Management of World Heritage Sites, Cultural Landscapes and Sustainability

Management of World Heritage Sites, Cultural Landscapes and Sustainability

Edited by

Fernanda Cravidão and Norberto Santos

Management of World Heritage Sites, Cultural Landscapes
and Sustainability

Edited by Fernanda Cravidão and Norberto Santos

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Fernanda Cravidão, Norberto Santos
and contributors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part II - Cultural Tourism and Local Identities

PREFACE

The second half of the 20th century marked the beginning of an era of change for society and for people. Although development is not a global phenomenon, concepts such as sustainability and sustainable development, heritage and culture, tourism and ethics, uniqueness and authenticity, materiality and intangibility, among others, have entered the lexicon of scientific research, political discourse, strategic and development plans and non-governmental organisations. The assumption that the human being is the most relevant heritage, is decisive for the respect for the other and to value the differences between us. This approach may help to create a common sphere where everyone and every place plays a crucial role. It is in this context that culture / heritage, as a differentiating element, assumes a progressive and continuously relevant significance, a central part of global society expressed throughout this Book.

The concern to protect the still visible course of human history, regardless of size or geographical location, is an example of a global concern that should involve us all. Many of the sites inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List are also, for this very reason, tourist sites and therefore subject to different uses, almost always different from their original purpose. These uses should not imply destruction, loss of genuineness or massification. Rather, they should preserve or restore the authenticity that identifies these sites, making them unique. This seemingly contradictory context places the focus on the reflection that is intended to develop in this book *Management of World Heritage Sites, Cultural Landscapes and Sustainability*. It was carried out with the high patronage of the International Network of Culture, Tourism and Development, associated to the UNESCO/Unitwin Chair Culture, Tourism and Development, based in Paris 1 (Phantéon-Sorbonne).

The central objective of this book is to present debates, reflections, practical cases and situations, that we are facing today, on the challenges between heritage and tourism. These trends with a focus on the process of future development, resulting from the mutability of the existing relationship, are discussed in the first part under the subheading *Management of Destinations and Sustainability in World Heritage Sites*, and in the second part under the subheading *Cultural Tourism and Local*

Identities. The chapters also refer to the tourism supply in World Heritage Sites, the preservation of a unique identity and uniqueness, the diversity of motivations for tourism demand, the creation of local tourism activities to complement internationally renowned heritage sites, and the management of a heritage that generates social cohesion and territorial solidarity.

Tourism is rapidly expanding. It is increasingly diversified and considered an important social value. Its economic value is also growing as well as its weight in national GDP increases. We are also witnessing the development of cultural and heritage tourism as an expression of societies' ability to transform their legacy into consumer products and instruments of local and regional development. From this perspective, there is a need to understand the motivations of the tourist and the profiles of visitors, linked to multi-attraction and multi-motivation demand. It is important to encompass and understand what is being visited, the search for experience and emotion, committed participation mediated by ethics and sustainable behaviour. All this allows to create the conditions for a new ontological tourism to grow within each one of us, in each trip, in each place.

The scope of this Book also focuses on the uniqueness and notoriety of classified sites, as well as on those with potential for future integration into the List of Representatives. They are landscape laboratories that allow to avoid the global dynamics of standardization of processes and spatial uniformity. In the same way, New Tourism and the relationship with the material and immaterial Patrimony, mainly gastronomy, wine tourism and religion, are included in some chapters. This is crucial because some elements previously considered of less relevance in their ability to attract visitors to tourist sites now play a key role. Nowadays, visitors are offered the opportunity to get to know the culture, customs, traditions and stories of the places and personalities in a very pleasant way, with expectations often exceeded, and a true enjoyment of the experience. Several chapters mention Destination Management and Sustainability in World Heritage Sites, highlighting the recognition of Outstanding Universal Value as a strong contribution to an exponential growth in tourism demand, posing new challenges to the sustainable management of tourist destinations. This is why responsible tourism is presented here as a key concept in preserving the values and spirit of the place and in safeguarding World Heritage Sites. Similarly, cultural events and local identity are seen as resources of a certain area, planned and implemented in a way that encourages and facilitates greater and more active participation by tourists. They are a fundamental component of the differentiation of a tourist destination's offer. Last but not least, importance is given to issues of territory, tourist routes and cultural

landscapes. Several texts express the significance of the territory as a key element of thematic tourism. This is why it is possible to bring together the values of place identity, authenticity of practices, global communication and technological diversity, cultural differentiation, support for sustainability and notoriety.

The growing interest and desire for historical and cultural heritage sites, whether material or immaterial, allows us to (re)discover the uniqueness, authenticity, notoriety, and, at the same time, originality of World Heritage sites and other Heritage Sites. This requires tourism management to be carried out in such a way that physical, social, cultural and economic sustainability becomes a permanent and dynamic, open and complex concern.

