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Outline

- Motivation - Cultural tourist: who is s/he?
- Aim of the paper - Do tourists learn while at a museum?
- Our survey – Vittoriale visitors
- Dependent variables – Motivation and cultural capital
- Econometrics – how did we select our models?
- Main findings
  - Museums do succeed in their primary mission of cultural dissemination
    - even when their visitors’ motivation is mainly recreational.
  - The role of museums as tourist attractors is perhaps questionable
    - but their role as a valid learning environment is not.
Premises: our research line (1)

Demand for cultural tourism
- Tourists@museums


Authenticity perception of visitors
- Archaeology (ÖTZI) VS modern and contemporary art (MART).
  - 1288 questionnaires, Jun-Sep 2011
  - Authenticity perception: related to peculiar authenticity-related factors and specific socio-demographic characteristics of the interviewee, although common elements emerge.
  - ÖTZI: uniquenes in the world
  - MART: museum’s building and the perception that it was not just a tourist attraction
  - Authenticity perception is a dynamic experience, depending on the peculiar characteristics of the attraction analysed.

Premises: our research line (2)

Visitors’ determinants of spending: do they differ with museum type?
- MART: positively related to cultural interest
- ÖTZI: more ‘generalist’


Repeat visit to the same museum
- Review of the literature: actual behaviour (i.e., return): better than attitudes (i.e., willingness to return)
- Give attention to perceived cultural value during the visit
- Promote cultural events during the week and addressed to children
- Take care of those visitors that come from far places also through an integrated tourist supply
Premises: our research line (3)

Segmentation of museum visitors
- MART: Interested, Knowledge seeker, Non-motivated
- ÖTZI: Knowledge seeker, Non motivated
  ✓ Knowledge seeker:
  ➢ heterogeneous socio-demographic and economic characteristics between the museums
  ✓ Non-motivated
  ➢ ????

Previous step: JCEC, 2015 (1)

Can questions on motivation in a survey should be able to capture the segments of ‘true’ cultural tourists?

Frequent museum attendant: motivation, cultural capital, and constantly occasional consumption.

• Tested propositions
  ✓ Proposition 1 - ceteris paribus, museum visitors driven mainly by a recreational motivation tend to visit less museums. They are in fact constantly occasional visitors, whose visits are likely to take place only during their holiday.
  ✓ Proposition 2 - intellectual motivation has no impact on cultural participation if cultural capital is already accounted for.

Those having a more intellectual approach to museums: agents endowed with a high amount of cultural capital
• if both a proxy for cultural capital and one for intellectual motivation are in a model explaining frequency of attendance, either will turn out to be insignificant
Previous step: JCEC, 2015 (2)

Results:

- Cultural capital matters in explaining frequent museums visit.
  - Intellectual motivation is not significant
- Recreational motivation: associated to less visits.
  - Museums as part of a must-do list during a holiday. They are not necessarily visited by art lovers. Tourists may look for entertainment. Guided tours. Rainy days.

Constantly occasional consumption: set of consumers who
- ‘constantly’ visit museums while on holiday
- do it once in a while (low frequency)
- once they do it, they have mainly recreational purposes

Previous step: JCEC, 2015 (3)

Some tourists care little about museums’ symbolic message. Yet they do visit museums while on a holiday/trip. Why?

- Constantly occasional museum attendance: difficult to reconcile with existing models of cultural consumption (Becker and Stigler, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984; Lévi-Gargoua and Montmarquette, 1996)

- Our answers:
  - tourists look for entertainment, and they may not find substitutes (rainy day effect)
  - role of travel guides with must-do-lists
  - tourists have their own must-do-list
A further step along our research line

What we do in this work ...

Do tourists learn while at a museum?
- Determinants of a museum visit’s length
  - Willingness to stay
  - Actual stay
- Assessing the role of motivation and cultural capital
  - Same estimation strategy as JCEC, 2015
  - A cleverly devised question on motivation in a survey should be able to capture the segments of ‘true’ cultural tourists
- Econometric issues
  - identify your set of dependent variables & covariates
  - estimate a model: is it adequate?

