

PICTURE



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

Case Study

Badajoz

Task n° **3.4**
Task Leader: **Universidad Autónoma de Madrid**

Authors: **Mikel Asensio Brouard, Manuel Mortari Fernández.**

Date: 30-11-2006



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

The whole city	3
Objective A – Real Visitor Profile	4
Survey 1, Visitor Profile	4
Conclusions	6
Objective B – Previous knowledge and image of the city among real and potential visitors	6
Survey 1, Visitor Profile, Question 10	7
Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer	7
Survey 6, Meaning Maps	9
Conclusions	12
Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage	12
Survey 4/A, Representativity, Cultural Identity	12
Conclusions	14
Objetivo D - Impacts of Tourism on the city and the integration of Tourism, Culture and School	15
Focus Group A	15
Focus Group B	16
Conclusions	17
The cultural offer in detail	18
The Museo de la Ciudad “Luis de Morales”	19
Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit	19
Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part	19
Conclusions	20
Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit	21
Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, second part	21
Survey 5, Absolute valuation	22
Conclusions	23
Objective C - Level of comprehension of the information offered at the venue	23
Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication)	24
Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, Question 10	24
Conclusions	24
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	24
Survey 7, Integration in city	24
Conclusions	26
General Conclusions	27
Proposals and suggestions	29

Case Study: Badajoz

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

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 Museo de la Ciudad.

The surveys have been conducted between July 2005 and March 2006.

There have been used 7 surveys.

We have worked with 9 techniques: questionnaires, self-distributed questionnaires, multiple answer questionnaires, in-deep interviews, scales of preferences, Focus Groups and Meaning Maps.

The total sample was 395 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.**
- D. Assess impacts of Tourism on the city and the integration of Tourism, Culture and School.**

Objective A – Real Visitor Profile

Survey 1, Visitor Profile

Sample: 200 subjects

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the Badajoz's Tourist Information Centre.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

40 - 64 years old:	50,5%
25 - 39 " " :	37,5%
19 - 24 " " :	4,5%

Instruction level:

5-years university studies:	26,5%
3-years university studies:	21%
High school:	36,5%
Primary School:	7%

Occupation:

Employees:	73,5%
Students:	4,5%
Executives:	3%
Retired persons:	3%

Provenance:

Eastern regions of Spain (Aragón, Cataluña, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares):	34,5%
Northern regions of Spain (Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria, País Vasco y La Rioja):	20,5%
Madrid:	12,5%
Andalucía:	11%
Europe:	6,5%
Extremadura:	1,5%

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

Know the city: 84% visits Badajoz for the first time.

Question 1: Reason of the visit

Tourism in general:	69,5%
Specific interest for Art, History, Culture:	6%
Have some rest:	8,5%
Work:	5%
Family:	5%

Question 2: Visit planning schedule

More than 2 weeks:	24%
1-6 months:	30,5%
6-12 months:	13,5%
Less than 2 weeks:	23,5%

Question 3: Visit organisation habits

Do not organise the visit:	37%
Internet:	21%
Family/Friends:	16,5%
Printed Tourist Guides:	14%
Travel Agencies:	7%

Question 4: Visits to other places

Visit only Badajoz: 17%

Visit other places: 83%, of which 68% go to Mérida, 56% go to Cáceres, 35% go to Trujillo , 16% go to Plasencia, 15% go to Zafra, 11% go to Olivenza, 8% go to Jerez de los Caballeros, 12% go to other places (mainly towns or villages) of Extremadura, 10% go to places in Andalucía, 13% go to Lisboa and 14 go to other Portugal

Route preferences: the sample is not big enough to draw conclusions, but some tendencies have been detected. Tourists from Eastern Spanish regions visit an average of 3 places, while tourists from Andalucía visit only an average of 1,7. Tourists from Northern Spanish regions are more inclined than other tourists to include in their routes Portuguese places. Regardless provenance issues, the most followed circuit touches the three most visited cities: Mérida, Cáceres and Trujillo.

Question 5: Transport

Private (car, motorcycle...):	86,5%
Bus:	7,5%
Train:	2%

Question 6: Length of stay

Weekend:	22,5%
3 days:	12%
up to one week:	23%
Just one day:	32,5%

Question 7: Accommodation

Hotels or Parador:	62%
Hostels, B&B:	11,5%
Their own place, or relative/friends houses:	7,5%

Question 8: Shopping

Will buy something: 72,5%, of which 39,3% Souvenirs, 32% craftwork, 13,1% Regional food products.

