

# **Inclusivity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen**

Boijmans Op Zuid as a Catalyst For Change?

**Student name:** Meerten Anna Renée Zegers

**Student number:** 504655mz

**Supervisor:** Koen van Eijck

**Arts, Culture and Society**

**Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication**

**Erasmus University Rotterdam**

Master Thesis

June 14, 2019

INCLUSIVITY IN MUSEUM BOIJMANS VAN BEUNINGEN  
BOIJMANS OP ZUID AS A CATALYST FOR CHANGE?

ABSTRACT

This study examines to which extent key factors in Dutch cultural policy (creativity, inclusivity & life-long learning) are experienced in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen by 13 young inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid. This study was initiated due to plans for a temporary museum in Rotterdam Zuid: Boijmans Op Zuid. Rotterdam Zuid is one of the problematic areas in the Netherlands in terms of its socio-cultural and socioeconomic characteristics. For example, this entails that its population has higher unemployment rates, lower incomes, and higher levels of criminality and social exclusion than in most regions of the Netherlands. The population in Rotterdam Zuid is ethnically and socio-culturally diverse, generally younger than elsewhere, and increasingly more socioeconomically disadvantaged than in the rest of the Netherlands. How do these inhabitants experience the museum and what do they foresee happening as a result of Boijmans Op Zuid? This study centralizes the perspective and experiences and desired museum visit outcomes of the participants. Furthermore, what are the personal outcomes for these visitors after their visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen? For this research, members of the population of Rotterdam Zuid were invited to visit the museum. Through non-obtrusive observation and focus group discussions, participants shared their experiences and thoughts on the museum experience, and voiced their opinions on Boijmans Op Zuid. Participants pointed out that museum inclusivity should be increased and that Boijmans Op Zuid should be marketed for and shaped for the authentic population of Rotterdam Zuid if it wishes to attract this audience.

KEYWORDS: *museum inclusivity, diversity, audience experience, cultural participation, inclusion.*

## Table of contents

<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>1. Theoretical framework</b>	5
1.1 Diversity in Rotterdam	5
a. The value of art in society	7
1.2. Barriers for non-visitors in Rotterdam Zuid	9
a. Dimensions of the audience experience and desired museum outcomes	10
<b>2. Methodology</b>	14
2.1 Choice of method	14
2.2 Method of analysis	15
2.3. Sample	17
2.4. Operationalization	18
a. Focus group outline	18
b. Theoretical concepts in relation to the research questions	19
2.5. Validity and reliability	20
<b>3. The audience experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen</b>	23
3.1 Experienced museum inclusivity, audience diversity and expected motivations for inclusivity in the museum context	23
3.2. Personal significance	33
3.3. Familiarity & cognitive competency	36
3.4. Expected educational effect	38
3.5. Restorative or relaxed museum outcome	41
3.6. Flow experience and chaotic experience	42
3.7. Shared or solo visit	45
3.8. Sharing the experience online	47
<b>4. Rotterdam Zuid</b>	49
4.1. Stigma	49
4.2. Experience superdiversity in Zuid	49
4.3. Does Zuid want Boijmans Op Zuid?	51

<b>5. Expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid</b>	55
5.1. A highbrow museum is (not) an inclusive museum	56
5.2. Interactive and participatory museum experience	57
5.3. Financial element	60
5.4. Location	61
5.5. Exhibition content	64
5.6. Suggestions for marketing in Zuid	66
<b>6. Conclusion</b>	70
a. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen	70
b. Boijmans Op Zuid	74
c. Suggestions for further research	76

## **References**

**Appendix A** - Focus group outline

**Appendix B** - Questionnaire for participants

**Appendix C** - Observation form

**Appendix D** - Participant information overviews

## **Introduction** – *museum inclusivity for a superdiverse society*

Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is one of the Netherlands' top museums. It aims to be an inclusive cultural organization, which is also a key goal in Dutch cultural policy (Zijlstra, 2011; Bussemaker, 2013; Van Engelshoven, 2018). In order to realize this policy goal, the interests and requirements of the audience must be understood, which in part explains the increasing interest in audience research in Dutch museums (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Therefore, knowing the museum's current audience, and its potential audience, is of importance. Indeed, museum inclusivity has been one of the key concerns in Dutch museums for multiple years, other key concerns being creativity and lifelong learning. Taking into account the rigorous renovation plans that are expected to take until 2026 (Boijmans Van Beuningen, 2018), there are plans to exhibit part of the immense collection in various museums and temporary exhibition spaces, to ensure that people still have access to parts of the collection. As a response to the increase in attention to museum inclusivity and the value of audience diversity, the museum proposes a location in Rotterdam Zuid: the project for this location is known as Boijmans Op Zuid (Kuijk, 2018).

The majority of Zuid's population have an immigrant background, lower incomes compared to the rest of Rotterdam, and are generally younger than the inhabitants of other areas in Rotterdam (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). The population of Rotterdam is superdiverse, which also indicates that it is increasingly more fragmented than before (Vertovec, 2007). Social cohesion and a sense of unity are lacking in neighborhoods in Rotterdam Zuid, according to the participants of this research. They experience a divide between "Dutch people" and "people with a migration background". These citizens are more often light users of culture, which means that they are less likely to engage with culture (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Rotterdam Zuid's population is younger than other populations in the Netherlands, which is important to take into consideration in this study because young people are less likely to visit highbrow cultural institutions, such as Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen (Mason & McCarthy, 2006; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Key barriers for younger people, that keep them from visiting museums, are discussed in detail in the theoretical framework of this thesis.

Opening a museum in an area where most people are non-visitors may seem like an odd choice at first. But studies suggest that bringing the collection to the area of light users of culture could lower the threshold to visit the museum, and suits the inclusive nature of the cultural organization. Furthermore, research shows that bringing cultural organizations to those who are generally light users of culture can improve socio-economic and socio-cultural

aspects of neighborhoods, and increase cultural participation if executed effectively for the authentic population (Belfiore, 2002). However, there are also cases where neighborhood renewal through cultural organizations sparked gentrification, such as the neighborhood of Katendrecht in Rotterdam Zuid, which changed the neighborhood and its population immensely (Florida, Mellander & Adler, 2011).

Opening a temporary museum in Rotterdam Zuid may increase the level of cultural participation of the authentic population living in this area, and it could attract non-visitors in Rotterdam Zuid to both Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and the temporary museum Boijmans Op Zuid. Following key concerns in Dutch cultural policy, a suitable and interactive museum in Zuid could also increase the authentic population's creative skills, and help them to achieve the "lifelong learning" process with 21st century skills (Van Engelshoven, 2018).

It becomes relevant to question what should and could happen to Boijmans Op Zuid, by centralizing the opinions and expectations of the participants from Rotterdam Zuid, whilst taking into account their experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen as it exists today. This study aims to answer the following research question: how do the young inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and how do they perceive plans for Boijmans Op Zuid?

This question is compartmentalized into sub-questions, all of which are answered in the results section of this thesis. In the results section, three main themes are covered: the participants' museum experience, their experience and desired changes in Rotterdam Zuid, and finally their concerns for Boijmans Op Zuid. The first section answers two sub-questions as it discusses the participants' personal experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. The first is: How do inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen? The second is: To which extent do the participants experience inclusivity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and which factors influence this experience?

The second theme provides context that is needed to answer the final sub-questions, discussing the desired changes in Rotterdam Zuid, what Boijmans Op Zuid should be like, and the expected effects of Boijmans Op Zuid for Rotterdam Zuid. The final theme answers the following sub-questions: What do the participants expect of Boijmans Op Zuid and what do participants foresee necessary for a valuable execution of Boijmans Op Zuid to increase the museum's audience diversity and inclusivity? How do the inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid expect Boijmans Op Zuid to fit into their neighborhood?

The value of cultural participation in museums, and the value of culture in general, have received significant attention in both cultural policy of the last ten years, and by scholars

from numerous disciplines (Zijlstra, 2011; Raad voor Cultuur, 2012; Van Engelshoven, 2018). Dutch cultural policy reveals three clear key concerns, or arguments, in favor of cultural participation in Rotterdam. The first is that cultural participation and cultural education can increase people's creativity. Furthermore, it is suggested that in turn this could benefit people's socio-economic status and entrepreneurial innovation at the level of the national economy (Zijlstra, 2011; Bussemaker, 2013).

Secondly, it is argued that cultural participation can increase one's "21st century skills", which is a term Bussemaker used in her plans. It is used to describe skills that benefit people to participate successfully in not only today's society, but also in the future. For example, such skills are critical thinking, collaborating, social and cultural competencies, communicating, and computational thinking (Bell, 2010). This has long-term benefits, therefore it has a positive influence by creating a "life-long learning" experience, which is thought to be a meaningful learning experience as well (Bussemaker, 2013).

Lastly, if we believe that culture and the arts can have a positive influence on people, then it is only logical that it should aim towards being highly inclusive so as to ensure that a diverse and large audience can enjoy such benefits of the cultural sector (Zijlstra, 2011; Van Engelshoven, 2018; Bussemaker, 2013). Inclusivity is a key concern especially in Rotterdam, with a society that is superdiverse and increasingly more "open", which entails that it is more diverse and even increasingly more socioeconomically as well as socio-culturally fragmented than it used to be (Vasta, 2007; Vertovec, 2007; Van Engelshoven, 2018). Ultimately though, reflection of inclusive cultural policy in museums could be implemented more vastly as those three key factors - creativity, lifelong learning, and inclusivity – may not be incorporated in the museum context to a very effective extent (Golsteyn, 2012).

Following the postmodern and social-constructivist perspective, museums in the Netherlands dedicate more attention than before to the subjective experience of their audience. Centralizing the experiences and opinions of inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid would enable Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen to learn more about its potential future audience for Boijmans Op Zuid. What is more, the critical and aesthetic analysis of art is becoming more important to museums, it also influences how exhibitions are framed (Hein, 2006; Heilig, Cole, & Aguilar, 2010; Schep, Van Boxtel, & Noordegraaf, 2018). Thus re-evaluating the current Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and its traditional museum status are valuable to see how exhibitions might be presented differently in Boijmans Op Zuid. It may be fruitful to examine if Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen could implement this social-constructivist

perspective and those three key points in cultural policy<sup>1</sup> in such a manner that the inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid will benefit most.

To examine the extent to which those values and this perspective are noticeably reflected in their museum, and to examine how general non-visitors of the museum experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, 13 participants who live in Rotterdam Zuid were invited to visit the museum and discuss their opinions and thoughts on their museum experience<sup>2</sup> and their expectations of Boijmans Op Zuid. Using a non-obtrusive observation procedure during the participants' museum visit, their behavior was examined. These observations were used throughout the focus groups, where the structure of a semi-structured interview was followed. This is further elaborated on in the methodology chapter.

First, an overview of relevant theory is given in the following chapter. Studies on museum audience experiences, museum inclusivity and diversity, the value of a participatory museum experience, and levels of cultural participation, educational and restorative or therapeutic effects of a museum visit, are explored in this section. Vertovec's notion of the superdiverse society is explored as well, its implications for Rotterdam are discussed. The analysis of the acquired data is presented in the results section. These findings are then linked to the chosen framework and theory, and the main differences or similarities are explained. In the final conclusion, the main outcomes of this study are evaluated, and suggestions for future research are proposed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Creativity, lifelong learning, and museum inclusivity

<sup>2</sup> This is based on Alain de Botton's theory on the therapeutic effect of a museum experience (De Botton & Armstrong, 2013), and the two dominant expected valuable outcomes of a museum visit (educational and restorative function) as described by Kaplan, Bardwell, and Slakter (1993).

## **1. Theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework that forms the basis for this thesis revolves around issues that concern the relation between culture and society. Theories and concepts that I will examine are museum inclusivity and audience diversity in the museum context, superdiversity and its implications for the population of Rotterdam Zuid, cultural participation and its expected ‘lifelong’ effects, hurdles for light users of culture in Rotterdam, dimensions of the audience experience, the value of art and expected outcomes for museum visitors in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. First, the importance of inclusivity for both Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and for Rotterdam are explained. Then, the dimensions of cultural participation and potential barriers to visit Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and Boijmans Op Zuid are discussed. Finally, factors that influence the audience experience and expected museum outcomes are explored.

### **1.1. Diversity in Rotterdam**

Rotterdam is one of the top cities in the EU creative cities monitor, placing itself in the highest category of creative cities (Creative Cities Monitor, 2017). Points 23 and 24 of this internationally renowned monitor are Integration of foreigners and Tolerance of foreigners. Indeed, tolerance matters to Rotterdam, though there are cities with higher scores on this (Creative Cities Monitor, 2017). The societal agency of tolerance and societal inclusion is furthermore clearly voiced in national and municipal policy documents of the past decade.

The superdiverse city of Rotterdam consists of generally younger, and more multicultural citizens than elsewhere in the Netherlands (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; CBS 2018). On average, these young and culturally diverse segments of the population in Rotterdam are light users of culture or not participating at all (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018). This reveals a paradox, because the Creative Cities Monitor argues that population diversity enhances a city’s creativity, though studies also show that the inhabitants of Rotterdam are generally light users of culture and experience highbrow culture as less accessible (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). If these people participate less in cultural activities, then they are thought to be less likely to learn creative thinking skills that encourage creativity, for these skills are also taught in the cultural organizations. Encouraging creativity through cultural education in organizations, is a key concern in Dutch cultural policy for all cultural organizations in the Netherlands (Van Engelshoven, 2018).

I define Tolerance within the context of the 3T model of Florida. Florida states in his economic development model on the creative class that tolerance is one of the key conditions

for a creative class to flourish, which is in turn the prerequisite for creative cities (Florida, Mellander, & Adler, 2011). They conclude that successful places have high levels of concentration of talent, technology and tolerance. These factors are coined in the 3Ts model of economic development to be the three key elements to attract creative workers - the creative class - in cities (Florida, 2002).

A creative city such as Rotterdam aims to have a high level of tolerance. This is reflected in its cultural organizations. Since Rotterdam is a major creative city (Creative Cities Monitor, 2017), the attention of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen to their potential inclusivity is no surprise. Furthermore, it follows cultural policy on museum inclusivity (Van Engelshoven, 2018). The museum's actions to increase inclusivity - such as offering free public events in the museum and offering free entrance to the museum for citizens with a *Rotterdampas* - reflect their intentions to invite a diverse audience. Indeed, inclusivity matters to Rotterdam's image, to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, and to the population of Rotterdam. Looking into the experienced levels of tolerance, feelings of inclusivity and the overall visitor experience of the participants is valuable to gain an insight in the extent to which inclusivity is actually experienced.

Superdiversity is used to describe the population in Rotterdam Zuid. This is important to take into account in my research because the type of population that Boijmans Op Zuid will be surrounded by is also the group of people that the project wishes to attract (Kuijk, 2018). Furthermore, I needed to know this to collect my sample. The term is nowadays often used in cultural policy documents because of the influence that it has on the cultural field (Rotterdam festivals, 2015). Vertovec (2005) first used this term to describe the shift in population demographics, which he noticed changed from unified immigrant groups to more fragmented and more impermanent migration groups. These newer groups have varying socio-cultural and socio-economic characteristics, they are less organized than before (Vertovec, 2007). This also entails that nowadays the immigrant groups vary more in terms of their education, and income. Rather than thinking of the population of Rotterdam as consisting of "Dutch" and "Other" people, which is similar to Foucault's notion of othering, seeing nationalities - regardless of legal status or migration group - as equal parts in society seems more suitable in debates surrounding inclusion (Peters & Besley, 2014).

However, equal does not mean that society is experienced as one cohesive unity. Superdiversity does not directly indicate a positive shift, rather it just pinpoints the recent shift of population dynamic. This superdiverse population in Rotterdam also reveals problems due to its increasing fragmentation, such as a lesser sense of social cohesion and a greater

difficulty to solve issues related to positive migrant integration into the existing society (Scholten, Crul & Van de Laar, 2018). To understand this society, a more Individualistic approach is needed to make sense of what would work best to approach issues with inclusion as there is no longer a solution that would fit all, or even most (Vertovec, 2007).

Meissner and Vertovec (2014) state that superdiversity is a term which is used to frame city dynamics, and the fragmentation of diversity in cities such as Rotterdam. Later, superdiversity is used to describe city dynamics more critically, more specifically the tension between inequality and segregation is addressed by Geldof (2016). Rotterdam exemplifies perfectly the change in population dynamics: there is a shift from segregated immigrants in society, to a society that no longer recognizes immigrants as segregated groups. Rotterdam consists of a range of minorities. Indeed, more than half of the population of Rotterdam has an immigration background (CBS, 2018).

#### *a. The value of art in society*

Bourdieu explained that the value of art is socially constructed (1979). He also noted that, although nearly everyone can physically set foot inside a museum, there are cultural barriers for many people, thus the traditional museum has an exclusionary character. "The inheritance of cultural wealth only really belongs (although it is theoretically offered to everyone) to those endowed with the means of appropriating it for themselves" (Bourdieu, 1979, p. 73).

Indeed, art and cultural participation are factors that can indicate social distinction, for the elites define the meaning and value of the arts. Cultural capital reflects the extent to which certain Individuals can recognize the qualities assigned to works of art (Vuyk, 2010).

Bourdieu, Darbel, and Schnapper (1991) state that artistic appreciation is used to create distinctions between people. This means that if "love of art is the clear mark of the chosen", as they phrased it, then museums "reinforce for some the feeling of belonging and for others the feeling of exclusion" (Boudieu et al., 1991, p.112). Museums do not "naturally" come across as inclusive organizations, but much is done (and can be done) to increase museum inclusivity. Numerous studies support Bourdieu's theory that pinpoints the restrictive character of the profile of the visual arts museum audience, which in turn reflects the higher cultural capital of those who are more engaged and more familiar with high culture art forms, such as art in museums (Bourdieu, 1979; Dimaggio & Useem, 1978; Bennett, Emmison & Frow, 1999; Merriman, 1989).

Bourdieu describes that the ground for cultural capital lays mainly in primary socialization and is acknowledged and often reinforced in education (1979). After the family

of origin, education, where people develop their institutionalized cultural capital, is the most important environment where habitus is formed. Habitus consists of one's habits, skills and dispositions. Having art, such as Boijmans Op Zuid, in a neighborhood where a lot of people with less cultural capital grow up, might help increase cultural capital because it acquaints them with the art. Attracting a wider audience, which is one of the main catalysts for opening Boijmans op Zuid, could help people with less cultural capital to learn more about culture. Light users of culture in Rotterdam Zuid, who generally have below average cultural capital, are often not only disadvantaged in a material sense - in terms of income and expenditures - but they are also culturally and socially more excluded in society (Gibney, 1988; Rotterdam festivals, 2015).

The arts are by some scholars recognized to have positive influence on the social inclusion and neighborhood renewal as they improve communities' performance in the four main Indicators that the government identifies: health, education, crime, and employment (Belfiore, 2002). However, nuance is much needed because empirical evidence is lacking to support such outcomes (Belfiore, 2002). If art could alleviate symptoms of this social exclusion, then cultural engagement should be stimulated (Belfiore, 2002). Indeed, culture is a public good because it is thought to be of universal importance (Dubois, 2011). Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen already voices to take inclusion into account in their exhibitions and public programs, much like what is voiced in Dutch politics on cultural policy as well (Schreuder, 2018).

Rotterdam has been active in the development of extensive cultural and largely effective policies based on the creative city concept. According to Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam (2017), Rotterdam's current long term cultural policy plan 2017-2020 continues its focus on being a creative city with, among others, focus points on renewal and innovation, cultural education and talent development, and increasing and broadening its audiences for cultural products. However, the same documents recognize that, despite long-term active cultural policy, most non-western citizens do not participate in culture and most youngsters and non-Dutch citizens do not feel comfortable with the supply and atmosphere of current subsidized cultural institutions (Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam, 2017).

Many citizens in Rotterdam Zuid are light users of culture, which means that on average they rarely visit cultural venues or events. They generally do not know what information about cultural organizations is available, or where they can find this information (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). They do not feel like it is suitable for them and mainly come across it by chance. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen aims to make itself accessible to all

types of people, including light users of culture and non-visitors (Schreuder, 2018). The frequency of cultural participation of light users is low. Therefore, it is useful to create ways for these non-visitors to feel like the threshold to visit the museum is lowered.

If the Dutch government and the museum itself want art to be accessible for everyone, then encouraging them to get familiar with a museum that houses world-class collections is a step in the right direction. The concept of cultural identity is used to understand how culture can alter the levels of integration of citizens in Rotterdam Zuid. Cultural identity is defined as "those aspects of our identities which arise from our 'belonging' to distinctive ethnic, racial, linguistic, religious and, above all, national cultures" (Hall & Du Gay, 2006, p.274). Due to the superdiverse nature of the population of Rotterdam Zuid, it is interesting to examine the potential role or significance of Boijmans Op Zuid in their lives. Integration into Dutch society can alter their cultural identity. It must be noted that I do not at all propose they give up their original cultural identity. Rather, increasing cultural participation among these people and making a museum visit more inviting may help to create another cultural identity linked to their environment (Ennaji, 2005).

## **1.2. Barriers for non-visitors in Rotterdam Zuid**

51% of the citizens in Rotterdam have a migrant background (CBS, 2018). Despite active cultural policy, the superdiverse citizens -especially the younger group- are light users of highbrow culture. Generally, this demographic does not match with the supply and atmosphere of current subsidized cultural institutions, meaning that what is offered often does not speak to them (Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam, 2017). The content of museums usually attracts only certain social groups, due to the fact that it caters more to their needs than it does to others; although done unintentionally, this means museums in a sense prohibit others from visiting the museum (McLean, 1999). Within the past decade, much has been done to increase museum inclusivity (Belfiore, 2002; Van Engelshoven, 2018).

