

PICTURE



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

Case Study

Real Monasterio de Santa María de Guadalupe

Task n° **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 n° SSP1-CT-2003-502491



Table of content

| | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| The town of Guadalupe and its monastery, in the Cultural Tourism offer of Extremadura region | 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 | 6 |
| Survey 1, Visitor Profile, Question 9 | 7 |
| Tarea 4/b, Prototipicidad de la oferta | Erreur ! Signet non défini. |
| Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer | 8 |
| Objective C – Link between Extremadura’s Residents and Heritage | 11 |
| Survey 4/A, Representativeness, Cultural Identity | 11 |
| The cultural offer in detail | 14 |
| The Real Monasterio de Santa María de Guadalupe | 15 |
| Objective A – Evaluate the level of expectations and previous knowledge of the audience, before the visit. | 15 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, first part | 15 |
| Objective B – Level of satisfaction, preferences, opinions and fidelisation, after the visit. | 17 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, second part | 17 |
| Survey 5, Absolute valuation | 18 |
| Objective C - Level of comprehension of the information offered at the venue | 20 |
| Objective D - Level of visibility of the venue evaluated, among the offer of the city (strategies of marketing and communication) | 21 |
| Survey 2, Expectations/Impact, Question 10 | 21 |
| 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 | 21 |
| Survey 7, Integration in city | 21 |
| Conclusiones generales | Erreur ! Signet non défini. |
| Propuestas | Erreur ! Signet non défini. |
| General conclusions | 24 |
| Proposals | 26 |

Case Study: Real Monasterio de Santa María de Guadalupe

The main objective of this case study is to evaluate the quality of the cultural offer of the Royal Monastery of Santa María of Guadalupe.

The team of the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid has approached the study as a cultural offer on its own, and as a part of the Extremadura Region cultural offer.

The surveys have been conducted between September 2005 and January 2006.

There have been used 5 surveys.

We have worked with 4 techniques: questionnaires, self-distributed questionnaires, multiple answer questionnaires and scales of preferences.

The total sample was 217 subjects.

The town of Guadalupe and its monastery, in the Cultural Tourism offer of Extremadura region

The evaluation of the cultural offer of the region 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 region, 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 region, to identify the elements that are regarded as most typical and representative of it.**

Objective A – Real Visitor Profile

Survey 1, Visitor Profile

Sample: 96 subjects

Technique: Questionnaire and self-distributed questionnaires offered to visitors by the personnel of the *Monasterio de Guadalupe*.

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers < 18 | 1 | 1,0 |
| 19 - 24 | 5 | 5,2 |
| 25 - 39 | 27 | 28,1 |
| 40 - 64 | 47 | 49,0 |
| >64 | 8 | 8,3 |
| Didn't answer | 8 | 8,3 |
| Total | 96 | 100,0 |

Instruction

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Primary studies | 10 | 10,4 |
| High School | 21 | 21,9 |
| 3-years university | 31 | 32,3 |
| 5-years university | 24 | 25,0 |
| Didn't answer | 10 | 10,4 |
| Total | 86 | 89,6 |
| Total | 96 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers Executives | 4 | 4,2 |
| Medium managers | 3 | 3,1 |
| Employees | 62 | 64,6 |
| Students | 3 | 3,1 |

| | | |
|---------------|----|-------|
| Housekeepers | 5 | 5,2 |
| Retired | 6 | 6,3 |
| Didn't answer | 13 | 13,5 |
| Total | 96 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| Galicia, Asturias | 6 | 6,3 |
| Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 5 | 5,2 |
| Cataluña, Aragón, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares | 30 | 31,3 |
| 2 Castillas | 7 | 7,3 |
| Madrid | 19 | 19,8 |
| Andalucía, Ceuta, Melilla | 16 | 16,7 |
| Extremadura | 4 | 4,2 |
| Canarias, europeos | 2 | 2,1 |
| No europeos | 1 | 1,0 |
| Didn't answer | 6 | 6,3 |
| Total | 90 | 93,8 |
| Total | 96 | 100,0 |

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

Know the city: 63,5% is visiting the city for the first time.