Conclusions

The provenance of Badajoz tourists is distributed mainly between Eastern and Northern Spanish regions. Half of the subjects are adults between 40 and 64 years old, with a medium-low study level. The greatest part of the sample visits the city for the first time. The reasons are mainly "general tourism", with a very scarce presence of specifically cultural, artistic or historical motivations. Improvised tourists represent only something more than 1/5 of the sample, and visitors that come to Badajoz without having organised the trip are a little more than 1/3. The greatest part of the sample visit other cities and towns beside Badajoz (most frequent are Mérida, Cáceres and Trujillo). Tourists that visit more places use to be those coming from Eastern Spanish regions, and those that visit less places are from Andalucía. The car is still the preferred transport solution for the greatest part of visitors, only 7,5% uses bus. The greatest part of the sample spends in Badajoz more than one day and usually stays at Hotels or at the Parador. Souvenirs and Craftworks are the most frequent 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:

Alcazaba (the medieval Arab fortress)

Cathedral of San Juan

Torre de Espantaperros

Giralda

Iglesia de la Concepción

Iglesia de San Andrés

Ermita de la Soledad

Museo MEIAC (Museo Extremeño e

Iberoamericano de Arte Contemporáneo)

Puente de Palmas

Museo Catedralicio

Puerta de Palmas

Feria de San Juan

Fiestas de Almosassa Batalyaws

Carnivals

Semana Santa (Easter celebrations)

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 Badajoz

The results of this part of the survey are not conclusive because many subjects didn't answer to this question, and the few answers are very scattered. Generally speaking, we can say that subjects regroup their answers in the field of built heritage.

Regarding the first part of the question ("What do you consider most representative of Badajoz?"), only 60,5% answered. The results are:

Alcazaba:	37%
Other specific monuments or heritage elements (except the Cathedral):	27,8%
The monumental value of the city in general:	10,7%
The Cathedral:	10,7%

Regarding the second part of the question ("What do you consider as second most representative element of Badajoz?"), only 42,5% answered. The results are:

Specific monuments or heritage elements (except the Cathedral):	34,1%
Cathedral:	30,6%
Regional typical cuisine:	9,4%
Alcazaba:	8,2%

Regarding the third part of the question ("What do you consider as third most representative element of Badajoz?"), only 28% answered. The results are:

Specific monuments or heritage elements (except the Cathedral):	33,9%
Museums of the city:	21,4%
Cathedral:	12,5%
Alcazaba:	10,7%

The conclusion is that the most representative element of Badajoz for the tourists that have just arrived to the city is its built heritage, particularly its Alcazaba and its cathedral, though also the museums and the local cuisine have a certain presence.

Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer

Sample: 3 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the *Museo de la Ciudad*, 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 Badajoz.

The persons that answered this survey are adults of age comprised between 25 and 64 years old, with a medium-low instruction level. Concerning the occupation, they are two employees and a retired subject. Two persons come from Madrid, and the third comes from the Eastern Spanish regions.

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

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

The only places where the three subjects have been are the *Ermita de la Soledad*, the *Puente de Palmas* and the *Puerta de Palmas*. Concerning other places, they are all familiar to the subjects by having heard of them, but they haven't actually been there.

Question 2: Preferences (subjective Heritage valuation)

The elements that emerge as preferred by the subjects are the Carnivals, the *Feria de San Juan*, the *Torre de Espantaperros*, the *Puerta de Palmas*, the *fiestas de Almassasa*, the Cathedral and the *Ermita de la Soledad*. One of the most frequent reasons is the "good atmosphere, amusement", obviously related to the three mentioned fairs and holidays. Regarding other elements, the most frequent reason is "beauty", frequently together with "Heritage value", "Representative of the city", "surprising" or "local cuisine".

Question 3: Positive surprises

The only element mentioned is the *puerta de Palmas*, because of its Heritage value and importance.

Question 4: Deceiving experiences

There is only one element in this part, the *Alcazaba*, considered deceiving because of its conservation state.

Question 5: Badajoz's typical and representative

Two of the three subjects interviewed believe that the most representative element of Badajoz is the *Alcazaba*, while the third thinks it is the *Cathedral*. Concerning the second part of the question, new elements emerge: the *puerta de Palmas*, the *puente de Palmas* and the Guadiana river and banks.

