

A common Approach to Capturing Visitor Figures

Kate Pontin

An Interim report

May 2013

The single biggest factor in the North West's museums and galleries' raising their game and ensuring increased relevance in the region is partnership working (Virginia Tandy speech for the northwest consortium "Making sure your organisation is relevant")

Contents

- 1. Introduction and aims**
 - 2. Research approach**
 - 3. Findings**
 - a. Basic visitor data**
 - b. Government associated organisations**
 - c. Data collection across museums**
 - d. Segmentation**
 - e. Survey feedback**
 - 4. Development of a Framework for the southeast**
- Appendices**

1.0 Introduction

Rationale

Underpinning this project is the need to promote the worth of museums, and in particular small museums in the regions. With a change in emphasis by government to assessing the economic worth of museums it is important that we are able to promote success and this clearly includes the need to capture numbers of visitors (as well as the quality of their visit). This data can also be used as part of forward planning and applications for funding. However for the smaller museum with only a few hundred visitors this can be a real challenge. Thus in developing the quantitative framework it is hoped that visitor figures can be combined across an area or a smaller region to feed into economic impact studies (eg Cambridge system or AIM) whereby visitor data can be used to assign a monetary value to it.

Visitor data has been collected by museums for many years (approximately 100 years) but as museums have developed and been funded in a myriad of ways this has never been systematic across the industry. Some more recent efforts are underway and The Association of Independent Museums (see appendix) has recently initiated a benchmarking toolkit that they hope many of their members will use and again it focuses on key areas such as demographic information (adults and children, local/ day and overnight and visitor spend)

Of course there have been numerous project evaluation where data on visitors has been collected often across different institutions (for example evaluations undertaken by myself have included 'Moving Here' for the National Archives and a number of museums and archives across England, by the Research Centre at Leicester University Museum Studies Department) but these reports are frequently kept within the museums or funding body. It is clear that these reports need collecting together and making available. Work by the Museums Association has looked at this as part of their review of evaluation (by Maurice Davies – report pending) and we await their recommendations.

There is also a need for someone to review as much data as possible and write a set of summaries as was undertaken for education by Durbin et al by the Group for Education in Museums. More importantly though is the need for different regions to talk to each other more effectively. Frameworks are now being developed elsewhere too – including in the southwest and also across big projects like Breaking Barriers in Hampshire. Consortia such as the Cumbrian organisation also include, as part of their remit, visitor data.

1.1 Aims:

- To develop a common visitor data capture framework for the museums in Surrey, East and West Sussex, Kent & Medway, Berkshire, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire and the Hampshire Solent.

Key outputs:

- Benchmark data on current data collection methods and collation of existing data sets
- Agreed framework in place for data collection/sharing in Q2-3 of the financial year 2013 (or draft for piloting) with subsequent implementation

Key outcomes

- All museums to understand the benefits of capturing their visitor numbers
- All museums submit their data to a central repository
- All museums gain new skills, confidence and knowledge about existing audiences
- Museums the South East Development Service and other stakeholders have a robust data set/framework upon which future advocacy can be based.

2.0 Research

In searching the type of data already captured it is quickly discovered that a number of different audience demographic categorisations are used, even across government departments and associated bodies such as Arts Council, Visit England and Heritage Lottery Fund. In fact Arts Council England has yet to complete any guidance for museums on the visitor data that is required although there is clearly still guidance via MLA, Accreditation and also for arts bodies. In a recent survey the ACE asked the arts sector the types of data they collected (Visual Arts Sector Toolkit for Collecting Audience Data) and they found that they often used the frameworks set up by bodies including the Arts Council, other funders such as the HLF, but also Census categories.

Clearly with changes in government and funding, museums have often changed their approach over time and thus reducing the ability to compare across time. Councils big and small also have different key parameters and it is frequently difficult to find specific details. There is however a number of reoccurring themes across data capture and thus it is intended to use these as part of the framework. These include total audiences participating in the various museum services (exhibitions, talks, loans and more recently the internet/social media) as well as age, gender, ethnicity, disability status and postcode. The survey undertaken as part of this research of museums in the southeast has also provided rich data with over 100 museums responding (see section 3.5). Again there are patterns across the region in core types of data captured. It is also imperative that this new framework does not add significantly to the work load of already stretched volunteers and staff. Thus we hope developing a framework that links to Accreditation, where smaller museums have a simple set of data to collect but the data required of bigger museums fits into this data set so that a whole set of data can be completed for the region at a more basic level.

Research so far has looked at:

- the types of visitor data that museums used in general surveys
- any coordinated approaches across a number of museums or heritage sites
- any visitor data collection that had been used in for advocacy including in applications for funding

- segmentation of visitors
- other relevant data including requirements of bodies such as Arts Council England, Visit England

Desk work using resources on-line formed the basis of this work but also contact with other professionals (see sources at the end of this report for complete list) highlighted specific examples relevant to this research.

It would be useful in the longer term if the profession had a central location for such material/reports so that we can not only learn from each other but also share and use data. The Culture Hive website has started to do this but is a more marketing focused website and thus the focus does not include more learning orientated research.