Indeed, cultural participation overall has increased, although the potential audience diversity is currently not a representation of the superdiverse society; in fact, most museum visitors are relatively older than the overall population (Merriman, 1991). Despite attempts to increase cultural participation amongst the younger (15-30 years old) citizens, museums still generally fail to attract young visitors (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). It is important to understand what it is that may deter non-visitors from visiting museums, if we wish to increase museum inclusivity and audience diversity. One explanation for this is the threshold fear, which means that people do not want to enter a space that is perceived as uncomfortable

and unknown because the threshold to enter is too high, for one or multiple reasons that may be physical or psychological (Gurian, 2005; Macleod, 2005; Fleming, 2003). Examples of this are intricate architecture with unfamiliar entrances or the community's attitude towards a certain museum (Gurian, 2005). To decrease the threshold to visit museums, there need to be more motivators that lower the threshold, and less barriers that create a higher threshold to participate in cultural activities.

Audience research shows that key hurdles for participation by such audiences in Rotterdam are insecurity, lack of knowledge and/or disinterestedness in programming and high prices (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018). Following the aforementioned key hurdles for light users of culture, there are more barriers that citizens experience which keep them from visiting museums. Individual motivation, expectations and satisfaction influence visitor behavior, and these are factors that can either be motivators or barriers for people to frequent museums (Mason & McCarthy, 2006; Thyne, 2001; Todd & Lawson, 2001).

Young people experience a dissonance between museum culture and their own cultural identity, which makes them feel excluded from museums (Mason & McCarthy, 2006). A motivator for young people is museum content that focuses on the present and the future (or contemporary subjects), rather than the past which is often the subject of exhibitions (Mason & McCarthy, 2006). Another factor that plays a role in the museum experience revolves around the personal and collective cultural identity of visitors (Kaplan, Bardwell & Slakter, 1993; Coombes, 2004; Sandell, 2002). It is believed that if a culture is represented in museums, then it can increase self-esteem and make Individuals feel validated, which in turn helps to promote tolerance and may increase the understanding within society (Sandell, 1998).

What is more, the population of Rotterdam Zuid is on average lower educated than populations in other regions in the Netherlands (CBS, 2018). Following Bourdieu's theory (1979) on cultural capital, stating that education is one of the most influential places where habitus is formed, then it becomes evident that low education is a barrier for people to visit a museum as well.

#### *a. Dimensions of the audience experience and desired museum outcomes*

According to Goulding (2000), there are three basic approaches in the literature to understand museum visitors. The social approach is based on consumption within the social context of the visitor (e.g. provides status) and it is often influenced by peer group pressure (Kelly, 1985). The cognitive approach looks at the consumers' motivation, whereby intrinsic motivations focus on the usefulness of the experience during the visit (i.e. personal meaning,

instructiveness) and extrinsic motivation includes feedback or rewards for achievements (Screven, 1986). The museum environment and special interaction approach focus more on the setting in which the consumption behavior takes place, which is a balance between leisure and consumption (Shields, 1992).

Fitting within the cognitive approach, there are two desired outcomes of a museum visit (Kaplan et al., 1993). The first is the educational effect, which indicates that the audience hopes to have learned something during their visit that feels useful and rewarding, making their visit "worth their while". The second desired museum outcome is the restorative effect, which in turn is related to the therapeutic experience that art experiences can have on one's personal life. This follows the subjective perspective on artistic appreciation that fits within the postmodern framework (De Botton & Armstrong, 2013). A restorative effect within this thesis means that the participants have experienced a soothing, relaxing or mindful effect (Hartig, 2004).

Following the aforementioned approaches (i.e. the social, the cognitive, and the special interaction approach), one may derive three visitor perspectives on their motivation: they are primarily exhibition driven, they are visitor driven by following their own agenda, or they are motivated by a more holistic setting perspective where the museum caters for the optimal environment for the visitor and which draws more on ethnographic studies (Falk, 1985). As these perspectives all look at different aspects, in understanding the potential museum audience it may be relevant to look at all of them.

Rotterdam has recently obtained an extensive follow-up audience research on the experiences, preferences and motivations of non-users of culture, which shows that the main reasons not to participate are insecurity, lack of knowledge or disinterestedness in the programming or lack of money. All the reasons refer to social inequalities and socially related lack of access (Menko, 2018), which are precisely those issues that policymakers aim to resolve or prevent. Since there is still an obvious disconnect between non-users and cultural institutions, it may be worthwhile to hear what non-users think of the museum. It then becomes evident if all these perspectives are already efficiently taken into account in the museum context, if new aspects become apparent, and what may change to increase audience diversity. This is based on the expectation that the visitors of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen will feel more welcome and more accepted if their expectations are met.

Furthermore, an educational museum visit could stimulate meaningful learning, which can teach visitors long-term skills (Bussemaker, 2013). This is thought to be more time consuming than just a museum visit, but it does increase the attributed value to the experience

for visitors (Mayer, 2002). I believe that for specifically Boijmans Op Zuid, which thus far seems to be marketed for a young and local audience, the desired outcomes for the audience may be to learn skills that are useful in their daily life as well. Schep, Van Boxtel & Noordegraaf (2018) reveal that for many cultural organizations their desired outcomes do indeed revolve around learning more about developing tolerance towards various perspectives and cultures, and to learn more about relevant (societal) subjects. There is a positive correlation between a greater understanding during the museum visit, and the attributed value to this experience; this may even be a motivator to participate in cultural activities in the future (Vivek, Beatty & Morgan, 2012; Kemp & Poole, 2016).

Following the idea that inclusion matters as it benefits individuals, one must understand the attention of cultural policy to museum inclusivity. If we believe culture to have beneficial effects on people's lives, then it should be available to all. Evaluating in what ways Boijmans Op Zuid could be marketed and shaped to motivate the authentic population of Rotterdam Zuid is important in order to increase its success at attracting a diverse audience. As discussed, making people actually visit a museum is not as simple as knowing who wants to visit it, and who does not want to go. Certain social factors play a role in the likelihood that one visits a museum, such as education, class, ethnicity, and age (Hood, 1983). To attract its local audience, it is important for it to be marketed and framed in a way that reduces the highbrow image that museums have, in order to reduce the threshold fears that non-visitors may have (Gurian, 2005; Macleod, 2005; Fleming, 2003). This also means that its content should be relevant and interesting for the diverse inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid.

Another important aspect that can influence the audience experience for generally non-visitors is to increase the participatory nature of the museum visit. Nina Simon points out that an engaging museum experience increases the educational results of the museum visit, and that it also increases the attributed value to the experience (Simon, 2006). Furthermore, a meta-analysis from more than 500 studies shows that intergroup contact does indeed reduce prejudice, and can increase interaction on a long term basis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Taking into account that the inhabitants in Rotterdam Zuid experienced their neighborhood as fragmented and even "not sociable" at times, and that they expressed that they feel there is a stigma on Zuid and its inhabitants, it would be useful to encourage interaction between different people. This could positively increase the perspective people have of others in Zuid, and decrease the stigma that others may have of Zuid. Finding ways within the museum that can encourage interaction to increase positive contact between people and simultaneously reduce prejudice would be useful to initiate a positive change in the outlook that visitors of

Boijmans Op Zuid would have of others (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). A way to achieve this is through an active museum experience that encourages participation and interaction between visitors (Simon, 2006).

What is more, the interactive museum experience is expected to keep even general non-visitors involved and engaged, and during programs or events that Boijmans Op Zuid may offer it could increase the transfer of knowledge and the overall learning experience (Simon, 2006; Crawford, 2017; Hein, 2006). If a museum has more opportunities for involvement, then it is likely to increase the audience's intrinsic motivation for a positive and meaningful museum experience, which in turn is a prerequisite for a flow experience (Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1999). This interactive experience also focuses more on the audience's subjective experience, and is a motivator for those who are not familiar with highbrow culture (Hein, 2006).

Acknowledging what may be barriers to visit museums is important, because bringing Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen as it exists today closer to non-visitors is not expected to in itself increase the cultural participation from the inhabitants in Rotterdam Zuid. Indeed, research indicates that bringing cultural organizations closer to areas where there are many non-visitors it is not likely to already increase their visits to such organizations (Badisco, Glorieux & Van Tienoven, 2011). Frankly, if Boijmans Op Zuid wishes to attract the local population in Rotterdam Zuid, then lowering the threshold to visit it in all possible ways is crucial.

To conclude, research suggests that there are many barriers that explain why non-visitors do not visit museums, but there are motivators that could be implemented more rigorously to increase the museum inclusivity. This may increase audience diversity, and to attract even those who generally do not feel comfortable with museums. Research suggests that neighborhood museums may encourage societal change, if they are executed to fit the local population's needs (Kinard, 1985). Boijmans Op Zuid could do this, which may encourage societal change in Zuid, something that this area of Rotterdam could benefit from.

## **2. Methodology**

The following section aims to provide a justification and explanation of my methodology. It first covers my methods and my argumentation for using focus groups, unobtrusive observations, and questionnaires. Then I discuss the approach to my analysis and an explanation of the steps I took in my analysis, my sample and how I acquired this specific sample, and finally an evaluation of the validity and reliability of this study.

### **2.1. Choice of method**

To answer the research questions that were stated in the introduction, I opted for three methods in my qualitative study: questionnaires, non-obtrusive observations, and focus groups. The questionnaires and observations support the focus group data, thus the focus groups were my main method. The questionnaire can be found in appendix B. I gave all participants this questionnaire before their visit to inquire about preconceived notions they had about the museum experience, and to learn more about general statistics such as age, occupation, and nationality. These translated questionnaires can be found in appendix D. The observation form that I used during my observations can be found in appendix C. It covered dimensions of the observable museum experience through the participants' behavior.

I observed each participant for two minutes, although I also observed to which extent they used interactive options in the exhibitions and whether their behavior changed significantly throughout their visit. I used my data from these observations in my focus groups, which means that some probing questions during the focus groups were based on earlier observations. Although I told the participants before their visit that I would observe them for some time during their visit, they did not notice exactly when I observed each participant to ensure that they did not behave differently because I was present.

I performed a qualitative study with three focus groups, which followed the structure of a semi-structured interview. Focus groups are guided discussions in small groups. The intended group size was 5-7 people. Due to cancellations, two groups counted five people and the last group counted three people. Because these participants were still able to have in-depth discussions with each other, I opted to use the data from this last group as well but did not use quotes from those specific participants. The focus groups were helpful to learn more about a group's opinions on certain topics. I chose for focus group research because it allows for more multifaceted data with enough possibilities for participants to share detailed accounts of their experience and opinions, thus this method does result in valuable data. Focus groups are more successful at this for my research purposes than other forms of research could be.

One of the main motivators for me to opt for focus groups is that it is easier for participants to talk to one another about their thoughts and the experiences they all just had before the focus group, then simply answering questions directly to someone who they know studies culture and is involved with Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. The focus groups enabled even those who were not satisfied with their visit, and those who had strong opinions on their expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid, to be honest and elaborate on their findings because participants validated each other's opinions. Furthermore, because I studied the inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid and wanted to study their expectations and experiences, a focus group was suitable and efficient enough within the time that I had for this research (Smithson, 2000; Bryman, 2012).

This approach is the most fitting to answer the research questions because it allowed me to inquire multiple participants at once, immediately after their visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Conducting these focus groups immediately after the museum experience was important because I wanted to discuss their experience before the participants had discussed it with others, or had forgotten about details of their experience. The focus group method is obtrusive and reactive; it is a flexible approach which allows for detailed accounts of the audience's experience and their point of view (Smithson, 2000; Bryman, 2012). The focus group method is also captivating because I could interpret answers during the focus group meeting, and ask follow-up questions or specification questions that depended on the focus group's answers. Furthermore, it is interesting that participants discussed their opinions together for it enabled them to evaluate their own perspective and opinions, discuss nuances and find a common ground when they disagreed.

## **2.2. Method of analysis**

The qualitative method I used to analyze my transcripts was a thematic analysis that used an inductive open coding approach. This method aids to present themes that occur in my rough data (Smithson, 2000; Boyatzis, 1998; Bryman, 2012). It seemed to be the most suitable method for a qualitative analysis because the nuances and the diverse subjects in the transcripts could be organized and categorized without losing details. Furthermore, it helped to discover implicit themes as well (Bryman, 2012). What is more, a thematic analysis was useful to compare, contrast, and link concepts; this also helped me to compare the opinions of my participants to one another. The accuracy of this method helped to achieve a meaningful interpretation of my results, therefore a thematic analysis was a logical step in my research (Alhojailan, 2012).

This thematic analysis entails that I coded the interviews based on reoccurring themes, for which I used an inductive open coding approach (Bryman, 2012). To do this, I used the computer program ATLAS.ti because it made it easier to label sections with codes in an organized fashion (Friese, 2014). The open coding method allowed me to be open and it kept me from being too selective, which is a potential risk when following existing theory and thus becoming more biased when coding the data (Alhojailan, 2012; Bryman, 2012). It ensured that I could create codes that are meaningful to my specific data. Through successive readings of my transcripts, I saturated the analysis; after having coded my data multiple times, there were no parts of the transcripts left that did not receive a fitting code.

Practically, the thematic analysis entails that I first collected data that was relevant to my research topic, and that I then looked for patterns and themes in the data. Then I moved towards more general themes that I could identify in the data, which ultimately lead to multiple themes. Then I grouped themes that indicated the same things together, and ultimately I created three overarching themes that offered clarity to divide all the themes into. This final process helped to clearly report the results of this study.

Another important part of my analysis was comparing and contrasting statements, both between respondents but also per respondent individually. Some participants changed their opinion after a discussion in the focus group, for example. I also identified exceptional cases, where one or a few participants noted that they experienced something differently than others, or had different opinions. At times, the way in which participants formulated their ideas added to the meaning of their statement, therefore I paid attention to this as well at times. The final analytical strategy I used was that I compared the data from the observations and questionnaires to the outcomes of my focus group analysis. This was useful because I could see if participants' preconceived notions and their behavior in the museum matched up to what they voiced during the focus groups.

The overarching themes and the sub-themes are as follows:

### **1. The audience experience**

- a. Experienced museum inclusivity
- b. Personal significance
- c. Expected educational outcome & cognitive competency
- d. Restorative outcome & therapeutic effect
- e. Flow experience
- f. Shared or solo visit

- g. Sharing the experience

## **2. Change in Rotterdam Zuid**

- a. Stigma
- b. Lived experience
  - i. Superdiversity
- c. A call for change
  - i. Increase social cohesion
  - ii. Fear of rapid change

## **3. Expectations of Boijmans Op Zuid**

- a. Why the classical museum will (not) be successful for Zuid
- b. Interactive and participatory museum experience
- c. Financial element
- d. Location
- e. Exhibition content
- f. Suggestions for marketing the museum to non-visitors in Zuid

### **2.3. Sample**

When selecting focus group participants, there were certain criteria. The sample for this research is taken from the population that lives in Rotterdam Zuid. Thirteen people participated in this study. To be eligible to participate, the participants had to have been living in Rotterdam Zuid for at least two years, and to be fairly young (15-30 years old). There were no criteria regarding their gender, age, or nationality. To collect this sample, used criterion sampling, but I also asked participants that wanted to join if they knew others who fit the criteria and who would want to join as well, thus I also used a snowball sampling method (Bryman, 2012). I employed this method because I had some criteria for my sample, but I also struggled to find enough participants. Marianne, Ricardo, Julius, Najib, and Aurora joined by study through a snowball method. Fred shared a message about my study on Facebook, which is how Najib joined the last focus group. However, Fred and Najib were not in the same focus groups and did not know each other. People who ended up not participating themselves asked Aurora and Marianne to participate, Jeffrey invited Ricardo, and Pip invited Julius. Indeed, only these four people already knew each other before the study.

I believe the difficulty to gather participants is due to the high threshold to be a participant in this study (i.e. traveling to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, going to the

exhibition, and discussing their findings are time-consuming and unfamiliar to the majority of the people that could participate), despite offering participants a financial reward of twenty euro's. Their participation was indeed fairly time-consuming: The visit to the museum's exhibitions took one hour, then immediately after in a conference room in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen the one-and-a-half hour long focus groups took place.

## **2.4. Operationalization**

Now that my sample is vividly introduced, I will explain the structure of the focus groups. The second part of this operationalization section discusses how theoretical concepts relate to the research questions.

### *a. Focus group outline*

The aim of my focus group research was to gain insight into the experiences, expectations and thoughts of the participants, regarding Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and Boijmans Op Zuid. The questions during the focus groups were divided into three parts: the first covers the participants' experience of the visit to museum Boijmans van Beuningen and their participation in culture, the second focuses on their experience of living in Rotterdam Zuid and the changes that they wish to see in their neighborhood, the latter focuses on their opinion and expectations of Boijmans Op Zuid.

Before the focus groups took place, I explained the outline of my questions, and that the focus of this research was on their experience, not their knowledge of the exhibition they had just visited. I explained that all data was going to be used anonymously and that at a later time they could still inform me not to use their data, and I pointed out that participants were allowed to end their participation at any point during the focus group. The participants had signed a consent form before their museum visit, but I did tell them that they could withdraw from the study at any point if they wanted to.

The beginning contained introducing questions to learn more about the participants, and their thoughts on museum Boijmans van Beuningen and their experience in the museum. Following this, I asked them specifying, probing, and follow-up questions about this to reveal more details (Babbie, 2016). I then moved on to a middle part in the questions, this is when I mostly asked structuring and intermediate questions about their personal experiences, with Indicators such as their sense of belonging or the subjective value of their experience. In the second half of the interview, I also focused the questions on Boijmans Op Zuid and the participants' expectations and thoughts on Boijmans Op Zuid. Following this, I used the end

part of the conversation about the museum visit to ask some direct closure questions. This is also where I gave the participants the chance to share anything they felt they had not been able to share yet about the experience itself.

The theoretical concepts that were central in the focus group discussions were mostly the audience experience, museum inclusivity, and superdiversity. These are also described in the list of themes above. Aforementioned studies by Falk and Dierking (2016), and Goulding (2000) about the audience experience support how I measured the sample's experiences and thoughts. Of course, experiences and opinions are multifaceted and it is nearly impossible to find categories that are all encompassing. I attempted to follow the structure of the visitor experience as discussed by Falk and Dierking (2016), focusing mainly the personal and socio-cultural approach because those are most relevant to the study. However, these two approaches seem to overlap, so a strict separation between them and its operationalization was possible. I linked certain Indicators to each concept, the final questions that were asked in the focus group can be found in appendix A.

First, the personal approach is interesting because it shows how each participant experiences their museum visit. Categories for this are: mood, feeling welcome, feeling out of place, general sense of (dis)satisfaction, level of experienced stress or relaxation, attributed value to the museum visit, sense of pride or status, sharing the experience, experiencing a calm or chaotic feeling. The second is the socio-cultural approach, which gives insights that could also indicate levels of experienced tolerance (Creative Cities Monitor, 2017), which relates to experienced museum inclusivity. This is reflected in the categories: sense of belonging, awkwardness, cognitive effect, experienced interactive exhibition content, experienced value of information in the exhibition.

A discussion about the participants' expectations of Boijmans Op Zuid, revolved around the following categories that were used in open questions that allowed participants to come up with expectations themselves, rather than guiding them to certain conclusions: expected changes in cultural participation in Rotterdam Zuid, expected changes for inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid.

### ***b. theoretical concepts in relation to the research questions***

This section shows how concepts were made observable, this is where I describe how theoretical concepts that were introduced in the theoretical framework relate to the research questions. As stated in the introduction, my main research question is: *how do the young*

*inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and how do they perceive plans for Boijmans Op Zuid?*

The 4 sub-questions below are needed to answer this question, these focus on the participants' museum experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and their expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid. The first two sub-questions are answered in the first theme of the results section.

*1. How do inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?*

The first sub-question covers the concept of the audience experience.

*2. To which extent do the participants experience inclusivity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and which factors influence this experience?*

The second sub-question relates museum inclusivity and audience diversity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen to my data.

The second and third overarching themes in the results section discuss the answers to the two final sub-questions. The second theme provides context that is useful to answer the final sub-questions, by discussing the desired changes in Rotterdam Zuid, what Boijmans Op Zuid should be like for specifically Rotterdam Zuid, and the expected effects of Boijmans Op Zuid for Rotterdam Zuid. The final theme focuses on expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid, it answers the following sub-questions:

*3. How do the inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid expect Boijmans Op Zuid to fit into their neighborhood?*

The central concepts in this sub-question are inclusion and expected museum inclusivity, because the answer to this question reveals something about what participants foresee happening with project Boijmans Op Zuid.

*4. What do the participants expect of Boijmans Op Zuid and what do participants foresee necessary for a valuable execution of it to increase the museum's audience diversity and inclusivity?*

Concepts that are used for this final sub-question are audience diversity and museum inclusivity, but for the case of Boijmans Op Zuid.

## **2.5. Validity and reliability**

This section covers my study's rigor and trustworthiness. Firstly, I acknowledge the bias in my sampling. Appendix 4 contains overviews of characteristics of the participants, including their name, age, gender, ethnicity and level of education. I attempted to gather a larger, more diverse group of participants from Rotterdam Zuid to participate in this research, but I found

that there were hard-to-reach groups of inhabitants that I could not get to participate, for various reasons. The low response rates to my call for participants plays a part in the biased sample. Most people that were asked to participate did not feel comfortable to join this study either because they were so unfamiliar with the museum, or because they also did not speak Dutch or English and therefore communicating with me was very difficult. The latter would have made communication during a focus group difficult as well. Coming back to the unfamiliarity with the museum, the vast majority of inhabitants that I spoke to had never heard of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen before, and they did not want to visit it for this research either.

Another reason there were hard-to-reach groups is that the population of Rotterdam consists of many young families: mothers pointed out that could not join the study because they could not leave their children at home, and they did not want to bring their children to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen either. Fathers mostly pointed out that they had to work during the week, and wanted to be at home with their families on the weekend. Similarly, many inhabitants voiced that they had no time to participate because they work 40-80 hours per week, often in their own small businesses. A final reason why some people did not want to join the study is that they did not know how to travel to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, because they did not have a bike or car, and they found public transport too expensive - despite the monetary compensation I offered.