This Book enriches the knowledge of tourism studies, through the debate between the different participants and case studies. The aim is to improve the capacity to build in each World Heritage Site an identity capable of generating processes that improve the quality of local residents´ life, a marketing strategy designed to offer cultural / reference products, and informed, committed and motivated research to use (somewhere between entertainment and development) and improve the offer in World Heritage Sites.

May, 2020
Fernanda Cravidão
Norberto Santos

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Special Acknowledgment to

Luís Silveira, always present to solve any problem and manage with care and professionalism the relations between authors and publishers.

PART I –

MANAGEMENT OF DESTINATIONS AND SUSTAINABILITY IN WORLD HERITAGE SITES

CHAPTER ONE

MUSEUMS AND TOURISM IN WORLD HERITAGE SITES IN SPAIN

SALVADOR PERELLÓ OLIVER
AND NURIA MORÈRE MOLINERO

Introduction

In an era in which culture has been massified and therefore simplified, we believe it is essential to define the dynamics generated at the micro-level between the domains of culture, heritage, and tourism (Vera Rebollo 1995; Velasco 2009) through the precise application of the general framework of human relations in space (García López 2015). The creation of "cultural tourism" (Galí-Espelt 2012; Munsters 2012; PNIT 2012-2015), a phenomenon involving highly complex cultural, social, economic and territorial components, has inspired a great deal of further research (Richards and Munsters 2010), much of which is still ongoing. The preference nowadays is to refer to "territorial cultural heritage" (Troitiño Vinuesa 2014), underscoring the territorial factor while also emphasizing the evolution of demand or the exclusively cultural motivations of tourists, whose numbers have fallen in Spain (Prieto Gutiérrez 2015).

In this context, this empirical study was designed with the aim of analysing cultural tourism in Spain, focusing on the interrelationship between cultural and touristic destinations and museums, regarded as tourist attractions, by examining the management of these institutions, as well as their strategy with regard to tourist territory. The general results, together with related aspects such as hiring practices, have already been analysed and interpreted as materializations of "cultural tourism" and we have argued that these social/professional relationships are key to understanding the interrelationship between culture and tourism (Morère and Perelló 2012; Morère and Perelló 2014). Museums were chosen as our analytical tool since they are classic tourist attractions, but are also representative of the

dynamics generated by a given territory in relation to its actors and visitors. For this reason, they form the basis of the empirical analysis.

On the one hand, museums are the result of a long cultural evolution.[1] They are now institutions managed within the field of culture whose significance transcends that of conservation; they can take on social, cultural and tourism roles, as reflected in the recent ICOM definition which emphasizes their social character and connections with the public.[2] This lengthy process extends from their initial role of conserving and collecting artefacts to their transformation into institutions open to visitors (Patin 1992; Sildelberg 1995; Bolaños 1997; Santacana 2004; Appleton 2006; Poulard 2007; Michaud 2008), with internal management structures that prioritize education, research and leisure (van Aalst and Boogaarts 2002; Brugman 2012) and help consolidate such principles as cultural democracy, interdisciplinarity and inclusivity (Johanson and Kjell 2010; Galla 2013-14). On the other hand, museums are the only heritage-oriented institutions that can be created and built in the face of a historical legacy that has definitively come to an end, given that this legacy can be reconstructed or interpreted. Hence they are extremely dynamic institutions (Sildelberg 1995; Stylianou-Lambert 2010), both internally and externally, and have provided an opportunity for those who regard culture and heritage as a stepping stone towards development and growth. Museums have evolved and changed their identity and position within different environments, thereby modifying their role, as well as the ways in which they are perceived by the public. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that, as institutions, they combine cultural dissemination, territory, heritage and history and, on their long march forward, have turned towards society and consequently towards tourism, demand, territory and actors. Significant literature has been produced on this subject since the 1990s (Gascon 1992; Chassé and Thornin 1992; Renimel 2005; Arrieta Urtizberea 2012; Morère and Perelló 2013; Fagnoni and Gravari-Barbas 2015), revealing an interesting thematic development.

The first strand in our research deals with the public and visitors and also analyses demand (Hooper-Greenhill 1998; Pérez Santos 2000; Herrero Prieto et al. 2002), a central issue in the debate on whether museums should primarily be sources of revenue or repositories of heritage (Patin 1992; Herrero et al. 2003; Greffe 2009; Vernières 2012).[3] It has thus become

---

[1] This is of even greater interest when analysing museums located in World Heritage Sites, given that the historical and heritage evolution is essential.

[2] http://icom.museum/la-vision/definition-du-musee/L/2/: 2007.