Background 1

Tourist destinations invest in museums: does it make sense?
- Do museums make a destination more attractive?
  - Causality goes from tourist flows to cultural attendance, not vice versa (Di Lascio et al., 2011; Cellini and Cuccia, 2013)
  - Actual utility tourists derive from attending museums, exhibitions etc. may be negligible (Cellini and Cuccia, 2007; Álderighi and Lorenzini, 2012)
  - Literature on cultural consumption:
    - a number of agents are characterised by frequent consumption of cultural services ...
    - whereas a much larger number is not
  - Presence of a large share of consumers who do not attend museums (Seaman, 2006; Stigler and Becker, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984).

Then: do not invest in museums, but rather in a facility potentially attracting a larger number of tourists!
**Background 2**

- Yet empirical research on cultural tourists highlights that their socio-economic profile is rather high (Brida et al., 2013)
  - Destinations aiming to increase not just the number, but rather the quality of their tourists, may consider the option.

- Also, in perspective cultural consumption will be generally increasing
  - Tourists who attend museums today will do more and more so in the future.
  - Capital accumulation approach (Stigler and Becker, 1977): exposure to the arts leads to increasing individual cultural consumption, as it improves the ability to appreciate culture.
    - Shifts in individual demand without changes in prices or income.
  - Positive dependence of today’s cultural consumption from yesterday’s: addiction:
    - May also imply repeat visits to the same museum – hence, from a policy maker’s perspective, returning tourists.

**Background 3**

**Addiction – do tourists actually learn while visiting museums?**

- Perhaps this is not necessarily their aim.
  - Brida et al. (2015): tourists are often driven by a prevailing recreational motivation (constantly occasional visit of museums)
  - Such pattern differs from the one predicted by Stigler and Becker ... 
    - Tourists do not learn at the museum
    - or they do not learn enough to generate a cultural addiction process
  - ... but seems consistent with Di Lascio et al. (2011): exhibitions’ dynamic impact on tourist flows is negligible.

- **Museum fatigue** is well-documented (Serrel, 1998)
  - yet this does not mean museums do not attract people with prevailing recreational motivation, who are often tourists

**We use visit duration as a proxy for learning**

- **standard in visitors’ studies**, which often refer to cognitive activities as engagement (Serrel, 1998).
Intersecting two streams of literature 1

- **Bring together two streams of the literature:**
  - motivation of cultural visits (tourism studies)
  - length of visit to museums and heritage sites (visitors’ studies)

- **Length of stay at a museum:** often proxy for engagement
  - Shettel (1995, 1997) is critical in this respect
    - time is a necessary condition for paying attention, and then also for learning.
  - Easy measurability: suitable to investigate visitors’ engagement
  - Other strategies: quizzes at the end of the visit
    - Prentice et al. (1998) – they often do not measure actual learning at the museum: previous stock of cultural capital matters!

Intersecting two streams of literature 2

- Serrel and Sulston (1997): **Two worlds?** Those who do not care much VS those who are actually engaged?
  - Big sample size: visitors’ length of visit is not represented as a bimodal distribution, but rather by a distribution with a single peak on the left hand side.
  - Museum visitors do not show a high degree of engagement, which is possibly coherent with constantly occasional cultural consumption (Brida et al., 2015).

- Moreover, Serrel (1998): compares the **time spent at museums of different size**.
  - Actual duration of the visit VS. number of stops at different exhibited items: positively correlated.
  - Indirect evidence of the correlation between visit duration and learning.
  - The average time spent at exhibitions is shown to be rather short (20 minutes) irrespectively of their individual characteristics.
Intersecting two streams of literature 3

• Davey (2005): survey on museum fatigue
  ✓ decrease in visitors’ interest and selectivity in the course of their visit
  ✓ combination of physical and cognitive fatigue and reaction to repeated exposure to the same stimulus
  ✓ the phenomenon is found to be very general, and visitors’ socio-demographic attributes do not seem to be important determinants
  ✓ after a wave of interest up to the second half of the 90s, visitors’ studies seem to have abandoned this research area