As a result, most of my participants were born and raised in the Netherlands, integrated successfully into society, the majority was highly educated, and I noticed that the majority was already interested in museums and already familiar with Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. To reduce bias in this respect, I framed the focus group questions in a way that encouraged participants to take the perspective of other inhabitants in Rotterdam Zuid into account as well. I found that this worked quite well. Another step I took to reduce bias was that I ensured that I did not know any of the participants before this study, even if that would have made gathering my sample easier, because this is a foreseeable issue during self-selection sampling.

What is more, there may have been some respondent bias, meaning the participants could have answered the questions in the way they thought I would like to hear them being answered, or that they did not tell the truth because they felt insecure about certain things (i.e. how often they visit museums). By asking open questions, and by stating before the focus group that there were no "good" or "bad" answers, I felt I reduced this bias as well. Still, certain statements could be interpreted in multiple ways, for example when participants were

apprehensive to discuss their expectations and opinions, or when they were being overly argumentative in a focus group discussion, which made other participants apprehensive to voice their own opinion. This is where my interpretation influenced how I used this data, because in such cases I felt that just because some people did not go against a statement from someone else at one point, this did not mean they wholeheartedly agreed. Therefore, I repeated similar questions at later times in the focus group, and used this to examine how answers should have been interpreted. At times, data seemed to counter my interpretations, I account for this in the way that the various participants could have various opinions. Therefore, although the "majority vote" went in one direction, I did still take into account that some Individuals had different reactions and I voice this in my results as well.

I already explained my approach to the data, but my perspective is also important to take into account when examining the validity of this research, as there may be researcher bias. I interpreted my data, and although I did this systematically as explained previously, this unavoidably causes some bias as well due to my own knowledge and background. To reduce this bias, I included many quotes to encourage the reader to judge the extent to which they may expect similar results if a similar study is conducted in the future. I used triangulation of my data to reduce bias as well, thus by relying on multiple sources for my data and checking if all sources implied similar results I reduced the intrinsic bias.

### 3. The audience experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen

The first central theme in this study, to answer the question how inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and how they perceive plans for Boijmans Op Zuid, is the personal audience experience. This consists of the experience and opinions of the 13 participants in the museum during their visit. This section also includes their expectations regarding the museum experience and the museum audience. This was discussed during the focus groups, but a short questionnaire that the participants filled in prior to their museum visit also plays a role in the analysis of their expectations. Furthermore, the observation during their visit revealed what behaviors may be linked to the kind of experience the participants had. Of course, due to the nature of this research, the participants' experience runs as a common thread throughout this results section, although it is most prominently discussed in this first theme and more so serves as a basis that supports the participants' opinions and expectations throughout the following themes.

This first theme is built up out of the following concepts: experienced museum inclusivity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, the personal significance and its relation to the experience value of the visit, familiarity and cognitive competency, an educational museum outcome, the calming effect, the flow experience & the chaotic experience, the influence of a shared or solo visit, and sharing the experience online.

#### 3.1 Experienced museum inclusivity, audience diversity and expected motivations for inclusivity in the museum context

To make sense of the experienced museum inclusivity and audience diversity, it is sensible to start with some of the preconceptions participants had about Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen as it places their actual experiences in perspective. The questionnaires revealed that multiple participants expected a relaxed and calm experience. Najib and Alima did expect it to be crowded in the exhibition space, but Alima expected it to be a laidback experience nonetheless: *Ik verwacht een relaxte sfeer en veel bezoekers*. In the focus group she pointed out that it was indeed crowded, and that this played a part in her actually having a chaotic experience, rather than a relaxed one.

Najib: Ik denk dat het druk is in het museum.

Aurora was the only participant who focused her expectations on the exhibition content itself, saying she expected *"een tentoonstelling die zich focust op Bauhaus en waar ik erg in geïnteresseerd ben"*. Her statement also shows that she was a motivated visitor who already knew what to expect before she walked in to the museum. She is not only positive,

however. Her connotations to the word museum range from "interesting" to "boring". When I inquired about this later she mentioned that certain things intrigue her more than others in museums.

Some participants voiced that they expected to learn something from their museum visit. For example, Pip stated: *Rondkijken naar de kunst en leren van de verhalen die de kunstenaars erbij hebben*. Marianne also expected to become inspired and see an exhibition that was focused on history: *inspiratie en geschiedenis*. She also pointed out in the focus group that she had hoped to become inspired, and that she had hoped to learn more than she did.

Only Shanice and Aurora indicated that they also expected something aesthetically from the museum itself. Shanice wrote down: *kunst, educatief, mooi licht*. During the focus group, she noted that she usually enjoys going to museums with friends so they can take aesthetically pleasing pictures in front of museum walls. Aurora used the words "neat" and "light", which I believe to refer to the exhibition space itself.

Significantly different from the expected exhibition content that others described, Julius wrote that he expected: *Het beeld van Rotterdam Zuid verbreden door middel van kunst*. He later said he did not know what to expect, but it shows that he was at least somewhat expecting art that revolved around Rotterdam. For connotations to the word "museum", he wrote down words that indicated he expected a relaxed experience and that the experience would make him think and muse about certain things: *kunst, rust, gedachtes, opvattingen, impressie*.

Participants also noted some expectations for the general museum audience. Some expected tourists, for example Kevin said he expected: *Veel kunst, qua publiek voornamelijk veel toeristen*. Shanice stated: *Ik verwacht een rustige tour met veel toeristen*. In the focus group, she shared that she did notice some Asian tourists, but they were very rowdy and this kept Shanice from having a calm experience. Others expected mostly older people, for example Robin expected a certain visual arts style, but she also expected that the audience would be generally older: *Moderne kunst, een wat ouder publiek*. Uniquely, Alima was the only one who expected to see yuppies, but similar statements were made during focus groups. She wrote: *kunst, audio tour, gids, yuppen, stilte*. Alima also expected some active and informing elements (audio tour, guide).

The following results are predominantly based on the analysis of my focus groups. Participants discussed their presumptions during these groups as well, which is more nuanced than what I gathered from the questionnaires, but most importantly the data allowed me to

compare their expectations for the museum experience to what they actually experienced. Their experiences are valuable to make sense of before moving on to the expectations they had for Boijmans Op Zuid, as those expectations are partially based on their own museum experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Firstly, I present the results that cover more in detail what types of people the participants expected to be fellow museum visitors, and if they felt like Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen also actively tries to attract these types of visitors.

All participants agreed that most museum visitors were around the age of retirement. Most visitors did not think that this is the intended museum audience. Alima states that she believes the museum would rather have more younger visitors as well.

*Alima: Ik denk niet dat het museum 65-plus bejaarden aan wil trekken, ik denk dat ze juist een wat jonger publiek willen aantrekken.*

This is not to say there were no younger visitors, but if there were other young visitors, they were thought to be mostly yuppies or art students.

*Jeffrey: Misschien inderdaad vooral yuppen en inderdaad veel bejaarden.*

*Robin: en ik zag ook wel een groepje kunststudenten.*

This matches well with the presumptions participants voiced in the questionnaires. It also confirms other research on museum audiences (Simon, 2006; Mason & McCarthy, 2006; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015).

Another aspect that was mentioned is the level of education they expected museum goers to have finished, or at least the level of pre-existing knowledge about visual arts. Participants voiced that they expected other museum visitors to be highly educated, or to already have some knowledge about the exhibition beforehand. Pip points out that a museum visit is experienced more positively if one knows how to make sense of the exhibition's content. Indeed, Hood (1983) also concludes that social factors such as education and age influence the likelihood for someone to visit a museum.

*Pip: Ik denk... In ieder geval wel hoogopgeleid, nou ja "hoog opgeleid". Mensen die wel iets hebben geleerd over de kunst op hun middelbare school denk ik, dat je tenminste nog wel als je iets ziet denkt van oh dit is deze richting op dit thema. Het is wel leuker als je er iets van begrijpt.*

At a later moment in the focus group, Pip says something else about the influence of education on cultural participation. She explained that she believes non-visitors to usually not be very highly educated. The higher someone's education level is, to higher the chance that they will appreciate a museum visit, she states. Bourdieu also concluded that one's milieu-

specific cultural capital is mainly acknowledged and often reinforced in education (1979).

*Pip: Dat heeft ook wel een beetje te maken [dat sommigen niet naar musea gaan] met denk ik, je opleiding vooral. ... Het zit wel echt in je- het was gewoon zo. Ja het is gewoon zo, zo wordt het bij jou ingeprent, dat dat zo hoort.*

But other focus group members did not necessarily experience this as such. Kevin said that although he goes to university, he rarely goes to museums, is not actively interested in art history and knows very little about art. He described that a higher level of education is not necessarily related to one's cultural participation. However, he still had an overall positive museum experience and actually went back to the exhibition after the focus group had ended, so I do believe this negates the point he was trying to make about there not being a correlation between the level of education and the likeliness to appreciate a museum.

*Kevin: Ik denk dat ik wel in dat hoogopgeleid plaatje pas, ik ben wel de universitaire student. Tegelijkertijd met kunstgeschiedenis, eh, daar heb ik [me] al jaren niks in verdiept dus in die zin niet.*

Julius reveals something similar to Pip, but also relates this expectation to his own experience because he did not know anything about Bauhaus before going to the museum, and he felt he was different from other visitors in this sense.

*Julius: Ik denk niet dat heel veel mensen die, zeg maar zoals ik [zijn] want ik weet er eigenlijk heel weinig van. Eh, die dan- die dan de stap zetten om naar een museum te gaan. Ik denk dat de mensen die hier waren vooral wel al die kennis hadden en daarom meer wisten voordat ze hier kwamen in ieder geval.*

A more diverse museum audience would have increased the level of museum inclusivity that they attribute to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Participants noticed that the museum audience was not a reflection of the people they saw outside of the museum, in Rotterdam itself.

*Jeffrey: nee dit [publiek] is geen afspiegeling van wie er rond loopt buiten het museum.*

Moreover, participants also did not think that the majority of the museum audience were locals from Rotterdam.

*Robin: Het is wel raar als je zeg maar op de weg in de metro hierheen en als je hier heen loopt, dan is het gewoon- dat is het publiek van Rotterdam. En dan stap je hier binnen en dan is het inderdaad dus compleet anders. Dus het is dus niet eens denk ik voor mij "Oh dit zijn Rotterdammers per sé".*

Marianne contrasts the museum audience to the inhabitants in her neighborhood in Rotterdam Zuid, pointing out that she did not see her neighborhood's diversity in the museum's audience

in any way.

*Marianne: Wat mij heel erg opviel was de, nou ja om er maar een heel hip woord dan van nu in te gooien, niet de diversiteit, zeg maar. [...] Ja gewoon hartstikke blank en waarschijnlijk afkomstig inderdaad nog niet eens uit hartje Rotterdam, maar meer uit de omstreken.*

The following segment revolves around a discussion about the lack of influence of ethnicity or one's culture on the appreciation for museums, as well as the expected influence of being acquainted with highbrow museum culture as a child.

*Alima: Maar ik weet dat ik als kind- Ik ben Turks. Mijn moeder nam mij wel altijd mee naar musea. [...] Maar ik weet dat de familie van mijn verloofde, die gaan echt nooit naar musea. Maar dat zit er gewoon niet in-*

*Jeffrey: Ja maar dat heb je denk ik met autochtone Nederlanders, exact hetzelfde.*

*Robin: Dat heeft niet echt te maken met iemands cultuur, inderdaad .*

*Alima: Dat heeft niet met afkomst of cultuur te maken.*

*Marianne: Kijk dat is een drempel waar het museum altijd al mee te dealen heeft, zeg maar.*

Alima explains that her fiancé's family never visits museums because they "are just not like that". Artistic appreciation is thought to be some type of skill that certain people have learned and have acquired over time. Indeed, this trail of thought confirms much of Bourdieu's (1979) theory on cultural capital, and the influence of education and one's family as the most important ways in which habitus is formed. She begins her statement by saying that she is of Turkish descent, that her family is quite creative and that she has been going to museums since her childhood. Therefore, she does appreciate museums but her fiancé does not. One's background and culture may influence their cultural appreciation to a certain extent, but it is not the most dominant influence on one's taste. Other focus group members agree partly with what she points out, the one argument they vastly disagree with is that one's heritage or culture is an indicator of the extent to which they can appreciate museums.

Following this initial observation, what I found noticeable as well is that participants share the belief that a visual arts museum by definition is unlikely to be an inclusive museum, because this subject simply does not interest its diverse potential audience, at least in the way it is presented in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen now. The participants voiced that inclusivity already starts with the type of exhibition that a museum offers. In general, they presume that museums market themselves for who they want to see as their audience. Regarding Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen's exhibition, Alima stated that an exhibition focused on a certain design period attracts a more posh type of visitor, who also already have some knowledge of the exhibition content. She does not think such exhibitions are suitable for

young children.

*Alima: Bauhaus trekt een heel ander soort publiek aan. [...] Er loopt nu gewoon nu heel veel kak rond omdat zij dat helemaal fantastisch vinden dus ik denk, je kan op basis van de tentoonstelling die je gaat laten zien, kun je al een beetje bepalen "wat voor publiek komt hier naartoe?". Je zal hier niet, naar deze tentoonstelling, daar zal je geen scholen of zo tegen komen want wat heeft de basisschool hier te zoeken, ja helemaal niks.*

Julius reveals that different types of museums attract different types of visitors. Children are for example more interested in participatory museums. Research into museum participation supports Julius's opinion. Simon (2006) concludes that an active museum experience increases the attributed value to the visit, for both children and adults.

*Julius: Met kinderen kun je beter naar een praktijkmuseum toe, naar Nemo of zo daar is meer praktijk omdat dat wat actiever is.*

Participants wondered why a museum would take its inclusivity into account. Some thought that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen does not dwell on what types of exhibitions may attract certain audiences. For example, Pip initially does not think that the museum takes the audience's response into consideration.

*Pip: Denk echt niet dat ze erover nadenken van als we deze tentoonstelling doen dan komen deze mensen opdagen. Ik denk niet dat dat ermee te maken heeft, het is denk ik gewoon de reactie op wat er zou komen.*

Pip's opinion changes throughout this discussion, she does still think some museums do not care much for audience diversity, but she does think that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen wishes to attract more than one type of visitor. Although she did not experience much inclusivity, she now did expect this to be an aim of the museum

*Pip: Ik denk echt meer dat het ligt aan welk museum het is. In sommige musea, die willen graag hun hoge status hoog ophouden en die willen dat bepaalde mensen alleen maar komen kijken. Die hoeven niet per se die diversiteit en andere musea willen juist wel weer dat het heel divers is en dat er meerdere mensen komen kijken. ... Ja die willen wel een meer divers [publiek]. Het is niet per se dat ik denk dat ze hier 1 groep willen aantrekken.*

Throughout the entire focus group, Julius maintains the same opinion, which is that he expects the museum to care more for the amount of visitors than the diversity of their audience.

*Julius: Ik denk dat ze hier juist gewoon voor kwantitatief gaan en niet voor de diversiteit. Ik denk dat het gewoon is voor de getallen en niet om wie hier echt komt eigenlijk.*

Fred adds to this and thinks that enough people will visit the organization regardless of what is being exhibited, so from a business point of view it is not necessary for the museum to attract different types of people, he believes.

*Fred: Ik denk sowieso dat mensen hier wel komen, ondanks dat het museum niet echt verschillende typen mensen aanspreekt... Denk dat mensen sowieso wel komen en ik denk dat het gewoon gaat om dat er zoveel mensen komen en dan vinden ze het goed.*

Similarly, others point out that there is a group of visitors that will always come to new exhibitions, regardless of its content. However, Kevin and some other participants do voice that they do experience that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen attempts to increase its audience diversity.

*Kevin: Je hebt altijd een groep mensen, zoals die hier nu ook zijn, die eigenlijk altijd al wel zullen gaan als er een nieuwe tentoonstelling is. Die vast wel sowieso al zullen gaan. Ik denk dat een museum wel zal proberen om mensen die niet uit deze groep komen aan te trekken.*

Shanice agrees wholeheartedly, she explains that there are deals that the museum offers to lower the threshold to visit it, such as the *Rotterdam pas*.

*Shanice: Ja denk ik ook wel. Anders hadden ze hun prijs denk ik ook wel flink omhoog gegooid. Of niet meegedaan met bepaalde acties dan. Ze staan bijvoorbeeld ook gewoon bij de Rotterdampas. En dat trekt ook een heel ander soort publiek aan dus ik denk dat als ze die mensen niet wilden hebben, dan hadden ze dat wel niet gedaan.*

Certain statements quite clearly related to the participants' experienced museum inclusivity. Mainly this became evident through what they foresaw and experienced as barriers for an audience, or as what was thought to lower the threshold for people to visit the museum, as Shanice did in the quote above. For example, participants mentioned that the great difference between the people they saw outside of the museum on their way to the museum, and the visitors inside of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. They then mused about why this might be the case. Jeffrey, as shown earlier, noted that he found this phenomenon strange. He also did not think that the majority of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen's audience are locals from Rotterdam.

Multiple participants pointed out that they believe Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen aims to be an inclusive organization, but the motivations for such thoughts vary. Marianne believes that the museum does want to be inclusive, but that she did not experience it as such.

*Marianne: Ja ik denk dat de wens er wel is, maar ik voel het nog niet.*

Jeffrey expects inclusivity to be of value because it would mean that a more diverse audience

is attracted to the museum, and that this increase in visitors would result in an increase of the ticket sales.

*Jeffrey: Dat lijkt me haast wel want elke onderneming zou dat wel moeten willen om gewoon een breder publiek te kunnen trekken. Breder publiek betekent meer bezoekers, en meer bezoekers betekent dat je meer omzet kan draaien.*

Robin responded saying that she expects visitors to need a certain knowledge of the exhibition and museum collection in order for them to actually feel the need to visit the museum. Because the content of the exhibition that she visited, Bauhaus, is quite specific and artistic, she does not think a diverse audience is already familiar with it. According to her, if Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen wishes to achieve a greater audience diversity, then seeking exhibition content that is familiar for a more diverse group is needed. Because she did not see a diverse audience, nor notice that inclusivity was reflected in the exhibitions, she did not experience much museum inclusivity.

*Robin: Je moet het óf al kennen, of een beetje een vaag idee hebben, anders kom je er denk ik niet voor. En als het musea een divers publiek wil aanspreken kunnen ze beter een collectie om een soort van thema heen bouwen, want als je al een een... Een begrip neemt uit, ja iets wat mensen niet kennen, dan komen ze er ook niet voor heen. Dus dat is denk ik een beetje het probleem met de huidige collectie.*

Others express similar thoughts. Alima also relates the diversity of the population of Rotterdam to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen's inclusivity and potentially diversifying its audience. If a museum wants to attract its local population, of which the majority has a non-Western background, then taking into consideration what might attract them is needed.

*Alima: Maar volgens mij is in Rotterdam ook 70 procent- heeft een niet westerse achtergrond, in Rotterdam. Als jij je eigen publiek wil aantrekken als hét Rotterdamse museum. Dan moet je daar ook wel op inspelen.*

Robin later compares Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen to the Kunsthal, to explain why she felt like her experience was not as inclusive as it could have been.

*Robin: Ik vind dat de Kunsthal bijvoorbeeld dan meer divers is. Dat is misschien ook omdat die om bepaalde thema's... Bijvoorbeeld toen Keith Haring er was hadden ze altijd heel veel dingen ook voor kinderen en ehm, een soort van workshops en ze hadden toen mensen die kwamen vogue dansen en zo. Het was veel meer engaging, en d'r was veel meer. Ook overal van die poppetjes door de stad en zo. Veel meer mensen hadden toen het idee- denk dat iedereen wel door had dat er een expositie was toen. Dus daar kwam denk ik een veel breder publiek op af, terwijl hier heb ik eigenlijk nog niks over het Bauhaus gezien in de stad of zo.*

Others note that audience diversity is important not only for the museum's income, but also it is thought that museums have a certain influence on society.

*Alima: Ik denk dat je dat [diversiteit] sowieso als museum wel wil, of moet willen in ieder geval; dat je meer aantrekt dan die vaste groep 65-plusser elite bejaarden. Want als museum dat ik denk je ook wel invloed wil hebben, ook een beetje op de maatschappij, en dan moet je bij de jongeren zijn, denk ik. En dan vooral bij de diverse groeperingen die je in Rotterdam kan vinden. Volgens mij doen ze dat wel met projecten op school en dergelijke. Zij gaan meestal naar school toe volgens mij, en ik weet niet of scholen ook daadwerkelijk deze kant op komen. Ja en als ze hier naartoe komen weet ik ook niet of dat dan scholen uit Rotterdam zuid zijn of dat het inderdaad meer scholen zijn uit bijvoorbeeld eh, Hillegersberg [gebruikt bekakte stem].*

Ricardo points out that in order for a museum to be inclusive, its content should also match the expectations of a diverse audience. Such is not the case here. It must be noted that Ricardo does see that as the "problem" of those who are not interested in the museum's current exhibition, he does not see the museum change its content. He also says that some people simply do not like museums, which may refer to the highbrow character of museums, which will be later explained.

*Ricardo: Ehm ja ik denk, ik kijk ook nu bijvoorbeeld naar deze tentoonstelling en dan denk ik "kijk dit is niet...", dat het niet mij het gevoel geeft, zeg maar, dat ze alle diversiteiten- alle diverse mensen hier naar toetrekken. Maar ja dan, is het is ook soms de vraag van, zeg maar er is zo veel diversiteit. Ik ken genoeg mensen die bijvoorbeeld naar Piet Mondriaan z'n schilderijen kijken. Piet Mondriaan, zo heet die gast toch? Oké. Nou dat ze naar zo'n schilderij kijken en dat ze zeggen van "ja het is maar een paar- het is maar een wit vlak met een strepen er op. Wat is dit?". Ik denk dat dát het ook voornamelijk is, en dat dát nu ook, niet alleen Boijmans maar überhaupt een museum... Ja dat soort mensen aan trekken ook gewoon héél erg moeilijk is.*

In line with Ricardo's statement, Alima stresses the importance of having a collection that is interesting for a broader audience. This follows previous theory on museum inclusivity as well, pointing out that if people feel more engaged with or connected to exhibitions, they are more likely to want to visit it and appreciate it (McClean, 1999; Menko, 2018; Mason & McCarthy, 2006).