[3] Tourism is one of the indirect and direct consequences of heritage (Vernières

essential to understand data relating to museum visitors, hence the development of new methodologies for analysis (Pérez Gómez 2012) and periodic studies (Puiggrós 2005; Pena and Sánchez 2006; Caracterización 2012). We have taken into account differences between residents and tourists (Jelida 2013), seasonal variation (Pérez Gómez 2000), visitors' experiences and satisfaction (De Rojas and Camarero 2008; Weavor 2007; Brida et al. a 2013; Brida et al. b 2013; Kasim et al. 2014), and even museums' own internal perceptions as a factor in strategic planning (Periañez and Quintana 2009; Yoshimura et al. 2014).

The second strand focuses on museums and destinations. Museums can be considered major cultural and tourism brand names (Fernández Sabau 2006) and, in fact, the central attraction of many tourist destinations (Stylianou-Lambert 2011; Puiggròs 2005). They have also become a driving force for territorial development, planning and the redevelopment of destinations (Murphy and Farmer 2012), working alongside other actors, including the local community and institutions (Valenzuela et al. 2008; Cárdenas and Conde 2012). The museum's location also plays a major role (Johanson and Kjell 2010).[4] Furthermore, we address the relationship between museums and destinations, i.e. the museum's mission, and whether it fails or succeeds (Leiper and Park 2011), as well the links between attractions within the same destination and how they may fail. Museums make up part of the territory which, as a unit in the analysis of tourism, has recently been termed "heritage territory." Within the tourism territory, the connections between tourist attractions, their hierarchization and the networks uniting them, such as the museums and world-scale attractions which are the focus of this study, are considered essential. This is the framework for our study (Donaire 2012; Bryan et al. 2012).[5]

2012).

[4] There are numerous examples of this in Spain and in other countries around the world (Hamnet and Shoval 2003; Basso and Funari 2004; Tresserras and Matamala 2006; Lusso 2009; Shoval and Strom 2009 ; Unsal 2010; Brida et al. 2012; Camprubi Subirana 2015; Gilabert 2015), specifically the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (Zulaika 2002; Plazaet al. et al. 2010) or certain destinations with a wide range of museums, such as Frankfurt, which has 40 museums (Renimel 2005), and Malaga, which has 36, including its signature brands the Picasso Museum, Carmen Thyssen Museum, and Georges Pompidou Centre.

[5] In our analysis, we carefully considered the complementarity between properties that have been classed as World Heritage, one of the greatest tourism and heritage distinctions that can be conferred on a destination, and museums. World Heritage is acquiring a touristic function with regard to promotion, management, and governance (Bourdeau et al. 2015; Ruiz Lanuza and Pulido 2015).

Spain, Museums, World Heritage and Tourism

In Spain, tourists visit museums more than any other sites except monuments. In 2014-2015, the most recent period in which the survey "Habits, Practices, and Cultural Consumption" was carried out, 47% visited museums and 51% visited monuments, (http://www.mcu.es/estadisticas/ MC/EHC/2010/Presentacion.html), indicating the economic and cultural impact of these visits on local populations. The total number of visitors (both resident and non-resident) to museums also underscores the latter's overall importance, both as social and cultural (i.e. not solely tourist) institutions. The Prado Museum in Madrid received 2,536,844 visitors (2014), the Reina Sofía Museum in Madrid 2,673,745 (2014)[6], the Thyssen Bornemisza Museum in Madrid 998,992 (2014), the Picasso Museum in Barcelona 915,224 (2014), and the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao 1,1011,363 (2014). Art museums were the most frequently visited, ranking highly as places of interest to tourists (Stylianou-Lambert 2011; Morère and Perelló 2014).[7]

In recent decades there has been a concerted effort to develop museums, supported both by legislation and the economic boom which lasted from the 1980s until the 2008-2009 crisis. This legislative development is the force behind the conceptual evolution of museums within society, the framework for national laws governing heritage, and laws which are specific to the various autonomous regions.[8] In addition, it has paved the way for later developments such as the State Secretariat for Culture, which has consolidated the role of museums as strategic assets by creating a "Network of Museums" (RD 1305/2009)[9], and the Permanent Public Laboratory (Garde and Varela 2009-2010). In terms of economic development, it has meant a radical change to the Spanish museum sector, ranging from its cultural and social content to its position within the context of tourism.

---

[6] http://www.iet.tourspain.es/es-es/estadisticas/otrasestadisticas/museodelprado/ paginas/informespublicaciones.aspx. The tables reveal that the number of visitors to large museums rose between 2014 and 2015, with some exceptions. There was an increase of 6.3% for the Prado Museum and 9% for the Bilbao Guggenheim Museum.

[7] These are among the most frequently visited monuments, apart from the Sagrada Familia (Barcelona), which had 3,230,000 visitors in 2013 and the Alhambra and Generalife which had 2,402,473 visitors in 2014.