Finally, in the third position we find again elements previously mentioned: the *puente de Palmas* and the Guadiana river and banks.

Survey 6, Meaning Maps

Sample: 110 subjects

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the UAM team in Madrid.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

Under 18 years old:	42,7%
40 - 64 years old:	20%
25 - 39 " " :	33,6%

Instruction level:

5-years university studies:	47,3%
3-years university studies:	6,4%
Primary School:	44,5%

Occupation:

Employees:	50%
Students:	45,5%

Provenance:

Madrid:	86,4%
Two <i>Castillas</i> regions of Spain (Castilla y León, Castilla La Mancha):	5,5%
Northern regions of Spain (Galicia, Asturias, Cantabria, País Vasco y La Rioja):	4,5%

Survey design: a meaning map of New York city is shown to the subject, as an example. The subject is asked to draw a similar map of the city of Badajoz.

Frequency: The identification and cataloguing of all the concepts that arise from the task conveys into a global representation of the city made up of 78 elements, which correspond to an average of 8,1 elements per subject. This representation is very detailed, but not easy to use. A report such as this needs less elements, so we have regrouped similar concepts (i. e. we have regrouped "Specific monument" and "monuments in general" into a category comprehensive of both elements: "Built Heritage"). After this operation of synthesis, we find that the most remarkable category in the meaning map of Ávila is that of "Nature, landscape, *plein-air* activities" that represents the 22% of the whole meaning map, followed with 19% by a more general category, "geographic position" (which has no interest for this study because it refers to such generic concepts as the fact of belonging to Extremadura region or being in Spain). The third most important category is "Culture, Art History" with 12%, followed by 10% of "Built Heritage" and 9% of Regional typical Cuisine. Other less relevant elements belong to what can be considered *local* in opposition to *global* "Traditions, folklore, country-life" with 8%, and elements related with the primary sector "agriculture, cattle farming" with another 8%. In the last positions we find some contradictory elements associated on one hand with progress and good economy, and on the other hand symptoms of back warding economy both with 3%. It is interesting to notice the relatively important presence of Culture and Heritage: regarding the first, if we analyse the results more in detail we can remark that Badajoz is associated insistently with History in general, and with the presence of Romans in ancient times; concerning the second, we can remark the importance of archaeological remains in the mind of potential tourists, suggested by the proximity to the roman ruins of Mérida.

Depth: In the representation of the meaning map, each element is linked to the city with a variable depth level, which is measured by the number of other elements placed between them. If the depth is minimal, or in other words, if the element we are analyzing is close to the centre of the meaning map, we will say that the depth is 1. If there is an element between them, we will say the depth is 2, and so on. The nearest an element is to the centre of the meaning map, the more relevant it is (in the opinion of the subject). More in general, the maximum depth reached by the elements of a meaning map suggest a higher complexity in the mental representations of different kinds of subjects. If the meaning maps of a city are in

average very complex and deep, the offer and the marketing strategies should be more elaborate than the cases where the average meaning maps are simple and not too deep.

The average depth of the Meaning Map of Badajoz is 2,56. If we analyse the potential tourists of Badajoz we can appreciate some remarks. The first, obvious, is that the elements that can be considered as more specific are usually found around some general element to which they are related, and they are usually rather far away from the centre. (i.e., consider the depth of such specific elements as "local Fauna", with an average depth of 1,88, or "local flora", with an average depth of 1,90 and compare it with the more general category of "Nature" or "Landscape" respectively in an average position of 1,15 and 1,36. Other elements that also are found in positions far from the centre and are interesting for their relation with cultural tourism are the ruins and archaeological sites (2,14) , the Ancient Romans (1,95), the History (1,72). In the intermediate positions we find elements such as Regional typical Cuisine (1,6), the hot and dry climate (1,54), the monuments and churches of the city (1,5). Other important elements located closer to the centre are the presence of water (river, dams... 1,27), the country/rural (in opposition to the *urban*, 1,36), the monumental and Heritage (1,25) and the Art (1,27). Generally speaking the average position of each category in the meaning map of Badajoz is 1,78.

