

PICTURE



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

Case Study

Cáceres

Task nº **3.4**

Task Leader:

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Authors: Mikel Asensio Brouard, Manuel Mortari Fernández.

Date: 30-11-2006



SIXTH FRAMEWORK
PROGRAMME



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 nº SSP1-CT-2003-502491

Table of content

| | |
|---|----|
| Case Study: Cáceres..... | 3 |
| The whole city | 3 |
| Objective A – Real Visitor Profile..... | 4 |
| Survey 1, Visitor Profile..... | 4 |
| Objective B – Previous knowledge and image of the city among real and potential visitors | 7 |
| Survey 1, Visitor Profile, Question 10 | 8 |
| Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer | 9 |
| Survey 6, Meaning Maps..... | 11 |
| Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage..... | 14 |
| Survey 4/A, Representativeness, Cultural Identity | 14 |
| The cultural offer in detail..... | 17 |
| Case 1: <i>Centro de Interpretación y Muralla – Torre de Bujaco</i> | 18 |
| Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit. | 18 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part | 18 |
| Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit. | 20 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, second part..... | 20 |
| Survey 5, Absolute valuation..... | 21 |
| Objective C - Level of comprehension of the information offered at the venue | 23 |
| Survey 3, Knowledge Acquisition | 23 |
| Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication) | 25 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, Question 10..... | 25 |
| 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..... | 25 |
| Survey 7, Integration in city | 25 |
| General conclusions | 28 |
| Proposals | 29 |

Case Study: Cáceres

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

The team of the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid has structured the study on the whole city, and on one of the specific elements that constitute this offer: the Visitors Centre “Centro de Interpretación y Muralla Torre de Bujaco”.

The surveys have been conducted between February and September 2005.

There have been used 7 surveys.

We have worked with 6 techniques: questionnaires, self-distributed questionnaires, multiple answer questionnaires, in-deep interviews, meaning maps and scales of preferences.

The total sample was 370 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: 179 subjects

Technique: Questionnaire, self-distributed questionnaire and in-depth interviews conducted by the personnel of the Tourism department at the offices of Plaza Mayor and Calle Ancha. For reasons of optimisation of resources, 76,5% of this survey has been answered in a reduced version. This is the reason why in some questions the percentage of “Didn’t answer” is unusually high. In these cases we will refer to this circumstance as A Factor.

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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 25 - 39 | 27 | 15,1 |
| | 40 - 64 | 11 | 6,1 |
| | >64 | 2 | 1,1 |
| | Didn't answer | 139 | 77,7 |
| | Total | 40 | 22,3 |
| Total | | 179 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary School | 3 | 1,7 |
| | High school | 4 | 2,2 |
| | 3-year university | 3 | 1,7 |
| | 5-year university | 21 | 11,7 |
| | master | 2 | 1,1 |
| | Doctor | 3 | 1,7 |
| | Didn't answer | 143 | 79,9 |
| | Total | 36 | 20,1 |
| Total | | 179 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Didn't answer | 140 | 78,2 |
| | Executives | 1 | ,6 |
| | Medium managers | 14 | 7,8 |
| | Employees | 19 | 10,6 |
| | Students | 2 | 1,1 |
| | Housekeepers | 1 | ,6 |
| | Retired | 2 | 1,1 |
| | Total | 179 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Galicia, Asturias | 10 | 5,6 |
| | Cantabria,País Vasco, La Rioja | 12 | 6,7 |
| | Cataluña,Aragón, Valencia,Murcia,Baleares | 33 | 18,4 |
| | 2 Castillas | 26 | 14,5 |
| | Madrid | 44 | 24,6 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 24 | 13,4 |
| | Extremadura | 1 | ,6 |
| | Canarias, europeos | 18 | 10,1 |
| | No europeos | 10 | 5,6 |
| | Didn't answer | 1 | ,6 |
| | Total | 178 | 99,4 |
| Total | 179 | 100,0 | |

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

Know the city: this question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, 70,7% is visiting the city for the first time.

Question 1: Reason of the visit

Tourism in general: 12,3%
 Specific interest for Art, History, Culture: 75,4%

Half of the subjects that answered (51,4%) added a second reason for their visit, which is the interest in the local typical cuisine.