Question 1: Reason of the visit

| | |
|--|-------|
| Tourism in general: | 39,6% |
| Specific interest for Art, History, Culture: | 18,8% |
| Religion: | 16,7% |

Question 2: Visit planning schedule

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Less than 1 month: | 41,7% |
| More than 6 months: | 28,1% |
| Improvised (less than 1 week) | 7,3% |

Question 3: Visit organisation habits

| | |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Do not organise the visit: | 37,5% |
| Family/Friends: | 28,1% |
| Internet: | 15,6% |
| Guidebooks: | 13,5% |

Question 4: Visits to other places

Visit only Guadalupe: 33,3%

Visit other places: 66,7%. Out of this partial percentage, 65% go to Cáceres, 60% go to Trujillo, 53% go to Mérida. Less popular, but still significant destinations, are Plasencia (19%), Badajoz (9%), Yuste and Valle del Jerte (both with 8%)

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 2,9 places, while tourists from the two *Castilla* regions and Madrid visit on average of only 1,4. Provenance isn't associated to any route in special, the most frequent circuit touches the three most visited cities, Cáceres, Trujillo and Mérida.

Question 5: Transport

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Private (car, motorcycle...): | 89,6% |
| Bus: | 10,4% |

Question 6: Length of stay

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Between 4 and 8 days: | 52,5% |
| Just one day: | 19,8% |
| 2 or 3 days: | 13,5% |

Question 7: Accommodation

| | |
|--|-------|
| Hotels or Parador: | 71,2% |
| Hostels, B&B: | 11,2% |
| Their own place, or relative/friends houses: | 11,2% |

Question 8: Shopping

Will buy something: 59,4%. Out of this percentage 61% will buy general souvenirs, while 26% looks specifically for religious souvenirs.

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:

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Cáceres | Plasencia |
| Monasterio Guadalupe | Valencia de Alcantara |
| Parque natural de Monfrague | Monasterio Yuste |
| Badajoz | Mérida |
| Valle del Jerte | Las Hurdes |
| Trujillo | Festival de teatro de Mérida |
| Olivenza | The Easter celebrations (<i>Semana Santa</i>), in any Extremadura city |
| Zafra | |

Survey 1, Visitor Profile, Question 9

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 Extremadura region among its real, actual visitors.

Question 9: Elements typical or representative of Extremadura

The answers are very scattered, however it is possible to regroup them in four main thematic domains: Built heritage, Cultural Heritage, Natural Heritage and specific cities.

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

| | |
|---|-------|
| Monuments and art: | 20,8% |
| Guadalupe: | 16,7% |
| Mérida: | 10,4% |
| Cáceres: | 10,4% |
| Historical/Cultural heritage of the region: | 10,4% |
| Local typical cuisine: | 9,4% |

Regarding the second part of the question ("What do you consider as the second most representative element of Extremadura?") the results are even more scattered:

| | |
|---|-------|
| Guadalupe: | 12,5% |
| Local typical cuisine: | 12,5% |
| Mérida: | 10,4% |
| Cáceres: | 9,4% |
| Nature/Environment | 8,3% |
| Historical/Cultural heritage of the region: | 7,3% |
| Monuments and art: | 6,3% |

Finally, regarding the third part of the question ("What do you consider as third most representative element of Extremadura?"), only 67% answered. The results are as scattered as in the previous points:

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| Guadalupe: | 7,3% |
| Local typical cuisine: | 5,2% |
| Mérida: | 9,4% |
| Cáceres: | 10,4% |
| Nature/Environment | 10,4% |
| Local inhabitants | 6,3% |

The conclusion is that the most representative element of Extremadura for the tourists that have just arrived to the city is its artistic and monumental richness, particularly represented in

Mérida, Cáceres and Guadalupe. Also typical, but less important, the Historical/Cultural Heritage, the local cuisine and the region's natural Environment.