Links: in the meaning map of a city, each element can be related to one or more elements. If an element is represented with many links it means that the subjects attribute to this element a structural role in the offer of a city. Generally speaking, the average of links in a Badajoz's Meaning Map is 10,58. And the average number of links per category is 1,47. As we saw before, talking about the depth of the elements, the more generic elements have a higher number of links than the more specific concepts (i.e., "Regional typical Cuisine" has an average of 1,93 links, while related but more specific elements such as "wine" have an average of 1 link). For the average visitor, the elements with higher structural relevance are "Heritage and monumental character of the city" with an average of 2,67 links, "Art" (2,36), "Economy" (2,21) and "History" (2,11). "Nature" has an average of only 1,77 links, "Specific monuments" has an average of 1,5, "ancient Romans" 1,28, "Country/rural" 1,27 and "archaeological sites" 1,18.

Conclusions

This part of the study offers interesting and useful information about the previous knowledge of Badajoz's Cultural Offer. A potential tourist has an image of Badajoz strongly influenced by the "Nature/Environment". The city is also associated to the concepts of Culture, Art and History, followed by "Built Heritage" and "Regional typical Cuisine".

Regarding real, actual tourists, we can make a difference between those that have just arrived to Badajoz, and those that have already had the chance of visiting a part or all of it. The first ones consider that the most typical element of the city is its Built Heritage, particularly the Alcazaba and the Cathedral, though also museums and Regional Cuisine are mentioned. For the second kind of tourists, the results are similar, but less reliable because of the reduced sample: the most typical is still the Built Heritage (Alcazaba, Cathedral, *puente* and *puerta de Palmas*), followed by the Guadiana river and banks. It is interesting to remark how "Built Heritage" is more important and representative for real tourists than for potential visitors. The latter associate Badajoz more with "Nature and Environment". The results suggest a mismatch between the potential tourists, that do not know well the Heritage and Cultural image of the city, and the Real tourists, that seem to come to Badajoz already knowing what they will see, and attracted to the city precisely for this aspect.

Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage

Survey 4/A, Representativeness, Cultural Identity

Sample: 10 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the *Museo de la Ciudad "Luis de Morales"*, indifferently at the beginning or at the end of the visit.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

40 - 64 years old:	70%
Under 18 " " :	20%
25 - 39 " " :	10%

Instruction level:

High school:	60%
Primary School:	30%

Occupation:

Employees:	70%
Students:	20%
Executives:	3%
Retired persons:	3%

Provenance:

All residents in Badajoz (or its province), since an average of 27 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

All elements are known to at least 70% of the sample, with peaks of 90% in the cases of the Alcazaba and the *Puerta* and *Puente de Palmas*.

Question 2: Recent Visits (in the last year)

Alcazaba and *Ermita* visited last year by only 60% of sample. Less visited places: MEIAC and *Museo Catedralicio* (both by 10%) and the *Giralda* (by 30%).

Concerning the reasons for these visits, some of the most frequent are "Historical/cultural value", "Beauty", "Pleasure". The place that evokes more kinds of reasons is *Ermita*.

Question 3: Preferences

It appears clearly that the favourite built heritage element in Badajoz is the Alcazaba, mentioned as preferred by 50% of the sample, because of its "Historical/cultural value", "Beauty" and "Representativeness". Concerning other monuments, the most popular are the *Ermita* (by far, because of its "Historical/cultural value" and "Representativeness"), the *Museo*

Catedralicio, the *Giralda*, the MEIAC, and the *Puente de Palmas*. The less popular places are the Cathedral, the *San Andrés* church and the *Puerta de Palmas*.

Question 4: Representativeness

The results, though approximate because of the reduced sample, suggest that the resident's idea about their city is very rich and structured. Actually, in first position we find three kind of elements: The most important, with the 66% of valid percentage, is the Built Heritage (dominated by the Alcazaba), followed by the intangible Heritage (Carnivals) and by the Natural Heritage (Guadiana river and banks). In second place we find again the Built Heritage (again the Alcazaba, and the Cathedral) and the intangible Heritage (Carnivals and convivial atmosphere). In third placed only two clear answers were collected, and both agree mentioning Regional typical Cuisine as something representative of Badajoz.

Conclusions

Residents in Badajoz seem to know well the built Heritage of their city, though they do not frequent it too much. Alcazaba and the Hermit seem to be the beloved elements, but when asked to indicate what is most representative the Hermit leaves its place to the Cathedral. Beside the monumental aspect, residents consider particularly representative of Badajoz other elements of intangible Heritage (carnivals and typical cuisine) and Natural Heritage (Guadiana river and banks).