Question 2: Willing to visit something in special

| | |
|---|-------|
| Nothing in special (the whole city in general): | 50,3% |
| The Historic (XVI-XVII centuries)downtown district: | 47,5% |

Question 3: Visit planning schedule

This question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, it is difficult to identify a predominant pattern, but the general tendency is to plan with less than one month of advance:

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Less than 1 weeks: | 31,4% |
| 1 or 2 weeks: | 17,1% |
| 3 or 4 weeks: | 20% |
| 1-6 months: | 22,9 % |

Question 4: Visit organisation habits

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Do not organise the visit: | 8,5% |
| Internet: | 20,5% |
| Family/Friends: | 55,9% |

Question 5: Visits to other places

This question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, the results are as follows:

Visit only Cáceres: 65,9%

Visit other places: 34,1%. The most frequent places are Mérida and Trujillo, followed by Guadalupe and other regions' cities.

The reduced number of valid answers makes it useless to further analyse the data and to extract route preferences.

Question 6: Transport

This question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, the results are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Private (car, motorcycle...): | 71,4% |
| Train: | 14,3% |
| Bus: | 11,9% |

Question 7: Length of stay

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| Just one day: | 37,6% |
| Weekend: | 44,4% |
| 3 days: | 9% |

Question 8: Accommodation

| | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Hotels, Parador: | 62,5% |
| Hostels, B&B: | 22,5% |
| Relative/friends houses: | 12,5% |

Question 9: Shopping

This question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, only 56.1% will buy something. Out of this percentage, 65,2% will buy souvenirs and regional products, while 26,1% specifies that will buy regional food products. of which 28% non-specifically tourist items, 13% souvenirs, and 20%.

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:

Mercado Medieval

Arco Romano del Cristo

Casa de los golfines de abajo

Concatedral de Santa María y museo

Centro de interpretación de Torre del Bujaco y

Muralla

Festival de Teatro Clásico de Junio

Torre de los Sande

Museo Vostell

Palacio de las Veletas

Torre de las cigueñas

Semana Santa

Convento de San Pablo

Iglesia de San Francisco Javier

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 10: Typical or representative elements of Cáceres

This question was affected by Factor A. Concerning the part of the sample that did answer to the question, the results are as follows.

Regarding the first part of the question ("What do you consider most representative of Cáceres?"):

| | |
|---|-------|
| Historic downtown district (built heritage): | 75% |
| Monumental character of the city, architectural value (aspects of built heritage) | 13,9% |

Regarding the second part of the question ("What do you consider as second most representative element of Cáceres?"), the valid answers are very few (also because factor A), only 11,2% of the total number of subjects. Out of this valid percentage, the results are:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Local typical cuisine: | 30% |
| Specific places in the Historic downtown district (built heritage): | 15% |
| Storks (birds): | 15% |

Finally, regarding the third part of the question ("What do you consider as third most representative element of Cáceres?"), the valid answers are even less than before, only few (also because factor A), only 5,6% of the total number of subjects. Out of this valid percentage, the most frequent answer is Local typical cuisine, followed by "Culture and History" and by specific places of the city.

Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer

Sample: 7 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 "Centro de Interpretación y Muralla Torre de Bujaco" and the UAM team. At the beginning this survey was attached to the Survey 2, as second page; they were distributed at the beginning of the visit, and collected at the end. However it was noticed that many subjects answered only survey 2, ignoring survey 4/B, and subsequently it was decided to distribute both surveys separately. When alone, survey 4/B was distributed 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 Cáceres. The most significantly represented segments of audience are the following

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 19 - 24 | 1 | 14,3 |
| | 25 - 39 | 3 | 42,9 |
| | 40 - 64 | 1 | 14,3 |
| | >64 | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Total | 6 | 85,7 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 14,3 |
| Total | | 7 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary School | 2 | 28,6 |
| | High school | 1 | 14,3 |
| | 3-year university | 1 | 14,3 |
| | 5-year university | 3 | 42,9 |
| | Total | 7 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Employees | 5 | 71,4 |
| | Students | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Retired | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Total | 7 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cataluña,Aragón, Valencia,Murcia,Baleares | 1 | 14,3 |
| | 2 Castillas | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Madrid | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 1 | 14,3 |
| | Extremadura | 3 | 42,9 |
| | Total | 7 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Knowledge of the tangible and non tangible Cáceres' Heritage

The most known places are the Cathedral and the WOMAD music festival, followed by the *Concatedral de Santa María y su museo*, and by the *Medieval market* organised once a year. A little bit less known are the *Palacio de las Veletas* and the *Semana Santa* (the Easter celebrations). Much less known are other elements of the city or surrounding area, such as the *Arco Romano del Cristo*, the *Torre de las Cigüeñas*, or the *Museo Vostell*, known by less than half of the sample. Almost unknown elements are the *Torre de los Sande*, the *San Francisco Javier Church*, the *June's Festival de Teatro Clásico* and the *Convento de San Pablo*.