Survey 4/B, Prototypicity of the offer

Sample: 24 subjects. Because of the reduced number of the sample, the following results are to be considered just tendencies.

Technique: Questionnaire and self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the *Monasterio de Guadalupe* 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 | Didn't answer | 1 | 4,2 |
| | 19 - 24 | 1 | 4,2 |
| | 25 - 39 | 10 | 41,7 |
| | 40 - 64 | 12 | 50,0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100,0 |

Instruction

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary studies | 1 | 4,2 |
| | High School | 8 | 33,3 |
| | 3-years university | 4 | 16,7 |
| | 5-years university | 10 | 41,7 |
| | Total | 23 | 95,8 |
| Didn't answer | . | 1 | 4,2 |
| Total | | 24 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | 2 | 8,3 |
| | Executives | 1 | 4,2 |
| | Employees | 17 | 70,8 |

| | | |
|--------------|----|-------|
| Students | 1 | 4,2 |
| Housekeepers | 1 | 4,2 |
| Retired | 2 | 8,3 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cataluña,Aragón, Valencia,Murcia,Baleares | 4 | 16,7 |
| | 2 Castillas | 3 | 12,5 |
| | Madrid | 10 | 41,7 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 5 | 20,8 |
| | Canarias, europeos | 1 | 4,2 |
| | Total | 23 | 95,8 |
| | Didn't answer | 1 | 4,2 |
| Total | 24 | 100,0 | |

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

Question 1: Knowledge of the tangible and non tangible Heritage

The analysis of the answers suggests that the visitor's knowledge of Extremadura's Heritage is quite good. The best known places, both personally or by having heard of them, are Cáceres (92% of subjects), Trujillo and Mérida (both known to 83%), Yuste (80%) and Zafra (75%). The less known places are the Cáceres' Eastern celebrations (known by just 41% of subjects), Alcántara and Olivenza (both known only by 50%).

Question 2: Preferences (subjective Heritage valuation)

The elements that emerge as preferred by the subjects are Cáceres, Mérida, Guadalupe, Trujillo and the Monastery of Yuste. The most frequent reasons are "Art and Monuments", "Culture and History", "beauty", "Religion". It is also frequent, however, the lack of specific reasons, and we find also negative reasons, such as "scarce aesthetical value", referred to the city of Badajoz.

Question 3: Positive surprises

The only elements mentioned are the "castles", "Works of Art" and "Trujillo".

Question 4: Deceiving experiences

Visitors didn't mention any deceiving element or experience in the offer of Extremadura.

Question 5: Extremadura typical and representative

Due to the way the questionnaires have been distributed, the tourists that answered this question are the same kind (real tourists just arrived to the monastery) that that answered question 9 of survey 1. Results are therefore very similar:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Didn't answer | 33% |
| Monuments and art: | 17% |
| Guadalupe: | 12% |
| Mérida: | 8% |
| Calm, relax: | 8% |
| Historical/Cultural heritage of the region: | 8% |

Regarding the second part of the question ("What do you consider as the second most representative element of Extremadura?") the results are:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Didn't answer | 33% |
| Cáceres: | 17% |
| Historical/Cultural heritage of the region: | 12% |
| Local typical cuisine: | 8% |

Finally, regarding the third part of the question ("What do you consider as third most representative element of Extremadura?"), only 67% answered. The results are as scattered as in the previous points:

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| Didn't answer | 37% |
| Local typical cuisine: | 12,5% |
| Mérida: | 8% |
| Cáceres: | 8% |
| Nature/Environment | 8% |

The results are very similar to those of question 9 of survey 1: that the most representative element of Extremadura is its artistic and monumental richness, that can be found particularly in cities as Mérida, Cáceres and Guadalupe. Other important elements are the Historical/Cultural Heritage, the local cuisine and the region's natural Environment.