Intersecting two streams of literature 4

• Motivation to the visit: as determinant of different aspects of cultural consumption in tourism studies
  ✓ motivation does not show such a high correlation with (self-reported) attention, nor does it with actual learning (Prentice et al., 1998).
  ✓ satisfaction may be influenced by some of the motivations to the visit through their impact on affective image. Gil and Ritchie (2009) find that the motivation to ‘have a rich experience’ (including intellectual enrichment) is shown to impact positively on affective image. Ex post satisfaction possibly reveals that the desire to learn has not been frustrated
The survey at Vittoriale

- A small world on its own: Prioria, “D’Annunzio eroe” museum, gardens, an open air theatre and a military ship
- Interesting features of Vittoriale:
  - summertime visitors: (almost) all holidaymakers and excursionists
  - though the collection requires a lot in terms of cultural capital, the house and the park are easily enjoyable by anyone ➔ potentially attractive museum for a heterogeneous audience
- Survey in summer 2012: 390 valid respondents, all Italian, almost no organised tour groups
- Respondents were mainly 25-44 y.o. (42.24%), women (59.54%), with a middle-low income (63.36%), highly educated (40.71%) and coming from the North of Italy (73.8%)
Motivation

- Suggested answers derived from Prentice et al. (1998) and Gil and Richie (2009)
- Respondents were free to choose as many as they liked
- Answers indicating light consumption in yellow, hard consumption in gray
- Accompany excluded from MCA analysis and included as separate regressor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation (% yes)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time/Relax</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a cultural attraction of the area</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>39.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn something new</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific interest in D’Annunzio</td>
<td>67.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompany friends/relatives</td>
<td>18.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Covariates

Approach

1. Willingness to stay
   - Type of ticket purchased at the bookshop
2. Actual stay
   - # Minutes spent onsite
Motivation: MCA

- **Main aim:** by imploding motivation-related items into latent orthogonal dimensions, we avoid collinearity

- Jeong and Lee (2006) and Gil and Richie (2009) use factor analysis

- Here Multiple Correspondence Analysis (Benzecri, 1992) because the set of items measuring motivation are categorical variables

- The initial data matrix of $K$ variables with overall number of $Q$ modalities, recorded on $N$ individuals, is decomposed into the matrix $Z$ of dimensions $N \times Q$, reporting a set of 1 and 0 respectively if an individual reports a given modality or not. MCA is a simple correspondence analysis applied to the matrix $B = Z'Z$

### Motivation: MCA, first 2 dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Dim.1</th>
<th>Dim.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time/Relax (No)</td>
<td>-0.1242</td>
<td>0.1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spend free time/Relax (Yes)</td>
<td>1.4383</td>
<td>-2.1077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity (No)</td>
<td>-0.3260</td>
<td>-0.1752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity (Yes)</td>
<td>0.5050</td>
<td>-0.2714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural attraction (No)</td>
<td>-0.1255</td>
<td>-0.0319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural attraction (Yes)</td>
<td>2.3223</td>
<td>0.5899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn (No)</td>
<td>-0.2587</td>
<td>-0.1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn (Yes)</td>
<td>1.7198</td>
<td>1.1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in D’Annunzio (No)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.5410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in D’Annunzio (Yes)</td>
<td>-0.4721</td>
<td>0.2556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest (No)</td>
<td>-0.0951</td>
<td>-0.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional interest (Yes)</td>
<td>1.5913</td>
<td>2.5096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % explained variance                   | 28.4 | 19.3  |
**Light motivation?**

Emergence of dimension 1: confirms that some tourists care little about museums’ symbolic message. Yet they *do* visit museums while on a holiday/trip. Why?

- Difficult to reconcile with existing models of cultural consumption (Becker and Stigler, 1977; Bourdieu, 1984; Lévi-Gargoua and Montmarquette, 1996)

- Our answers:
  - tourists look for entertainment, and they may not find substitutes (rainy day effect)
  - role of travel guides with must-do-lists
  - tourists have their own must-do list

---

**Nonstandard proxy for cultural K**

Notten *et al.* (2014)

- education captures both cultural K and social status effects.
- They use a *proxy for literacy (i.e., score at literacy test)* as an additional covariate in a demand regression.