Question 2: Preferences (subjective Heritage valuation)

The WOMAD music festival emerges as the preferred cultural attractor by little less than half of the sample. The reduced number of answers do not permit to reach more detailed conclusions. We can only add that other elements placed somewhere in the preferences list of visitors are the *Concatedral*, the *Palacio de las Veletas*, the *Torre de Bujaco* and the *Iglesia de San Jorge* (although it was not originally included among the list of elements of the questionnaire). Regarding the reasons why these attractors are preferred to others, some of the most frequent are subjective and visual reasons ("pleasure", "beauty", "the panorama"), but there are also (only in one occasion) conceptual reasons "historical/cultural value". Also the "no particular reason" is a frequent answer.

Question 3: Positive surprises

The only elements mentioned, once each, are the are the *Torre de Bujaco*, the Jewish district and the historic downtown in general.

Question 4: Deceiving experiences

Subjects didn't make any remarks about this issue.

Question 5: Cáceres' typical and representative

The following answers are only tendencies, the number of valid answers being extremely reduced. The built heritage aspect, the monumental richness of the city is the common feature of all answers registered. In second and third position we find more varied elements, such as the WOMAD music festival, the local typical cuisine and the *Semana Santa*.

These results suggest that there is no significant difference between the idea of the city that may have a visitor just arrived, and that of a visitor that is in Cáceres since some hours.

Survey 6, Meaning Maps

Sample: 87 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 UAM team in Madrid.

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers < 18 | 44 | 50,6 |
| 19 - 24 | 7 | 8,0 |
| 25 - 39 | 25 | 28,7 |
| 40 - 64 | 10 | 11,5 |
| >64 | 1 | 1,1 |
| Total | 87 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Primary School | 6 | 6,9 |
| High school | 57 | 65,5 |
| 3-year | 11 | 12,6 |

| | | |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| university | | |
| 5-year university | 11 | 12,6 |
| Doctor | 2 | 2,3 |
| Total | 87 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Executives | 3 | 3,4 |
| Employees | 29 | 33,3 |
| Students | 52 | 59,8 |
| Unemployed | 1 | 1,1 |
| Housekeepers | 1 | 1,1 |
| Retired | 1 | 1,1 |
| Total | 87 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 1 | 1,1 |
| Cataluña, Aragón, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares | 3 | 3,4 |
| 2 Castillas | 4 | 4,6 |
| Madrid | 79 | 90,8 |
| Total | 87 | 100,0 |

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 Cáceres.

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 8,26 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 Cáceres is "Nature, landscape, *plein-air* activities", that represents the 24% of the whole meaning map, followed with 14% 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 the *Extremadura* region or being in Spain). The third most important categories are "Built Heritage" and "Regional typical Cuisine", both with 13%. The ranking continues with a category where can be included anything

considered *local* in opposition to *global* "Traditions, folklore, country-life", with 10%. Elements related to "Culture, Art History" represent only 7% of the meaning map of Cáceres, a little bit more than the 6% associated to the category related with the primary sector "agriculture, cattle farming". If we examine more in detail the category "Culture, Art History" we find that the elements that are included (Culture, museums, History, Art, Ancient times, Ruins / Archaeology, ancient Romans, Muslims, Jews) are quite distributed, and none of them is more mentioned than the others. Concerning the "Built Heritage" element, it is composed in equal parts by the "Monumental character and architecture of the downtown" and by the "general and specific monuments and churches".

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 maximum-depth of the Meaning Map of Cáceres is 2,77, which can be considered medium-high

If we analyse the potential tourists of Cáceres 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. For instance, consider the depth of such specific elements as "specific monuments", with an average depth of 1,63, and compare it with the more general category of "Heritage, Architecture", placed at an 1,40. Generally speaking the average position of each category in the meaning map of Cáceres is 1,56.