Objective C – Link between Extremadura’s Residents and Heritage

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

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Cáceres | Zafra |
| Monasterio Guadalupe | Plasencia |
| Parque natural de Monfrague | Valencia de Alcantara |
| Badajoz | Monasterio Yuste |
| Valle del Jerte | Mérida |
| Trujillo | Las Hurdes |
| Olivenza | |

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 *Monasterio de Guadalupe* before the visit.

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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Didn't answer | 3 | 30,0 |
| | < 18 | 2 | 20,0 |
| | 19 - 24 | 1 | 10,0 |
| | 25 - 39 | 3 | 30,0 |
| | 40 - 64 | 1 | 10,0 |
| | Total | 10 | 100,0 |

Instruction

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary studies | 1 | 10,0 |
| | High School | 3 | 30,0 |
| | 3-years university | 1 | 10,0 |
| | 5-years university | 2 | 20,0 |

| | | |
|---------------|----|-------|
| Total | 7 | 70,0 |
| Didn't answer | 3 | 30,0 |
| Total | 10 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 3 | 30,0 |
| Employees | 4 | 40,0 |
| Students | 3 | 30,0 |
| Total | 10 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| Cáceres province | 2 | 20,0 |
| Badajoz province | 5 | 50,0 |
| Total | 7 | 70,0 |
| Didn't answer | 3 | 30,0 |
| Total | 10 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Heritage knowledge

Knowledge of the region appears to be medium: most known elements are Cáceres, Mérida, Jerte Valley and Plasencia (80% has been there), followed by Badajoz, Yuste and Trujillo (70%) and by Monfragüe and Zafra with 60%. Less known places are Olivenza and the area of Hurdes (by 40%), and *Valencia de Alcántara* (by 30%).

Question 2: Recent Visits (in the last year)

Guadalupe was visited last year by 70% of sample. Other cities are much less frequented, they have all been visited by less than 30%. This percentage falls down to 10% in the case of Monfragüe, Olivenza and Plasencia. Finally, *Valencia de Alcántara* and the *Hurdes* area haven't been visited by anybody in the last year.

Concerning the reasons for these visits, some of the most frequent are "Monument and Art", "Historical/cultural value", "work reasons", "Nature/Environment", "Beauty", and "To have

some rest". The place that evokes more kinds of reasons is Guadalupe (five different kinds of reasons), followed by Trujillo (three different kinds of reasons).

Question 3: Preferences

It appears clearly that the favourite built heritage element in Extremadura is Mérida, mentioned as preferred by 40% of the sample, because of its "Monuments and Art", and followed by Guadalupe (due to its "Historical/Cultural Value") and Trujillo (due to its generic tourist interest), both preferred by 20%. The less popular places are Badajoz, *Valencia de Alcántara* and the *Hurdes* area, considered non-interesting or unprepared for tourism. Also quite ignored are Monfragüe, Olivenza, Zafra, and Yuste.

Question 4: Representativeness

The results, though approximate because of the reduced sample, suggest that the resident's idea about their region is quite structured. Actually, in first position we find Mérida and Cáceres, respectively because their "Monuments and Art richness" and its "Historical/Cultural Value" & "Beauty". Secondly, we find again Mérida, y Guadalupe, both because of their "Historical/Cultural Value" & "Beauty". Finally, in third position we find Monfragüe y Trujillo, respectively due to the "Nature/Environment" and the "Beauty" of these places.

The cultural offer in detail

The evaluation of the quality of the specific cultural offer of Guadalupe has considered its most representative element: the Monastery. 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 Real Monasterio de Santa María de Guadalupe

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 and self-distributed questionnaire distributed by the personnel of the Monastery. 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 of the Monastery collects the questionnaires at the exit of the visit.