3.0 Findings

3.1 Basic visitor data collected by a random selection of large and small museums

Appendix 1 illustrates a variation of questions asked on standard visitor surveys.

Despite this diversity there is commonality with the following being seen most frequently:

3.11 Museum visitor figures

- Visitor numbers
- Children's events
- School pupil numbers
- Other educational groups
- Loans
- Events
- Talks
- Outreach
- Group visits

3.12 Visitor profile:

- Gender
- Age (children under 16) and then various groupings from the simplest adult category through to 5 year age gaps.
- Ethnicity – commonly HLF or local council style
- Where from – categories often being local, other UK, overseas and sometimes with postcode
- Social background using a variety of approaches.

3.13 Other data

- Satisfaction level
- Repeat visit or not
- Why visited
- What other types of venue visited
- Use of website/social media

3.2 Government associated organisations

These clearly set the baseline for a framework to fulfil part of its purpose and appendix 2 shows the data categories used by Visit England, Heritage Lottery Fund and Arts Council England. The overwhelming pattern is that there isn't one and categories are NOT entirely consistent across bodies. Thus conforming to important bodies such as these within a framework will not be easy! However a baseline of data similar to that listed above is often seen.

3.3 Data collection in projects or schemes set up by groups of museums

Reports relating to frameworks used across museum or other heritage bodies were few and far between. Appendix 3 provides a summary of these and full reports from small historic houses in London and from the Thrive and Strive funding stream project (London Museums) in Dagenham and Barking. The wale district framework was developed as a tool to support a number of small museums in the area and the data has been used in the Cambridge economic impact tool and offers guidance on what could be used across the region.

3.4 Segmentation

Segmentation approaches used to group different types of visitors and in particular by the way they use museums has become quite popular and a selection of these can be found in appendix 4. Some are particularly difficult to use as they use a set of complex data sets (eg Morris Hargreaves and McIntyre) and I would not recommend these. Simpler approaches are used by other heritage organizations such as the National Trust who categorize visitors by their type of visit (eg the NT uses Explorers, Facilitators, Professional/Hobbyists, Experience Seekers and Rechargers) or that by Falk and Dierking or ACE. Segmentation uses a set of questions that ascertain the "type" of visitor/visit and thus the questions needed to ascertain this would need to be part of a more in-depth survey or other data collection approach used one or twice a year and collected by students or contractors (particularly in smaller museums). Further reflection is needed here to consider the purpose and most appropriate approach and perhaps a pilot with some of the bigger museums in the region.

3.5 Survey feedback

A survey was sent via Survey Monkey to all museums in the southeast via the mdo's and 98 responses were received. The results are outlined below. Further assessment linking type of approach to type of museum is underway, in particular a focus on the museums already collect more complex data.

3.5.1 Do you collect regular visitor data?

Every day we are open	92.84% 90
Once a week	2.04% 2
Once a month	3.06% 3
Once a year	6.12%

	6
Never	0% 0
Total Respondents: 98	

3.5.2 What categories do you use when collecting this data? Please detail how you break them down, eg Children (0-17), adults (18-64) and 65+, schools, events.

The categories below are slightly arbitrary (some approaches could be put in a different category) but it illustrates a) the differences in data collection approach but also b) the similarities. The data offers guidance on approaches that could easily be adopted as part of a framework eg smaller museums using type 1a and larger ones a combination of 2 and 3 using surveys to supplement everyday data collection.

Type 1: No categories or simple division - 22

For example

We collect info on all visitors via a people counter. We also collect info on schools and visitors to events using a manual count.

School groups, guided tours, walk-in visitors, services

Visitors overall number Then Adults over 18s Children

We don't have categories, it's an automatic people counter

Totals only – occasional surveys

We don't do a breakdown, only when we do a full 6-monthly survey

None: we abandoned use of categories

Adults (all ages) Children (groups) Events (ad hoc)

For booked groups, we can break down in adults / children / university students. For individual visitors, we don't

Type 1a: Basic categories – Children, Adults, Schools and other groups - 24

For example

Adults Children (0-17) Events

Children 0-16 adults 17+

Children 0-16 Concessions (students and over 65) Adults Schools Groups Events

Children and Adults, Events, Meetings, Visitor Information, Volunteers

Children (0-16) Adults (17-117) Schools in museum Schools in classroom Children's Activities Adult

Children, adults, 65+, families, friends of the mill

*Men, women children Groups Events
under 5, students in full time education, adults, 65+*

Children, adults, students, seniors, schools, educational groups, adult groups

Type 2: Further breakdown of visitors into younger children, children adults, over 60s - 27

For example:

Children, Adults, Senior Citizens, Serving Soldiers, Families, Schools etc

Children 5-16, under 5s, adults, seniors & students, family tickets

Age Gender Ethnicity Any access Reason for visit

Adults, Concession, Children, Members, Overseas pass, Schools and other free

Children 4-18 Adults 18-64 Senior Citizens 65+ Schools/groups members/patrons events

Children, non paying (members of Dorking and district preservation society and museum members),