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 number of links per category in Cáceres is 1,44, and the average total number of links used by every subject is 9,09. 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 1,59 links, while related but more specific elements such as “wine” or “Meat” have an average of 1 link each). For the average visitor, the elements with higher structural relevance are “Art” (with an average of 2,75 links), “Culture” and “Local flora” (both with 2), interest for “near villages and surrounding area” (1,89), “leisure and amusement” (1,88) “Built Heritage” (1,80), “holidays” (1,71), “Agriculture” and “symptoms of economic/cultural backwardness” (both with 1,67) and “Nature and Environment” (1,64).

Objective C – Link between Residents and Heritage

Survey 4/A, Representativeness, Cultural Identity

Sample: 12 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 “Centro de Interpretación y Muralla - Torre de Bujaco” and by the UAM team. At the beginning this survey was attached to the Survey 2, as second page; they were distributed at the beginning of the visit, and collected at the end. However it was noticed that many subjects answered only survey 2, ignoring survey 4/A, and subsequently it was decided to distribute both surveys separately. When alone, survey 4/A was distributed indifferently at the beginning or at the end of the visit.

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers 19 - 24 | 2 | 16,7 |
| 25 - 39 | 6 | 50,0 |
| 40 - 64 | 4 | 33,3 |
| Total | 12 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers High school | 4 | 33,3 |
| 3-year university | 2 | 16,7 |
| 5-year university | 5 | 41,7 |

| | | |
|--------|----|-------|
| Doctor | 1 | 8,3 |
| Total | 12 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 1 | 8,3 |
| Medium managers | 2 | 16,7 |
| Employees | 5 | 41,7 |
| Students | 4 | 33,3 |
| Total | 12 | 100,0 |

Birthplace

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Galicia, Asturias | 1 | 8,3 |
| 2 Castillas | 2 | 16,7 |
| Madrid | 2 | 16,7 |
| Extremadura | 7 | 58,3 |
| Total | 12 | 100,0 |

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 attractors of the city can be divided into two groups: the first is composed by the *Concatedral* and the *Palacio de las Veletas*, known to 100% of the sample. The second group is composed by other buildings or monuments known to more or less the half of the sample; these attractors are, in order from best known to less known, the *Arco Romano del Cristo* and the *San Francisco Javier Church* (75% of sample has been in both places), the *Casa de los Golfines de abajo* and the *Museo Vostell* (58%), the *Torre de las cigueñas* (50%), the *Torre de los Sande* (41%) and the *Convento de San Pablo* (33%). Other buildings not originally included in the list but cited by the audience several times are the *Santiago Church* and the *Palacio Carvajal*.

Question 2: Recent Visits (in the last year)

The most visited place of all Cáceres is the *Concatedral* (visited by 83% of sample), followed by the *Arco del Cristo*, the *museo Vostell* and the *Palacio de las Veletas* (all visited only by 50%). Under the threshold of 50% of visits we find the *Torre de las cigueñas* and the *San*

Francisco Javier Church. The less frequented place of Cáceres are the *Casa de los Golfines de abajo*, the *Torre de los Sande* and the *Convento de San Pablo* (all below the 20%).

Concerning the reasons of these visits, some of the most frequent explanations are "Historical/Cultural value", "show friends/relatives", or "Beauty/pleasure". The places that are associated to more reasons to visit them are the *Concatedral*, the *Museo Vostell*, the *Palacio de las Veletas* and the *Arco del Cristo*.

Question 3: Preferences

The results of the analysis suggest that the preferred element in Cáceres is the *Palacio de las Veletas*, with its underground Arab water-tank (the *Aljibe*), because it is considered unique and particularly representative. Secondly we find the *Concatedral* and other buildings located in the historic downtown area (*casa de los Golfines*, *Torre de las Cigueñas*, *San Pablo* and *San Francisco Javier Churches*). The *Vostell Museum* and the Jewish downtown district also appear to be quite popular, because a small part of the sample would choose them to finish a hypothetical visit to Cáceres, respectively because of the views and the Historical/Heritage value.

Question 4: Representativeness

The results, though approximate because of the reduced sample, suggest that the resident's idea about their city is strongly attached to the historic downtown district, with its rich built heritage, and is followed closely by specific attractors such as the *Concatedral* and the *Aljibe* of the *Palacio de las Veletas*. We can therefore conclude that the most representative aspect of the city, from the resident's point of view, is its built heritage and monumental richness, because it is unique and representative of the town.