Our survey: **no. of books read in the last 12 months and in the previous year**

- We use this information as our proxy for literacy, and include it as a regressor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of books read in the last 12 months</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two</td>
<td>18.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-four</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four</td>
<td>53.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of books read the year before</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two</td>
<td>22.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-four</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four</td>
<td>54.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other covariates

- Repeat visit (RepeatN)
- The motivation of the visit is to accompany someone (Accomp)
- Visited the bookshop (BookVis)
- Age, Age²
- Going home/hotel after the visit (ActAHome)
- Overnight stayer (Overnight)
- Number of years of formal education (Edu)
- Income greater than the median value - €40,000 (Income40 + Income_miss, dummy for missing income)
- The respondent visited the museum with the partner (PeerPar)
- Number of people in the group (PeerTot)

Robustness check: #museums visited in the last 24 months; occupation; marital status; gender; presence of kids during the visit

Willingness to stay, WTS
WTS – Dependent variable

• Type of ticket purchased at the bookshop

1. Just the park
   ✓ Type 1 ticket, 21.3%

2. All Vittoriale attractions except Prioria
   ✓ Type 3 ticket, 8.4%

3. All Vittoriale attractions
   ✓ Type 2 ticket, 70.3%

WTS – The model

\[ y_i = f(CK_i, x_i, z_i, s_i, m_i) \]

• Where:
  ✓ \( y_i \) is the type of ticket purchased by the visitor
  ✓ \( CK \) is cultural capital
  ✓ \( x \) are socio-demographic controls (gender, age, education, profession, marital status)
  ✓ \( z \) is a set of economic status and wealth related variables
  ✓ \( s \) represents a measure of proximity of supply
  ✓ \( m \) is the class of variables expressing visitors’ motivation
WTS – Estimation (1)

Approach

Widespread approach: ordered logit regression

\[ y_i^* = \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} + u_i \]

with \( y_i^* \) being a latent variable, for which we observe only \( y_i \). The ordered model with \( M \) alternatives puts the observed variable \( y_i = j \) if \( \alpha_{j-1} < y_i^* \leq \alpha_j \), where \( \alpha_1 = -\infty \) and \( \alpha_M = \infty \).

Then we model \( \Pr[y_i = j] = \Pr[\alpha_{j-1} < y_i^* \leq \alpha_j] = F(\alpha_j - \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta}) - F(\alpha_{j-1} - \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta}) \)

with \( F \) being logistic distributed.

Assumption: proportionality of odds (i.e., distance between two categories of the response variable is equivalent) – too restrictive and rejected in our model.

Then we use generalised ordered logit models, with partial proportional odds

- Proportionality is removed for those covariates for which the test is rejected.

WTS – Estimation (2)

Approach

Estimation via gologit2 (Williams, 2005)

Interpretation:

\[ P(Y_i > j) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X_1 \beta_1 + X_2 \beta_2 + X_3 \beta_3)}{1 + \exp(\alpha_j + X_1 \beta_1 + X_2 \beta_2 + X_3 \beta_3)} \quad j = 1, 2, ..., M - 1 \]