Adults Annual Pass - Garden Only - Child (16 and under) - Readmissions - Guided Groups - Groups without a guide - Educational Groups - Gallery admission - Friends (of the Museum) admission - Volunteer Admission

We ask them to write down their age

Children, adults, concessions-students and senior citizens, school/uniform groups, social groups

Children 3-16 Adults 17 upwards Events (free admission for street market day & special event openings Group bookings outside of normal opening hours Tour Bus from Bluetown Heritage when visiting

Infants 0-3 Children 3-13 Adults 14- 64 Senior Citizens 65+ Outside talks

Under 4's Children 4-17 Adults 18-60 Senior 60+ Schools Other groups Events Members Birthday parties

Adults 16+ Child 6-16 Under 6's Free Groups School entry Talks Visits/trips Book club Gift Aid entry on all entrance categories

Other – usually including where they come from

For example

Postcodes

Whether in catchment area or not (within 30 Miles)

Children Children under five Adults(16+ I think) Concessions School groups Student groups Language school group Garden admission adult Garden admission child Carer Helper Disabled (might be changing the term) Events A variety of special group rates eg NHS and 2for 1 Complimentary ATAK Friends of the Museum Giftaid visitor Annual pass holder YAC

Children (0-14) Adults Free Passes (e.g Friends Scheme, Trade Passes) Gender- Male/Female Age- Under 16, 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64 and over 65. Ethnic origin- Asian/Asian British, Black/Black British, Chinese, Mixed, White and Other

Electronic counter gives Total Number of visitors Visitor book is broken down into GB, Europe, USA, Aust/NZ, Far East, Canada, All other countries

We separate Friends, OAPs, schools, course attendees, students and special offers For entry tickets we use: - Adult - Concession (people with disabilities, seniors 60+, unemployed and students) - Youth (aged 4 to 15 years) - Family (2 adults & 2 youths) - Infant (free entry) For our annual survey we collect more comprehensive data: - Postcode - Current employment status (in work, retired, student, not working) - Gender - Age group (under 16, 16-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65+)

Schools; adults (18 to 59); children (5+ to 18); children (under 5); concessions (students, adults 60+, those with disabilities); workshops

We have a survey first developed by Towner and now standardised with all of the visual arts galleries across the South East to allow benchmarking - it would be easier to send the survey to you!

Visitor numbers on door counters everyday we are open. Once a month we check tills for numbers of students, school children, teachers, adults, children, art fund, resident card holders, resident card holder's children, concessions (OAPS).

Postcodes Visitor numbers - adults, over 60, children (3 to 15) and families (2 adults/2 children)

Male Female Children under 18 19-30 31-60 60+ Home location

Yes; by income band = age (0-5/14+/AD/conc) and by purpose = groups/schools/orgs

We now collect: Couples (i.e. two people recorded as one entry) ,Adults , Under 16s Age, home address, reason for visit

EPOS ticket types, Gift Aid related postcodes, visitor comments

3.5.3 How do you collect your data?

Answer Choices	Responses
Clicker	17.86% 15
Tick Sheet	33.33% 28
Electronic system	23.81% 20
Entry Tickets	25% 21
Total	84
Other (please specify) (38)	

3.5.4 Do you add this data to a computer database such as a spreadsheet?

Yes	76.60% 72
No	23.40% 22
Total	94

3.5.4 Have museum staff used this data to support their work?

No	16.30% 15
To help develop audiences	54.35% 50
For focused publicity or marketing	42.39% 39
To apply for grants	67.39% 62
Total Respondents: 92	
Other (please specify) (18)	

3.5.5 Do you collect any other quantitative data e.g. for special projects or HLF programmes?

Yes	44.21% 42
No	55.79% 53
Total	95
Please specify (39)	

3.5.6 Do you collect data on how many users you have on the web, facebook or other social media?

Yes	73.40% 69
No	26.60% 25
Total	94

3.5.7 Who else do you send your data too?

Trustees	58.82% 50
Local Council	25.88% 22
Borough Council	27.06% 23
County Council	7.06% 6
VisitEngland	30.59% 26
Arts Council England	17.65% 15
HLF	29.41% 25
Other	15.29% 13
Total Respondents: 85	

3.5.8 Have you ever used or considered using segmentation of visitors according to their needs or interests e.g. Arts Council categories?

No	56.25% 54
Have thought about it	29.17% 28
Yes	14.58% 14
Total	96
Please specify (17)	

4.0 The development of a Framework

It is clear from the research so far that the framework needs to be clear and offer a simple approach, especially for smaller museums.

It is suggested that the framework use the Accreditation breakdown of museums as a basis for differentiation:

- Small independent museums
- Larger independent museums
- Local government museums
- University museums
- National Museums
- Where should regimental museums go?
- And are non-accredited museums being included in the simplest category?

Within this structure the complexity of data to be collected can build but remain linked with a spreadsheet type approach adding together more complex data into the simplest categories for use in assessing museum impact across the whole region.