*Alima: Maar ook als jij je minder verbonden voelt met iets wat daar wordt tentoongesteld, dan ga je daar toch niet heen? Want het Boijmans, het is natuurlijk het is wel echt een*

*kunstmuseum, het is geen sociaal of cultureel museum of zo. ik heb nog nooit zo'n soort tentoonstellingen hier gezien. Het is echt gewoon kunst periodes wat ze hier tentoonstellen.*

Following such thoughts on inclusivity in the museum context, it is sensible to evaluate how participants foresee the museum's role in this. In short, do they believe that the museum is solely the responsible party for limited experienced inclusivity or do they acknowledge that there may be more factors that play a role in this? The answer is complicated, as opinions varied on this matter. Some stated that it is a two-way street, meaning that the (potential) audience needs to be interested in the museum as well, much like what Ricardo's previous statement pointed out as well. Marianne also states this indicates that it is more unlikely for people who were not already raised with such cultural participation to be interested in going. This idea clearly confirms Bourdieu's theory; clarifying that the family of origin is the most important environment where habitus is formed. It also raises the issue of psychological barriers, because of the unfamiliarity with museums (Macleod, 2005; Fleming, 2003; Gurian, 2005). As a result of this, she questions how much a museum could effectively do to increase its inclusion because even in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen increases its inclusivity, the non-visitors need to be motivated to go to the museum as well. Of course, there are certain strategies to increase the motivation for non-visitors, which is further discussed in the third theme of this results section.

*Marianne: Maar het is wel dat wat jij net ook al zei, dat van "de cultuur krijg je mee". Word je als kind inderdaad meegenomen naar een museum, want anders zoals ik al bijna de deur hier voorbij liep zeg maar, hoe wil je dan met iemand die er nog nooit is geweest... [...]Ik weet niet eens of een museum daar iets aan kan doen, dat vraag ik me af.*

What is more, Marianne also points out that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen has a difficult entrance and layout for those who are not already familiar with it. She states that she is quite an avid museum visitor, but that she did not even recognize the building as a museum. Other participants voiced similar issues with finding Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. This confirms Gurian's study (2005) on physical barriers to the museum, he argued that intricate architecture can be a threshold for people to set foot inside a museum. Examples of this are intricate architecture with unfamiliar entrances or an exterior that people do not recognize as a museum.

Alima had a strong opinion on the influence of exhibition content on museum inclusivity, she voiced multiple times that familiar or relatable content would be expected to have a positive influence on museum inclusivity. She pointed out that although it is a two-way street, there are definitely things that a museum can do to lower the threshold for non-visitors.

For the case of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, she explained that it might just not be in line with the museum's image or intentions. Indeed, there is only so much Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen can change to increase its inclusivity. Its unique visual arts collection and exhibition themes are also what sets the museum apart from other museums.

*Alima: Maar je kan wel dan als museum de drempel verlagen om dan wel die mensen wel aan te trekken door niet aan Bauhaus tentoonstelling te doen maar de pioniers van Rotterdam, dus de eerste immigranten die hier kwamen of zo. Maar dat is het ding van Boijmans, het is een kunstmuseum, het is geen sociaal museum. Dan kun je je[zelf] afvragen inderdaad van "waarom moeten ze dat eigenlijk wel willen?" of "gaan ze daarmee hun eigen punt voorbij?".*

### **3.2. Personal significance**

This theme covers the influence that personal significance has on the museum experience. I explain how my research indicates that personal significance has a strong positive influence on the attributed value to the museum experience. This confirms previous studies about museum visitors and their motivations for visiting museums. Goulding (2000) described this in their cognitive approach to a museum visit. This approach explains that intrinsic motivations that focus on the usefulness of the experience, such as personal meaning, increase the attributed usefulness of the visit. To explain this, I examine the most captivating statements about how some personal significance influenced the overall experience of a participant. Throughout the focus group conversations, it became clear that Fred had had a very positive museum experience and he found it valuable for multiple reasons. He found it very enlightening, one of the explanations he gave is that he found out something about himself and the house he grew up in through the exhibition.

*Fred: Ik ben opgegroeid in een arbeiderswoning. En ik zag mijn huis dus in miniatuur staan. Dat is echt zo vreemd om terug te zien. En ik wist eigenlijk niet dat het echt een typische arbeiderswoning was. En ik had het dus ook helemaal niet hier terugverwacht, hier in dit museum. Dat was best wel apart. En ik heb ook wel echt wat geleerd... Ik heb nog wat over gelezen dat het dus de typische arbeiderswoning was en dat wist ik helemaal niet, dus dat had ik vandaag geleerd.*

Jeffrey compared the Bauhaus exhibition to an earlier exhibition in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen about the museum during World War II. He says he preferred his first visit to this one, but he points out that that is a personal opinion. Jeffrey is interested in history, and has studied this in high school.

*Jeffrey: De vorige keer dat ik hier was, dat was een tentoonstelling geloof ik over het bombardement. Dat vond ik eigenlijk veel interessanter dan wat er nu was, inderdaad. Maar ja in ieder geval, dat is dan ook weer heel persoonlijk.*

Robin then related the value of personal significance of an exhibition to her fellow museum visitors who seemed to enjoy their museum experience more than she did. She attributed this to the fact that those older visitors had a greater personal significance to the Bauhaus time period. She even overheard some visitors talk about their own experiences with each other.

*Robin: Ik hoorde ook inderdaad "Ah in mijn tijd was dat anders", "Oeh dat hadden wij niet". Er was iets over het Delftse lustrum, of zoiets, en toen gingen ze het allemaal hebben over "in hun tijd" en ik weet niet... Ze waren allemaal wat ouder en het was dus best wel persoonlijk, telkens iets over hun verleden. Die hadden hun eigen beleving denk ik, van hoe ze die stijl hebben ervaren en dat dat dan misschien nu anders was tentoongesteld en nu waren die daar een beetje pissig op [lacht]. Ik vond dat wel bijzonder omdat ik geen connectie heb met Bauhaus en al die anderen blijkbaar wel heel erg.*

Another reason that Jeffrey later gave for his overall negative museum experience is that there was no intrinsic motivation (i.e., personal meaning or instructiveness) and also no extrinsic motivation in this visit for him (Goulding, 2000; Screven, 1986). He felt that the exhibition showed nothing worth being in a museum because they were everyday objects. This indicates that he could not attribute meaning to the exhibition because he expected a certain highbrow art exhibition or something that he found personally interesting. This decreased the value of the experience for Jeffrey. Because he was not motivated in the exhibition space, he also did not experience a calming or educational effect. I observed Jeffrey in the exhibition space as he sighed, crossed his arms, slouched through the exhibition, and did not read any information signs.

*Jeffrey: Ik weet niet wat Bauhaus is, weet ik nog steeds niet. Maar toch voornamelijk meubilair en architectuur, heb ik het idee als ik het zo goed gok. En dan denk ik 'Nou ja, als dat de functionaliteit en zo niet meer als eerste nastreeft, dan vind ik het een beetje een idiote gedachte', dus daarom interesseert het me niet echt. Zoiets hoort niet in een museum thuis.*

Ricardo agrees with Jeffrey that the exhibition could have been made more enjoyable.

However, he does think that Bauhaus objects are worthy of being displayed in a museum, although it could have been done differently. He suggested that implementing some active aspects of high quality in the exhibition would be nice as it gives visitors the chance to experience what they saw. This would positively influence the museum experience. This is

also voiced by Nina Simon (2006), who also stresses the importance of high quality of active museum elements. When I observed Ricardo, he mostly sat on a bench in the corner of the main exhibition space, and he listened to music with earphones in for the majority of the visit. This indicates that he did not have an overly positive museum experience, either.

*Ricardo: Ja en nee. Ik denk dat het wel in een museum hoort maar dat ze het wel leuker zouden kunnen maken. Zoals hoe jij het net al zei, dat ze misschien een replica maken er van. Ik denk dat dat wel meer, het boeiender en leuker wellicht had kunnen maken. Maar ja dan zit je een beetje met hetzelfde probleem ook als met die bordjes, als dan iedereen er op gaat zitten. Dat je dan in een rij moet gaan staan om gewoon op een stoel te gaan zitten...*

Jeffrey agrees that an interactive museum experience could have made his visit more interesting, although he does not think it would make it any more fun as that is thought to depend highly on the content of the exhibition. He does think that encouraging an active stance could increase intrinsic motivation to learn something from the exhibition.

*Jeffrey: Ja, interessanter in ieder geval. Misschien niet per sé leuker, dat ligt ook een beetje aan of het onderwerp waar het dan over zou gaan leuker vindt natuurlijk. Maar het trekt je wel sneller, zeg maar om je er in te gaan verdiepen.*

This suggests that an interactive museum experience is expected to increase one's intrinsic motivation, which in turn is expected to increase the overall attributed value to the museum experience. This confirms much existing research on meaningful museum experiences, on the value of active involvement in museums, and on the overall learning experience in museums (Simon, 2006; Crawford, 2017; Hein, 2006; Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1999). Indeed, this confirms that a deeper understanding of the museum experience is expected to increase the value of the museum experience, which may even lower the threshold to engage in cultural activities in the future (Vivek et al., 2012; Kemp & Poole, 2016).

What is more, research confirms that younger audiences are generally more interested in exhibitions that focus on the present or future (Mason & McCarthy, 2006). This is something that Ricardo describes in the quote below, but it is evident throughout statements that were made by participants. Contrastingly to this, Jeffrey did point out earlier that he did enjoy a historical exhibition about Rotterdam. Indeed, museum content usually only attracts a certain social group (McLean, 1999). Furthermore, the disinterestedness in the programming of museums is a barrier for people to visit a museum (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018).

*Ricardo: Het ligt ook wel aan welk tijdperk het is. Ik denk... Het is gewoon zo. Weet je dat van Oud Rotterdam, denk dat de jongeren dat nu wel hebben gezien. En ik denk dat die*

*jongeren ook wel meer misschien iets willen zien van wat de stad nu meer te bieden heeft.*

This suggests that a certain personal attachment or connection to the exhibited works has a positive influence on the experienced value of the museum visit, although it is not a requirement for an overall positive or satisfied experience. For example, Ricardo notes the value of an aesthetic attraction to works. Thus he points out that an aesthetic experience positively influences the experience as well. He also states that he believes that not everyone is sensitive to the aesthetic value of a work, and that a lack of connectedness - ‘‘the feeling of if it does not belong to you’’, as he also describes it – definitely influences one’s judgment.

*Ricardo: Ik denk ook dat, zeg maar, je hoeft niet tot al de kunstwerken verbonden te zijn.*

*Soms kijk ik ook gewoon naar een foto en dan denk ik "Oh dat is een coole foto", maar het is niet zo dat ik me daar dan mee verbonden voel of er iets van een, een diepgaand iets is. Soms kijk ik er- naar iets en dan denk ik "Cool"! Maar, niet iedereen heeft dat natuurlijk denk ik. Ik denk dat misschien het gevoel van dat als het niet bij jou hoort, ‘‘dan hoef ik het ook niet’’, dat dat ook een beetje er mee in speelt of je iets dan leuk vindt of niet.*

Fred describes an aesthetic experience from his visit. When I observed the participants, I also noticed that they observed some works with greater attention and for a longer time than other works. One of the works that Fred stood in front of for a while was the painting that he described to be fascinated by, which was Kokoschka's *The Mandrill*.

*Fred: Ik had meer schilderijen verwacht. Dit keer heb ik alleen maar één hal gezien met schilderijen. Daar had ik er meer van verwacht. Het was zo mooi, ik had er een met een baviaan gezien of zo, hoe die was getekend was echt heel mooi. Daar ben ik een tijdje bij blijven staan.*

### **3.3. Familiarity & cognitive competency**

The following section confirms that having some knowledge of a certain topic increases the intrinsic motivation to look into it and therefore has a positive influence on the museum experience (Belfiore, 2002; McLean, 1999; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Some participants spoke about this influence of familiarity or pre-existing knowledge in detail. For example, Kevin describes this when he explains that subjects in school increased his knowledge on the subject matter of some paintings in the museum. The mythological subject matter made him more inclined to look into those art works. This also confirms what has been described by Goulding (2000) about how knowledge and personal significance increase one's experience as it makes people more curious to look into the art.

*Kevin: Ik heb Latijn en Grieks ook gehad op de middelbare school. ... Nou je weet al een beetje het verhaal er achter dus je gaat ook meteen op zoek naar wat er gebeurt. Of nog iets achter in zit verborgen of zo. Gewoon kleine details. Als ik het globaal dan al wist dat vond ik dan wel... Ik had meteen de neiging om dat te doen.*

Indeed, knowledge of art works - even just remembering seeing it before - is likely to positively influence how one perceives those works. Studies already indicate that lack of knowledge or disinterestedness are hurdles for people to actually visit a museum (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018). Therefore, it makes sense that the opposite is hereby also confirmed: having knowledge or being interested is a motivator for people to visit a museum. The following quote from Alima reflects this clearly, she only took pictures of art that she already recognized.

*Alima: Maar meestal heb ik ook, maak ik veel meer fotos en nu had ik ook die behoefte niet. Dus ik heb van dat ene schilderij in het begin, want dat herkende ik, toen dacht ik "Hee dat herken ik!". En ook, ook van die stoel heb ik een foto gemaakt, van de rietveldstoel.*

Robin shares a similar experience she had wanted to visit the highlights section from the permanent collection for longer even though she was already familiar with those works. She thought those paintings were more worth looking at, and she had no interest in the Bauhaus exhibition so this decreased the perceived value of those works.

*Robin: Ja wat ik net al zei ik baalde er wel van dat ik later achter kwam dat de vaste collectie daar ging. Want toen kwam ik er achter aan "Ah shit, ze gaan natuurlijk best wel lang dicht". Dus daar hingen ook wel werken die ik al eerder heb gezien maar als ik het van tevoren had geweten had ik er even wat beter bij stilgestaan. En nou echt even goed kijken want ja, je ziet ja- of misschien nog ergens in een ander museum... Ik weet niet of dat ze ergens anders gaan hangen tijdelijk maar toen dacht ik "o ja dat is wel jammer op zich" want anders dan had ik dat museum daarvoor speciaal nog wel bezocht om nog eventjes de laatste keer die dingen te zien. Maar met de Bauhaus had ik eigenlijk niet zo heel veel. Maar dat deel vond ik wel redelijk waardevol.*

What is more, pre-existing knowledge of the museum was thought to lower the threshold to visit the museum as well. This became evident through some interactions from focus group participants, for example, Marianne and Alima talked about this. Gurian (2005) also found that people are less likely to enter a space that is unknown because there are certain psychological or physical barriers. My findings here confirm that pre-existing knowledge of the museum's set-up lowers the barriers to enter the museum.

*Marianne: Dit is makkelijker. Je weet hoe het is, hoe je er komt, je weet hoe het er van binnen*

*uitziet.*

*Alima: Je weet hoe de garderobe werkt, is ook al ingewikkeld.*

### **3.4. Expected educational effect**

Related to the influence of familiarity and cognitive competency on the museum experience, all participants also voiced that they expected to take something away from their time in the museum. Simon (2006) observed this expected educational outcome as well in her research. They wanted to learn something new, and this educational effect of the museum visit had a positive influence on the overall attributed value to the experience. In fact, some participants even voiced that the purpose of museums is to teach its audience something.

*Alima: Ja, ik verwacht wel iets te leren of op te steken. Dat is ook de bedoeling van een museum, toch?*

Indeed, an educational effect has a strong influence on the perceived value of the museum experience. For example, Ricardo had had an overall negative experience. One of the reasons why he did not have a positive experience is related to the expected educational effect. He had expected to learn something, but he did not manage to do so and it left him feeling unsatisfied. I did notice that Ricardo was listening to music with headphones in the exhibition space, that he did not watch the informative film at the beginning of the exhibition, and that he did not use the informative Ipads that people could use to learn more about art works. He later explained that he also was not sure if he could just take one of the Ipads, but I think this also shows that Ricardo did not have intrinsic motivation to learn.

*Ricardo: Het voelt... Zeg maar de voldoening dat je iets [hebt] opgestoken, dat mis ik wel een beetje, ja.*

Contrastingly, Robin showed a high level of intrinsic motivation to learn. She pointed out that she tried to follow a logical route through the main exhibition because she hoped to learn something from the exhibition, and she thought that following the intended route would increase the meaning of the exhibition. She also felt like she needed some kind of guidance to make sense of what she saw, she wanted to learn something and felt that she needed help to achieve an educational experience. It must be noted that Robin is an avid museum visitor who had also visited Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in the past six months and felt very comfortable in this space, whereas Ricardo is a light user of culture who was more unfamiliar with the museum. For example, Ricardo told me he felt quite unsure where he had to enter the building and where he could walk in the museum itself, which indicates that he experienced a

high threshold to visit the museum. Indeed, this confirms much of the known thresholds for non-visitors (Gurian, 2005; Menko, 2018; Mason & McCarthy, 2006; Thyne, 2001; Todd & Lawson, 2001). This is thought to have influenced the different levels of motivation as well.

*Robin: Omdat het een onderwerp is waar ik niet veel van afwist wilde ik inderdaad ook gewoon echt wel volgen, zoals dat voor je werd voorgekauwd. [...] Normaal doe ik dat minder denk, in een museum, als het wel gewoon- wel een beetje meer mijn ding is. Maar ja, dan ga ik gewoon kijken, en dan weet ik er zelf ook nog wat dingen van, maar nu heb ik wel echt een soort van, gedaan wat ik denk dat het museum wilde dat ik deed. ...Ik denk dat het beter is dat ik het wel heb gedaan, als ik echt alleen maar wat had gekeken dan had ik er niet echt niks uitgehaald zeg maar.*

Jeffrey mentioned something similar, he pointed out that the type of exhibition influences what may be necessary to lead to a valuable experience. He said that unless you already know something about the content of an exhibition, you need some kind of explanation because otherwise it is impossible to learn something. Unless the purpose of an exhibition is to only offer "entertainment value", which he thought would be unlikely, then there should be some kind of help to learn more about the exhibition's content.

*Jeffrey: Het ligt ook een beetje aan wat voor tentoonstellingen het is natuurlijk. Of het iets is waar ik al wat van af weet of gewoon puur, kunst om naar te kijken of zo, waar geen uitleg bij staat... Ja dan ga je er niks van leren, dat is entertainment value maar daar houdt het ook bij op. Maar dat zal zelden zijn denk ik.*

According to Marianne, there are types of desired museum outcomes that vary per type of museum. She mentions that she expected to learn something historical from her visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, and that she had wanted to see this historical element being related to something from contemporary life. This confirms the desire from younger audiences to focus exhibitions on the present or future as well, which was concluded by Bartlett and Kelly (2000).

*Marianne: Ja zo'n museum als Boijmans Van Beuningen, wat ik dan toch even in de oude categorie zou stoppen, daar verwacht ik ook echt wel iets eh, historisch zeg maar, van mee te krijgen. Ehm ja, bij zo'n tentoonstelling dan inderdaad, om echt mee te krijgen van "wat was dit". En eventueel, ik zou het dan fijn vinden als er nog een vertaalslag in zou zitten van "wat betekent dat dan nu".*

If participants felt that they had not managed to achieve this educational effect, they often planned to look up more information after the museum visit.

*Ricardo: Ik heb 2 kunstwerken gezien, wat ik best wel tof vond. Dat- ik heb ook op mijn mobiel wel geschreven hoe ze heten. Dan ga ik thuis even kijken wat ze meer erover te zeggen hebben. ... Ja, weten dat ik straks dan wel wat meer ga leren, dat is wel fijn.*

*Marianne: Ik heb ook wat foto's gemaakt, van die van een aantal teksten zeg maar, maar dan vooral van het begin bij Bauhaus maar dat was meer omdat ik dat eigenlijk voor mezelf nog een keer wou doorlezen.*

This does indicate that participants who did not experience an educational effect, did experience an increase in their motivation to learn. I later asked if Ricardo and Marianne had actually looked into the things they pointed out during the focus group, and both of them had looked online for more information.

*Marianne: Nu heb ik het idee dat een soort van, ja ik zelf nog zeg maar moet gaan alles onderzoeken. Ik- ik zal nu wel ik heb wel zoiets van "nou dan wil ik wel echt weten wat Bauhaus is", maar het is me dus niet helemaal duidelijk. Maar ik ga nu thuis waarschijnlijk opzoeken wat het is en wat beter onderzoek doen en dan vallen er waarschijnlijk weer heel veel stukjes van de tentoonstelling meer op z'n plek. dus dat heeft het wel opgeleverd, ik vond het wel nuttig.*

Other participants also used art to initiate further contemplation, and showed that the museum experience stimulated their critical thinking skills. For example, Shanice shared something that she had learned from one of the paintings, and it made her think about her perception of the Biblical story - because she already knew it before this visit - but that she was now considering other perspectives to make sense of what the story may mean.

*Shanice: Ik ga er thuis sowieso nog wel even mee door met er naar te kijken want, bijvoorbeeld ook dat Bijbel ding. Want ik ... zag dan, ik had het best al een keer vaker gezien, maar nooit er écht naar gekeken. Dus nu heb ik zoiets van "ja wat hebben we eigenlijk hier van geleerd" en nu ben ik nog helemaal aan het verder denken van "waar lezen we eigenlijk in" weet je want, "waar gaat het Christendom nu eigenlijk over"? En, ja dus, als mij gewoon zoiets werd verteld dan- dan- ik had daar [Bijbelse verhalen] nog nooit zo naar gekeken, zeg maar.*

Whether or not participants had expressed that they learned something during their visit, those who had an overall positive experience did feel like they would think about what they had experienced after their visit.

