8. The average position of these places is 9. The reasons why the *Marais Poitevin* are placed in position 9 is that they are well preserved and have a lot of plants. The highest position is because they are more extended than the *Hortillonnages*. No reason was given regarding the St. Omer Gardens.

Conclusions

The *Hortillonnages* are so original that it is difficult to compare them with other places (77,7% of visitors declare they have never been to a place like this). The few comparisons do not affect the quality and the satisfaction offered by the visit to the *Hortillonnages*.

Objective C – Level of comprehension of the information and knowledge offered at the venue evaluated

Survey 3, Knowledge acquisition

Sample: 30 subjects.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the CAUE de L'Oise at the exit of the *Hortillonnages*.

Profile: A high percentage of subjects didn't answer to some of the following profile questions. Beside this accident, we can examine the profile: concerning the age we have 23% of unanswered questions, and the remnant answers are mainly concentrated on an interval of age between 30 and 49 years old (43,2%); the remaining percentage is distributed between other groups older people. Concerning the instruction level, the percentage of people that do not answer ascends to 53%, and the remnant is composed of people with just secondary studies (high school) (26%) and people with 3-year university studies (16,6%). Regarding occupation, 36% didn't provide any information, 16,6% are retired and 10% are students. The remnant categories are equally distributed. Concerning the provenance, only 13% didn't answer; beside this, 13% are foreign visitors, and the rest are french: *North-Pas-de-Calais* (20%), *Vallée de Somme* (13,3%) and *Dordogne, Rhône Alpes, Oise, Amiens and Paris* with 6,6% each.

Survey Design: Seven questions about aspects of the *Hortillonnages* history explained along the visit. There are four possible answers for each question, but only one is correct.

Questions 1-10:

The average ratio of correct answers is of 7,3 (the maximum is 10). Due to the high percentage of persons that didn't answer to the *Instruction* question on the profile part, and the relatively homogeneous level of those who answered (high school and 3-years university studies), there is no point in crossing the variables "level of instruction" and "correct answers", which would have

provided us data to conclude whether or not the information given during the boat trip is assimilated.

Conclusions

It is not possible to provide any conclusion about the assimilation of the information provided to the audience during the boat trip.

Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication)

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, Question 10

The sample, technique and profile of this survey are the same as Survey 2.

Survey design: one semi-directive question about how did the visitors know the existence of the *Hortillonnages*.

Question 10: Awareness of the *Hortillonnages*

Half of the sample (52%) knows the Museum by family and friends. Printed tourist guides of Amiens are the second important element of promotion (28%). The Leaflets and the TV are also important since they bring 20% of visitors each one. Press has an impact on 14% of the sample, and finally the Tourism Office of Amiens brings 10% of the audience.

Conclusions

The promotion of the *Hortillonnages* is very heterogeneous, however the impact is not too evident, since half of the sample came because recommended by family or friends. It would be interesting to intensify the efforts also on the Internet promotion, which would also raise the percentage of foreign visitors.

Objective E - Level of integration of the venue evaluated in the rest of the city's offer, both from the aesthetic and the cultural points of view.

Survey 7, Integration in city

Sample: 34 subjects.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the CAUE de L'Oise at the exit of the *Hortillonnages*.

Profile: There is a 61,8% of adults of age comprised between 40 and 64 years, 11,8% of adults between 25 and 39 years old, and 8,8% of young people of age comprised between 19 and 24 years old. The instruction level is medium-high, with 26,5% of people with high school studies, 29,4% of subjects with 3-year university studies, 8,8% of people with 5-year university studies, and another 8,8% of subjects with post-university studies. Concerning the occupation, 20,6% are executives, 23,5% employees, 11,8% retired people and 5,9% unemployed (this is the first time we meet this category in this study). Almost $\frac{1}{4}$ of the sample (23,5%) comes from *Picardie*, 14,7% come from Normandy region and 5,8% from *Alsace* and *Lorraine*. Regarding foreign visitors, 11,8% of the sample are Belgians, followed by English and Germans, both with 8,8%.

Survey design: 7 open and semi-directive questions regarding the integration of the *Hortillonnages* in the urban, cultural and aesthetic context of the city.

Question 1: Signposts to get there

The sample agrees that it is easy to get there (58,8%), but there are some comments asking for more signals or more visible.

Question 2: Transport

More than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the visitors (70,6%) get to the *Hortillonnages* by car. Only 14,7% get there by foot.

Question 3: The surrounding area

In a scale from 0 to 3 (0 very bad, 3 very good), the judgement of visitors about the security sensation in the area is quite good (with an average value of 2,3), as well as the impression about the traffic. The cleanliness of the streets and

façades is perceived in a quite similar way (2,2), but then we get to the existence of parking areas, that deserve a not so good opinion (1,8).

Question 4: Preferences or problems

There are no important remarks, actually 52,9% of the sample didn't express anything. Looking more in detail, some visitors (5,9%) praise the river Somme, and on the other side some other miss better services (toilets) and parking areas (5,9% both).

Question 5: Aesthetical Integration

85,3% of the sample considers that the *Hortillonnages* are well integrated with the surrounding buildings and areas.

Question 6: Cultural Integration

The greatest part of visitors (85,3%) thinks that the cultural offer of the *Hortillonnages* is an important component of the city's cultural offer.

Question 7: Urban Integration

88,2% of the subjects are not resident in Amiens, so they can't give any opinion about the importance and relevance of the centre in the urban tissue. The remnant part of the sample does not answer.

Conclusions

The area of the *Hortillonnages* is perceived positively, though the signposts could be improved. The integration with the city is good, both at cultural and aesthetic level.

General Conclusions

Amiens appears to be an important part of the offer of the northern French regions, but does not arrive to affirm itself as a city worth of staying more than one night. However there are some tourists that use it as a base to explore the surrounding areas. The target of a tourism development strategy for this town should be precisely this, to increase the number of overnight stays of tourists that wish to know better the region.

Suggestions

It would be wise to strengthen the co-operation with the regional Tourism office and with the local authorities of the surrounding towns, to create and coordinate a net of cultural/tourism offers to increase the number of overnight stays and share the benefits of medium-long term stays. It would also be necessary to develop activities on the Heritage elements of Amiens, in order to make the citizens more familiar with their town's heritage

Regarding the *Musée de Picardie* there are 3 important goals to achieve: improve the image, attract new visitors, reinforce some segments of audiences (only 15,8% are young between 19 and 24 years old). This could be done creating dynamisation activities to involve people in the life of the museum.

Concerning the *Hortillonnages*, there are 2 main objectives: first, to improve the image in order to attract an audience as wide as possible, not only to environment-interested people. Second, the *Hortillonnages* are seen as a tourist-oriented offer, so it is necessary to develop some activities addressed to residents, to make them appreciate this particular heritage and therefore involve them in its conservation

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Conseil d'Architecture, d'Urbanisme et d'Environnement de L'Oise for their co-operation in this study, particularly Carole Dauphine, Séverine Paillé and Caroline Rainette for their accurate work.