The basic visitor data could be collected quarterly with museum inputting their data into a spreadsheet system. There is a question about smaller museums and their ability to do this. What support would be needed and could be offered needs to be ironed out. Guidance on how to gather and submit data will also be provided on paper and on the website. It is also intended to include a number of case studies showing how data gathered across a region or group of museums can actually have a positive impact. Training sessions on data gathering and using the resulting data could be available to staff and volunteers in the region. The real success of this project is if all museums contribute and see the benefits and thus anyone wishing to discuss or comment on anything is welcome to contact me/Sarah.

Making sure data is collected effectively is important and contributes to a more reliable and valid set of data. Thus it is important for museums to remember to:

1. Collect data as fairly as possible, not counting staff and volunteers
2. Using a system that works effectively (ie not missing those entering from elsewhere in the building and includes off-site work)
3. Data is recorded everyday
4. Data is collected in one place preferably a computer or failing that a visitor data record book
5. A particular individual is given responsibility for “keeping” this data and sending it in on the appropriate sheet/inputting into a spreadsheet quarterly

MDOs will also need to make sure:

1. data is provided by their museums with reminders etc
2. data is all inputted into the one system
3. reports on data collected are issued to all the museums
4. that combined data is used eg through Cambridge economic impact system

5. that resulting successes – eg funding, advocacy etc are fed back to all museums
6. that visitor data collection be seen as a part of evaluation and visitor studies policy and plan
7. that training and support be given to regional and museum staff and volunteers
8. and that a culture of sharing information across the region and the UK is developed.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Different Museum approaches to capturing visitor data to illustrate diverse approaches

Organisation	Questions asked
Chertsey standard visitor data captured in survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Museum visitor figures • Children's events • Scholl pupil numbers • Other educational groups • Loans • Events • Group visits
National Maritime Museum Greenwich visitor data categories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London • Southeast • Rest of uk • Overseas • Age • 0-4 • 5-11 • 12-15 • 16-24 • 25-34 • 35-59 • 60+ • Social background NS SEC • Large employers and higher managerial • Higher professional occupations • 2 Lower managerial and professional occup. • 3 Intermediate occupations • Small employers and own account workers • Lower supervisory and technical occup. • Semi-routine occupations • Routine occupations • Never worked and long-term unemployed • White British • White other • White Irish • Indian • Chinese • Other • And local area • White • Black African • Indian

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Caribbean • Black other (inc mixed heritage) • Other - • Other Asian • Chinese • Pakistani • Bangladeshi • Duration • Disability
Birmingham Museum and Art gallery standard visitor data capture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools • Loans • Talks • Age • Employment status • Ethnicity • C2 social class etc • Income • Postcode • Repeat visitor or not • Satisfaction levels
British Museum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ages • Families/Not • Where from • Ethnicity • Motivation for visit • Repeat visitor
MoL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Families • Sightseers • Repeat Social Visitor • Self developer • Experts • Art Lovers
Wellcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic/researchers • Health professionals • Policy makers • Teachers • Art professionals • Science communicators • Media/promoters etc • Community leaders • Local community • Other: • Children < 11 • Youth 11-18

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adults 18+ • Local • Regional • National • International
Australian Museum Visitor Profile (reknowned for its visitor research)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why visited: • General • Tourist • Special exhibition • School holidays • For the kids • Particular collection • Recommended • How heard of? • What enjoyed • Satisfaction • Visitor type: • Family • Alone • Friends • Partner • Family and friends • Organised group • Members • Visited website • Age • Education • Travelled to museum by train, car etc • Live where • Language spoken • Earnings • Other places visited recently – aquarium, zoo, powerhouse etc
English Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor Numbers by adults and child (definition not available but related to tickets) • Local/other UK./overseas • Free/paid • School visits • Non-school education visits • Events • Venue hire • Corporate • Members • Use of particular services eg audio, café etc

Appendix 2: Government and associated overarching bodies

Organisation	Detail
Visit England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor adults, children and school groups • Local/day trippers/UK and overseas • Charges • Other services eg café etc • Social media use • Revenue • staffing
Heritage Lottery Fund	<p>Breakdown for data collected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visited before <p>Age</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under 5 • 5-10 • 11-16 • 17-18 • 19-25 • 26-59 • 60+ <p>Gender</p> <p>Ethnicity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian • Asian Chinese • Mixed • White • Irish • Other <p>Social background</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher managerial and professional • Lower managerial • Intermediate • Lower supervisory and technical • Small employers and own account workers • Semi routine • Routine • Longterm unemployed
Audiences	<p><i>Snapshot and Snapshot London Visual Arts 2010/11 Benchmark Report – Highlights</i></p>