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 2 | 5,3 |
| Didn't answer | 3 | 7,9 |
| < 18 | 2 | 5,3 |
| 19 - 24 | 18 | 47,4 |
| 25 - 39 | 13 | 34,2 |
| 40 - 64 | 38 | 100,0 |
| Total | | |

Instruction

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 4 | 10,5 |
| Primary studies | 12 | 31,6 |
| High School | 6 | 15,8 |
| 3-years university | 13 | 34,2 |
| 5-years university | 35 | 92,1 |
| Total | 3 | 7,9 |
| Didn't answer | 38 | 100,0 |
| Total | | |

Occupation

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | 4 | 10,5 |
| Executives | 3 | 7,9 |
| Employees | 26 | 68,4 |
| Students | 3 | 7,9 |
| Housekeepers | 1 | 2,6 |
| Retired | 1 | 2,6 |
| Total | 38 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| Galicia, Asturias | 2 | 5,3 |
| Cantabria, País Vasco, La Rioja | 2 | 5,3 |
| Cataluña, Aragón, Valencia, Murcia, Baleares | 9 | 23,7 |
| 2 Castillas | 4 | 10,5 |
| Madrid | 9 | 23,7 |
| Andalucía, Ceuta , Melilla | 6 | 15,8 |
| Extremadura | 2 | 5,3 |
| Canarias, europeos | 2 | 5,3 |
| Total | 36 | 94,7 |
| Didn't answer | 2 | 5,3 |
| Total | 38 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Previous knowledge about the Monastery

| | |
|---|-------|
| Know something about its artistic, monumental or cultural value | 39,5% |
| No idea | 31,6% |
| Spiritual of religious aspects | 23,7% |
| Details about the Monastery's History | 5,3% |

Question 2: Learning expectations

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Historical and Cultural aspects | 31,6% |
| Artistic and Monumental aspects | 31,6% |
| Religious aspects and monastic life | 13,2% |

Question 3: Ideal Visitor.

Only 36,8% of the sample thinks that the Monastery is a cultural offer appealing to all the people in general. The remnant believes it is a place for people with special interest in Culture/History (21,1%), Monuments/Art (10,5%), Religion (13,2%) or belonging to specific cultural or age segments.

Question 4: Reasons of the visit

There is a 47,4% that came to the Monastery for general tourism. The remnant part of the sample came for specific reasons, such as interest in Culture/History (13,2%), leisure and rest (10,5%), Religion (7,9%) or interest in Art and Built Heritage in general (5,3%).

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

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| No idea | 0% |
| Scarce knowledge | 28,9% |
| General knowledge | 55,3% |
| Good knowledge | 15,8% |
| Expert | 0% |

Question 6: Content expectations

| | |
|---|-------|
| Objects, documents related with Culture and History | 23,7% |
| Artworks | 15,8% |
| Spirituality, religious atmosphere | 10,5% |
| Don't know/Didn't answer | 26,3% |

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: 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 |
| Sacristia (Monastery's treasure) | 2,8 |
| Art collection | 2,7 |
| Church | 2,7 |
| Manuscripts | 2,6 |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Embroided clothes | 2,6 |
| Hanging and museography | 2 |
| Entrance fee | 2 |
| Written information | 2 |
| Opening hours | 2 |

Question 8: Preferences

| | |
|--|-------|
| <i>Sacristia</i> (Monastery's treasure) preferred by | 34,2% |
| Guadalupe Virgin shrine | 10,5% |
| Cloister | 10,5% |
| Zurbaran's paintings | 2,6% |

Question 9: Problems

| | |
|---|-------|
| Didn't answer / No problems | 72% |
| Would have liked to assist to real monastic life scenes | 10,5% |
| Would have liked to find more information in general, and particularly about the artworks | 10,5% |

Question 10: Fidelisation

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| This is the first visit | 68,2% |
| Has already been here | 31,8% |

Those who repeat the visit do it for general tourism reasons (41,7%), to recall what they learnt in previous occasions (33,3%) or to see again the artworks exhibited here (8,3%).