It is interesting to see how, from the three domains that constitute the conceptual map of residents, only two are transmitted to the potential and real visitors: in fact, the intangible heritage (carnivals and regional cuisine) are practically non mentioned by tourists. On one hand, this seems to suggest a good relationship between residents and Badajoz's Heritage (in all its domains) but on the other hand this suggests that the image of Badajoz for the others is inadequate because it does not transmit its surprising intangible richness.

Objective D - Impacts of Tourism on the city and the integration of Tourism, Culture and School

Focus Group A

Sample: 5 subjects.

Technique: focus group recorded and transcribed.

Profile: The subjects live and work in Badajoz, in the tourism and cultural sectors (Tourism Observatory, Tourism Office, Dynamisation Plan Office, Hotels, travel agencies, restaurants, souvenir shops and museums).

Survey design: 4 issues related with Tourism, explained and debated under the supervision of an UAM team moderator.

First issue: Impacts of Tourism

No negative impacts, also because the particular kind of tourism in Badajoz: the predominant aspect are the Business tourism and "health" tourism (residents in nearby Portugal provinces, come to Badajoz for its health services, considered more reliable than in their own country). Positive impacts: restoration of Built Heritage.

Second Issue: Good practices and bad practices

Reasons for the underdeveloped tourism situation in Badajoz

- 1) Lack of a strategy, of an offer-structuring plan.
- 2) Concurrence of other nearby destinations, and consequent political conflicts with the regional authorities.

As a consequence of this, all the other problems: lack of consciousness of the tourism potential, resources underdeveloped and non adapted to tourism purposes (i.e., the Alcazaba), fruitless and short-term investments, scarce co-ordination and integration of actions, both in the horizontal and vertical axes.

Third Issue: Risk of prettification

The members of the Focus Group are aware of this problem, and agree that Badajoz is at risk. Only the Alcazaba could become a *plein air* museum, in the future, but this is a very remote possibility.

Fourth Issue: Future projects

A new Congress centre, a Fairs area, the restoration of the Alcazaba for different purposes, the growth of the accommodation offer, the construction of a commercial centre, the connexion to the AVE (high speed train line), the construction of an airport and the enhancement of the Guadiana as a river-tourism offer.

Focus Group B

Sample: 5 subjects.

Technique: Focus Group recorded and transcribed.

Profile: The members of the Focus Group live and work in Badajoz, in the education (schools and high schools) and tourism (*Plan de Dinamización*) sectors.

Survey design: 4 issues explained and debated under the supervision of an UAM team moderator. The issues are the same as in the Focus Group A, plus some other that study the integration of the cultural offer, tourism and education.

First Issue: Tourism Impacts

Tourism is not so developed to cause impacts, and eventual impacts would be positive (restoration of Heritage, security improved in the downtown area).

Second Issue: Use of the Heritage offer in the school.

In Badajoz and its province the tourism and heritage offer is not adapted to the school, its educative potential is underdeveloped. There are only some didactic activities related with Heritage (Excursions, visits, workshops), but promoted punctually by teachers. Institutions do not propose actions nor plans for the integration of the heritage offer in the content of the school lessons. The co-operation of museums or cultural centres depends entirely on the good

disposition of their directors, and is usually used as an power instrument to obtain good reputation (which generates situations of rivalry and unproductive concurrence).

Third Issue: Educative tools/materials

Teachers in Badajoz do not use any kind of specific educational tools in their experiences related with the tourism and Heritage offer of the city. The reason is that they believe that these tools are expensive (which is false).

Fourth Issue: Heritage awareness Raising

The only action to raise the awareness about the Heritage among the younger people is a small book developed by the Dynamisation Plan Office for Primary school students. This is perceived as an important goal, particularly since in Badajoz vandalism is an important problem.

Conclusions

The main problems in Badajoz and its province are basically the lack of a structuring plan, and the concurrence with nearby destinations. The city and the surrounding area have many important tourism resources, but are underexploited, and the offer is not sufficiently articulated nor co-ordinated. The offer of educational/didactic resources is not sufficiently structured, too, nor integrated in the school system.