	<p>Categorised art galleries into large (1 million +) medium (½ million – 1 million) and small (les than ½ half million) and</p> <p>interviewed staff to benchmark on the following: Café, shop signs welcome, ease of use, value for money and overall experience</p> <p>And then</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • UK/Overseas (including London Borough, region) • Age • Previously visited galleries • Length of visit • How visited described their knowledge of art eg specialist general or very little
Accreditation	<p>The museum must do the following as part of section three of accreditation:</p> <p>3.1.1 understand who its users and non-users are 3.1.2 evaluate and analyse information to assess users' needs 3.1.3 devise plans to broaden its range of users 3.1.4 have a culture of customer care with arrangements in place to make sure all users are treated with courtesy and care 3.1.5 take account of users' needs, guided by a policy statement setting out a commitment to give everyone access to collections and associated information 3.1.6 respond to tourism and local priorities where appropriate</p>
England Tourism Research and Intelligence Action Plan	<p>RESEARCH AND INTELLIGENCE ACTION PLAN</p> <p>Vision Maximise the use of tourism market intelligence and performance data to inform the investment and planning decisions of businesses and public sector partners, which will contribute to 5 % growth, year on year, in the England tourism market by 2020.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish an industry partnership to lead the development and dissemination of market intelligence and performance data for England's visitor economy. 2. Improve the understanding and use of market intelligence and performance measures through improved communication and interpretation.

3. Develop and deliver a programme of sector performance indicators, consumer focused intelligence (including a new measure of visitor satisfaction),

Why take action on Research and Intelligence?

Good quality and timely market intelligence is vital for the tourism industry; to inform decision-making and investment choices, provide insight for the small and medium sized businesses which make up a large part of the industry, and to measure the economic and social impact on the wider economy.

Intelligence tells the industry about visitors - what they do, what they think, where they go, how much they spend. It also provides a clearer picture about the visitor economy – what businesses there are and where, how well they are doing, who’s growing and who’s facing challenges. Intelligence helps the industry understand what’s going on, helps it make better decisions, and helps it understand the product - England.

Challenges and Opportunities

- The visitor economy is characterised by its disparate nature, comprising small and large businesses across a range of sectors
- Meaningful intelligence.
- The need for wise use of scarce resources is a key issue for all tourism partners. Opportunities exist to forge new partnerships – across the public and private sector, at local and national level - to fund and deliver meaningful intelligence for the industry and explore means of delivering the full value of existing research.
- Ensure continuity in data trends where these are required by businesses and partners across the visitor economy, as well as improving the comparability of data and intelligence.

The Action Plan

Working closely with industry partners, *VisitEngland* and *VisitBritain* have established a suite of national surveys and performance measures, including key tourism volume and value, market

Appendix 3: Joint Projects across museums

Organisation 1
Swale Museums Group (SMG) – collected quarterly
A development amongst museums in Swale district to make sure there was more performance measurement into the Authority.
Questions asked
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Number of adults visiting• Children < 16• Special events relating to collections• Presentations by museum staff in the museum – number of attendees• Number of attendees x number of organised school groups• Number of attendees x number of organised adult groups• Number of presentations x number of presentations made outside the museum to schools• Number of presentations made outside the museum x number of attendees
Resulting outcomes/advocacy etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Makes a business case and also allows us to access funding (ACE) –• Have forward individually and collectively with regard to Section 106 and funding applications to HLF.• Many of Swale’s museums are small with hundreds rather than thousands of visitors and the data collection initiative has enable the Swale Museums Group to qualify for funding and support it would otherwise not be able to access. This has resulted in greater partnership work and increased attendance at the meetings.• By quantifying the amount of visitors to Swale Heritage attractions we have in discussion looked at other authorities or events who have put an value on a visitor to try and allude to an economic value of the heritage sector to the area. (We have not done our own research on this)• Our Council Members have been able to use the data and had their own appreciation of a venue in their Ward improved – it has also informed their debates on any continued support (which is now mostly in officer time) the authority should give the heritage sector.

Organisation 2

Small Historic Houses in London

Questions asked·

Undertaken by Audiences London

- Visited in the last year/1-2 years/2-5/>5/never
- How did you find out about us _ brochure, leaflet, email, website, word of mouth, newspaper, guidebook, social media, etc
- Why did you visit today – interest in the collections, interested in the building, specific exhibition, attend a specific event, visit the garden/outside, part of an organised tour, with friends, to use the cafe, hire enquiry etc
- Rate signage, welcome, guide, labels, cafe, shop, value for money, whole experience
- Did you speak to staff and were they helpful?
- Would you recommend the house/museum
- Do you have any suggestions for improvement
- Gender
- Age - <16/16-19, 20-24,25-29,30-34,35-39, 40-44,45-49, 50-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75+
- Are you visiting alone, with partner/friends, family, organised group
- Ethnicity – white, Black/Black British, Mixed, Asian/Asian British, Chinese, other
- Disability
- Postcode

Resulting outcomes/advocacy etc

This project aimed to create a benchmark for the visitors to the *London Shh...* network of small historic houses.

Between them, four *Shh...* houses conducted 1, 712 interviews with visitors between September 1st 2011 and February 29th 2012, based on a common set of questions. This data was combined and weighted to present a picture of the combined audience of these houses over this time period.

The comparison across the historic houses presented opportunity for benchmarking but the report does not discuss how the data has been used.

Handel House said “*We have had a chance to use this for funding applications as it has helped us identify our audience and those who we are not yet reaching*”.