It is not possible to define clearly a second and third representative element. We can say that, together with other elements that belong to the built heritage of the city, we find also intangible attractors, such as local typical cuisine (rather frequently), Culture and History, the *Semana Santa*, and the lively atmosphere of Cáceres' streets and squares.

The cultural offer in detail

The evaluation of the quality of the specific cultural offer of Ciudad Real has considered one element: the **Centro de Interpretación y Muralla – Torre de Bujaco**. 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.**

Case 1: Centro de Interpretación y Muralla – Torre de Bujaco

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 personnel of the Centre and the UAM team. 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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 19 - 24 | 3 | 7,9 |
| | 25 - 39 | 18 | 47,4 |
| | 40 - 64 | 11 | 28,9 |
| | >64 | 5 | 13,2 |
| | Total | 37 | 97,4 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 2,6 |
| Total | | 38 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary School | 2 | 5,3 |
| | High school | 17 | 44,7 |
| | 3-year university | 5 | 13,2 |
| | 5-year university | 12 | 31,6 |
| | Doctor | 1 | 2,6 |
| | Total | 37 | 97,4 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 2,6 |
| Total | | 38 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 2 | 5,3 |
| Executives | 1 | 2,6 |
| Medium managers | 7 | 18,4 |
| Employees | 18 | 47,4 |
| Students | 5 | 13,2 |
| Housekeepers | 1 | 2,6 |
| Retired | 4 | 10,5 |
| Total | 38 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| Galicia, Asturias | 1 | 2,6 |
| Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 1 | 2,6 |
| Cataluña, Aragón, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares | 6 | 15,8 |
| 2 Castillas | 5 | 13,2 |
| Madrid | 8 | 21,1 |
| Andalucía, Ceuta, Melilla | 8 | 21,1 |
| Extremadura | 7 | 18,4 |
| No europeos | 1 | 2,6 |
| Total | 37 | 97,4 |
| Lost answers | 1 | 2,6 |
| Total | 38 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Previous knowledge about the Cáceres Wall, before the visit.

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| No idea | 52,6% |
| Some historical / cultural notions | 28,9% |

Question 2: Learning Expectations.

| | |
|---|-------|
| History of the City | 24,5% |
| History of the Wall | 18% |
| Enjoy nice views (panorama) | 13% |
| Learn details and trivia about the construction | 8,1% |
| Trivia about palaces and monuments of the city | 8,1% |
| Information about the culture, and every day's life at the time | 6,5% |
| Details about the conservation and restoration of the wall | 1,6% |

Question 3: Ideal Visitor.

Half of the sample believes that this Visitors Centre is a cultural offer that may be of interest for everybody. 34,2% believes it is a place for people with special interest in the subject.

Question 4: Reasons of the visit

There is a 31,6% that came moved by a specific interest, to learn things, while 21,1% are general tourists that consider the Visitor Centre a part of their visit to Cáceres. The remaining sample is composed of people that came by chance (13,6%), were brought here in their guided tour (10,5%), or heard good things about the place (another 10,5%). 5,3% came only for the views.

Question 5: Depth of knowledge about the painter.

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Scarce knowledge | 36,8% |
| General knowledge | 47,4% |

Question 6: Content expectations

| | |
|--|-------|
| No idea/didn't answer | 28,9% |
| Objects (mainly weapons) | 23,7% |
| Written info about fortifications and medieval military architecture | 18,4% |
| A/V installation | 7,9% |
| Nice view-point | 7,9% |
| Architecture of the tower | 5,3% |

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 visit to the Centre and the Wall, 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 | 2,3 |
| Entrance fee | 1,2 |
| Access to the facilities | 2 |
| Opening hours | 2,3 |
| Enhanced part of the Wall | 2,1 |
| Visitor Centre | 2,1 |
| Hanging and museography | 2,1 |
| Written information | 2,3 |

Question 8: Preferences

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| The views | 50% |
|-----------|-----|

| | |
|---|-------|
| The preservation of the architecture inside the tower | 23,7% |
| General state of preservation | 7,9% |
| The content | 2,6% |

Question 9: Problems

| | |
|--|-------|
| The museum is satisfactory | 26,3% |
| The enhanced part of the Wall is too short | 23,7% |
| The texts and didactic apparatus should be improved (they are not interesting) | 8,3% |
| There are no real objects exhibited | 15,8% |

Question 10: Fidelisation

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| This is the first visit | 90% |
| Has already been here | 10% |

Those who repeat the visit do it for second time, and they came back to enjoy the views.