Remember that \( T_1 < T_3 < T_2 \)
### Ordered Logit Regression, PPOM, Ticket Type as Response Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>se(coef)</th>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>se(coef)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td>2.0595</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1.1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepeatN</td>
<td>-2.052 **</td>
<td>-1.2052 **</td>
<td>0.0946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCons</td>
<td>1.0355 ***</td>
<td>0.3231</td>
<td>0.5609 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCons</td>
<td>-0.0766</td>
<td>0.2391</td>
<td>-0.0766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomp</td>
<td>0.3962</td>
<td>0.3968</td>
<td>0.9672 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boo24</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>0.0058</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BookVis</td>
<td>-0.3544</td>
<td>0.2691</td>
<td>-0.3544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0547</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
<td>-0.0547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActAHome</td>
<td>-0.3024</td>
<td>0.2323</td>
<td>-0.3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>-0.6222 **</td>
<td>0.2544</td>
<td>-0.6222 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>-0.0254</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>-0.0254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income40</td>
<td>-0.3208</td>
<td>0.3522</td>
<td>-0.3208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income_missing</td>
<td>-0.2720</td>
<td>0.7536</td>
<td>-0.2720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeerPar</td>
<td>0.8586 ***</td>
<td>0.2646</td>
<td>0.8586 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeerTot</td>
<td>0.2484 ***</td>
<td>0.0870</td>
<td>0.0974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **HCons**: longer WTS; **LCons** and **Boo24** are not significant.
  - Higher apriori learning interest by “hard” cultural consumers.
- **Accomp**: significantly negative estimate (significant prediction of part of the response variable)
  - No a priori expectations: somewhat ambiguous motivation.
- **RepeatN**: lower WTS
- **Overnight**: staying less
  - High proportion of beach lovers?
- **PeerPar, PeerTot**: increase the probability to purchase a full ticket
- Income variables are not significant
  - Confirms our choice to interpret tickets with different prices as willingness to stay, instead of willingness to pay.
- **HCons, Accomp** and **PeerTot** violated the proportional odds assumption
Length of stay, LOS

\[ y_i = f(CK_i, x_i, z_i, v_i, m_i) \]

• Where:
  ✓ \( y_i \) is the number of minutes spent at the museum
  ✓ \( CK \) is cultural capital
  ✓ \( x \) are socio-demographic controls (gender, age, education, profession, marital status)
  ✓ \( z \) is a set of economic status and wealth-related variables
  ✓ \( v \) is a set of visit-related variables
  ✓ \( m \) is the class of variables expressing visitors’ motivation

Oct 13, @Unibo Rimini, copy to M.Sc. students in Tourism Economics and Management (do not quote) ©raffaele.scuderi@unikore.it 2015
LOS – Dependent variable

- The question was about the **length of the visit at the museum** in hours and minutes - all converted to minutes
- **Censoring (“+”):** 49.7% was still visiting the site while interviewed
- Out of those who finished: 174.9 minutes avg. (about 3 hours)
- Decreases after 100 mins until more than 5 hours.

![Kaplan-Meier estimate with 95% confidence bounds](image)

LOS – Cox Proportional Hazard Model

Cox Proportional Hazard Model models the conditional hazard, that is the probability to end the visit if it had lasted until a certain time.

\[ \lambda(t) = \frac{P(t < T \leq t + \Delta t | T \geq t)}{\Delta t} = \frac{I(t)}{S(t)} \lambda(t|x) = \lambda_0(t) \phi(x, \beta) \]

where \( \lambda \) is the hazard function. It is a flexible model, more than parametric ones, as it requires the baseline not to be specified in advance.

It is called “proportional” as it assumes that \( \lambda(t | x_1) \) and \( \lambda(t | x_2) \) are proportional to each other and independent from time – found via Grambsch and Therneau (1994) test.

## LOS – CPHM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>coef</th>
<th>se(coef)</th>
<th>hazard ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RepeatN</td>
<td>-0.0590</td>
<td>0.0518</td>
<td>0.9427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCons</td>
<td>-0.1402</td>
<td>0.1621</td>
<td>0.8692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCons</td>
<td>-0.3423 **</td>
<td>0.1522</td>
<td>0.7101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomp</td>
<td>-0.4284 **</td>
<td>0.2008</td>
<td>0.6515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boo24</td>
<td>-0.0010</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
<td>0.9989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BookVis</td>
<td>-0.3640 **</td>
<td>0.1653</td>
<td>0.6949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.0735 **</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>0.9291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age2</td>
<td>0.0008 **</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>1.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ActAHome</td>
<td>0.1817</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
<td>1.1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.1617</td>
<td>1.2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>-0.0063</td>
<td>0.0130</td>
<td>0.9937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income40</td>
<td>0.0319</td>
<td>0.2263</td>
<td>1.0324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income_miss</td>
<td>-0.4851</td>
<td>0.5489</td>
<td>0.6156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeerPar</td>
<td>-0.4206 **</td>
<td>0.1635</td>
<td>0.6566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeerTot</td>
<td>-0.0248</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.9755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## LOS 1

### HCons: no impact

- tendency to pay for longer visit.
- This does not imply a longer stay (the comprehension of the symbolic meanings of the exhibits is easy for them?)