*Julius: Waardevol meer dan nuttig, denk ik. Maar ja, het is wel iets wat nu de rest van de dag ook voortaan nog die beelden zijn die in mijn hoofd gaan zitten*

*Kevin: Je denkt er nog een beetje over na ook. Dat idee heb ik ook wel, dat ik er zo uit kom ja.*

### 3.5. Restorative or relaxed museum outcome

Another museum outcome that participants experienced is the restorative effect, meaning that visitors felt more calm after their museum experience. The soothing effect had a positive influence on the museum experience.

*Pip: Niet per se dat ik iets heb geleerd, maar ik voel me wel kalm.*

Alima did not have a positive museum experience, she thought it was too chaotic, the exhibition subject did not grab her attention, she did not experience an educational effect, she also did not experience a therapeutic or restorative effect. An overall low valued museum experience decreases the chance that someone has relaxing or calming experience during or after their visit as a result of their museum experience.

*Alima: Maar nee, ik ga me niet de rest van het was anders voelen of zo omdat ik hier ben geweest.*

The crowdedness of the exhibition space is related to the extent to which participants experience a restorative or therapeutic effect. If the space is fairly calm and not that busy, it has a positive effect on the attributed value of the museum experience. Pip expressed that her experience was soothing, others agreed.

*Pip: Rustgevend... Ja juist omdat er zoveel geluiden me heen [waren] en dat ik dan zo'n kunstwerk zag en dan dat verhaal ging lezen...*

She is the only one who notes that the sounds from her surroundings helped her to have a relaxing experience. Most participants who did not experience a certain restorative or therapeutic effect noted that the chaos and noise actually kept them from becoming calm at all. For example, Shanice responded to Pip by stating that she experienced the opposite of a relaxing effect. Because there was not that much open space in the museum, the art works hung closely together and it kept her from entering a therapeutic or restorative zone. Furthermore, the noisy exhibition space kept her from experiencing her visit as relaxing as well.

Another positive influence on the restorative effect after a museum visit is the content of the exhibition. Kevin points out that he felt focused and that the context of art works increased his experience and the fact that he experienced it as calming.

*Kevin: Ik vond het wel rustgevend. Ik vond dat wel een interessante woordkeuze maar ik denk dat ik me daar wel in kan vinden. Ik merkte dat ik vooral heel gefocust was op wat ik voor me zag en de beschrijving er bij. Zo vooral de context er bij dat vond ik toch wel interessant. Die*

*beschrijving van "Wie heeft het gemaakt? En waar komt dat vandaan?". ... Dat was meer bij de schilderijen en zo, zeg maar dat de verhalen je er wat meer introkken maar bij het Bauhaus bijvoorbeeld, was dit interactieve waar je zelf je keuzes kon maken en dat soort dingen kon je ook echt, ja, [dingen die] je rust gaven.*

Fred then agreed with what others noted, he says he came to himself, learned something about himself and that it was even a feast for the eyes. Fred had not visited a museum in at least a decade, and he sounded surprised saying that he relaxed in the museum.

*Fred: Ik kwam ook helemaal tot mezelf. Echt. Ik heb gewoon mijn ogen uitgekeken, zeg maar. ... ik kwam hier juist tot rust.*

One of the reasons why people experienced a relaxing effect in a museum is that the whole experience makes them forget about their own life for a while, literature supports this finding as well (Kaplan et al., 1993; Hartig, 2004). Shanice said that she was enjoying her time and felt relaxed until she saw why the museum was going to close shortly, which made her worry about her own health.

*Shanice: Ik voelde me ook zo, eigenlijk wel prima. Totdat ik de reden zag waarom ze gaan verhuizen. Want ze verhuizen dus door dingen met asbest en dat soort dingen en toen had ik zoiets van "oh zo... Maar ik loop hier echt al jaren... in asbest". Toen had ik wel echt even zoiets van "oké". En toen sloeg het voor mij wel even om, zeg maar.*

### **3.6. Flow experience and chaotic experience**

Of course, due to the nature of this research I cannot conclude to which extent participants experienced a flow experience, therefore I use the term to indicate that participants experienced a soothing effect and that they felt they were in their own "zone". The opposite also occurred for some visitors, meaning they experienced their visit as quite jarring and chaotic. Other visitors in the museum influence the museum experience, because participants felt that they at times stood in their way, and kept them from being able to comfortably look at art works or information signs. Indeed the crowdedness of the exhibition space annoyed participants. What is noticeable is that the focus groups that visited the museum in the morning did not complain about the crowdedness, they were more annoyed with the layout of the exhibition. It was also significantly more crowded during the visit of the afternoon focus group on Sunday.

*Jeffrey: Ik had dat niet zozeer op het onderwerp, omdat ik ook op het stuk waar de vaste collectie dan hangt dat ook al had, dat ik niet in mijn eigen flow kwam. Dat je bijvoorbeeld, niet even rustig de tijd neemt om iets te lezen of zo want er staan al weer meerdere mensen*

*achter je te wachten. Of je moet zelf wachten tot je iets kon gaan lezen dus dan denk ik ook van "ja dan loop ik maar door en dan ga ik wel iets anders bekijken". En dan herhaalt dat zich constant eigenlijk.*

Jeffrey voiced this, he also said that the exhibition layout influenced the annoyance he experienced.

*Jeffrey: Normaalgesproken heb ik altijd het idee dat je een beetje ruimte maakt voor elkaar, wanneer je ergens bij wil bijvoorbeeld, of als je ergens langs wil. Maar omdat het nu dan zo druk was, en chaotische opbouw dus niks stond zo in een logische volgorde. Inderdaad, niemand wist welke kant die op moest lopen. daardoor werd dat ook een stuk minder, dat ik dacht van "Ja, ik doe wel een stap opzij want toch niemand weet waar je heen moet".*

Most participants were annoyed by the exhibition layout. In fact, Ricardo the only participant who said that he was not bothered by the layout of the exhibition. The type of museum visitors did deeply influence the experience for Ricardo, he was the only participant who explained that the older audience made him feel out of place and that he did not dare to ask them to make room for him when he wanted to read signs.

*Ricardo: Ik denk, dat mijn aandacht op m'n gedrag ook wel een beetje was gebaseerd op de mensen die daar liepen. ... Veel oudjes, dus gewoon veel respect... Maar dan wanneer je ergens wil kijken, daar bij zo'n bord... Dan wil ik wel sorry zeggen om het te kunnen lezen, maar dat durf ik niet dus dan denk ik "Ik kom strakjes wel weer eventjes langs". Hmm, dus dat, ja, voornamelijk. De opstelling, dat irriteerde me niet zo zeer.*

Ricardo was also interrupted during his museum visit because staff told him to go back and put his personal belongings in a locker. He said that it ruined the mood he was in. Indeed, during a flow experience not being interrupted is quite important (Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1999).

*Ricardo: Hij zei dat pas toen ik midden in het museum stond. ... Dat verpest ook wel best wel een beetje de "mood" waar ik in zat.*

The behavior of other visitors did bother numerous participants. For example, Alima's experience was not like her previous museum experiences. She felt that it was a chaotic experience, partly because of the noise from other visitors.

*Alima: Maar ja, ik ga er altijd vanuit dat je gewoon stil bent of stil moet zijn in het museum. En dat was nu gewoon echt niet. Het was gewoon echt druk.*

The pace from other visitors influenced the influence as well, Marianne described that she had to walk through the exhibition at a slower pace because of other visitors. This kept her from being in her own "zone" as well.

*Marianne: Ja natuurlijk, ik merk gewoon aan mijn tempo- natuurlijk, in het museum ligt je tempo wat lager, maar ik ben wel iemand die dan toch nog wel flink de pas er in heeft. Maar ja, als er super veel mensen van oudere leeftijd zijn, ja ik merk gewoon dat ik wat langzamer en wat rustiger...*

Robin noticed the same annoyances, but she also noticed that what was different was her visiting the museum alone. Usually she would be one of the visitors who talked and who stood still for a while.

*Robin: Ik denk dat dat ook anders is, hoe ik me nú voel naar andere bezoekers, omdat ik alleen ben want normaal ben jij ook misschien met iemand aan het praten en sta je ook effe ergens en "Hé heb je dit al gezien?". Nu ben je in je eentje een soort van door alle mensen aan dus worstelen dus ik denk dat dat wel een beetje een verschil maakt.*

Another barrier to get into the flow was the way in which the exhibition was displayed. The exhibition space itself was a barrier to experience a calming effect as well, becoming relaxed and calm is thought to be necessary for any kind of flow experience as well. This was more significant for the afternoon focus group because the museum was more crowded, but some participants from the morning groups pointed this out as well.

*Shanice: Ah dat had ik dan dus weer totaal niet. Ik denk dat komt ook wel omdat nu alles een beetje- zeg maar normaal heb je wat meer open ruimte en is er zeg maar wat meer ruimte tussen het werk- ... omdat er een deel afgesloten is hebben ze alles een beetje bij elkaar gehangen waardoor het echt zo "packed" was. En dan was het al druk met geluiden en alles dus ik vond het wel iets minder rustgevend.*

The participants also pointed out that they missed a logical order in the exhibition space, which kept them from enjoying themselves to the fullest. A spacious museum layout is expected to have a positive influence on the audience experience, because the chaotic layout had a negative effect on the experience.

*Marianne: Zelfs als ik in mijn eentje in die ruimte had gestaan dan was ik waarschijnlijk nog steeds de weg kwijt geweest tussen al die wanden. ... Nee, dus trok ik m'n eigen pad, maar dat was ook leuk...*

This also proved to be a barrier for participants to learn more about the exhibition.

*Robin: Maar ja ik snapte dat knooppunten ook helemaal niet. ... Ik had wel een plattegrondje maar ik heb wel echt alleen maar de stukjes gelezen daarop maar ik heb niet de verbindingen kunnen leggen of zo. Ik denk dat als het iets breder was uitgesteld in plaats van inderdaad alles zo op elkaar dan het voor dat voor mij al plezieriger geweest.*

Another issue that kept some participants from getting into their own flow was that

some experienced time pressure to be back on time. The morning groups did not mention that they experienced this, though. However, time pressure is known to be a barrier for a flow experience (Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1999). Not having to worry about the time positively increases the experience for participants.

*Marianne: Nee inderdaad ook wel dat dat niet echt lukte. Maar of dat nou echt kwam omdat ik niet echt onder de indruk was, of dat onderwerp of de chaos. En daarnaast, gewoon echt heel eerlijk, ik heb ook gewoon minstens 5 keer zo zitten te kijken van wat voor tijd is het en hoe lang heb ik nog, en niet omdat ik het mega saai vond maar toch die druk misschien zeg maar onbewust. Dat je na een uurtje zeg maar, normaal zou ik mezelf misschien nog veel meer verliezen.*

### 3.7. Shared or solo visit

General non-visitors mention that having to visit the museum alone forms a threshold to actually go to the museum, or at least has been a threshold in the past. For example, Fred notes that he passes by museum Boijmans Van Beuningen on a weekly basis, but he had never been to the museum because he could not find anyone to go with him.

*Fred: Ik kom hier wekelijks langs. ik werkte ook een stukje verder aan de andere kant van het park. Wat me er van weerhield... Gewoon niemand over de streep kunnen trekken om mee te gaan. Ja ik weet ook eigenlijk niemand waar ik mee zou kunnen gaan.*

The participants who often go to museums, mention the opposite of what the light users of culture in the group state when it comes to visiting the museum together or alone. They prefer going to museums on their own because it allows them to be in their own zone, meaning they feel no pressure to rush or accommodate to others' needs.

*Alima: Ik bezoek het liever in m'n eentje of met m'n broertje maar dat komt omdat ik weet dat die een beetje op dezelfde golflengte zit. Ik zou niet zomaar met iemand gaan waarvan ik niet weet hoe die zich gedraagt in musea. Als er iemand is die altijd er doorheen, dus jij [Jeffrey] misschien, ja ik zou nooit met jou gaan. Dan, als het mij interesseert dan kan ik makkelijk drie uur rondlopen.*

*Robin: Ik vind het inderdaad vervelend als je met iemand bent en je bent de persoon telkens kwijt omdat je sneller bent, of langzamer. En als ik alleen reis ga ik ook wel vaker naar het museum want dan kun je- dat is heel logisch om daar alleen rond te lopen en niemand kijkt er dan raar naar of zo. Dus in dat aspect ben ik denk liever alleen.*

The participants agreed that going to the museum with someone else has its advantages as well. For example, Pip and Julius did visit the museum together and they were

glad to be able to share thoughts and have some discussions about art works. They felt like a shared visit positively influenced their experience and they also say it increased the educational value of their experience. This confirms literature on the topic of museum experiences. For example, Simon (2006) also noted that sharing thoughts and experiences increases the overall experience, and that it can improve educational outcomes as well. Indeed, if there are more opportunities for active involvement, then this is thought to increase the intrinsic motivation for a meaningful museum experience as well ((Csikszentmihalyi & Hermanson, 1999). What is more, a more interactive experience focuses more on the visitors' subjective experience, which is concluded to be a motivator for those who are not familiar with highbrow culture, such as Julius (Hein, 2006).

*Julius: Zeg maar op het begin van Bauhaus, of net vanaf Bauhaus daar was dat. Dan heb je vaak 5 schilderijen op een rij en dan, zeg maar, kiezen we de eerste die ons aanspreekt en dan zijn we nooit het met elkaar eens, en dan praten we daarover.*

*Pip: Ik vind samen juist wel fijn omdat je dan ook weer iemand anders hoort praten over wat hij of zij vindt en dan kun je ook weer nieuwe dingen vinden. ... En je eigen interesses daar, dat is waar je naartoe loopt en dat is waar je naar gaat kijken, en als iemand anders er bij is die andere interesses heeft, en dan kun je daar nieuwe dingen van meenemen. ... Je zou zo veel kunnen leren.*

*Kevin: Ja, in je eentje ben je snel uitgedacht want je hebt maar één kant en ben je zo van "ik vraag me af of het zo kan zijn" en dan stop je want je weet die kant helemaal niet. En dan komt er een andere kant van een ander en dan kun je d'r heel lang heel lang over doorpraten.*

However, those who visited the museum alone did feel like this had benefits as well, because it was more laid back and more focused on the art itself.

*Shanice: Ja normaal ben ik ook altijd [in een museum] met iemand en nu ben ik dan voor het eerst hier alleen. Je hebt dan gelijk helemaal tijd om dingen te lezen en rustig dingen te zien... Dat je gewoon rustig je ding kan doen vind ik eigenlijk wel fijn.*

Shanice usually visits museums with peers, this time she had a different museum experience because she visited alone. She had more time and more focus for the art itself, whilst with friends she sees it more as a social event.

*Shanice: Maar ik zou het tegelijkertijd ook wel met vriendinnen- want soms gaan we ook gewoon naar het museum en dan ook gewoon om foto's te maken omdat het gewoon altijd mooi licht heeft in een museum [licht] voor die witte wanden naast de schilderijen, gewoon staan en een beetje foto's maken. Dus dat vind ik, ja dus daardoor zou ik ook wel graag samen gaan ja.*

Kevin considers what he might like more, he concludes that there are benefits to both a solo and a shared museum visit. However, he also points out that it might be a barrier to go to the museum alone.

*Kevin: Ja denk wel dat voor allebei wel wat gezegd kan worden. Ja want, het is meer van, als je met iemand gaat dan kun je het erover hebben kun je discussiëren, zo was het inderdaad ook leuk om met andere mensen die ook gewoon aanwezig zijn, als dat kan. Tegelijkertijd weet ik ook wel van daar kan soort- toch een soort barrière tussen zitten. Tegelijkertijd, als je alleen bent... Ik kijk naar alles wel wat ik een beetje interessant vind ik. Dan kan ik er lang naar kijken zo van "Oh dat vind ik ook wel interessant". Ik vind het ook wel fijn dat ik niet rekening hoeft te houden met iemand die naast me staat te kijken. ... Dan hoeft je geen rekening te houden met iemand anders die zegt "ik ben er klaar mee".*

### **3.8. Sharing the experience online**

Even when participants have a negative museum experience, they still share pictures online if that is what they would usually do if they go somewhere. Those who did share something online did not know how to phrase why they did that, but generally I believe it indicated that the cultural activity gave them some sense of pride or that they may even have felt a certain pressure to enjoy their visit, because sharing their visit made them come across to peers as someone who knows how to enjoy going to the museum.

*Ricardo: Ik heb wel met de, eh, die twee kunstwerken heb ik wel gedeeld op mijn Instagram Story. ... Ik denk, weet je, misschien dan om te laten zien waar je bent. Maar misschien ook onder anderen om aan andere mensen te laten zien dat jij het leuk vindt of "kijk hoe tof dit er uit ziet". Misschien ja, is dat wel een beetje wat ik heb gedacht.*

This confirms the social approach that Goulding (2000) explained as well. Furthermore, Bourdieu's theory (1979) on cultural capital and the exclusionary character of highbrow culture are confirmed throughout these results.

*Alima: Ja ik heb van- van dat licht een foto gemaakt, of een filmpje gemaakt, en op Instagram gezet. En nog van een werk. ... Ja ik heb het gewoon gedaan voor herkenning. Ik herkende dat schilderij en ik herkende die stoel. En de eerste foto was gewoon van "ik ben hier". Dat was het.*

However, Alima did only want to take pictures of things she already knew, or found interesting. Being familiar with a work seems to increase the perceived value of that work.

*Alima: Maar meestal heb ik ook, maak ik veel meer foto's en nu had ik ook die behoefte niet. Dus ik heb van dat ene schilderij in het begin, want dat herkende ik, toen dacht ik "Hee dat herken ik!". En ook, ook van die stoel heb ik een foto gemaakt, van de rietveldstoel.*

Fred wanted to take pictures to share them but he did not dare to do so, because he was not sure if he was allowed to take pictures of the art works.

*Fred: Ik wou mijn telefoon pakken om een foto te maken en toen dacht ik "toch doe ik dat maar niet" voor de zekerheid. Straks grijpt iemand me bij m'n nek of zo [lacht]. Dus ik heb me wel ingehouden ja.*

He did share his museum visit on Facebook, and did not give a particular motivation although he did think it sounded interesting and he wanted his peers to know about this.

*Fred: Ik heb wel ingecheckt of Facebook ja. ... Ik heb eigenlijk, daar helemaal geen reden voor. Als ik ergens naar binnen ga dan check ik gewoon in. Ehm, misschien een beetje ook om interessant te doen. Zo laten zien dat ik naar een museum ga, dat doe ik normaal nooit.*

Shanice usually does share her trips to museums on her social media, but she got caught up in the moment and forgot to post something.

*Shanice: Ja ik doe wel iets op social media maar ik dacht- ik dacht dat er toch niet aan.*

## 4. Rotterdam Zuid

### 4.1. Stigma

Rotterdam Zuid is an area of Rotterdam that has its problems, all participants wholeheartedly agreed on this, and shared experiences about why they experience their neighborhoods as somewhat troublesome at times. However, the stigma perpetuates issues that are being improved upon, and it generalizes all inhabitants of Zuid. The participants did not agree with how they feel that Zuid is stigmatized by outsiders, even if it is based on the truth.

*Alima: Nou gedeeltelijk is het [imago] wel waar natuurlijk maar ik denk dat er wel steeds meer ontwikkelingen zijn in Zuid en dat het ook steeds beter wordt.*

All participants agreed that the situation in Rotterdam Zuid needs to be talked about with more nuances. Several participants pointed out that the municipality tries to improve problematic neighborhoods, but opinions varied on the actual changes.

Indeed, Rotterdam Zuid is experienced to be somewhat problematic, although the stigma perpetuates a hopeless and overly problematic image of it. What is more, the problems that are present in Rotterdam Zuid are not only happening in Rotterdam Zuid. For example, Pip explained that there were multiple places in the city that she would rather not go to.

*Pip: Het zijn vooral... Dat heb ik wel, dat er bepaalde plekken zijn waar ik niet zou komen. [...] Maar dat is niet alleen zo in Rotterdam Zuid.*

### 4.2. Experienced superdiversity in Zuid

The participants express a desire for a successful integration of people with a migrant background and the old majority group (Scholten et al., 2018). Currently, they notice that the neighborhood dynamic in their neighborhoods is experienced as fragmented; people are diverse in terms of ethnicity, age, income, and lifestyle; this makes making a connection more unlikely. There is a general consensus that you only interact with who you know for your own safety and comfort. Clearly, there is a lack of social cohesion, something that follows much of what the term superdiversity encompasses (Vertovec, 2007).

Vertovec names Rotterdam as an example of a city that is superdiverse. This term has received critique, due to its broad or vague meaning. Therefore I feel I should reiterate what I think superdiversity means for the population in Rotterdam Zuid, according to my data. Superdiversity does not mean that there is merely a positive shift in society, rather it means that we are coming to terms with the changing societal dynamic. The increased fragmentation of the society is characterized by a shift to multiple minority groups who make up one society.

However, that does not suggest this one society is experienced as one cohesive group.

The neighborhood dynamic is not experienced as social or open by most of the participants. There is a certain estrangement from others if they are unknown. This unknown Other evokes anxiety amongst participants, they fear who they do not know because they expect confrontation. Pip voices that she does not dare to talk to people on the street, or even look at them, to avoid confrontation. Fred, Julius, and Kevin agree with her. Fred points out that he believes the best thing in Zuid is to avoid contact with others. In the fragmented population there seems to be a general fear for others who are unknown, many participants voiced similar concerns.

*Fred: Ik weet niet meer beter. [...] Dat ik geen contact wil met mensen.*

Many participants voiced similar concerns, but Shanice was visibly surprised to hear that there is so much anxiety from the other participants. She struggled to point out why that might be different for her. She said that because of her Surinam heritage, she looks similar to many others she sees on the street so they do not feel like strangers. An influence in the lack of social cohesion or sense of familiarity is the fact that people see themselves as significantly and essentially different from ‘the other’, relating to Foucault’s philosophy on othering and power dynamics (Peters & Besley, 2014). This unknown Other makes them fearful of what might happen because they alienate this other and create their own connotations with what this Other may act like (Peters & Besley, 2014). If they would see familiarities in the Other, then the fear for them and the antisocial experience of living in Zuid is expected to decrease. About this, Shanice voiced the following:

*Shanice: Dat is interessant om te horen want ik ervaar dat heel anders. Misschien is het dan anders omdat er heel veel Surinamers wonen en ikzelf ook Surinaams ben zeg maar. [...]*

*Maar ja dat is misschien omdat het mensen zijn op me lijken. [...] Ik heb dat [angst voor anderen] totaal niet, in mijn omgeving hebben wij dat ook totaal niet. [...] Ik weet hoe ze zijn.*

Shanice looks at everyone on the street as ‘her people’, she explains. She feels safe in most neighborhoods in Zuid because she experiences the majority of her fellow inhabitants of Zuid as somewhat familiar to her.

