



Journal of Recreation and Tourism Research

Journal home page: www.jrtr.org

ISSN:2148-5321

A LITERATURE REVIEW ON MUSEUM VISITORS

Ecem TEZGEL ^a

Orhan AKOVA ^b

^a İstanbul Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul, Türkiye (ecemtezgel@gmail.com)

^b İstanbul Üniversitesi, İktisat Fakültesi, İstanbul, Türkiye (oakova@istanbul.edu.tr)

EXTENSIVE SUMMARY

As a component of tourism supply, museums have become one of the main attractions in destinations. Due to this, number of museum visitors and studies on museum visitor has increased day by day. The interest of relationship between tourism and museums has dramatically begun after 1990's (Harrison, 1997). Nowadays, museums are accepted as a tool for development of urban tourism (Jansen-Andrbeke and van Rekom, 1996). It is estimated that every year more than one billion people visit museums (Falk, 2016). When evaluating studies on museum visitors, it is clearly understood that researchers are from various fields such as arts, museum management, tourism and education.

In this paper, a literature review of studies on museum visitors was held in order to make classification and was aimed to reveal a holistic view of studies. The paper is important in terms of being a seminal work for future studies. The studies on museum visitors can be classified as studies on (1) visitors experiences, (2) visitor motivations and typologies and (3) visitor benefits according to literature review.

A classification of museum visitors studies in terms of their methodological aspects was presented in Table 1. Literature review indicates that the earliest study on museum visitors belongs to Graburn (1984). On the other hand, the current study belongs to Falk (2016) and Nielsen and Guler (2016).

Table 1. A Classification of Museum Visitor Studies According to Methodological Aspect

Theoretical	Graburn, 1984; Hood, 1993; Doering, 1999; Rounds, 2001; Hennes, 2002; Ferguson, 2005; Bitgood, 2006; Hooper-Greenhill, 2006; Spiegel et al., 2006; Hooper-Greenhill, 2007; Rounds, 2007; East, 2008; Dawson and Jensen, 2011; Kirchberg and Tröndle, 2012		
Empirical	Ashworth and Johnson, 1996; Jansen-Andrbeke and van Rekom, 1996; Smith and Wolf, 1996; Harrison, 1997; Moussouri, 1997; Serrell, 1997; Brown and Koran, 1998; Falk, Moussouri and Coulson, 1998; Combs, 1999;	Interview	Jansen-Andrbeke and van Rekom, 1996; Falk, Moussouri and Coulson, 1998; Pekarik, Doering and Bickford, 1999; Pekarik, Doering and Karns, 1999; Thyne, 2001; Serrell, 2002; Ballantyne, 2003; Krmpotich and Anderson, 2005; Falk, 2006; MacFadden et al., 2007; Falk, Heimlich and Bronnenkant, 2008; Packer, 2008; Evans et al., 2010; Falk and Storksdieck, 2010; Léger, 2014; Falk, 2016; Nielsen and

Pekarik, Doering and Bickford, 1999; Pekarik, Doering and Karns, 1999; Goulding, 2000; Chiozzi and Andreotti, 2001; Thyne, 2001; Todd and Lawson, 2001; Yucelt, 2001; Packer and Ballantyne, 2002; Serrell, 2002; Ballantyne, 2003; Falk et al., 2004; Falk and Storksdieck, 2005; Krmpotich and Anderson, 2005; Packer and Ballantyne, 2005; Falk, 2006; Gyllenhaal, 2006; Rojas and Camarero, 2006; MacFadden et al., 2007; Falk, Heimlich and Bronnenkant, 2008; Packer, 2008; Eandrett and Barrett, 2009; Tsybulskaya and Camhi, 2009; Evans et al., 2010; Falk and Storksdieck, 2010; Hede and Thyne, 2010; Packer and Bond, 2010; Pekarik and Mogel, 2010; Rowe and Nickels, 2011; Sheng and Chen, 2012; Trainer, Steele-Inama and Christopher, 2012; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2013a; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2013b; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2014a; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2014b; Del Chiappa, Andreu and Gallarza, 2014; Léger, 2014; Pekarik et al., 2014; Dancstep, Gutwill and Sindorf, 2015; Kirchberg and Tröndle, 2015; Yang et al., 2015; Falk, 2016; Nielsen and Gürel, 2016		Güler, 2016
	Observation	Serrell, 1997; Goulding, 2000; Chiozzi and Andreotti, 2001
	Observation and Interview	Falk et al., 2004; Falk and Storksdieck, 2005; Packer and Ballantyne, 2005; Gyllenhaal, 2006; Eandrett and Barrett, 2009; Tsybulskaya and Camhi, 2009; Pekarik and Mogel, 2010; Pekarik et al., 2014; Kirchberg and Tröndle, 2015
	Focus Group Interview	Combs, 1999
	Observation and Interview and Survey	Hede and Thyne, 2010; Dancstep, Gutwill and Sindorf, 2015
	Observation and Survey	Smith and Wolf, 1996
	Interview and Survey	Yang et al., 2015
	Survey	Ashworth and Johnson, 1996; Brown and Koran, 1998; Todd and Lawson, 2001; Yucelt, 2001; Packer and Ballantyne, 2002; Rowe and Nickels, 2011; Sheng and Chen, 2012; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2013a; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2013b; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2014a; Brida, Disegna and Scuderi, 2014b; Del Chiappa, Andreu and Gallarza, 2014; Harman and Akgündüz, 2014

Resource: Edited by authors.

According to Table 1, the most of studies focusing on museum visitors are empirical and in a qualitative nature. In large part of these studies data triangulation was employed in order to improve reliability and validity of the research.

As a result, studies on museum visitors have mainly focused on museum experiences, visitor motivation/typologies and outcomes of museum visitation. We can provide some suggestions to museum managers. Firstly,

they should consider; interests, expectations, needs, motivations of visitors. This will improve satisfaction level of the visitors. There are also other suggestions for museum researchers. Especially in Turkey number of studies on museum visitors are behind their foreign counterparts. Thus, it is clear that number of studies on museum visitors should be increased. In addition to that, if there are significant differences in terms of motivations, typologies, and satisfaction level occurring according to different types of museum should be investigated.