Organisation 3

‘Thrive and Strive’ with the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Questions asked·

- Recommend the museum
- Had fun
- New visitor to the museum
- Welcoming
- Number of visits to the museum
- Visitors over 60
- Visitors under 16
- Visitors gender
- Disabled (DDA)
- Visitors BME communities
- % Teachers who think sessions help develop children's understanding
- % of visitors who understand more about the heritage of the area
- % of visitors who are proud of their area/community
- Number of school children visiting
- Number of outreach sessions
- Number of people attending outreach sessions
- Number of enquiries
- Number of people attending social events
- % of people who agree they are able to socialise/meet new people at the museum
- % of volunteers who are satisfied that they learn, develop, socialise and contribute to society through volunteering
- Number of volunteer hours
- Number of training and development hours completed per volunteer

Resulting outcomes/advocacy etc

As part of the Survive and Thrive programme we had a consultant which helped us develop an outcomes framework for Heritage Services in the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. Essentially we looked at everything we did (ie outputs/services) to see if they contributed directly or with partners to the outcomes the Council was expected to achieve as set out in the Council's policy house document.

This formed the basis of our outcome framework produced on an excel spreadsheet which took the look and feel of the Council's policy house document (see version in pdf attached)

From this a service development plan, an improvement plan and a set of Outcomes and performance measures, all linked on the spread sheet, were produced. There is also a review and improvement system.

This outcome framework then formed the basis of our *Heritage Strategy* for 2013-16 which was taken to and presented at committee, assembly and cabinet where feedback was taken before the final version was approved at cabinet.

The outcomes framework and the process we went through to develop it played a key role in producing the *Heritage Strategy*

(<http://www.lbbd.gov.uk/MuseumsAndHeritage/Pages/Heritagestrategy2013-16.aspx>)

which was formally approved and adopted and certainly helped in increasing the profile and advocacy of Heritage in Barking and Dagenham.

We have and are reviewing and adapting the outcomes framework (which is key part of the process) and although we are collecting data for performance measures we are still developing the 'dashboard' part of the outcomes framework.

Organisation 4

AIM Economic value of the independent Museum sector

Questions asked

- Adults and children
- Local/ day and overnight – using figures in last column to assess impact
- Can also look at visitor spend
- And staffing

Resulting outcomes/advocacy etc

Level 1 – Tourism Impacts Example:

A museum in the East Midlands had 13,500 visitors in the last financial year (2009/10), of which 10,000 were adults.

The museum estimates that:

40% are local visitors,
40% day trippers and
20% overnight visitors.

Thus:

- Local visitors: 4,000 X £14.42 = £57,680
- Day trippers: 4,000 X £28.84 = £115,360
- Overnight visitors: 2,000 X £51.02 = £102,040

Total gross visitor impacts of £275,080 in the local economy in 2009/10.

Organisation 5
NorthWest museums consortium
Questions asked
<p>A paper by Virginia Tandy, Director of Culture, Manchester City Council</p> <p>A four-year collaboration between Manchester Museums Consortium to reposition the region as a more popular cultural tourist destination and increase cultural tourism. In order to secure funding for this initiative, the group first had to prove the potential for economic impact. In 2007, the group commissioned Arts About Manchester (now All About Audiences) to undertake an economic evaluation and assess the contribution the consortium was <i>already</i> making to the city region and North West economies. This found that together, the consortium venues generated a significant impact on the Greater Manchester economy, in terms of full time employment, on and off-site visitor expenditure, volunteering value and capability and the volume of visitors attracted. Again, before this study, there was a lack of detailed information about the economic contribution of the museums sector in the UK. But this gave the group the opportunity to call the funders' bluff for extra funding and resources, in order to prove what could be achieved. The discussion has taken two years, but they are now convinced of the argument. The project was designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen museums and galleries' contribution to the visitor offer • Build sustainable partnerships between the museum and gallery sector and the tourism sector • Attract and retain out-of-region visitors • Grow the visitor economy <p>A paper by Virginia Tandy, Director of Culture, Manchester City Council Kate Farmery, Head of Services, Manchester Art Gallery <i>Making sure your organisation is relevant</i></p>
Resulting outcomes/advocacy etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing national tourism visits to partner venues by 10% and international tourism visits by 5% • Increasing levels of visitor satisfaction to 85% very satisfied • Other targets relating to media coverage, awards and numbers of evaluation events <p>Kate and Virginia were astonished at how arts organisations worked with tourism bodies in the city. They couldn't believe the lack of communication. Obviously your local development agency or tourism body will be instrumental in communicating the message of your city as a whole. Manchester museums' and galleries' biggest lesson</p>