*Shanice: Misschien een beetje ons kent ons, ofzo ja. [...] Ik ben niet bang voor jou want ik weet hoe [je bent]" weet je wel, het is dan toch- ik denk dat het meer een stukje onwetendheid is dan.*

Indeed, the participants voiced that they would like to see some change in their neighborhoods. In short, they voiced a need to increase social cohesion and to renew certain neighborhoods. The following section of the results covers what changes the participants

wished to see in their neighborhood, they also voiced what change they do not want to see. Participants noted that the social cohesion and atmosphere in neighborhoods need to be improved. Secondly, they deemed it important to renew neighborhoods with better housing and improving the looks of a neighborhood.

### 4.3 Does Zuid want Boijmans Op Zuid?

Multiple participants expressed a certain hopelessness that Zuid could ever truly change for the better. This made them hesitant if Boijmans Op Zuid would be an organization that the local population in Rotterdam Zuid actually would want.

*Pip: Nee ik denk echt niet dat het [Boijmans Op Zuid] een slim plan is. Ik denk niet dat het iets gaat opleveren, en ik snap echt het idee van de overheid dat ze het willen veranderen. Maar het imago van Rotterdam Zuid veranderen en vooroordelen veranderen... Dat is echt moeilijker dan dat het zo in één keer door een museum dat daar geplaatst wordt verandert. ... En ik denk ook dat het museum binnen een half jaar failliet is en vergeten, eigenlijk.*

Pip clearly states that she does not expect Boijmans Op Zuid to change much about anything, either for better or worse, at least if it is to be executed in the same manner that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen exists today. She is doubtful that the stigma of Zuid is ever going to become anything close to positive, regardless of what the government or municipality attempt to do. She also says that she thinks a museum will not attract many people, and that it will be soon forgotten about. To conclude, a regular museum is not expected to attract the local population of Rotterdam Zuid, and its effects to change the stigma of Zuid are thought to be small as well.

Shanice voices a similar concern, being that having the accessibility to a cultural organization physically does not imply that it will encourage people to visit that organization. As an example, she gives event hall Ahoy, next to Zuidplein. The nearer location alone will not motivate non-visitors to go, according to her. Literature supports this as well; audience diversity and museum inclusivity do not increase by only moving cultural organizations closer to people who generally would not visit them (Badisco et al., 2011). There is also a theatre next to Zuidplein, which, according to the participants, also does not encourage the local population in Zuid to pay a visit to it.

*Shanice: Ja, Ahoy zit daar al. En dat, is niet eens een trigger voor mensen daar, om iets te gaan doen. En ik denk dat een museum dan ook echt niks uitmaakt.*

*Fred: En als ze het boven [bij] Zuidplein bouwen kunnen ze het beste naast het theater bouwen bijvoorbeeld of zo; is hetzelfde soort publiek.*

Ahoy and Theater Zuidplein did not change the stigma of Rotterdam Zuid, or push away the authentic inhabitants of its neighborhood Charlois. Therefore it is a logical step to assume that no rapid change would occur if Boijmans Op Zuid were to be opened in this neighborhood.

Other participants do think that a museum in Rotterdam Zuid could facilitate a certain change in the neighborhood, or at least they are hopeful that it could change the neighborhood's problems or its stigma. It is noticeable that when we discussed Boijmans Op Zuid as a museum, as they know it from their experience in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, they are doubtful anyone from Zuid is going to pay attention to it. Expected changes that are mentioned are infrastructural changes that may happen. The participants mention that a classic museum will not attract many authentic inhabitants of Zuid but that it could increase other things in the neighborhoods. For example, Kevin expects that a museum may lead to more investments and improvements in the neighborhood. In this case, the museum itself might function as a catalyst for neighborhood change and improvements in the area.

*Kevin: Ik denk, dat een museum zal leiden tot meer investeringen dan wat nu plaatsvindt en dan wat er nu gebeurt.*

Kevin explains that if the general museum audience actually visits Rotterdam Zuid, they can see that it has changed a lot and that it might change their perspective of Zuid. This could help to change the stigma of Zuid, because a lot of projects in Zuid already function to change Zuid for the better.

*Kevin: Ja ik weet niet, ik denk dat zo een museum misschien gepaard is met al die projecten die nu aan de hand zijn om de leefomgeving te verbeteren en al. [...] als het publiek dat naar het museum gaat, ook daar, rondom het Zuidplein [...], dat die misschien ook zien dat het nu al wel een stuk beter is dan 20 jaar geleden. Ik bedoel, het museumpubliek, dat is nou eenmaal wat ouder, blank, grijs. Rotterdam Zuid is het tegenovergestelde daar van. Dus ik denk dat die [museumbezoekers] wel een ander beeld kunnen krijgen als ze zien dat het in verbetering is. ... Het is heel erg veel aan verbeterd, dus ik denk dat ze het, dat als wel, als ze dat publiek ook naar Zuidplein weten te krijgen dat nu hier komt, dat het wel kan bijdragen aan het imago minder slecht te maken in ieder geval. Niet meteen een soort helemaal positief is, maar wel gewoon minder negatief.*

Kevin also points out that it could increase cultural participation for children in schools who may visit Boijmans Op Zuid as a fieldtrip, implying that it might lower the

threshold for schools to offer cultural trips. He implies that the location of a cultural organization can be a motivator for people to visit it, although for a traditional museum set-up this would only work if people are going there in groups with schools.

*Kevin: Maar ik denk dat het misschien wel voor scholen in Zuid of zo die in de buurt zitten, dat dat wel iets is voor hun. [...] Want dat is ook goedkoper bijvoorbeeld dan als je er met het openbaar vervoer heen moet met de hele school in de metro.*

A concern that was raised during the discussion on change in Zuid is that although change is needed and necessary, there might be too much of it or it could occur too rapidly. Robin notes that neighborhood change can slowly change the stigma, although changing this is a slow process. She continues to explain that if you want to change her neighborhood for the better, change should be slow and fit the authentic population. Otherwise, she mentions, it might cause the authentic population to be pushed out of Zuid. Alima states that she also noticed the change in neighborhood dynamics in Katendrecht, a neighborhood in Rotterdam Zuid where they point out that the effects common to gentrification did affect it. Multiple participants note that change which drastically changes the neighborhood is not the desired change that Zuid needs. They note that housing costs have become more expensive in Katendrecht, that the original inhabitants have moved away because it all became too expensive, and that it would be a shame if the same happens in other neighborhoods in Zuid. However, it did change the stigma because the participants note that it is thought to be a safe and fun area now, whereas it had the same stigma as other neighborhoods, merely ten years ago.

*Robin: Ik denk dat dat imago wel heel erg blijft hangen. Dus als het twintig jaar geleden slecht was dan denken mensen dat dat nu ook zo is. ... Het gaat natuurlijk ook niet snel, want ik bedoel er zijn andere wijken, bijvoorbeeld Katendrecht, daar is het gewoon enorme "gentrification". Ik weet niet hoe je dat in het Nederlands zegt. ... Nu is het alleen maar- ja toch- En het is hartstikke duur om er te wonen en daar zijn "food halls" en zo. En dat is zeg maar het andere uiterste en dat wil je denk ik ook niet. ... Ja maar zoiets, zo zien veel mensen dat een stadsdeel opeens kan veranderen. Van "nu is het opeens superveilig en leuk" en dat was 10 jaar geleden niet maar ik denk niet dat je dat zou moeten willen met heel Zuid. Maar dan is het gewoon een langzame ontwikkeling of zo. ... Ja Katendrecht ... daar zijn de originele bewoners van weg, daar werd het te duur voor dus die zijn dan weg. En dan, weet je hoe dat gaat gebeuren als dat bij Zuid is-*

*Alima: Met alleen maar yuppen.*

Marianne also mentions that if the authentic population of Zuid is pushed out of the city, and

out of their current neighborhoods, you do lose some of its authenticity and atmosphere.

*Marianne: Maar ja inderdaad als je al die mensen ook nog eens dwingt om nog verder uit de stad van Rotterdam te gaan dan ben je ook een stukje sfeer kwijt denk ik.*

Jeffrey discusses this “Katendrecht effect”, saying it may occur if a museum opens which would not adhere to the authentic population’s needs. He notes that although Boijmans Op Zuid sounds like a non-intrusive, temporary organization, something as simple as a foodhall already gave rise to so much change in Katendrecht within a decade, so the same could happen near Zuidplein. He is aware that just one museum would not significantly change the area, but that it could be a catalyst for other companies or organizations to move to the same neighborhood.

*Jeffrey: Nee. Inderdaad ik denk dat je moet opletten voor een Katendrecht effect.*

As discussed in the theoretical framework, there are factors that influence Rotterdam’s role as a creative city, part of this is the creative class that lives and works in Rotterdam. Florida explained that this creative class is needed for the creative city to develop and thrive (2002). However, since the publication of Florida's book in 2002 on the creative class, much has played out differently than he assumed (Florida et al., 2011). His 3T<sup>3</sup> model mainly benefits and attracts the already fairly rich middle class population. This would mean that gentrification in Zuid, which, according to the participants, could be brought on by a temporary project like Boijmans op Zuid if it is executed without the authentic population in mind, may actually negatively affect the current population in Rotterdam Zuid. The participants point out that change in Zuid might affect populations in adjacent regions as well, because they notice that certain actions of Rotterdam’s municipality to improve Zuid already cause the more problematic or simply poorer families in neighborhoods in Rotterdam Zuid to move further out of the city. This phenomenon is also discussed as a result of gentrification by Florida, Mellander and Adler (2011).

However, I do not think it is possible for one temporary museum to be a catalyst for such permanent changes in Charlois, in Rotterdam Zuid. Not only due to its temporary plans, but also because thus far it is marketed as a location that collaborates with local initiatives and aims to attract the young, authentic population of Zuid (Boijmans, 2019). If anything, change would suit the demands and expectations of the current inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid, which were also voiced in this results section. These discussions regarding gentrification and abrupt neighborhood change mainly reveal that inhabitants in Zuid want change, but they want

---

<sup>3</sup> The 3T model, which revolves around technology, talent and tolerance (Florida, 2002)

change that suits the needs for them and others who live in these neighborhoods. As long as a museum would fit the needs of these original inhabitants, there is little concern for the participants. Kevin points out that change is most likely to come slowly, and that efforts to change up Zuid are going to help, rather than harm its stigma.

*Kevin: Het zal nooit in een keer helemaal zijn van "Oeh, hier moet je zijn!", dat zie ik denk ik niet gebeuren maar ze proberen het er minder slecht te maken en ik denk dat dat gewoon ook belangrijk is, gewoon voor- het sluit ook aan in het grote plaatje van stadsontwikkeling.*

What seems like a more relevant issue is that the participants do not foresee the population of Zuid to actually want Boijmans Op Zuid in their neighborhood, at least not in the way they know museums now.

### **5. Expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid**

This third and final main theme in the results of the study covers the participants' expectations for Boijmans Op Zuid, within these expectations various barriers and motivators are covered as well. These factors either prohibit or encourage people to visit Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen or Boijmans Op Zuid. Barriers are factors that create a higher threshold for them to visit either Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen or Boijmans Op Zuid in the future. Motivators are factors that generally lower this threshold. Audience research in the Netherlands reveals that the main barriers for cultural participation amongst light users of culture are a lack of knowledge and/or disinterestedness in programming, insecurity, and high prices (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018).

Barriers that were mentioned by the participants are unfamiliarity with the museum, a highbrow image, (travel) costs, distance to the museum, the expected passivity of the museum experience, and exhibition content that has little significance or relevance to visitors. Motivators are familiarity with Boijmans Op Zuid, a decrease of the highbrow stigma by noting that pre-existing knowledge or a certain cognition is not required for a museum visit, low ticket prices, a shorter distance to the museum to increase familiarity and decrease travel costs, an active or participatory museum experience, events by the museum that 'take people by the hand' in order to be more inclusive, and relevant or accessible exhibition content. Opinions regarding the expectations and hopes for Boijmans Op Zuid were mostly unanimous amongst the participants.

According to the participants, Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen as it exists today does not attract the diverse inhabitants of Zuid for multiple reasons. Thus, if a temporary museum location in Rotterdam Zuid wishes to attract the local population of Zuid that

Boijmans Op Zuid would be surrounded by, then taking into account what may be barriers or motivators for this population is a sensible choice.

### 5.1. A highbrow museum is (not) an inclusive museum

The first barrier for visitors before their museum visit was that a traditional museum, such as Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, has a highbrow image. This may attract avid museum visitors, but it is thought to be a barrier for the majority of the population in Zuid, for it is not considered to be accessible to those who are not already familiar with museum visits. Indeed, the current museum set-up may not attract the population of Zuid, but it does attract avid museum visitors. Participants expect current visitors of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen to be likely to visit other locations of the museum, regardless of its location. The highbrow museum character that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen has, is a barrier according to the participants.

*Pip: Ja dat heel erg, en denk dat het ook wel een soort van status dingetje is. Als je naar het museum gaat en je kent die- heel veel kunstwerken, of kunstenaars en je kan er over praten met mensen, dan heb je toch wel een soort van... status icoon ofzo. ... Ah ja de sociale druk vooral, ook, denk ik wel.*

*Julius: En ik denk dat het voor heel veel mensen die het niet die d'r niks over weten, die die vinden- vinden dat ook dan eng om daar dan proberen tussen te komen. Omdat ze denken dat ze daar niet bij horen. ... Ja omdat ze dan- ze- dat ze de enige onwetende zijn en dan voelen ze zich- en dan, misschien weet je dan gaan ze en dan voelen ze zich zo en dan gaan ze daarna niet meer omdat ze merken van "dit past niet bij mij". Ook al vind ik het misschien leuk.*

The participants voiced that maintaining Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen's current audience is important to take into consideration as well. They said that being familiar with Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, or even with museums in general, is a motivator for people to visit Boijmans Op Zuid. Indeed, Robin and Alima are both high users of culture. Alima has studied art history, and Robin mentioned that she has a Museumkaart and frequents museums often.

*Robin: Ik denk dat dat [bekend zijn met het museum] wel uitmaakt op of ik naar Zuid zou gaan, daar. Want dan zou ik zoiets hebben van "Oh dat zit nu daar, én ik weet al wat het is". Dus...*

*Alima: Ja, da's leuk. Ik wil zien hoe het dáár zit en hoe het dáár is, ja.*

They both pointed out that familiarity increases the likelihood that they will visit Boijmans

Op Zuid. Thus, similar to what previous research suggests, this then indicates that disinterestedness in the exhibitions is indeed a barrier to visit Boijmans Op Zuid (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018).

*Kevin: Ik denk dat er ook vooral een beetje zo'n soort van vooroordeel op zit, dat mensen iets extra's moeten hebben om daar naar toe te gaan en dat te kunnen beleven. Bijvoorbeeld, ik denk dat bij dit als museum [dat] dan nog wel wat meer geldt. Vooral bij zo'n Bauhaus tentoonstelling. Dan denk ik van "ja...", [ik denk dat] heel veel mensen daar ook heel veel minder snel geneigd zullen zijn te gaan zonder dat ze de voorkennis erover hebben. Dan iets, weet ik veel, van de geschiedenis of zo. ... Denk dat dat een beetje een combinatie is van: én het staat misschien iets verder van je af. Én ik denk dat het misschien ook wel iets minder, ehm, wat is dat hoe zal ik het zeggen, "relatable" in het Engels, hé. Je kan je minder snel herkennen in een bepaalde architectuur stijl uit een bepaalde tijdsperiode uit het verleden, dan in de geschiedenis. Daar kan je sneller dingen mee associëren, denk ik, dan een bepaalde stroming.*

## **5.2. Interactive and participatory museum experience**

An interactive and participatory museum experience positively increases the experienced value of the museum visit. Simon (2006) found the same results. Furthermore, it also lowers the threshold to visit a museum; it is a motivator for light users of culture to visit Boijmans Op Zuid.

*Pip: wat vooral werkt is dingen interactief [maken] dus dat je gewoon echt dingen kan maken kans of verschuiven en zo, dus denk dat dat wel beter [werkt]. In plaats van verhalen over Griekse mythologie, ik zie dat minder aanslaan.*

A more practical museum experience where the visitor gets to do more things, rather than only observe, is going to lower the barrier for visitors. Others agreed with Pip as well.

*Fred: Ja het moet praktischer.*

Pip noted that it would positively influence the experience, at least for those who are unfamiliar in the museum. Heavy users of culture are expected to need a less interactive and practical experience to have a similarly positive experience.

*Pip: Ja dan is het ook leuk. Alleen ik denk dat mensen die meerdere keren naar het museum gaan, dat zij het wel beter kunnen hebben om gewoon uren naar een schilderij te kijken en verdieping te zoeken in dat, dan mensen die op Zuid eventjes na een theater ofzo er naar toe gaan.*

None of the visitors felt that their creativity was "sparked" during their museum experience, nor did they learn 21st century skills that were explained in the framework, which would contribute to a lifelong learning experience. There were attempts from the museum to implement this factor, through more engaging installations. For example, there were interactive Ipad's with information, and installations to experience first-hand what the focus points of the Bauhaus style are. Participants who are already familiar with museums also expected more interactive experiences. For example, Marianne described that the lack of participation decreased the value of her experience. She also pointed out that the interactive potential of an exhibition could have increased the educational experience that she wanted to have.

*Marianne: En dat hadden ze voor mij... Dat is wel wat ik meer gewend ben van het museum tegenwoordig, echt dat interactieve weet je wel. En dat ze dat verder ook nog hebben gedaan op een iPad. Maar die waren te klein als in, te veel mensen dus ik heb daar weinig aandacht aan besteed. En dat mag van mij nog wel veel meer. Het hoeft echt niet met een app of helemaal social media gericht [te] zijn. Maar het had me wel meer kunnen 'meenemen', zeg maar. ... Ik hou d'r eigenlijk gewoon van om iets te doen en daardoor ook weer na te denken.* Even though she did not think the quality of the interactive aspects of the exhibition were of high quality ("boring"), she does point out that it has helped her to increase her understanding of the exhibition itself.

*Marianne: Ja ik heb wel een iets beter idee van welke periode het inhield, wat best wel een korte periode eigenlijk was, was voor mij wel even een opsteker. Vooral die eerste... Ook al waren ze niet leuk, die interacties. De 3 stappen zeg maar, van die vormen en kleuren en texturen en dan... 2D naar 3D, dat idee zeg maar. En dan naar de kunstacademie ervaring, dat ik toen wel dacht van "Aha!". Er viel voor mij toen wel even een kwartje, dus dat ik dacht "oké dat hebben ze blijkbaar veel meer nog meegenomen naar vandaag de dag", dan dat ik dacht.*

Even though there were some participatory or engaging opportunities in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen, participants did not feel like these were engaging or challenging enough.

*Robin: Er stond iets van "Kunst kijk je met je handen", en er zat één kindje in een hoek op een [Rietveld] stoel, maar er was verder niks...*

Some also noted that it looked qualitatively not good enough for them to feel an intrinsic motivation to actually use those installations; they did not think that there would be a difference between doing the activity, or just watching others do it.

*Marianne: Zelfs toen zag ik mensen dat doen en toen dacht ik, 'jullie doen het, ik zie het effect'. Ik heb dat dus niet eens meer zelf gedaan, maar ik ben misschien gewoon ook niet helemaal zo.*

Marianne did repeatedly note that she would like a more active approach to the museum experience, though.

*Jeffrey: Ik had dat inderdaad een beetje hetzelfde ook, met die blokjes die je kon verschuiven. Dan dacht ik "Oh ja dit is leuk", dit is voor de kindertjes bedoeld, dus ik laat het wel voor wat het is want het is maar een lamp die van kleur verandert, het is niet heel bijzonder. ... Ja de kwaliteit, dat had misschien beter gekund. ik had eerlijk gezegd niet eens door dat je die blokken kon draaien, dat het de bedoeling was dat je daar iets mee mocht doen.*

This, of course, is not the desired outcome of interactive museum tools. Similar to what has been argued by Nina Simon (2006), it is expected that a higher quality that suits the competency of its audience would increase the intrinsic motivation to actively engage with the tools. So an interactive museum such as Boijmans Op Zuid would be a good idea, but it should be relevant and qualitatively fitting to its audience.

*Alima: Het was wel creatief, aan het begin, mocht je dingen aanraken. Dat was klein, er was weinig. En ik vond het een beetje chaotisch.*

Spreading out the interactive activities throughout the museum, rather than only offering it at the beginning of the main exhibition would have made the experience more balanced as well which could reduce the experienced chaos.