[8]http://www.mcu.es/legislacionconvenio/loadSearchLegislation.do?cache=init&leg islation.area.id=PAHI&layout=legislacionPatrimonio&language=es

[9] These networks, in fact, serve as a model of museum management: Calzada and Barandiarán, 2013

Traditionally, this sector was centred around provincial museums that were more closely linked to territory and identity, but it has been completely overwhelmed by the emergence of autonomous regions and the influx of money.[10] Hence, museums have begun to see themselves as resources which support cultural heritage, as much as forms of cultural heritage (Properties of Cultural Interest in Spain) or world heritage, in themselves (Bote 1998; Piñanes Leal 2004; Herrero Prieto 2011).

In fact, the 1990s witnessed the construction of great museums which were also architectural works of quality designed by prestigious architects, even though the goal of these projects was still mainly cultural and museum-oriented (Herrero Prieto et al. 1998; Herrero et al. 2002; Layuno 2004).[11] This regeneration took place in two main stages, the second of which was devoted more to decision-making and regional development.[12] Museums responded to museum-oriented projects first and then, little by little, to those that were more explicitly directed towards the tourist market. They embraced a simultaneously urban-based and renovation-centred planning strategy modelled on the classic example of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, followed by many other examples (Tresserras and Matamala 2006). This relationship would be established at both municipal and regional levels and hence museums would become brand names, following the examples set in Bilbao, Madrid and Barcelona - namely, the Guggenheim, Prado, Dalí and Picasso Museums - symbolizing both cultural and touristic quality.

These strategies, which were designed for urban areas, focused on major metropolises such as Madrid and Barcelona, but also included smaller urban environments (Herrero Prieto et al. 1998; Arrieta Urtizberea 2006; Feo Parrondo 2011).[13] This led to greater recognition for historical and ethnographic

---

[10] This group of museums proved to have a very specific touristic and social role, as revealed by our empirical study.

[11] Regarding the intervention of great architectural names, the first was the Roman Art Museum in Mérida designed by the architect Rafael Moneo, then the IVAM in Valencia, from 1984-1989, and the Thyssen Museum in Madrid in 1992. They were followed by the Reina Sofia Art Museum in Madrid (Jean Nouvel's reforms came later), the Galician Centre of Contemporary Art in Santiago de Compostela by Alvaro Siza, the University Museum of Alicante by Alfedo Payá (1995-1999), and the Barcelona MACBA (1989-95).

[12] The Carmen Thyssen Museum in Malaga, the Museum of Arts and Sciences in Valencia, the Museum of Science and Technology in La Coruña, in Galicia, the Archaeological Museum in Alicante, the Helga Alvear Museum in Cáceres (Extremadura) and the MUSAC in León (2001).

[13] The exception may be wine producers and their museums, including projects by important architects that are located in vineyards: Norman Foster and Ribera del

museums (Pérez Gómez 2012) in medium-sized and small cities (Rueda Torres 2006). In the rural region of Castilla y León, the number of museums in medium-sized cities doubled between 1970 and 1996 (Herrero et al. 2003), mainly during the 1980s with the development of small, locally-managed ecclesiastical museums. However, even though the pace of demand appeared to be consistent with the supply, at least in the early years (Herrero et al. 2003), this growth would appear to be disproportionate and unsustainable over time. Within regional research and development approaches, small and medium-sized cities, as well as rural settings, have been favoured sites for the creation of new museums that are closely linked to their territory and its identity, whilst medium-sized cities preserve the tradition of the provincial museum.

Similarly, the number of archaeological museums in Andalusia has risen by more than 100% over the last decade (Ramos Lizana 2011). Following the same trend, eco-museums (Arrieta Urtizberea 2012; Navajas Corral 2011; De Sousa Pedrosa 2014), small local museums and heritage interpretation centres of all kinds (Santacana and Mestre 2004) have also emerged. In each of these cases, the museums can be regarded as attractions which complement other cultural offerings in a given destination (Troitiño Vinuesa and Troitiño Torralba 2008; Mestre Balet 2010). However, the expanding numbers of museums has been affected by poor planning.[14] The National Tourism Administration regards museums as tourist attractions and this, in fact, is the focus prioritized by the PNIT (the *Plan National International du Tourisme*, or National International Tourism Plan, 2012-2015). Museums are included in the *Plan de Qualité Manual de Buenas practicas, 2010* (Quality Plan "Manual of Good Practices, 2010"), or in Promotion Plans such as the *Plan de Promoción Internacional de Turismo Cultural 2010-2012* (International Promotion Plan for Cultural Tourism 2010-2012).

In this context of excessive supply, the social and cultural sustainability of museum policy has been questioned (Herrero et al. 1998; Morente del Monte 2007; Feo Parrondo 2011; Ramos Lizana 2011-2012).[15] There has

---

Duero wine in Gumiel de Izán; Frank Gehry and Marqués de Riscal; Protos in Peñafiel and the works of Rogers.