The cultural offer in detail

The evaluation of the quality of the specific cultural offer of Badajoz has considered one element: the *Museo de la Ciudad "Luis de Morales"*. This study has evaluated the individual visitors of the venue, 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.**

The Museo de la Ciudad “Luis de Morales”

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

Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part

Sample: 15 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel 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 conducts this part of the interview, or collects the questionnaires, at the exit of the Museum.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

40 - 64 years old:	27%
25 - 39 “ “ :	53%

Instruction level:

5-years university studies:	20%
High school:	40%
Primary School:	13%

Occupation:

Employees:	53%
Students:	13%

Provenance:

Eastern regions of Spain (Aragón, Cataluña, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares):	27%
Madrid and two <i>Castillas</i> :	20%
Andalucía:	7%
Extremadura:	33%

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

Question 1: Previous knowledge.

The Museum is about:

History of the city	60%
Luis de Morales (Painter) house	13%
No idea	27%

Question 2: Expectations of learning.

History and Culture of Badajoz	41%
History of the Muslim domination period	29%
Artistic and Archaeological Heritage in Badajoz	25%

Question 3: Ideal Visitor.

73% of the sample agree that the Museum is a cultural offer appealing for all the people in general. The remnant believe it is a place for people with special interest.

Question 4: Reasons of the visit

There is a 60% interested specifically in the city and its History, and 20% that came to the museum as part of the visit to the city (general tourism).

Question 5: Depth of knowledge about the history of the city

No idea	20%
Scarce knowledge	44,4%
General knowledge	27%
Good knowledge	20%

Question 6: Content expectations

Pieces exhibited (objects, documents...)	47%
Written information (panels)	27%

Conclusions

The Museum raises thematic expectations quite similar to the reality. The things are different regarding the content, because half of the visitors think they are going to see a collection, with real objects.

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: 6 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)

Visit in general	2,5
Entrance fee	3 (it is free)
Written information	2,5
Opening hours	2,4
Hanging and museography	2,3
Luis de Morales' section	2,1
Objects exhibited	2,1
Program of activities	2

Question 8: Preferences

History of Badajoz under Muslim domination preferred by	40%
Guided tour to the Museum	27%

Reasons: because of personal interest on the subject

Question 9: Problems

Didn't answer	33%
Objects (collection)	47%
Bar or drinks-machine	20%

Question 10: Fidelisation

This is the first visit	77%
Has already been here	33%

Those who repeat the visit do it to learn more about the History of Badajoz, or to recall what they learnt in previous occasions.

Question 11: Exhibitions

Have seen temporary exhibitions	33%
---------------------------------	-----

The only mentioned exhibitions are "Belenes", "Carnaval", "Bosques de bosques", and "Monedas Árabes".

Question 12: Activities

Only one person has been at some of the activities organised at the Museum: games in the courtyard.

Survey 5, Absolute valuation

Sample: 7 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 Museum at the exit.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

40 - 64 years old:	43%
25 - 39 " " :	57%

Instruction level:

3-years university studies:	29%
High school:	29%
Primary School:	42%

Occupation:

Employees:	86%
Students:	14%

Provenance:

Eastern regions of Spain (Aragón, Cataluña, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares):	14%
Madrid	14%
two Castillas:	14%
Andalucía:	14%
Extremadura:	43%

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

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

Other museums: Only 43% declares to know other similar museums.

Position of the Museum:

The *Museo de la Ciudad* appears three times, two in position 9 (the second higher), and one in position 8. The average position is 8,7. The subjects justify their decision because the information received is interesting for them.

Position of similar venues:

Other venues mentioned by the visitors are all Spanish, and almost all in Badajoz. In tenth position (the highest) we find the *Museo de Bellas Artes* and the *Museo Catedralicio*. In the same position we find also *Museo Municipal* of Madrid. In the three cases, the presence of a collection and the quality of its pieces are the main reasons of their good ranking. Below, in positions 6 and 5, we find respectively the *MEIAC* and the *Museo Arqueológico Provincial* and the reasons are in both cases the interest and beauty of the buildings where they are located. The average position of all these venues is 8,2.

Conclusions

Generally speaking the valuation of the visit is "quite good", but there remains some level of disappointment because of the character purely informative of the museum. Visitors interested in History consider the part devoted to the Muslim domination the most interesting part of the museum. On the other hand, there is a part of visitors who are disappointed by the lack of a collection. Anyway the expectations are relatively poor, so the final opinion about the museum results quite positive.