Survey 5, Absolute valuation

Sample: 22 subjects.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the Visitor Centre and the UAM team at the exit.

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| 19 - 24 | 1 | 4,5 |
| 25 - 39 | 11 | 50,0 |
| 40 - 64 | 8 | 36,4 |
| >64 | 2 | 9,1 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| High school | 11 | 50,0 |
| 3-year university | 1 | 4,5 |
| 5-year university | 7 | 31,8 |
| Doctor | 1 | 4,5 |
| Total | 20 | 90,9 |
| Lost answers | 2 | 9,1 |
| Total | 22 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Medium managers | 4 | 18,2 |
| | Employees | 14 | 63,6 |
| | Students | 1 | 4,5 |
| | Housekeepers | 1 | 4,5 |
| | Retired | 2 | 9,1 |
| | Total | 22 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 1 | 4,5 |
| | Cataluña, Aragón, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares | 2 | 9,1 |
| | 2 Castillas | 5 | 22,7 |
| | Madrid | 4 | 18,2 |
| | Andalucía, Ceuta, Melilla | 5 | 22,7 |
| | Extremadura | 3 | 13,6 |
| | Canarias, europeos | 2 | 9,1 |
| | Total | 22 | 100,0 |

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

Other museums: 81,8% declares to know other defensive Walls.

Position of the Visitor Centre and Wall:

The Visitor Centre and Wall appears once in the highest position (10), three times in position 9 (the second higher), once in position 8, three times in position 7, once in 3, once in 2 and five times in position 1 (the lowest position). The average position is 5,3 (maximum is 10). The subjects justify their positive valuations because of the good state of conservation, for the enhancement of the tower as a visitor centre, and for the views. Negative valuations are justified by the entrance fee, and for the little part of the wall that can be visited.

Position of similar venues:

Other venues mentioned by the visitors are European (Rome, Lisbon), non-European (China, Jerusalem), and Spanish (Avila, Almería, Badajoz, Carmona, Cartagena, Elvas, Gerona, Lugo y Pamplona). One of the most cited is the Wall of Ávila, mentioned five times in position 10 (the highest), twice in position 9 and one time in position 7. In the highest position we find also the

Chinese Great Wall (twice), and the Walls of Jerusalem, Rome, Castillo de San Jorge in Lisbon, Lugo, Gerona, Badajoz and Pamplona. In position 9, together with Ávila and Cáceres we find also the Carmona Wall; in position 7, again together with Ávila and Cáceres, there is Elvas' Wall; in position 4 we find the Cartagena's Wall; finally, in position 1, the lowest, together with the Cáceres' wall mentioned five times we find the Wall of Almeria. The average position of all these venues is 9,4. The reasons given to justify the highest positions are usually related to the length of the enhanced part of the wall, or the monumental, imposing aspect of the wall. Negative opinions regarding the Almeria's Wall are a consequence of their bad conservation.

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

Survey 3, Knowledge Acquisition

Sample: 11 subjects.

Technique: Self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the Visitor Centre and the UAM team at the exit.

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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 19 - 24 | 2 | 18,2 |
| | 25 - 39 | 3 | 27,3 |
| | 40 - 64 | 3 | 27,3 |
| | >64 | 2 | 18,2 |
| | Total | 10 | 90,9 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 9,1 |
| Total | | 11 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary School | 1 | 9,1 |
| | High school | 2 | 18,2 |
| | 3-year university | 2 | 18,2 |
| | 5-year university | 4 | 36,4 |
| | Doctor | 1 | 9,1 |
| | Total | 10 | 90,9 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 9,1 |

| | | |
|-------|----|-------|
| Total | 11 | 100,0 |
|-------|----|-------|

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 1 | 9,1 |
| Medium managers | 4 | 36,4 |
| Employees | 3 | 27,3 |
| Students | 2 | 18,2 |
| Retired | 1 | 9,1 |
| Total | 11 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 2 | 18,2 |
| | 2 Castillas | 2 | 18,2 |
| | Madrid | 1 | 9,1 |
| | Andalucía, Ceuta, Melilla | 1 | 9,1 |
| | Extremadura | 4 | 36,4 |
| | Total | 10 | 90,9 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 9,1 |
| Total | | 11 | 100,0 |

Survey design: Ten questions about the comprehension and understanding of the information texts about the history of Cáceres, installed in the Visitor Centre. Four possible answers are offered, only one being correct.