[14] Inland regions such as Castilla y León and Andalusia have created plans such as the RECA Plan based on diversification of the heritage offer, including the construction of museums (Herrero et al., 1998; Feo Parrondo, 2011), which may explain this development.

[15] The "Plan del Impulso del Turismo Cultural e Idiomático" (2002-2003) emphasised expanding the cultural and heritage offer, without taking needs, contexts and tourist

been no planning at the level of individual destinations, only a general
economic analysis (Zara 2013), nor has there been any planning that takes
the position of museums within their territorial framework into account
(Ramos Lizana 2011-12).

   This is the reality that justifies our research on Spain's tourism industry
and on museums, as classic tourist attractions, and their connections with
World Heritage Sites. Spain worked actively with UNESCO with regard to
its policy on World Heritage Sites, at least until four years ago, and boasts
45 such sites, the most recent of which - the Dolmens of Antequera, in
Malaga - was granted World Heritage status in 2016.[16] The vast majority of
these sites are classified as monuments, historic cities, and archaeological
zones, with those of a cultural nature significantly outnumbering those that
are natural and mixed (Fernández Salinas 2008; Castillo and Querol 2015).
The following table shows Spain's WH Sites by autonomous community
(Table 1-1):

Table 1-1. WHS by Autonomous Community.

Andalusia 6 + 1 shared
Aragón 1 + 3 shared
Canary Islands 3
Cantabria 1
Castilla-La Mancha 1 + 1 shared
Castilla y León 7 + 1 shared
Catalonia 6 + 1 shared
Community of Madrid 3
Valencian Community 2 + 1 shared
Extremadura 3
Galicia 3 + 1 shared
Balearic Islands 1
Navarre 1 + 1 shared
Basque Country 1
Principality of Asturias 1
Region of Murcia 1 shared
Rioja 1 + 1 shared

Source: UNESCO and Fernández Salinas, 2008

---

destinations into account (Piñanes Leal, 2004).
[16] http://portal.unesco.org/es/ev.php-URL_ID=45692&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&
URL_SECTION=201.html.

Goals and Methodology of the Empirical Analysis

Within this context, two specific aims were defined for our analysis of the ways in which museums have acted as heritage-based tourist attractions and functioned internally within the framework of destinations as complex territorial systems:

SP 1. To analyse the relationship between museums' perceptions of themselves as tourist attractions and the destinations in which they are located. Separate internal and external strategies were therefore considered, inferred from discussion groups established prior to the analysis (Morère and Perelló 2013).[17]

SP 2. To analyse the interrelationship between museums and cultural tourist destinations, specifically those with World Heritage status - a designation of cultural and conservational significance, but also a brand-name, image and element of tourism. Hence, we studied museums segmented by the number of visitors they receive, a categorization that also indicates museum type. The bibliography shows the large number of museums built in recent decades and, quite specifically, the segmentation between museum types, whether art museums or old-fashioned museums more closely associated with identity (Rénimel 2005; Stylianou-Lambert 2011; Morère and Perelló 2013). The chosen museums correspond to a very specific typology, since they are the ones that receive the majority of visitors: art museums, normally located within an urban framework, are traditionally the most popular with tourists and visitors.

The research was carried out by means of documentary and bibliographic analysis and quantitative analysis based on a self-administered electronic questionnaire sent to a representative sample of directors and communications managers at museums and interpretation centres, i.e. cultural facilities in Spain identified from the Museum Directory and museum collections of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports

---

[17] For the analysis of the primary dynamics and internal strategies derived from museum management, more variables were defined than inferred from the results of discussion groups consisting of experts on cultural tourism and museum sectors, according to the study *Cultural Tourism, Heritage, Museums, and Employability*, financed by the School of Industrial Organization in 2013 (Morère and Perelló 2013).The following variables were determined: Creation of the Department of Tourism, Training Plan, Employment of Specialists in Tourism, Institutional Collaboration and Private Collaboration developed with Companies, Hotel Businesses and Travel Agencies. Experts highlighted collaborative networks involving the private and public sectors, and between institutions at all levels.

(CulturaBase).[18] Out of a total of 1,530 museums (INE, 2010), the responses constituted a sample of 180, determined by a confidence level of 95% (2 sigmas), an error of ±7% y p=q=50, proportionally fixed by autonomous region and museum type.[19] The study was carried out during the second half of 2012.

The destinations which were the most culturally-oriented were also identified: Madrid, where 35.5% of tourists stated cultural motives for their visit; Catalonia, where 33.2% stated the same; Andalusia, with 16.4%; the Valencian Community, with 11.3% in 2011. The data from 2012 confirms Catalonia's strength, and shows that international tourism has declined in Madrid and Andalusia. In terms of national tourism, the same regions, with the addition of Castilla y León, rank highest: Andalusia, Catalonia, Castilla y León, the Community of Valencia, and the Community of Madrid (IET, Familitur, 2010, 2011; Balantur, 2012). As far as the offer is concerned, these destinations are known for their cultural heritage, museums and World Heritage Sites (Piñanes Leal, 2004), hence the choice of museums which clearly provide a basis of quantifiable data.