Objective C - Level of comprehension of the information offered at the venue

This objective was not included in the evaluation of the *Museo de la Ciudad*.

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 *Museo de la Ciudad "Luis de Morales"*.

Question 10: Awareness of the Museum

39% of visitors knew discover the Museum by the tourism office of Badajoz. personal recommendations are the second vehicle of promotion (28%), and also the leaflets have an acceptable impact (22%).

Conclusions

The promotion of the *Museo de la Ciudad* should insist in printed media (newspapers, posters) and Internet, to attract more residents: at this moment, the greatest part of visitors is composed of Tourists, that come to the museum recommended by the Tourism Information Centre, while the other tourists come by personal recommendation or leaflets.

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: 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 Museum at the exit.

Profiles: The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Age:

40 - 64 years old:	44%
25 - 39 " " :	39%
18 - 24 " " :	6%
Under 18 " " :	6%
Older than 64 " " :	5%

Instruction level:

3-years university studies:	11%	
High school:		39%
Primary School:	44%	

Occupation:

Employees:	56%
Housekeeper:	17%
Students:	11%

Provenance:

Eastern regions of Spain (Aragón, Cataluña, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares):	17%
Madrid and two Castillas:	28%
Extremadura:	50%

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

Question 1: Signposts to get there

The greatest part of the sample (83%) agrees that it is difficult to find the Museum: all of them consider it should be indicated more and better, and should be also more advertised.

Question 2: Transport

More than half of visitors (56%) get to the Museum by foot, and 33% does it by car.

Question 3: The surrounding area in a scale from 0 to 3 (0 very bad, 3 very good)

Security	1,7
Traffic	1,6
Cleanliness of streets and façades	1,4
Public transport	2
Parking areas	2,2

Question 4: Preferences or problems

Some visitors left two positive comments: the first regards the kindness of the personnel, and the second is about the enhancement works in the downtown district. The other comments

are complaints, mainly about the state of decay of the area (44% agrees on this), the absence of green areas, the mess, the scarce lightning, the works and the lack of security.

Question 5: Aesthetical Integration

61% of the sample consider that the architecture is well integrated with that of the surrounding buildings.

Question 6: Cultural Integration

The greatest part of visitors (89%) thinks that the cultural offer of this centre is well integrated with the city's cultural offer. The remaining 11% didn't answer to this question.

Question 7: Urban Integration

56% of visitors is resident in Badajoz. Out of this percentage, 88% believes the museum is an important point of reference from the urbanism point of view, but half of them believe it should be more advertised.

Conclusions

The Museum is not too easy to find for non-residents. The degradation of the area doesn't help to make the visit fully satisfactory. The comments insist on the need to promote the museum, and accelerate the enhancement works of the surrounding area.

General Conclusions

Tourism in Badajoz is of a general kind, with an important component of subjects that come to buy or to use the sanitary infrastructures of the city. Visitors with specifically cultural, artistic or historical interests represent a minimal part of the tourism of the place. The provenance is distributed between East and North of Spain. Half of visitors are adults between 40 and 64 years old, with an instruction level medium-low, and almost all of them are visiting Badajoz for the first time. The visit is usually prepared more than two weeks before, but without tourism agents. The most frequent circuit touches Mérida, Cáceres and Trujillo, and the car is still the favourite transport. The greatest part of the sample spend in Badajoz more than one day, and stays in Hotels or in the Parador.

Concerning the image that Badajoz transmits, we have to distinguish between potential visitors, real visitors and residents. The first group has an image of the city characterized by the strong presence of the "Nature/Environment" element, followed by "Culture, History, Art", "Built Heritage" and "Local typical Cuisine". Concerning real tourists, we can make a difference between those that have just arrived and those that have already started their visit to the city. The first consider most typical of Badajoz the Alcazaba and the Cathedral, though they also mention the museums and Local cuisine. The second kind of visitors seem to be of the same advise: the most representative elements of Badajoz is its built heritage (*Alcazaba, Cathedral, puente and puerta de Palmas*), followed by Guadiana river and banks.

It is interesting to remark how "Built Heritage" is more important and representative for real tourist than for potential tourists. The latter associate Badajoz more to "Nature/Environment". The results suggest a mismatch between the potential tourists, that do not know well the Heritage and Cultural image of the city, and the Real tourists, that seem to come to Badajoz already knowing what they will see, and attracted to the city precisely for this aspect.