Questions 1-10: The average of correct answers is 7 (maximum is 10). Even if the sample is too small to provide definitive results, there seems to be confirmed the rule that the more instruction level of the subject, the more correct answers. However, there are significant exceptions, of subjects with low instruction level and high ratio of correct answers, and of subjects with high instruction level and a mediocre ratio of correct answers. This element suggests that the number of correct answers depends first of all on the fact that the subject has read the panels, and secondly on his general culture. This hypothesis, reinforced by the declaration of some subjects that have stated on their questionnaires that they didn't read all the panels, leads us to two conclusions: the first is that the texts are written in a clear and accessible way, but (second conclusion) the way they are presented in a way (panel with illustrations) and a number that discourage their complete reading.

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 Centro de Interpretación y Muralla.

Question 10: Awareness of the Wall

28% of visitors knew about the Visitor Centre and Wall by personal recommendations (family/friends), or arrived there by chance (26%). The remnant part of the sample is well distributed between those who came advised by the guided-tours personnel at the Plaza Mayor (13%), those who read about the centre on the newspapers (10%), those who knew about this place at the tourist information centres (10%), and those who read about the visitor centre and Wall in Internet (8%).

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: 14 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 and the UAM team, at the exit.

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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 19 - 24 | 2 | 14,3 |
| | 25 - 39 | 6 | 42,9 |
| | 40 - 64 | 5 | 35,7 |
| | Total | 13 | 92,9 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 7,1 |
| Total | | 14 | 100,0 |

Instruction level

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary School | 1 | 7,1 |
| | High school | 3 | 21,4 |
| | 3-year university | 1 | 7,1 |
| | 5-year university | 6 | 42,9 |
| | master | 1 | 7,1 |
| | Doctor | 1 | 7,1 |
| | Total | 13 | 92,9 |
| Lost answers | . | 1 | 7,1 |
| Total | | 14 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Executives | 2 | 14,3 |
| | Medium managers | 2 | 14,3 |
| | Employees | 4 | 28,6 |
| | Students | 4 | 28,6 |
| | Retired | 1 | 7,1 |
| | Total | 1 | 7,1 |
| | Total | 14 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cantabria,Pais Vasco, La Rioja | 1 | 7,1 |
| | 2 Castillas | 3 | 21,4 |
| | Madrid | 2 | 14,3 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 1 | 7,1 |
| | Extremadura | 6 | 42,9 |
| | Total | 13 | 92,9 |
| | Lost answers | . | 1 |
| Total | | 14 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Signposts to get there

The sample is divided, 50% thinks the Visitor Centre and Wall access is easy to find, and 43% believes it isn't. One visitor has remarked that the problem of the centre is that it doesn't transmit a clear idea of its content, so people does not get in.

Question 2: Transport

64% of visitors get to this part of the downtown by private car or by foot.

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

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Security | 2,5 |
| Traffic | 2,3 |
| Cleanliness of streets and façades | 2,4 |
| Public transport | 1,1 |
| Parking areas | 1,4 |

Question 4: Preferences or problems

A frequent positive comment regards the beauty of the historic downtown district. Concerning the complaints, two visitors remark that the aspect of the main square and some near buildings could be improved. The other critics are against the Visitor Centre and the Wall: some complaint of the entrance fee, some regret that the accessible part of the wall is too small, some miss information in other languages.

Question 5: Aesthetical Integration

100% of the sample consider that the Visitor Centre is well integrated with the architecture of the surrounding buildings.

Question 6: Cultural Integration

All the sample think that the cultural offer of this Visitor Centre is well integrated with the city's cultural offer.

Question 7: Urban Integration

35% of visitors is resident in Cáceres. Out of this percentage, 80% believes Visitor Centre itself and the small enhanced part of the Wall are not an important point of reference from the urbanism point of view.

General conclusions

The tourists who visit Cáceres have a clearly cultural motivation, focused on the built heritage offer of the city, the historic downtown district. More than half of the visitors organize the trip asking information to relatives or friends. Most of the visitors come only to see Cáceres, although 33,3% of the sample visit also Mérida and Trujillo. The car is still the favourite transport. The overnight stays ratio is good, a little less than half of the sample spends the weekend in the city, and only 33,3% come and go in the same day; the Hotel is the accommodation of a little less than two thirds of the polled subjects. Visitors buy mainly souvenirs and gastronomic typical products.