Question 11: Activities

Nobody has joined any of the activities organised in the Monastery.

Survey 5, Absolute valuation

Sample: 15 subjects.

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

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

Segments of age

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Didn't answer | 5 | 33,3 |
| | 25 - 39 | 6 | 40,0 |
| | 40 - 64 | 4 | 26,7 |
| | Total | 15 | 100,0 |

Instruction

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary studies | 2 | 13,3 |
| | High School | 4 | 26,7 |
| | 5-years university | 3 | 20,0 |
| | Total | 9 | 60,0 |
| Didn't answer | . | 6 | 40,0 |
| Total | | 15 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Employees | 5 | 33,3 |
| | Retired | 9 | 60,0 |
| | Total | 1 | 6,7 |
| | Total | 15 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cataluña,Aragón, Valencia,Murcia,Baleares | 2 | 13,3 |
| | 2 Castillas | 1 | 6,7 |
| | Madrid | 2 | 13,3 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 1 | 6,7 |
| | Extremadura | 3 | 20,0 |
| | Total | 9 | 60,0 |
| Didn't answer | . | 6 | 40,0 |
| Total | | 15 | 100,0 |

Survey design: A scale of preferences from 1 to 10, in which the visitor has to place the Monastery of Guadalupe and other similar monasteries or convents they know in the position that each of them deserves (between 1-very bad, and 10-very good).

Other monasteries: 93% declares to know other monasteries like this.

Position of the Monasterio de Guadalupe:

The *Monasterio de Guadalupe* appears twelve times, two in position 10 (the higher), six in position 9, one in position 8 and three in position 7. The average position is 8,6. The subjects

justify their decision mainly because the architectural value and monumental character of the monastery. Some visitors add another reason, the excellent conservation state.

Position of similar monasteries or convents:

Other monasteries mentioned by the visitors are almost all Spanish. The only exception appears in the highest position, 10, and is the *Monasterio de San Jerónimo* in Lisboa (the subject that mentions it remarks its extraordinary conservation state). The most frequently mentioned monasteries are the one of Yuste (five times, in an average position of 6,8 due to its architecture, its beauty and its history), the Poblet's one (mentioned four times, in an average position of 6,7 due to its good conservation state) and the Silos' one (mentioned three times, in an average position of 7,7 due to its architectural value, its good conservation state and the visible presence of monks). Some other monasteries appear only once or twice: the *Monasterio del Escorial* (average position 10, due to its dimensions and its Historic/Cultural value), the *Monasterio de las Huelgas* (average position 9, due to its architectural and Historic/Cultural value), the Chilla's and Veruela's monasteries (both in average position 7,5, due to its beauty), the *Monasterio de los Reyes Católicos* (average position 6,5, due to its architecture and its location), the one of the *Cartuja* in Sevilla (average position 6,3, due to its beauty) and the monastery of the Cuenca Cathedral (average position 6, due to its architecture). The average position of all these monasteries is 7.

The monasteries positioned higher are the previously mentioned *S. Jerónimo de Lisboa*, *el Escorial* (twice), Paular's one, Yuste's one (twice), Montserrat's one, Huelgas' one, Guadalupe's one (twice) and *Santiago de Compostela's* one. The reasons given are varied and span from the conservation state and the monumental character to the architectural value and the simplicity. On the other hand, the monasteries that appear in lower positions are the Poblet, Yuste and *San Leopoldo's* ones (in third position), the Rábida and the Piedra's ones (in second position) and the Cardeña's one (in first position, that is the lowest). The reasons for this bad evaluation are the bad conservation state, the architectural and decorative sobriety and the fact of being known only for historical reasons.

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

This objective was not included in the evaluation of the *Monasterio de Guadalupe*.