Regarding the relationship between residents and the tangible heritage of their city, the *Alcazaba* and the *Ermita* seem to be the beloved elements, but when asked to indicate what is most representative the Hermit leaves its place to the Cathedral. Beside the monumental aspect, residents consider particularly representative of Badajoz other elements of intangible Heritage (carnivals and typical cuisine) and Natural Heritage (Guadiana river and banks).

It is interesting to see how from the three domains that constitute the conceptual map of residents, only two are transmitted to the potential and real visitors: in fact, the intangible heritage (carnivals and regional cuisine) are practically non mentioned by tourists. On one hand, this seems to suggest a good relationship between residents and Badajoz's Heritage (in all its domains) but on the other hand this suggests that the image of Badajoz for the others is inadequate because it does not transmit its surprising intangible richness.

Concerning the impression about the tourism and everything related with its impacts and management, the main conclusion is that the problem of Badajoz and its province is basically the lack of a structuring plan. However, it is important to remark the role of the Dynamisation Plan, and the Tourism Observatory recently launched, two elements that if able to work in a co-ordinate way can obtain very good results in the study and preparation activities previous to a *Plan de Excelencia*.

Concerning the evaluation of specific cultural attractors of Badajoz, the only one we analysed is the *Museo de la Ciudad "Luis de Morales"*. The opinion of visitors about this museum is not as good as it could be. Actually, the museum generates thematic expectations quite similar to the reality, but if we talk about the content the things are different, because half of the visitors think they are going to see a collection, with real objects, instead of a visitor centre. Regarding the impact after the visit, generally speaking the valuation of the visit is "quite good", but there remains some level of disappointment because of the character purely informative of the museum. Visitors interested in History consider the part devoted to the Muslim domination the most interesting part of the museum. On the other hand, there is a part of visitors who are disappointed by the lack of a collection. Anyway the expectations are relatively poor, so the final opinion about the museum results quite positive. Concerning the promotion of the *Museo de la Ciudad* all visitors insist that it should be more and better advertised: printed media (newspapers, posters) and Internet would probably attract more residents. Talking about its integration in the urban context, the Museum is not too easy to find for non-residents. Moreover, the degradation of the area doesn't help to make the visit fully satisfactory. The comments insist on the need to promote the museum, and accelerate the enhancement works of the surrounding area.

Proposals and suggestions

The management of tourism and cultural offer in Badajoz has one main problem, which is the under exploitation of its rich resources. Our study has identified some actions, more or less general, that could improve the management of these resources.

First of all, it is clear the need for a strategic plan to carry on with the actions begun by the dynamisation plan, to take the most advantage from them, with the help of the information provided by the Tourism Observatory. This plan should consider the many tourism resources of the city and nearby area, little known and little exploited, structuring the offer and coordinating it with that of actors, province and region. Another necessary requisite of the plan would be its integration with other development strategies, as well as its co-ordination with actions promoted by the departments of Urbanism, Environment, Celebrations and other that can be somehow related to tourism.

Concerning more tangible actions, at a promotion level, Heritage and Cultural elements of the city should be reinforced, in order to approach the different images of Badajoz (that of tourists and that of residents). This action should be completed by a diversification and structuring of the offer, on one hand, and on the other hand it should be integrated by a campaign of awareness raising of the residents toward their city's Heritage. This last aspect should be related particularly with the youngest generations, developing a specific educational-cultural offer for the school; and for older people, by the dynamisation of built Heritage, to transform it in something alive and attractive, to increase its frequentation.

Concerning the *Museo de la Ciudad*, it is also possible to suggest some improvements. First of all, we can remark the incongruence between content and expectations caused by the title of "Museum". One of the consequences is the fact that many people with high and defined expectations do not go to this museum. Since we can't propose a full revision of the museologic project, the only two solutions would be whether change the name from "Museum" to "Visitor Centre", or to find an agreement with other museums of the city to exhibit a collection, even small, of real pieces, coherently with the historical / cultural objectives of the museum. Once the difference between content and title has been fixed, it would be possible to proceed with a redefinition of the communication strategies, to attract a wide range of visitors and transform the museum in a real centre of the cultural life of the city.