---

[18] http://www.mcu.es/culturabase/cgi/um?M=/t11/p11/principales/&O=pcaxis&N= &L=0 Museums constitute the main quantifiable heritage-based tourist attraction in Spain, according to the data.
[19] The percentage distribution of responses is not an accurate reflection of the distribution of museums in Spain, as far as type is concerned. In fact, archaeological museums represent 12% of the total, ethnographic and anthropological museums 17%, specialized museums 10%, fine arts museums 15%, history museums 7%, and contemporary art museums 9% (http://www.mcu.es/culturabase/cgi/axi). The responses obtained after administering the questionnaire to the chosen sample, distributed proportionally by Autonomous Region and type of museum, over-represent archaeological museums and contemporary art museums. On the other hand, the questionnaire's self-administered electronic format had the drawback of reducing the response rate: although our study was able to draw on 180 questionnaires that were completed and answered correctly, some museums that were formally invited to participate did not do so. The overrepresentation of certain types of museums resulted from the fact that they were more interested in participating in a study on cultural tourism, either because they considered the museum in question to be an attraction or because they considered it an opportunity for strategic improvement.

Empirical Analysis and Results: Museums and Tourism at World Heritage Sites

The first objective was to analyse the interrelationship between museums' perceptions of themselves as tourist attractions and their satisfaction with respect to the destinations in which they are located. This was the basis for understanding the dynamics between museums and destinations. In order to carry out the analysis, numerous internal and external strategies were taken into account. Museums claim that they consider themselves to be mainly tourist attractions, (83%, Table 1-2), which is confirmed by the fact that museum managers and administrators also consider them tourist attractions.

Table 1-2. Museums as attractions and museum satisfaction

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Museums as Attractions	83.3	13.2	3.4
Museum Satisfaction	51.1	46	2.9

Source: EOI Survey

This is a great step forward, considering the ways in which museums, their uses and the identity of the people who work for them have traditionally been understood, (Morère and Perelló, 2013). Nevertheless, the figures vary when levels of satisfaction are quantified: when this is taken into account, the number drops to 51% (Table 1-2), indicating a clear lack of satisfaction and a gap between the museum as an institution and its current social role.

The internal and external strategies developed by museums enable us to quantify how relevant tourism is for them. In Table 1-3 it can be seen that several internal strategies are perceived favourably by over 50% of the museums under consideration: training in tourism and, above all, institutional/business collaboration, accepted by over 95% of the museums, reflect their interest in linking museums with destinations. Local collaboration, or collaboration with the surrounding area, is accepted by 90% of the museums. The private sector is poorly represented, since its collaboration accounts for a smaller portion of the total, although contact with the hotel sector (51%) and travel agencies (55%) creates a new, important kind of connection for cultural tourist destinations.

Table 1-3. Museum strategies

Strategies	Depart.	Train.	Spec	Coll.	Nat.	Aut.	Prov.	Munic	Hotels	Travel Agencies
Yes	47.6	75.9	48.3	95.3	51.1	84.3	72.4	90.7	51.8	55.2
No	38.1	16.8	37.8	1.2	43	12.8	22.9	8.1	45.2	40.1
n.r.	14.3	7.8	14	3.5	5.5	2.9	4.7	1.2	3	4.7

Source: EOI Survey

Thus, museums have begun to look outwards towards territory and destinations, areas which still hold the key to lack of satisfaction in the tourism sector and which correspond to the second aim of the study: the interaction between museums and cultural destinations and their relationship with other attractions and heritage values, specifically World Heritage Sites.

Using the questionnaire, we found that the autonomous communities most involved in cultural tourism - Castilla y León, Catalonia, Andalusia, and Madrid - are the most dissatisfied, though Andalusia was slightly more satisfied at around 50% (Table 1-4).

Table 1-4. Regional Satisfaction, percentages (%)

Region	Satisfaction (%)
Andalusia	55
Aragón	50
Asturias	62.5
Balearic Islands	66.7
Canary Islands	50
Cantabria	33.3
Castilla y León	50
Castilla La Mancha	50
Catalonia	50
Valencian Community	50
Extremadura	60
Galicia	63.2
Madrid	33.3
Murcia	58.3
Navarra	100
Basque Country	33.3
La Rioja	33.3
Melilla	0

Source: EOI Survey

Despite their cultural ranking, these communities are in fact quite demanding with regard to relationships and networking with agents and institutions. This dissatisfaction is even more notable in Madrid. In contrast, within small autonomous communities such as Asturias, the Balearic Islands, Galicia, and Extremadura where it is easier to establish relations and networks between local territorial agents, the responses indicated higher levels of satisfaction. Hence it can be seen that that, with the exception of Madrid, the autonomous communities most dedicated to cultural tourism are also those which have the greatest number of World Heritage Sites and therefore, according to the data, are the most dissatisfied.