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 *Monasterio de Guadalupe*.

Question 10: Awareness of the Monastery

52% of visitors knew about the Monastery by relatives or friends. The remnant sample is divided quite equally among other channels, but the most important are guidebooks (12%), leaflets (another 12%) and Internet (10%).

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

Survey 7, Integration in city

Sample: 34 subjects.

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

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

Segments of age

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | |
| < 18 | 3 | 8,8 |
| 19 - 24 | 1 | 2,9 |
| 25 - 39 | 16 | 47,1 |
| 40 - 64 | 9 | 26,5 |
| Total | 29 | 85,3 |
| Didn't answer | 5 | 14,7 |
| Total | 34 | 100,0 |

Instruction

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Primary studies | 2 | 13,3 |
| | High School | 4 | 26,7 |
| | 5-years university | 3 | 20,0 |
| | Total | 9 | 60,0 |
| Didn't answer | . | 6 | 40,0 |
| Total | | 15 | 100,0 |

Occupation

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | | 5 | 33,3 |
| | Employees | 9 | 60,0 |
| | Retired | 1 | 6,7 |
| Total | | 15 | 100,0 |

Provenance

| | | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Valid answers | Cataluña,Aragón, Valencia,Murcia,Baleares | 2 | 13,3 |
| | 2 Castillas | 1 | 6,7 |
| | Madrid | 2 | 13,3 |
| | Andalucía,Ceuta ,Melilla | 1 | 6,7 |
| | Extremadura | 3 | 20,0 |
| | Total | 9 | 60,0 |
| Didn't answer | . | 6 | 40,0 |
| Total | | 15 | 100,0 |

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

Question 1: Signposts to get there

The greatest part of the sample (67,6%) agrees that it is easy to find the Monastery, but they suggest that signposts should be improved for those coming from Peñalsordo, from *Peraleda de Matas*, from Ciudad Real by the road N430 (interrupted at Valdecaballos) and, more in general, from the medium great distances. 29,4% didn't answer the question.

Question 2: Transport

91,2% of visitors came to Guadalupe by car, and 5,9% by Bus.

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

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Security | 2,4 |
| Traffic | 1,8 |
| Cleanliness of streets and façades | 2,3 |
| Public transport | 1,4 |
| Parking areas | 1,6 |

Some visitors remark that the main Parking should be better indicated.

Question 4: Preferences or problems

Only 41,2 left comments about positive experiences. Out of this percentage, 64,3% enjoyed particularly the surroundings of the town and the Nature/Environment. 14,3% has preferred the Guadalupe Virgin (conserved in the shrine), and the remnant sample is divided between local typical cuisine, the Monastery in general and the local craftworks.

Regarding the complaints, only 17,7% left evidence of them. Out of this percentage, 66% complaints about the toilets of the monastery; the remnant part regrets the heavy fires that have destroyed all the woods of the surrounding area.

Question 5: Aesthetical Integration

91,2% of the sample consider that the architecture of the Monastery is well integrated with that of the surrounding buildings and environment.

Question 6: Cultural Integration

The greatest part of visitors (88,2%) thinks that the cultural offer of this centre is well integrated with the region's cultural offer. Only 5,9% disagrees, and the remaining part of the sample didn't answer the question.

Question 7: Province Integration

Only 3% of visitors is resident in the province of Cáceres. For this reason, this question remains unanswered.

General conclusions

The tourists who arrive to Guadalupe come for general tourism, cultural tourism or religious tourism. The provenance of the tourists is mainly the East and the centre of Spain. Half of visitors are adults between 40 and 64 years old, with an medium level of studies, and most of them visits the place for the first time. The visit is usually planned with less than one month of advance, and does not involve travel agencies or tourism operators. The most frequent circuit of the tourists touches Cáceres, Trujillo and Merida. The car is the favourite transport. The weekend-break tourists are not too much, it is more common to see tourists that come to Guadalupe as a part of a 4 days-one week trip. Visitors usually stay in Hotels or in the *Parador* (state-run hotel).