Appendix 4: Visitor Segmentation approaches

Organisation	Approach
National Trust	<p>Audience segmentation used across the site to understand types of visitor and market effectively to them, presenting a range of appropriate activities</p> <p>Segmentation using type of visitor as a categorisation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explorers: Visitors who are curiosity-driven with a generic interest in the content of the museum. They expect to find something that will grab their attention and fuel their learning. • Facilitators: Visitors who are socially motivated. Their visit is focused on primarily enabling the experience and learning of others in their accompanying social group. • Professional/Hobbyists: Visitors who feel a close tie between the museum content and their professional or hobbyist passions. Their visits are typically motivated by a desire to satisfy a specific content-related objective. • Experience Seekers: Visitors who are motivated to visit because they perceive the museum as an important destination. Their satisfaction primarily derives from the mere fact of having “been there and done that.” • Rechargers: Visitors who are primarily seeking to have a contemplative, spiritual and/or restorative experience. They see the museum as a refuge from the work-a-day world or as a confirmation of their religious beliefs.
Cambridge approach to social impact	<p>The ‘Cambridge Model’ as the product is known, has been developed to make use of local level information. The Model is operated at one of five levels, depending upon the range and quality of local level information. Where there is a lack of local material the Model is able to incorporate data based on regional or national research to produce tourism estimates.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, the base economic formula makes use of 2001 tourism statistics from the United Kingdom Tourism Survey (UKTS), the International Passenger Survey (IPS) and economic / job ratios for that year. On top of this base, 2001 visitor figures to tourist attractions and national day visitor characteristics from the UK Day Visitor Survey (1998) have been added to enhance the model, with 2001 Accommodation Occupancy Survey results providing local trends.</p>

	<p>There are of course a number of assumptions in this approach especially a likely underestimation of those visiting for the day only or the evening only.</p> <p>See Swale Museums Group (SMG)</p> <p>Other similar programmes including STEAM and PRIME</p>
<p>Morris Hargreaves and McIntyre</p>	<p>An approach used by a marketing company working with a number of museums including various Nationals. This again an audience segmentation approach but uses a series of sub-sets to create and is really too complex for this project. There are researchers and academics who question the hierarchal nature of the framework see www.lateralthinkers.com/</p> <p>Categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immersion • Discovery • Exploration • Orientation
<p>Falk and Dierking</p>	<p>These American researchers also use a segmentation of audiences – developing a set of questions to assign people to the categories. These though are flexible and it may be that people may be in a different “category” on different visits (or even as part of a visit) depending on their aims and roles</p> <p>Many people have suggested the oversimplification makes this approach problematic and that we need an <i>approach that incorporates motivations, identities and sociological variables such as class and ethnicity</i>. (Dawson and Jensen in Visitor Studies)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explorers: Visitors who are curiosity-driven with a generic interest in the content of the museum. They expect to find something that will grab their attention and fuel their learning. • Facilitators: Visitors who are socially motivated. Their visit is focused on primarily enabling the experience and learning of others in their accompanying social group. • Professional/Hobbyists: Visitors who feel a close tie between the museum content and their professional or hobbyist passions. Their visits are typically motivated by a desire to satisfy a specific content-related objective. • Experience Seekers: Visitors who are motivated to visit because they perceive the museum as an important destination. Their satisfaction primarily derives from the

	<p>mere fact of having “been there and done that.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rechargers: Visitors who are primarily seeking to have a contemplative, spiritual and/or restorative experience. They see the museum as a refuge from the work-a-day world or as a confirmation of their religious beliefs. <p>See http://icom.museum/fileadmin/user_upload/minisites/icofom/pdf/Reconceptualizing%20the%20Museum%20Visitor%20Experience-Director%20John%20Falk.doc</p>
<p>Life Stage segmentation Barbara Cohen and Craig Kaczorowski</p>	<p>Segment current and prospective customers across three key components: age, presence of children in the household and income.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life-stage segmentation serves as a good model because it provides intuitive segments that are easy to create, understand and communicate. Furthermore, life stage often determines purchasing and decision-making behaviour. • The basic premise behind life-stage segmentation is that having children is a major milestone; therefore, • the data set is divided into three categories: those who have not yet had children; those who have children under eighteen at home; and those whose children have grown and left the home. • Next, within each group, consumers can be sorted into smaller, and more easily targeted, segments • based on their household-income levels: upper, middle and lower.
<p>Arts Council</p>	<p>In a survey about the types of data collected they discovered that most museums collected data on audience demographics – 60% age, 60% gender, ethnicity 53%, disability status 48%, postcode 65% and reason for visit 98% also contact details (77%, tourist/local 38%, education level 18% and employment status 30%.</p> <p>When asked what guidelines they used most museums (24-27% used arts council guidelines and others (11-13%) government guidelines, 12% census definitions and 10% audience development agency guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly engaged <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban arts eclectic • Traditional culture vultures • Some engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fun, fashion and friends