Regarding the image that Cáceres transmits of itself, it is necessary to distinguish between potential visitors, real visitors and residents. Concerning the first group, the potential tourists, their representation of the city is characterized by the strong presence of the "Nature / Environment" element. Secondly, with almost the same percentage, we find the categories of "Local typical cuisine", " Built Heritage" and "Traditions, folklore, rural Life". Also "Culture, Art and History" appear, although their weight in the entire representation is quite scarce.

Concerning the real tourists, we can distinguish between those who have just arrived and those who have already begun their visit to the city. The first ones think that the most typical element of Cáceres is the historic downtown district in general, followed by the local typical cuisine.

The second kind of visitors has a very similar opinion, they think that the most representative thing in Cáceres is the monumental aspect of the downtown, followed by other elements such as the WOMAD, the local typical cuisine and Easter celebrations (*Semana Santa*). It is interesting to notice how the value attributed to the built heritage offer does not comprise a corresponding knowledge of the specific monuments and buildings that constitute the above mentioned offer. For instance, the conclusion of the analysis suggest that the WOMAD music festival is more familiar than the *Palacio de las Veletas* and his *aljibe*, or than other important buildings of the downtown district.

This information suggests an important division between the potential tourists, who ignore the importance and uniqueness of the old town of Cáceres, and the real tourists, who come to Cáceres knowing in advance what they are going to see (and attracted precisely for this Built Heritage offer).

If we focus on the image that residents have of their own city we can see that the most familiar and frequented built heritage and cultural attractors are the *Concatedral*, the *Palacio de las veletas*, *el Arco del Cristo* and, already in the outskirts of the city, the *Museum Vostell*. Regarding the most representative or emblematic of Cáceres, the richness of the built heritage is in the first place, followed by the intangible heritage, such as the local typical cuisine, and the celebration and Holidays and local traditions.

We can conclude that the image that the tourists and the residents have of the city is almost equivalent.

Let's examine in detail the evaluation of one of the elements of cultural attraction that constitute the offer of the city, the Centre of Interpretation and Wall - Tower of Bujaco.

More than the half of the visitors come to the wall ignoring everything about it. They expect to learn some history of the city, of the wall and hope to enjoy the sights. Not all visitors think that this attractor is suitable for a general audience, actually 33% comes moved by specific interest. 25% would like to see real objects exhibited, and 20% hopes to see informative panels.

The audience judges the visit as "Good", although the entrance fee is considered to be excessive. What people most enjoy are the sights, and what they dislike the most is the little enhanced part of the wall (they consider it too short), the absence of a real collection, and the panels with the history of the city. The information, although interesting and well written, it is presented in a way that does not invite to the reading, and is too extensive. Only 10% of subjects repeat visit. Compared with other walls, the overall evaluation of Cáceres Wall results quite modest.

The promotion of the Wall is not adequate enough, since the visitors come mainly by chance or by personal recommendation.

The Centre of Interpretation and Wall isn't signposted adequately, nor from the point of view of the physical situation nor from the point of view of its content. People doesn't know it, and is underexploited if we consider the privileged position where it is located.

Proposals

The management of the tourism and cultural offer of Cáceres, though quite satisfactory, might still be improved by several actions some of them more general, some of them more specific.

At general level, from the point of view of the image of the city, the promotion should keep on reinforcing aspects related to the built heritage and to other cultural intangible elements such as the local typical cuisine and the traditions, in order to attract more tourists interested in cultural offer.

Concerning specific elements of the cultural offer, it is also possible to suggest some improvements. Regarding the *Centro de Interpretación y Muralla – Torre de Bujaco*, it would be necessary to transform its image to make it appealing to a wider audience. It would also be interesting to enrich its content with some pieces, and to improve the information support (improving the look of the panels, or adding audio-visual, dioramas, guided visits with disguised actors). Another action that would have a good impact would be the enhancement of a longer stretch of wall, or the reduction of the entrance fee. Talking about the promotion, it would be necessary to advertise more the Centre, and to indicate in a more efficient way its position and its content. It would also be useful to dynamise it with activities, in order to make it more familiar to people, so that they can consider it an important cultural resource for the city.