*Alima: Ja het is, dat interactieve gebeuren is natuurlijk in het begin en daarna in de tentoonstelling zelf is er niks meer wat je kan doen of aanraken. Zeg maar, dat je bezig kan zijn. Volgens mij ik heb één klein tv scherm gezien met nog een ander filmpje. En that's it, dat is dus allemaal gewoon lopen, kijken, bordjes lezen. En het interactieve dat is, dat was vooral ervoor.*

Julius also pointed towards the fact that a classical museum experience does not encourage visitors to interact. However, encouraging contact would be a productive step to improve some societal issues in Rotterdam Zuid because research indicates that that intergroup contact does reduce prejudice, and can increase interaction on a long term basis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

*Julius: Maar ik denk niet dat het een museum cultuur heel veel helpt in die anonimiteit doorbreken zeg maar, want ik hier ben ik niet heel veel met mensen aan de praat geraakt of ik ik zou nu denk ik misschien twee gezichten kunnen zien. Ik zou niet meer weten wie ik kan wel zien of we hebben gezien.*

### 5.3. Financial element

Boijmans Op Zuid would be built in one of the poorest neighborhoods in the Netherlands, with a high unemployment rate (CBS, 2018). Taking into account the financial constraints that the authentic population has is important to understand why the ticket price of the organization is expected to be a barrier for people to visit Boijmans Op Zuid. The influence of the barrier of the financial aspect was disputable during the focus group discussions. Pip believed money to be a great constraint, but Robin thought that other barriers have a more significant influence on the likelihood to visit Boijmans Op Zuid. Literature mostly supports Robin, Hood (1983) indicated that other factors such as education, class, ethnicity or age, play a far more significant role in the likeliness one will visit a museum. But not everyone agreed with this:

*Pip: Ik denk echt niet dat het met moeite te maken heeft in Rotterdam zuid. Ik denk dat het meer te maken heeft met geld, eigenlijk.*

*Kevin: Dus het ligt aan de toegankelijkheid er van, dan is denk ik de prijs barrière een flinke belemmering daarvoor.*

Some pointed out that the museum experience is not just the museum visit inside of the museum. Robin described that traveling to the museum is expensive, that eating in the city center or drinking in the museum café is expensive, and that the tickets to the museum itself are expensive as well. The financial aspect of a museum visit is experienced as a barrier to visit a museum. However, moving the museum more nearby is expected to already cut some of the costs, because the population of Zuid would not have to pay the travel costs and they could eat or drink for cheaper in Zuidplein, or at home.

*Robin: Maar ook er omheen is het gewoon een duur uitje met je hele gezin. Als je naar het museum gaat en je wil bijvoorbeeld wat drinken of zo, niets is zo duur als in een museum iets drinken of eten. Maar ik denk als je, ehm, ik weet niet, iets kan regelen inderdaad dat je het wat dichterbij haalt inderdaad door het op Zuid te zetten, dat het al iets anders is. ... Maar zeker als je ook al de stap moet zetten om naar het centrum te gaan en nou ja, met z'n allen weet ik veel, in de metro te stappen, dat is gewoon best wel een ding, ja, en duur.*

There are attempts to increase museum inclusivity by lowering the ticket prices for less fortunate people, though. This is done with the Rotterdampas, an initiative to encourage cultural participation. Participants discussed how this pass is a motivator for them to visit

cultural organizations more frequently. Julius voiced that being able to go to something for free, or at least for a cheaper price, encourages him to go and do those activities.

*Julius: Ja ik weet wel dat mensen met een lager inkomen, kunnen een Rotterdam pas krijgen, goedkoop zeg maar. En daar ben ik er één van. Dus ik heb nu die Rotterdam pas en daardoor kan ik nu ook hier zeg maar ook gratis ... hierheen.. En ja ik ga daar zeker gebruik gaan maken, van die lijst van die pas, dan, dan ga ik veel meer dingen doen die ik normaal nooit zou doen ook al was het maar 5 euro of zo. Als het van 5 euro naar gratis gaat, daar zijn mensen toch altijd van. "Ah we gaan we wel effe snel".*

#### **5.4. Location**

Participants were overall quite surprised to hear there were plans for a museum in Zuidplein, and in Zuid in general, because they did not know of any other museums in this area of the city.

*Ricardo: ... je hebt ook niet heel veel musea in Zuid. ... Heel veel mensen die moeten ... van Zuid naar de binnenstad om ... museums te bezoeken.*

Marianne thought that it made sense to open up a museum in Rotterdam Zuid if the aim of cultural policy is to encourage cultural participation and make museum visits more accessible. She related this to how cultural participation is also reinforced through education, to ensure that children acquaint themselves with culture as well. She noted that if people are confronted with a cultural institution because it is so close to where they live, they are highly likely to notice it.

*Marianne: Dat is die vertaalslag die ze hebben gemaakt ooit van "Oh, we moeten het naar scholen brengen", hè, want dan breng je het kind er al meteen mee in aanraking. En dat moet je dan nu ook eigenlijk doen, je moet het zo dicht bij de mensen thuis brengen dat ze er bijna niet omheen kunnen.*

Opinions varied about the extent to which a more nearby museum would increase the cultural participation of non-visitors in Rotterdam Zuid. Alima was one of the participants who was quite positive that people would visit Boijmans Op Zuid because they could come across it by chance. This is also to be expected from light users of highbrow culture, they mainly visit organizations if they come across it by chance (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Alima did note that she did not see the necessity for Boijmans Op Zuid, although she did think it could be interesting and lower the threshold to visit a museum for the population of Zuid.

*Alima: Ik denk het wel. Ik denk juist vooral als ze het op Zuidplein doen, dat er dan heel veel mensen wel geïnteresseerd zijn, van "Oh! Dit is er opeens", en dat ze dan wel iets van interesse hebben. Een lagere drempel ... om er eens heen te gaan. Maar ik denk dat het meer is van "oké we zijn nu op Zuidplein en we zien het toevallig, laten we naar binnen gaan", zeg maar. Dat het meer dat is dan dat je echt het gaan uitplannen, van "oké we gaan zaterdag". ... Dat je inderdaad- je weet dat de bevolking in Zuid minder in contact komt met musea, dus dan specifiek die musea, en als je dat dan daar neerzet dan denk ik dat dat wel iets heel interessants op kan leveren. Maar of het moet? Nee.*

Jeffrey agreed with Alima, but he did also think that the current museum audience had to be taken into account as well. Others voiced this concern for the museum in general, they should be able to maintain their current audience of more avid museum visitors as well. Jeffrey wondered if the threshold for high users of culture to visit a cultural organization would become too high for them if an organization moved out of the city center.

*Jeffrey: Ik denk dat je in dat opzicht wel iets meer mensen binnenhaalt die uit die wijken komen inderdaad, maar ik denk dat er nog meer mensen van buiten Rotterdam Zuid een keertje naar Rotterdam laat komen om daar het Boijmans te bezoeken.*

But most participants did not think that the motivated museum audience would be deterred from visiting an organization because of a new location. In fact, if the content of Boijmans Op Zuid could attract that audience, most participants did not think it would be an issue for them to visit the museum in the future. Indeed, participants do not think that location plays that much of a role into museum visitation for both high and low users of culture. This confirms the studies that noted that at least for non-visitors location alone is not a significant barrier (Badisco et al., 2011).

*Kevin: Ik denk dat het belangrijk is om het publiek dat steeds terugkomt aan te houden. Ik denk dat je die wel naar Zuidplein kan trekken als er weer iets nieuws is. Dus eh, waar ze naar willen kijken.*

Participants addressed that the current distance to the city centre, where the current Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is, may be a barrier for people in Rotterdam Zuid to pay a visit to it. However, generally the participants did not expect that many more people from Rotterdam Zuid would go to Boijmans Op Zuid if they did not already go to museums.

*Julius: Ik vraag me wel af of dan mensen die nu nog wel naar Boijmans gaan, dat ze denken als het in Zuid staat, dat ze dan misschien niet meer gaan. ... Ja toch, dat ze toch denken van: "Eh dan kun je toch maar beter ergens anders heen".*

They also did not expect the museum to open a location in Rotterdam Zuid because of

the population in Zuid, who they do not consider general museum visitors. Another reason for their surprise was that the atmosphere near and in Zuidplein is not that sociable, whilst the central location of Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is more attractive for motivated museum visitors. At first, participants were hesitant, whilst discussing motivators and barriers participants became more positive about Boijmans Op Zuid.

Some people thought that not a lot of people from their neighborhood were going to be interested in Boijmans Op Zuid. Pip also said that she thinks museums do not move to Rotterdam Zuid because she expects them to know that there are more non-visitors there, who are uninterested in what the museum may have to offer. She said that it is difficult to change the minds of those who are uninterested and unmotivated to visit a museum, even if it is nearby or free. These results confirm research on visitor thresholds amongst diverse audiences, which states that bringing a cultural organization closer to non-visitors is not in itself going to increase their visits to those organizations (Badisco et al., 2011). A change in the content and level of active participation in the museum would be more important to encourage people to visit the museum, according to her. This follows much of what Falk and Dierking (2016) and Nina Simon (2006) argued as well, because this could lower the threshold to participate.

*Pip: Nee en er is ook zeker een reden dat in Rotterdam Zuid er niet heel veel musea zijn. En het is niet dat ze denken: "Oh eh, we kunnen er veel geld mee verdienen maar laten we dat maar niet doen". ... Nee ik denk niet dat je het ook zou moeten willen en als je er echt geen zin in hebben om die ontwikkeling gratis mee te krijgen. Ja je kan ze ook niet kunnen dwingen om dat wel te doen en dan zouden ze meegaan hier... Gaan ze zitten op een bankje en denken "ik hoef deze ontwikkeling niet".*

Some participants, such as Julius, also feared that it could affect the current museum-visitors. They question if the threshold would be too high for museum goers if a museum opened in a neighborhood they did not know, and that has the stigma of not being safe and friendly.

*Julius: Ik vraag me wel af of dan mensen die nu nog wel naar Boijmans gaan, dat ze denken als het in Zuid staat, dat ze dan misschien niet meer gaan. ... Ja toch, dat ze toch denken van: "Eh dan kun je toch maar beter ergens anders heen".*

But there were more positive or hopeful responses as well. If the museum is nearby, it increases the visibility of that museum and this may motivate people to visit it. They also point out that it could make people curious to visit Boijmans Op Zuid, because people may

want to know what it is about. Although Shanice was doubtful of the plans at first, she did think it could encourage people to pay a visit.

*Shanice: Ik denk dat ze wel getriggerd zouden worden hoor, ja.*

More participants thought that increased visibility of culture could increase their cultural participation.

*Kevin: Maar het kan wel de zichtbaarheid voor die mensen verbeteren, en ook inderdaad als je al zo'n Rotterdammer hebt en je mag daarmee al naar binnen dan, eh, dat je dan ook ziet van Oh het is in de buurt. We gaan een keer, dat je er een aantal keer langsloopt en dan misschien toch nog een keer dan daar naartoe wil gaan. Ik denk dat dat hun dan wel op die eh, manier kan bevorderen.*

*Kevin: Ik denk dat vooral de zichtbaarheid verbetert. Dat je er van weet, dat dat al verbetering is. Dat als je gaat boodschappen doen, en je komt nooit in het centrum-...überhaupt kom je er in het centrum ook niet zo snel langs.*

*Kevin: nieuwsgierigheid ja, dat je dan toch als je boodschappen gehaald of wat dan ook even gaat kijken wat dat is.*

*Pip: misschien [zijn ze] nieuwsgierig maar onwetend. Ik denk dat ze geen idee hebben van nieuwe dingen die plaatsvinden.*

Fred agreed that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is not clearly a museum to those who are not already familiar with it. He agrees that increasing the visibility of the museum, no matter where it may be, is important to encourage non-visitors to become interested.

*Fred: ja inderdaad... Als je er niet van weet dan denk je niet echt van "hé, een museum".*

## **5.5. Exhibition content**

Another important factor to take into account is the exhibition content, because disinterestedness in museum programming is a barrier for many people. Marianne wondered how a cultural organization could meet the interests and needs of the superdiverse population? Indeed, many citizens in Rotterdam do not participate in highbrow culture, and many youngsters and non-Dutch citizens do not feel comfortable with the supply and atmosphere of current cultural organizations (Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam, 2017).

*Marianne: Dat zou ik me heel erg afvragen, van- oké je hebt ze gewonnen door interesse. Ze zijn binnen en hoe ga je ze dan vasthouden? Zeg maar zeker gezien de ervaring van net, dat ik denk van "hoe ga je die groep, heel divers, je verschillende leeftijden, van alles komt er op Zuidplein". Ook verschillende ervaringen met musea en cultuur natuurlijk. Dus wat ga je ze*

*bieden en zeg maar echt vasthouden- ze hoeven geen vaste bezoekers te worden maar hoe hou je ze überhaupt meer dan 5 minuten vast?*

One answer is trying to create exhibitions that are relatable to those people in one way or another.

*Jeffrey: Ik denk inderdaad bijvoorbeeld, wat net ook al werd genoemd. Stel je maakt daar een tentoonstelling over de ontwikkeling van Zuid of mensen die er zijn komen wonen in de wijk daar in de buurt, inderdaad. Dan zal dat veel meer mensen trekken dan als je inderdaad Bauhaus doet.*

An exhibition that displays something that relates to their lives, or to something that they already know is likely to increase their motivation to visit it (McLean, 1999). Indeed, cultural activities that in some way relate to one's cultural identity increase the motivation to participate (Ennaji, 2005; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018). Similarly, studies also reported that young people experience a dissonance between museum culture and their own cultural identity, which is a barrier to visit museums (Mason & McCarthy, 2006).

*Alima: ... Ik denk dat de aantrekkingskracht van de musea die er zijn ook niet heel groot is voor die groep daar.*

*Fred: Ja, ik denk niet dat mensen uit achterstandswijken [denken] "Oh nou dan ga ik vandaag even naar een museum!". ... Ik denk qua interesses, qua opleiding, ehm, financieel. Ik denk dat dat 3 factoren zijn.*

Participants do not believe that the current museum set-up interests the people who live in his neighborhood, because of the various constraints. He notes that there is indeed a financial constraint, but he also notes that there is a cognitive and relevance constraint. Fred links unfamiliarity to the exhibition contents, to the level of education and interests of people. Research already indicates that this cognitive approach to the museum visit could also be a threshold for people to visit the museum (Goulding, 2000; Screven, 1986; Simon, 2006). This relates to the fact that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen's highbrow image is a barrier as well, because visitors may think they are not capable of experiencing their museum visit "valuable" enough because they fear they will not understand what they see. Indeed, a better understanding of the museum's content increases the perceived value of this experience (Vivek, et al., 2012; Kemp & Poole, 2016). Ricardo has a more outspoken opinion about the content of exhibitions and how it influences the likelihood that people in Rotterdam Zuid will visit it.

*Ricardo: Ja ik denk, ik denk dat dat het ook een beetje is. Ik denk dat als je het in perspectief zet, zoals jij net zei, stel je voor, een kaartje voor een concert kost evenveel als een kaartje*

*voor Boijmans op Zuid, maar Abba speelt... Snap je? Ik kan me wel voorstellen dat er niet heel veel mensen uit Zuid denken dat ze daar dan heen gaan. ... Ja inderdaad, ik denk dat dat hetzelfde is. Het ligt er aan wat Boijmans Op Zuid daar doet, als ze dan die mensen daar uit Zuid willen motiveren om naar Boijmans Op Zuid te gaan...*

He notes that for people to become motivated to visit the museum, the subject of exhibitions needs to suit their interests. A certain personal significance or cognitive competency regarding the exhibitions is a motivator to visit Boijmans Op Zuid.

### **5.6. Suggestions for marketing in Zuid**

If Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen wants to create an inviting environment with Boijmans Op Zuid, which could encourage the local population to visit their museum, then seeking suitable marketing strategies for this superdiverse group of generally light users of culture is crucial to increase the museum inclusivity and potentially its audience diversity (Scholten et al., 2018; Peters & Besley, 2014; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). This section discusses what the participants thought to increase the motivation to visit Boijmans Op Zuid, how they stay up to date about museums currently, and what they experienced to be motivators for them to visit Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen.

Some participants already follow what exhibitions and events there are in museums, mainly on social media by following the organizations on Facebook or Instagram, or by seeing advertisements on the internet, or they are notified by friends who are interested in events from museums. This happens mostly if they are already interested in museums, such as Robin, Shanice, Aurora, Alima and Marianne expressed.

*Shanice: Ja via social media of via Facebook, meestal. Als er iets nieuws is dan posten hun dat meestal meteen. En ja je ziet het ook wel vaak bij anderen, want ik heb een vriendenkring die ook best vaak naar musea gaat. Dus als er iets nieuws is dan zie je het wel voorbij komen in hun feed, dus dan weet ik wel snel van "Oh kijk nu zijn er die soort dingen".*

However, those who are not already familiar with museums generally miss the museum's online marketing.

*Julius: Nee ik vind het museum- dat is wel interessant maar ik zie zo eigenlijk bijna nooit een museum voorbij komen op social media.*

Marketing with posters in the neighborhood can help people to get to know about Boijmans op Zuid.

*Pip: Met reclame misschien, dat ze 't voorbij zien komen. Dat je überhaupt weet dat het bestaat.*

Some participants hear about exhibitions from friends and family. Pip mostly only goes to museums if someone invites her to come along. Indeed, the social approach to make sense of audience behavior and motivation argues the same (Goulding, 2000). The social context of the visitor reveals that visitors are influenced by their social context, and that it may be influenced by peer pressure as well (Kelly, 1985). This study did not show that participants experienced peer pressure, though. They did note that the social context was relevant in whether or not they would share the experience online, the visit provides status (Goulding, 2000).

*Pip: Ik hou dat niet bij, ik niet... mijn moeder regelt eigenlijk alles en dan is het zo "we gaan dit weekend naar een museum". Is goed!*

Saying that pre-existing knowledge is not required would be helpful to attract those non-visitors as well, according to some participants. Fellow focus group members all agreed on this. Promoting that no knowledge is needed to visit Boijmans Op Zuid was thought to encourage people that do not usually visit museums to go.

*Julius: Mensen laten weten van "Je hoeft niks te weten van kunst". [Iedereen stemt hier mee in]. Dat- die zin er bij, dat trekt wel mensen aan denk ik.*

Research indicates that the visitation threshold can indeed be reduced by marketing and framing an organization in a suitable manner that aims to the highbrow character of the organization (Gurian, 2005; Macleod, 2005; Fleming, 2003).

It was also discussed that participants expected it to be useful to "take people by the hand" by inviting them in, which then would encourage them to go. Many participants who had not been to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen before (Kevin, Ricardo, Julius, Fred, Najib and Jonathan) voiced that they were glad to be invited to go to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen for my study, because they would not have went there if someone had not invited them and told them that they did not need to know anything.

*Julius: In zekere zin wel denk ik ja. Ja, want vooral vanuit mezelf- Ik ga normaal niet echt naar het museum toe.*

*Pip: Ja! projectjes juist, zoals deze. ... Contact opnemen met mensen. Ja gewoon contact opnemen met mensen en ze over de streep trekken. Zo van "Hé het is leuk als jullie nu hierheen komen en dit is er nu". ... En ook gewoon mensen duidelijk maken van "Hé, er is een museum. Dit is wat er nu is, en je hoeft niks te weten".*

It would be even more helpful to create exhibitions that have some significance to the authentic population of Zuid, because that in itself would also increase their pre-existing knowledge. The value of relevant content in the exhibition was explained previously.

As discussed, the active museum experience is expected to be a motivator for visitors to visit Boijmans Op Zuid. What would work effectively to market the museum to the population of Rotterdam is to not only offer an active museum inside of the museum, but to organize activities outside of it as well. This also follows the arguments from participants saying that a typical museum will not spark societal change (i.e. positive change in social cohesion), but that activities in neighborhoods can bring people closer together. This does indicate, again, that overall participants did not expect Boijmans Op Zuid to get the local population's attention. I think the most valuable effect Boijmans Op Zuid could have is that of encouraging interaction, both within and outside of the museum's walls. Indeed, the positive influence of a participatory experience on visitor interaction has already been argued by Simon (2006).

*Pip: Ik denk juist de buurtbarbecue en een feest geven in verschillende wijken, ook meer bij gaat dragen dan een museum. Toch wel meer elkaar kunnen aankijken, elkaar een beetje leren kennen. Dat mensen op straat niet van je denken "Uh eh die ken ik niet". En dat geldt denk ik wel overal in Zuid en zo.*

Events and tours that cater to the needs and to the ability of the population of Rotterdam Zuid would be a motivator for them to get to know Boijmans Op Zuid as well, according to Julius. He stated this because he did not think that people would encourage each other to go.

*Julius: Ik denk stimulerend al heel erg, want ja niemand in de omgeving is zo van "hé zullen we een keer gaan" of dat soort dingen.*

Marianne also thought that events could lower the threshold to visit a museum, because it would make it more fun for her.

*Marianne: Ik vind het [evenementen]wel leuk en het zou voor mij, en mijn drempel zeg maar om ook weer hier naar binnen te stappen ook weer wat lager maken. Als er iets is met muziek zeg maar, ja iets wat leuker maakt dan zou ik er wel voor in staan.*

Some participants thought that events or activities could attract more visitors because it makes people more curious to see what is happening.

*Ricardo: Ja dat idee, dat had ik precies hetzelfde. Je wilt zien wat het is. Het hoeft niet per se muziek te zijn maar ik denk als dat dan iets van, weet ik veel, artistieke optredens zou ik wel grappig vinden, of workshops. Dat lijkt me ook wel tof. Ik denk dat dat wel wat mensen wil aantrekken.*

Alima then mentioned that she had already been to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen because there were events that attracted her to the organization.

*Alima: Ik ben ook al twee keer naar het museum inderdaad gekomen omdat er een evenement was en niet door de tentoonstelling.*

However, not everyone believed events or activities to lower the threshold to visit Boijmans Op Zuid. For example, Jeffrey felt anxious about how crowded those events would be, and Kevin said that he just did not like workshops.

*Jeffrey: Ik denk het juist niet, eigenlijk omdat het dan alleen nog maar drukker zou zijn.*

*Kevin: Ik ben echt niet zo'n workshop persoon, voor mij zou dat niet echt veel gaan uitmaken.*

Another possibility to lower the threshold to visit Boijmans Op Zuid is to familiarize people with it by collaborating with other local organizations. This would encourage visitors from other locations in Rotterdam Zuid, such as Theater Zuidplein. However, Boijmans Op Zuid could also collaborate with local schools or stores, according to some participants. This falls in line with how Boijmans Op Zuid is promoted thus far.