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mature explorers • Dinner and a show • Family and community focused • Bedroom DJs • Mid-life hobbyists • Retired arts and crafts <p>Not currently engaged</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time-poor dreamers • A quiet pint with the match • Older and home-bound
<p>Dr Lynda Kelly – reviews audience segmentation</p>	<p>Higgins (1884)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students • Observers • Loungers • Emigrants <p>Wolf & Tymitz (1978)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The commuter – use the hall to get from one entry point to the exit • The nomad – casual visitor • The cafeteria type – interested visitor who treats museum like a cafeteria as they search for objects or exhibitions of interest • The VIP – very interested person <p>Falk (1982)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious shoppers – come with a clear predetermined notion of what want to see • Window shoppers – come 'to do' the museum • Impulse shoppers – discover one or more exhibits that are interesting and become more engaged than first planned <p>Bicknell & Mann (1993)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'buffs' – experts who know intimate details of objects and exhibits • 'it's for the children' – families that are explicitly or implicitly a 'learning unit' • 'I'm museuming' – usually couples, often tourist, often older. Culture vultures who know the international museum 'code' • School visits <p>Veron & Lavasseur (1989)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ants – move methodically from object to object • Butterflies – move back & forth, alight on some displays • Grasshoppers – chose specific objects and hop from one to the other • Fish – glide in and out of exhibitions with few stops <p>I always remember George MacDonald (formerly of the CMA and</p>

Museum Victoria) who called visitors 'streakers, strollers and students' which I quite like as it explains different visiting patterns really well.

In Kelly's own thesis *The Interrelationships Between Adult Museum Visitors' Learning Identities and their Museum Experiences*, I found that there were three roles played by visitors during a visit:

- 'visit manager' by directing and organising;
- 'museum expert' in explaining, clarifying and correcting;
- 'learning-facilitator' through questioning, linking, reminiscing and wondering.

These roles were interchangeable, occurred simultaneously and were dependent on both the social context of the visit and the group composition, particularly the ages of any accompanying children.

So, her view is that we like categorising visitors because it makes our lives easier and also that is the nature of museum work - to classify and explain. However, we need to remember that these are only an indication of the nature of visitors and that human nature is ever-changing and ever-fluid (and often inexplicable).

Sources: Segmentation

Association of Independent Museums

<http://www.aim-museums.co.uk/> for their economic impact tool kit

British Museum

<http://www.lateralthinkers.com/resources/Comment/GraysonPerry-case-study-FINAL.pdf>

Grayson Perry Case study for the **British Museum**, by Morris Hargreaves and McIntyre

National Trust

Segmentation see <http://visitors.org.uk/node/372>

Falk and Dierking

Segmentation of visitors See <http://visitors.org.uk/node/372>

Cambridge economic impact

<http://www.insights.org.uk/destinationmanagementguideitem.aspx?title=3C%3A+Determining+the+Local+Economic+Impact+of+Tourism>

Life Stage segmentation

Barbara Cohen and Craig Kaczorowski see

http://www.kannon.com/media/publications/GA_lifestage_insights.pdf

Visitor Data

English Heritage see <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/research/social-and-economic-research/the-historic-environment-and-tourism/> and

Visitor Attractions Trends in England 2009

Annual Report for Heritage Counts Prepared for English Heritage

Wellcome Trust www.wellcome.ac.uk

Museum of London, <http://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/london-wall/> for *Annual Review 2009 - 2010*

Birmingham Museums and Gallery:

<http://www.bmag.org.uk/uploads/fck/file/BMAG%20Annual%20Review%202010-11.pdf>

National Maritime Museum for 2006 – 2007 and collected by Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2007 - 2009 for the marketing department

Chertsey Museum report for Runneymede District Council

Australian Museum – Audience Research Unit and leading researcher into visitors

Lynda Kelly <http://australianmuseum.net.au/BlogPost/Museullaneous/Categorising-visitors>

Heritage Lottery Fund *Evaluation Good-practice guidance* October 2012

Visit England see *Understanding Visitor Satisfaction VisitEngland Brand & Satisfaction Tracker, 2011-12, 2012*

RESEARCH AND INTELLIGENCE ACTION PLAN England - A strategic action plan for Tourism 2010-2020

The All-England Destination Marketing Strategy: A New Approach

Kent and Medway

The Economic Impact of Tourism on Kent and Medway Estimates for 2011 County, District and Unitary Results

DCMS *Taking Part 2011/12 Adult and Child Report*

The *Economic Impact Assessment* of tourism in **Stratford-on-Avon District**
MLA Research Briefing
Briefing 4: Increasing Attendance and Participation
Pallant House OUTSIDE IN: Evaluation Report SUSAN POTTER OCTOBER 2009
Comparative visitor profile for project

With thanks to the following for information

Melissa Bentley, MDO London

Nicky Boyd, freelancer

Sharon Bristow, formerly ABC of Schools

Debbie Dainton, Dover District Council

Peter Davis, Canterbury

Chris Ford, Barking and Dagenham Council for information on their framework for data collection and their associated strategy to be found on

<http://www.lbdd.gov.uk/MuseumsAndHeritage/Pages/Heritagestrategy2013-16.aspx>

funded by Strive and Thrive programme

Martin Goodhew at SWALE District Council

Emily Leach, freelancer

Sonia Rasbery, freelancer and worked on draft framework for quantitative visitor data for Plymouth

Ella Roberts of Handel House Museum for the report by Audience London on the project *London Shh... Audience Benchmarking*, 2012

Matthew Tyler Jones of the National Trust

And **all the mdo's in the South East**

Consultation with:

Dover Museums Group

Kent Museums Group