With regard to the links between attractions, museums, and World Heritage Sites, a low percentage - only 20% of the museums - have any connection with World Heritage Sites (Table 1-5).

Table 1-5. WHS Links with Museums.

	Yes	No	Don´t know
Connection with WHS	21.7	76.7	1.6

Source: EOI Survey

This reveals museum policy and a certain type of behaviour, both independent of World Heritage Sites, which can be interpreted by analysing the museums more closely, together with the connections between their territory and World Heritage Sites (Table 1-6).

Table 1-6. WHS links with Institutions and Enterprises

Museum Connected with a World Heritage Site	Collaboration with Public Autonomous Community Institutions %	Collaboration with Public Municipal Institutions %	Collaboration with Hotels %	Collaboration with Tour Operators %
Yes	87-2	94-9	41	50
No	10-3	5-1	56-4	44-7
Ns-Nc	2-6	0	2-6	5-3

Source: EOI Survey

A bivalent analysis reveals the connections between museums, World Heritage Sites and levels of collaboration between different public and private institutions via the parameters previously considered: collaboration with regional and local governments, hotel businesses and travel agencies. The absolute figures, in percentages, are very important in themselves, as well as in comparison to those given in Table 1-3, which show networks of collaboration established in general by museums. Thus, when connected with UNESCO sites, 87.2% of museums develop regional-autonomous community projects, 94.9% collaborate with the municipality in which they are located, and 50% do so with travel agencies and tour operators. Once again, a wide range of public and private collaboration is evident, which extends to the most developed locations and the public as well.

In comparing this collaboration with the results obtained for museums in general (Table 1-3), it becomes clear that it is slightly less robust (84.3%) for autonomous institutions and slightly higher for municipal institutions when museums are associated with UNESCO (94%, compared with 90.7% of museums in general). Differences can therefore be identified: when the municipality is closer, denser networks of collaboration can be found. In the private sector, the data changes: 41% of museums claim that they collaborate with hotel businesses, compared with 51% of museums in general, i.e. collaboration is less marked (Table 1-3). A similar difference can be seen in the case of travel agencies. Whereas 50% of museums working with UNESCO collaborate with travel agencies, this increases to 55% for museums in general (Table 1-3).

Private collaboration is weak in the case of World Heritage Sites and lower than the figures for museums in general, given that territory and destinations follow more rigidly conceived, traditional tourism models, yet still have important municipal links.

However, these results are not homogenous. Museums are segmented according to the number of visitors they receive and this, in fact, corresponds to certain typologies: new creations for small museums, old-fashioned museums in medium-sized cities, and large museums in metropolises. In each case, they may behave differently with respect to WH. The data obtained for the number of visitors reveals that over two-thirds of the museums studied (69%) receive fewer than 50,000 visitors annually, 29% receive between 50,000 and 500,000 visitors, and very few museums (3%) claim to have more than 500,000 visitors annually.

Hence, three segments were identified, according to the annual number of visitors (Table 1-7).

Table 1-7. Visitors

Museums	Annual Visitors <50,000	Annual Visitors 50,000-500,000	Annual Visitors >500,000
Archaeological	65.9	34.1	.0
Contemporary Art	60.0	26.7	13.3
Decorative Arts	60.0	40.0	.0
Fine Arts	41.2	52.9	5.9
House museum	83.3	16.7	.0
Science and Technology	83.3	16.7	.0
Natural Science and Natural History	50.0	50.0	.0
Specialized	61.1	33.3	5.6
Ethnographical and Anthropological	90.9	9.1	.0
General	70.0	30.0	.0
History	75.0	25.0	.0
Other	75.0	16.7	8.3

Source: EOI Survey

We will begin with museums that receive fewer than 50,000 visitors. These are linked with their territory by tradition, given that they are primarily archaeological, ethnographic-anthropological and house museums. Exceptions include science and technology museums, which have few visitors. The second segment involves museums that receive between 50,000 and 500,000 visitors. In this category, there are major differences between types. Medium-sized museums tend to include those devoted to the fine arts. Finally, large museums which receive over 500,000 visitors annually are segmented into various typologies. These groups of museums provided different responses describing their links with World Heritage Sites (Table 1-8). It can be seen that museums which receive few visitors (less than 50,000) barely have any World Heritage connections. The most representative segments are medium-sized museums (about 30%) and the museums which receive the greatest number of visitors (60%).