### LCons: they stay more

- seems to deny that light motivation is associated with a superficial fruition of museums’ contents
- lack of familiarity with the informal learning environment of museums, and tend to take more time to complete their visit
- then, cultural capital accumulation may happen regardless visitors’ light motivation
LOS 2

- Accomp: positive impact
  - while in company, the perception of time passing is different ...
  - or visiting in groups induces long confrontation of opinions or longer enjoyment of the park of Vittoriale
  - this happens irrespectively of the number of peers – PeerTot

- The presence of the partner (PeerPar) concurs to decrease the probability to end the visit

- Boo24 and Edu: insignificant predictors, as for WTS
  - Darrel (2005) and museum fatigue visitors’ attributes do not seem to be particularly important. But there are exceptions. Though Age is significant and suggests non-linearity in the relationship.

Conclusion 1

- Motivation partially matters
  - hard motivated cultural consumers exhibit intention to stay longer
  - those who are searching for a recreational experience tend to have longer actual stay

- In spite of their light motivation, some tourists tend to engage.

- Previous work (Brida et al., 2015): light motivation is associated with infrequent attendance
  - learning takes place no matter individual motivations
  - however, for those having mostly recreational motivations learning is not enough to induce addiction to cultural consumption.
Conclusion 2

- Museums curators
  ✓ diversity of their audience
  ✓ it makes sense to try to attract the occasional traveller in search for leisure and entertainment
  ✓ it does not contrast with the traditional mission of museums, where culture is preserved and transmitted to visitors while exhibited. In fact, transmission can take place also when tourists visit a museum with a light motivation.

- Museums funding
  ✓ tourist boards may be involved
  ✓ museums are not attractions for the average tourist who is not addicted to culture, whereas cultural tourists are a small segment of the market.
  ✓ however, once at the museum, also lightly motivated tourists are likely to exhibit some engagement, which makes a museum a significant part of their overall experience.

Remarks
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Conclusion 3

Museums face a multi-faceted demand, and they must be careful in catering to all segments without causing one crowding out the other.

- In this sense, the contents of the core service they supply is crucial.
- Exhibitions are the solution to the problem, as they can attract both art lovers and agents only interested in them as fashionable events.

In order to provide leisure visitors with a satisfying experience, even more important are opening times, quality of non-core services (bookshops, cafés and restaurants), easy-to-read short bookguides to exhibitions in addition to the classic coffee table book, etc.

Impact of peer-effect: discounted tickets for groups and families, or promotional policies that would involve groups of people.

Remarks

Oct 13, @Unibo Rimini, copy to M.Sc. students in Tourism Economics and Management (do not quote)
©raffaele.scuderi@unikore.it 2015
Conclusion 4

Costs!
• Increase the supply of additional services (i.e., cafes, bookshops, etc.)?
• Do segmentation policies take place at the expense of the core missions of museums, namely conservation and education?
• Trade-offs: create an icon VS run a cultural institution
  ✓ core cultural mission VS the creation of an attraction for a vast audience
  ✓ conservation and maintenance costs VS running costs to attract more people
• Incentives and free riding: improvements to non-core services would benefit particularly to the local tourism sector
  ✓ however, hotel owners could object that it is them bringing visitors to the museum, not the contrary ...
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Conclusion 5

• Warning
  ✓ we are using reported time of visit, not actual time of visit.
  ✓ Bollo and Dal Pozzolo (2005): the two are often very different, with a predominantly positive bias characterising reported time
  ✓ this bias may be more frequent in the case of constantly occasional museum visitors
    o they are likely not to be used to museum fatigue
    o therefore tend to perceive the time at the museum as tiring, hence long
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