Regarding the image that the Extremadura region transmits of itself, it is necessary to distinguish between visitors and residents. Concerning the first group, the results indicate that what is considered to as most typical of the region is its Built Heritage and Artistic wealth (particularly concentrated in Merida, Cáceres and Guadalupe itself), as well as its Historical - Cultural value. Also the local typical Cuisine and the Nature/Environment are perceived as typical, representative elements. If we compare these results with those obtained in other studies realized with potential tourists in Madrid we find some differences: the idea potential visitors have of Extremadura is more structured on the Nature/Environment domain or on what can be considered as "local" in opposition to "global" (for instance, local cuisine, folklore). In other words potential visitors ignore or underestimate the built heritage and cultural value of the Extremadura cities, which suggests that the promotion is inadequate and is not able to transmit a realistic idea of the region.

If we focus now on the image that residents have of their own region, we can see that the most familiar and frequented built heritage and cultural attractors are Merida, Guadalupe and Trujillo. However, when asked to choose the most emblematic or representative element, Cáceres and Monfragüe join the list. It is interesting to remark that neither Nature nor the local typical cuisine are mentioned as representative or typical of the region.

Let's examine in detail the evaluation of the element of cultural attraction most representative of Guadalupe, the *Real Monasterio de Santa María de Guadalupe*.

The monastery generates in the audience thematic expectations that are according to the reality. Nevertheless, not all visitors (only 33%) think that this attractor is suitable for a general audience; actually less than the half come moved by general tourist interest.

The audience judges the visit as "Good". However, a small segment of audience visits the monastery with a special interest in his art collections, and these persons are dissatisfied by the information offered on this matter. Another segment, that hoped to be able to witness and learn more about monastic life, also declares to be disappointed. The fidelisation level is not too high, approximately a third part of the sample repeats visit, and does it for general tourism. Compared with other monasteries the overall evaluation of the Guadalupe's one is good since it is above the average of the others' valuation. Thanks to the quality of the answers gathered in this task, it is possible to associate the best valued monasteries with visual stimuli (beauty, conservation state), while cognitive values (historical value, cultural value) have a minor importance and tend to be associated with the monasteries most criticised.

The promotion of the Wall is not adequate enough, since the visitors come mainly by personal recommendation. Guidebooks}, leaflets, and Internet attract minor segments of audience.

The monastery isn't difficult to find, although the signposts it might improves (mainly for the medium and long distances). The parking and the public transport are other factors that should be improved.

Proposals

The results of the study suggest that the tourism offer in Extremadura is not very structured and is left to the tourists initiative. In the specific case of Guadalupe's visitors, an adequate planning and program by the municipality or the provincial authorities, in coordination with the monastery, would probably turn out in an increment of the weekend stays.

Concerning specific elements of the cultural offer, it is also possible to suggest some improvements. The main action would involve the promotion, both from a quantitative and qualitative point of view: an increment of the investment in promotion (leaflets, Tourism information centres, Internet and other communication channels) would sensibly increase the yearly number of visitors. On the other hand (qualitative point of view) it would be interesting to make the image of the monastery appealing to a wider audience, in other words to prevent its perception as a place for "extremely cultivated" people, or for the "ageing audiences", or for people "interested only in History / culture". Another front of enhancement involves the informative/didactic apparatus: it would be advisable to install panels, or plasticized leaflets with detailed information about different aspects of the visit; this would allow the most interested persons to find the information they seek for, without interfering with the visitors who are less interested on historical or artistic details.

Also the relationship and integration of the monastery in the city and in the region might be improved. Firstly, it would be suitable to study together with the municipality a way to create or facilitate the access to parking areas. Secondly, it would be necessary to improve the signposts regarding the Monastery in highways, in the medium and long distances, to make it easier to find.