Table 1-8. Museums, visitors and WH

Museum Visitors/WH	Yes	No	n/s-n/c
<50,000	15.6	84.4	0
50,000-500,000	31.4	62.7	5.9
>500,000	60	40	0

Source: EOI Survey

In order to interpret these differences, it is necessary to look more closely at museums in terms of their tourism function (Table 1-9). Small museums, which have hardly any connections to WH, do consider themselves to be touristic. Moreover, there is a large difference between the most frequently visited museums and medium-sized museums. Those which are visited most frequently consider themselves to be touristic in nature (100%),[20] while on average most museums do not think of tourism as their only option. We are therefore dealing with a highly individual segment.

Table 1-9. Museums, visitors and tourism satisfaction

Museum Visitors	Yes	No	N/a
<50,000	86.4	11	2.5
50,000-500,000	73.5	20.4	6.1
>500,000	100	0	0

Source: EOI Survey

In Table 1-10, the specific nature of this middle segment is defined: it receives resident and non-resident visitors in equal proportions, in contrast to the frequently visited museums which primarily receive non-residents, and small museums which, despite their mission and efforts to become tourist attractions, are mainly visited by residents.

---

[20] These museums are located in urban settings. It was for this reason that marketing strategies replaced cultural tourism with urban tourism.

Table 1-10. Museums and Resident Visitors

Museum Visitors	Yes	No	Ns/Nr
<50,000	53.4	43.2	3.4
50,000-500,000	49	49	2
>500,000	20	80	0

Source: EOI Survey

Analysis and Results

A number of relevant conclusions concerning the impact of cultural and World Heritage sites on tourism can be drawn from this empirical study, in which museums were analysed *per se* but also as heritage-based tourist attractions in relation to tourist destinations and other heritage sites including WH.

As a preamble, it should be remembered that the territory under analysis is one in which the regions most favoured by cultural tourism - Catalonia, Castilla y León, Andalusia, and Madrid - are also those that have the most World Heritage Sites, with the exception of Madrid. In addition, both traditional museums and World Heritage Sites are, in themselves, very valuable attractions for managers, hence both are located in areas that enjoy a certain tradition of tourism. In contrast, newly created museums often have no connection with WH. They are created and built as attractions in places where there are no other heritage sites to reinforce their attractiveness.

Moreover, our study confirms that museums are currently considered tourist attractions and that the barrier between cultural heritage and tourism has broken down. Nevertheless, there are high levels of dissatisfaction, which are more marked in regions with a stronger cultural identity, especially Madrid. Hence, museums, as tourist attractions, are implementing a series of internal and external strategies, both public and private, in an effort to interconnect collaborative networks throughout their territory.

However, the percentage of museums associated with WH, the subject of this study, is not very high. Networks of attractions and nodes are still in the initial stages of development. In effect, WH, made up of cities, monuments, and isolated properties, has not felt the need to relate, identify with, or possess museums. It is as if WH has enough presence and worth in

itself for it not to need to consider collaborating with other attractions, despite the existence of WH networks such as the Network of World Heritage Cities. The construction of new museum spaces may even be seen as an intervention that would alter the very meaning of heritage and therefore be unwelcome.

Nevertheless, in certain cases a special link between museums and WH (and territory) could be inferred. The museum universe is quite varied and it was necessary to segment museums by the number of visitors they receive in order to explain this link more clearly. Museums that receive between 50,000 and 500,000 visitors have the closest links with WHS. Moreover, these visitors comprise as many residents as tourists and because of this have a greater connection with local identity and the museum tradition in the area, especially in the case of fine arts museums. This can be explained by their location in urban settings - typically medium-sized cities - and by the history of the museum itself, created largely after the property seizures of the nineteenth century or the beginning of the collectivist movements. This is the museum of yesteryear in its most authentic form: the provincial museum. Hence, when the identity of a place is connected with that of the city, the population identifies with its museum; in fact, even though it may receive non-resident visitors, the museum remains a reference point for residents. This type of museum can be placed within the relevant groupings of WH monuments. Nevertheless, the Tables show that managers are somewhat averse to tourism: their territorial strategies are developed at local level and are conservative with regard to the private sector.

In the case of the other groups, the interpretation is different. Museums that receive fewer than 50,000 visitors are linked to their territory by tradition, since they are mainly archaeological, ethnographic-anthropological, and house museums. They are not usually associated with UNESCO properties and have been newly designed as part of regeneration projects. They are considered touristic even though they mainly receive local visitors and they are also the museums which participated most actively in our study. Exceptions may include science and technology museums, which receive few non-resident visitors, are usually found in urban settings, and whose main function is not, a priori, touristic. Large museums, with over 500,000 annual visitors, are divided into various typologies and claim overwhelmingly that their visitors are non-residents. They call themselves touristic and, as such, recognize the brand value of WH for tourism, even though they may not be able to establish networks within their territory. These urban museums, which are the most frequently visited, responded the least. Their data is meaningful insomuch as it shows the highest levels of