*Pip: ... Dan het gewoon naast het theater bouwen en dan een combinatieticket doen zodat je gewoon direct door kan gaan als de en- dan is er wel een snellere kans voor mensen...*

*Misschien wel mensen die al naar het theater gaan. En dan daardoor denken om misschien even het museum meepakken. maar niet per se dat mensen gaan shoppen in Zuidplein en denken "die pak ik eens even mee".*

*Jeffrey: Je zou dat zelfs nog kunnen doortrekken door bijvoorbeeld daar dan weer, ook van die dingen net als op scholen te doen, maar dan op buurthuizen of zo waar allemaal mensen komen, dat je daar mensen mee in aanraking laat komen*

Collaboration with local initiatives is expected to increase the impact that Boijmans Op Zuid could have on the local population of Rotterdam Zuid. Local stores, schools, neighborhood centers, and youth centers could be contacted for this, which also familiarizes locals with Boijmans Op Zuid. Kevin noted that a collaborative effort to change something in Zuid was expected to be a lot more effective than all the separate projects that he observes, because those are not that effective thus far.

*Kevin: Ik denk misschien een samen-groepering van- er zijn geloof ik heel veel verschillende projecten proberen er te zijn, vanuit verschillende instanties. Vanuit weet ik veel van winkels gewoon, uit hun buurt commissie of wat dan ook kan het zijn, vanuit de gemeente kan dat zijn, met scholen kan er wel wat worden gedaan. Ik denk dat het heel veel verschillende dingen moeten komen voor heel veel verschillende achtergronden. En dat samen als geheel kan bijdragen aan eh... Dat verschil moet uit veel verschillende hoeken komen, niet uit één.*

## 6. Conclusion

This section summarizes the presented results and answers the research questions. The main research question was: *how do the young inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and how do they perceive plans for Boijmans Op Zuid?* To answer this question the four sub-questions are answered below.

### *a. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen*

One of the dimensions for examining audience experience was the experienced museum inclusivity, with the the following sub-question: *To which extent do the participants experience inclusivity in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen and which factors influence this experience?* Indeed, a higher experienced inclusivity is expected to lower the threshold to visit a museum significantly. The factors that made participants experience inclusivity are partially the same factors that were thought to be motivators for the population of Rotterdam Zuid to visit Boijmans Op Zuid.

In short, the factors that positively influenced the experienced inclusivity were a participatory museum experience, affordable ticket price, interesting exhibition content, and a familiar location and museum building. There were two more factors that were important to the experienced inclusivity, but opinions on the importance of these varied. The first was the influence of ticket prices on inclusivity: some thought that this was a barrier for people, while others thought that other factors played a more significant role in being a barrier to visit the museum, such as familiarity or the location. Indeed, the second factor that participants did not agree on was the influence of the organization's location. The museum's location and intricate architecture were a barrier for some participants; being familiar with the museum made it a lot easier - both physically and psychologically - for participants to visit the museum. This confirms other studies on thresholds for non-visitors (Gurian, 2005; Macleod, 2005; Fleming, 2003).

It was already revealed in the introduction that attempts to implement the key concerns of Dutch cultural policy may not be as effective as they could be: cultural policies attempt to increase the participation of the lower socioeconomic strata in society (Hitters, 2007). However, it is becoming increasingly problematic to classify the superdiverse contemporary society into groups, so although socioeconomically they might be similarly challenged, not many other classifications will match all people that fit these strata, because society as a whole is becoming increasingly fragmented (Vertovec, 2007; Scholten et al., 2018; Dekker &

Van Breugel, 2018). Furthermore, it is sensible to re-evaluate what such policy aims practically mean for the specific case of cultural participation in Rotterdam Zuid, in order to put them into practice in an effective manner.

Dekker and Van Breugel pointed out that "a constructivist approach to policy assumes that there is no objective reality of policy problems, but that policy problems are socially constructed" (2018, p.109 in Scholten et al., 2018). Indeed, following a constructivist or post-modern perspective, it becomes evident why it is important to seek nuances in the key concerns of Dutch cultural policy for specific groups of society, to learn what may be of value for who. This also indicates that it must be further examined exactly for who we would seek museum inclusivity in the case of Boijmans Op Zuid. Furthermore, it is necessary to look at what the perspective on cultural inclusion is for these people in Rotterdam Zuid, considering that everything is perceived from a subjective and personal perspective.

In other words, this is why it was sensible to take into account what the inhabitants' perspective on their own cultural activity is, and what they thought may encourage them to visit a cultural organization; and if they are even motivated to visit such organizations at all. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen should take into account what the local population in Rotterdam Zuid actually believes it needs to increase its cultural participation and the experienced inclusivity in museums, to effectively increase the cultural participation of non-visitors from Rotterdam Zuid.

Regarding experienced inclusivity, my thesis concludes that effectively the inhabitants from Zuid did not experience a high level of inclusivity in the museum. This resulted in a low audience diversity; the participants saw a mostly older audience, tourists, or visitors who they thought to already have much knowledge of the museum's content. The majority of the participants did expect such a museum audience before their visit. The participants did not expect those visitors to be from Rotterdam because the superdiversity in Rotterdam was not reflected in the museum audience, according to participants. Thus the dynamics of this society are not reflected accurately in the museum's audience; it must be noted that such results are to be expected from a highbrow museum (Bourdieu, 1979).

The participants noted that the threshold to visit Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is high due to several factors, which are further addressed through the second sub-question on the audience experience. The following sub-question was: *How do inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid experience Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?* Most of the findings from my study confirm pre-existing literature on the topic of museum audience experiences, although there are some nuances because the experiences and expectations of the participants varied. The

participants experienced that certain factors from the museum and its exhibition had a positive influence on their overall experience, while other factors had a negative influence on this.

Firstly, a calm environment that did not feel crowded with other visitors positively influenced their museum experience. The opposite experience, a crowded space, did have a strongly negative effect on the overall experience. Whether or not there were many other visitors, many participants experienced their visit as chaotic in terms of the layout of the exhibition; this had a negative influence as well.

This study also concludes that there were two desired museum outcomes. The first outcome is the educational effect of a visit, the second is the restorative or calming effect that a museum visit can have on visitors. This study found that there not only is a positive correlation between the attributed educational value of the museum experience and the overall attributed value to the experience, but also that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen can make visitors feel more calm and relaxed. The crowdedness and chaotic experience had a negative effect on the extent to which participants felt they had been able to learn something.

The restorative effect made participants with a positive experience feel relieved from their daily life (Packer & Bond, 2014). In other words, this study confirms that Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen can give visitors a soothing and calming experience, regardless of their familiarity with museums before their visit. However, crowdedness was a barrier for participants to have a relaxing and positive museum experience; experiencing a chaotic layout was a barrier for some participants to have relaxing experience. This study also revealed that there is a positive correlation between a quiet, non-crowded exhibition space and the perceived soothing and positive effect of the museum visit.

Furthermore, some visitors pointed out that being able to enter their own "zone", positively influenced their overall museum experience; and that not being able to get into their own zone negatively impacted their experience and the attributed value of the museum experience. This seems like participants who were familiar with museum visits expected a type of flow experience, meaning participants felt they were in their own, optimal state to experience the museum visit to its fullest extent. Participants who did not expect this experience, but who did voice experiencing this effect, were pleasantly surprised. This flow experience during their visit had a positive effect on the restorative effect of their visit as well.

Being able to attribute personal significance to, or being interested in the exhibition's theme, relates positively to the audience experience as well, partially because it increases their knowledge of the works, but mostly because it increased their intrinsic motivation to put in the effort to observe and learn something (Goulding, 2000). Being able to find personal

significance or being interested in the exhibition increased the perceived value of the experience as well. Following this finding, this study confirms that disinterestedness in the programming of museums has a negative influence on the museum experience, and is a barrier to visit museums. This was also concluded in other studies (Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam, 2017; Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018; McLean, 1999; Hood, 1985).

Personal significance in the exhibition is a motivator for people to visit the museum because familiarity with the subject lowers the threshold to visit the museum. This confirms much of Goulding's cognitive approach to understand the audience's motivation (Falk 1985; Goulding, 2000; Falk & Dierking, 2016). Participants did indeed note that personal meaning and being able to attribute meaning to the exhibition in general, made them attribute a higher value to their experience. The intrinsic motivation that Goulding explains in this cognitive approach is evident, but the participants did not talk about the need for extrinsic motivation, such as a reward afterwards. This does seem to be an unusual result from a museum visit. Goulding and Screven do indicate that extrinsic motivation has a positive influence on the audience as well (Screven, 1986). However, participants did not mention anything of the sort.

Some participants voiced that they shared their visit online to seem interesting to peers, or because they simply felt like sharing it - even if they did not have a positive museum experience. This behavior reflects the sense of status that participating in a highbrow cultural activity has, and that there may be some group pressure to enjoy such activities (Goulding, 2000; Kesner, 2006). Similarly, sharing their experience and receiving validation from peers may be interpreted as extrinsic motivation, but more research should be done to establish its influence on the overall experience.

Visiting Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen alone or together did not seem to influence the overall experience positively or negatively. However, it did change the overall experience slightly. On their own, participants focused more on their own experience and on the exhibition itself. This made visitors feel more focused. This also encouraged a calming museum effect. It did not seem to influence the educational museum effect. The main upside to a shared visit is that it allowed participants to discuss and compare their thoughts, which all participants felt would enrich their overall experience; the social aspect of a museum visit was experienced positively. However, having to take someone else's behavior in the museum into account was thought to be a barrier to enjoy the museum visit fully. What is more, almost all participants pointed out during or after the focus groups that they enjoyed being able to reflect on their experience and discuss their findings. I feel this also indicates that sharing the

experience with someone in some way has a positive effect on the overall museum experience. Therefore it is neither a barrier nor a motivator, but it does affect the experience.

This study would suggest that light users of culture would enjoy a more participatory and active museum experience. The interactive parts of the exhibition that the visitors went to did not have a significantly positive effect on their experience, as most participants felt like the quality of the interactive installations did not match their competency. Some participants did learn more from those interactive installations, although most participants did not feel encouraged to actively try it out. Simon (2006) also revealed that a participatory museum experience can be beneficial to the overall experience, but it should be of high quality and it should fit the needs of its audience. Participants also thought that an interactive museum experience would lower the threshold for non-visitors in Rotterdam Zuid to go to a museum. What is more, research suggests that an interactive experience, not only with the museum, but especially with others, could reduce prejudice, and can increase interaction with others on a long term basis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Simon, 2006). A successful execution of Boijmans Op Zuid may improve the issues of social cohesion in Rotterdam Zuid and make inhabitants of this region experience it as a more sociable environment.

#### *b. Boijmans Op Zuid*

The aforementioned factors played a role in the overall museum experience. These factors were also discussed to evaluate how participants foresaw the plans for Boijmans Op Zuid, and how they thought it could be executed to attract the local population in Rotterdam Zuid. The second and third theme in the results section revealed the answers to the final sub-questions, starting with: *How do the inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid expect Boijmans Op Zuid to fit into their neighborhood?*

In short, participants thought that the population of Zuid would not actively appreciate Boijmans Op Zuid if it were organized as a traditional museum. This was voiced because the majority of the population in Rotterdam Zuid are light users of highbrow culture, who are unlikely to visit a museum on their own initiative. However, if the barriers for non-visitors are taken into account and if Boijmans Op Zuid makes sure to lower the threshold to visit the museum, then participants do think the inhabitants of Zuid are open to visit the museum. If Boijmans Op Zuid wishes to attract the local population in Rotterdam Zuid, then lowering the threshold to visit it in all ways possible is crucial. Their motivation for Boijmans Op Zuid can be sparked, and they can become motivated to go to Boijmans Op Zuid, by ensuring that there are more motivators and less barriers than a traditional museum. What is more, the inhabitants

of Rotterdam were hopeful that Boijmans Op Zuid may positively change their neighborhood, if it is executed properly. Participants pointed out that intrinsic motivation of the population of Rotterdam Zuid plays a significant role in whether or not these people would visit Boijmans Op Zuid, and that a more nearby location alone is not enough to encourage them to set foot in the museum.

The final research question covers what these motivators and barriers are, and what the participants thought to be necessary for a valuable execution of the project: *What do the participants expect of Boijmans Op Zuid and what do participants foresee necessary for a valuable execution of it to increase the museum's audience diversity and inclusivity?* As concluded previously, the classic museum is not deemed likely to be successful for Rotterdam Zuid because of the high visiting threshold. The location of the museum is thought by some to encourage participation of the inhabitants from Rotterdam Zuid, but many participants voiced that it is unlikely for this alone to encourage cultural participation. Overall, other factors are thought to be more important motivators. This confirms research into the influence of location on cultural participation amongst diverse societal groups (Badisco et al., 2011).

Boijmans Op Zuid should be affordable, because the majority of the neighborhoods in Rotterdam Zuid are economically challenged (CBS, 2018). However, this factor alone is unlikely to make the museum experience positive and experienced as valuable for general non-visitors.

A more participatory and interactive museum experience is thought to encourage even those who are not familiar with museums, and it is likely to increase the overall museum experience. Indeed, this confirms pre-existing literature (Simon, 2006). Furthermore, an active museum experience could encourage visitors to interact with each other, which could reduce inter-group bias within the museum. More importantly however, this could reduce inter-group bias in society as a long-term effect, potentially improving the experienced social inclusion in Rotterdam Zuid.

An important step to decreasing barriers to visit the museum is that Boijmans Op Zuid and its exhibitions should aim to mesh well with the local population's worldview, and with their interests. Research confirms that disinterestedness in programming is a barrier to visit museums, and that it contributes to the experienced exclusionary character of museums (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015; Menko, 2018).

The inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid generally do not know what information about cultural organizations is available, or where they can find this information (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). My study confirms this as well, therefore taking into account how Boijmans

Op Zuid should be marketed is important. Therefore, the marketing to promote Boijmans Op Zuid should be in line with the local population's perspective as well; this finding supports previous research from Mason and McCarthy (2006). It should be clear to non-visitors what Boijmans Op Zuid is, this could be done by clearly stating that it is a museum. Moreover, participants pointed out that the threshold to set foot inside the organization could be lowered by clearly stating that no knowledge is needed, because non-visitors often feel insecure about their competency to enjoy and understand a museum visit. This barrier was also voiced to be a concern by audience research on Rotterdam (Rotterdam Festivals, 2015). Events and activities are thought to familiarize people with Boijmans Op Zuid as well, although it was not thought to encourage everyone to visit, as some participants felt that events only made the threshold to visit the museum higher. A final note for marketing is that a focus on collaboration with other local initiatives may be beneficial, which is included in the current plans for Boijmans Op Zuid.

### *c. Suggestions for further research*

Finally, this thesis may be a step in the right direction for a more nuanced discussion on cultural inclusion and cultural participation in Rotterdam. However, further quantitative research could be done to study, for example, what the experienced cultural inclusion and actual cultural participation in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen is for inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid on a larger scale. A similar study on cultural participation of the population of Rotterdam has been conducted in 2015 by Rotterdam Festivals. Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen did not participate in this research, so it would be helpful to do more research on cultural participation in this museum specifically. Similarly, it would be interesting to do a follow-up study to examine whether or not the participants have changed their outlook on museums, if their museum visit had long-term effects, and if their experiences in Boijmans Op Zuid would be different than those in Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. One may also want to examine exactly what kinds of events would be beneficial to the population of Rotterdam Zuid, as participants did not agree on the effect of events.

More research into accessible museum education for the local, young population of Rotterdam Zuid would be necessary to evaluate which approaches may lead to more desirable outcomes. For example, further research into the various options for Boijmans Op Zuid to create a participatory museum experience would be valuable to increase the quality of the an active museum experience. For example, one may study the outcomes for young inhabitants of Rotterdam Zuid when using an interactive multimedia program during their visit. This

feasible and innovative proposal may encourage collaboration and processing of thoughts. Multimedia may encourage meaningful learning in the museum, and increase inter-group contact as a long-term effect. What is more, a collaborative multimedia approach reinforces the lifelong learning concern from Dutch cultural policy.

Possible collaborations with other local initiatives in Rotterdam Zuid could be explored further as well, as it would make Boijmans Op Zuid more engaging with local inhabitants. What is more, this collaborative focus is deemed to be most effective by the participants to positively change something in Rotterdam Zuid, focusing on more social cohesion. All in all, if executed to fit the needs of current museum visitors and - especially - the local population in Rotterdam Zuid, the participants and I conclude that Boijmans Op Zuid could be a positive addition to Rotterdam Zuid.

## References

- Alhojailan, M. I. (2012). Thematic analysis: A critical review of its process and evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 39-47.
- Babbie, E. (2016). *The practice of social research*. 14th Edition. Boston: Cengage.
- Badisco, J., Glorieux, I., & Van Tienoven, T. P. (2011). *Cultuurcentra op zoek naar een divers publiek*. Maklu.
- Belfiore, E. (2002). Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion: Does it really work? A critique of instrumental cultural policies and social impact studies in the UK. *International journal of cultural policy*, 8(1), 91-106.
- Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. *The Clearing House*, 83(2), 39-43.
- Bennett, T., Emmison, M., & Frow, J. (1999). *Accounting for tastes: Australian everyday cultures*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boijmans van Beuningen. (2018). *Renovatie museumgebouw [renovation museum building]*. Retrieved from <https://www.boijmans.nl/museum/renovatie-museumgebouw>
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A., & Schnapper, D. (1991). *The love of art: European art museums and their public* (p. 53). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. sage.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research Methods*. 4th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bussemaker, J. (2013). *Cultuur beweegt: De betekenis van cultuur in een veranderende samenleving*. Ministerie van onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschap.
- CBS. (January 1, 2018). Rotterdam: Bevolking; leeftijd, migratieachtergrond, geslacht en regio. Retrieved from <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/nl/dataset/37713/table?ts=1543961612941>
- Coombes, A. E. (2004). Museums and the formation of national and cultural identities. *Museum studies: An anthology of contexts*, 231-46.
- Creative Cities Monitor. (2017). *European Union Cultural and Creative Monitor*. Retrieved from <https://composite-Indicators.jrc.ec.europa.eu/cultural-creative-cities-monitor/>
- Cultuurverkenning Rotterdam. (2017). *Culture department, municipality Rotterdam*, 1-67.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Hermanson, K. (1999). Why does one want to learn. In: HooperGreenhill, E. (Ed.). (1999). *The educational role of the museum*. Psychology

Press.

- De Botton, A., & Armstrong, J. (2013). *Art as therapy*. Phaidon Press.
- DiMaggio, P., & Useem, M. (1978). Social class and arts consumption. *Theory and society*, 5(2), 141-161.
- Dubois, V. (2011). "Cultural capital theory vs. cultural policy beliefs: How Pierre Bourdieu could have become a cultural policy advisor and why he did not." *Poetics* 39: 491-506.
- Ennaji, M. (2005). *Multilingualism, cultural identity, and education in Morocco*. Springer Science & Business Media. p. 9-23.
- Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2016). *The museum experience*. Routledge.
- Falk, J. (1985). Predicting visitor behavior. *Curator*, Vol. 28, 249-257.
- Fleming, D. (2003). Positioning the museum for social inclusion. In *Museums, society, inequality* (pp. 233-244). Routledge.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life* (Vol. 269). New York, NY: basic books.
- Florida, R., Mellander, C., & Adler, P. (2011). The creative class paradigm. *Handbook of creative cities*, 56-71.
- Friese, S. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS. ti*. Sage.
- Geldof, D. (2016). 'Superdiversity and the City.' In: Williams C. (eds) *Social Work and the City*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51623-7\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51623-7_5).
- Gemeente Rotterdam, (2018). Wijkprofiel. Retrieved from <https://wijkprofiel.rotterdam.nl/nl/2018/rotterdam>
- Gibney, M. (1988). Open Borders? Closed Societies: the ethical and political issues.
- Golsteyn, B., & Innovatie, N. S. (2012). Waarom groeit leven lang leren in Nederland niet sterker ondanks de vele adviezen erover. *Een onderzoek in opdracht van de Onderwijsraad*.
- Goulding, C. (2000), The Museum environment and the visitor experience. *European Journal of Marketing*, 34 (3/4), 261-278.
- Gurian, E. H. (2005). Threshold fear. *Reshaping Museum Space*, 203-13.
- Hall, S., & Du Gay, P. (2006). *Questions of cultural identity*. Crane Resource Centre.
- Hartig, T. (2004). *Toward understanding the restorative environment as a health resource*. Accessed from: <http://www.openspace.eca.ac.uk/conference/proceedings/PDF/Hartig.pdf> on April 14, 2019.

- Heilig, J. V., Cole, H., & Aguilar, A. (2010). From Dewey to No Child Left Behind: The evolution and devolution of public arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111(4), 136-145.
- Hein, G. E. (2006). Museum education. *A companion to museum studies*, 340-352.  
<http://george-hein.com/downloads/MuseumEdBlackwellHein.pdf>
- Hood, M., (1983) . Staying away: why people choose not to visit museums. *Museum news* 61(4)pp.50-57, Washington: American Association of Museums
- Kaplan, S., Bardwell, L. V., & Slakter, D. B. (1993). The museum as a restorative environment. *Environment and Behavior*, 25(6), 725-742.
- Kelly, R. (1985). "Museums as status symbols 2: obtaining a state of having been there" in Belk, R. Ed., *Advances in Non-Profit Marketing*. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT.
- Kemp, E., & Poole, S. (2016). Arts audiences: Establishing a gateway to audience development and engagement. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 46(2), 53-62.
- Kinard, J. R. (1985). The neighbourhood museum as a catalyst for social change. *Museum International*, 37(4), 217-223.
- Kuijk, M. (July 12, 2018). Boijmans opent tijdens renovatiejaren een dependance in winkelcentrum zuidplein. *Volkskrant*, Retrieved from <https://www.volkskrant.nl/cultuur-media/boijmans-opent-tijdens-renovatiejaren-een-dependance-in-winkelcentrum-zuidplein~b6e24405/>
- Macleod, S. (2005). *Reshaping museum space*. Routledge.
- Mason, D., & McCarthy, C. (2006). 'The feeling of exclusion': Young peoples' perceptions of art galleries. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 21(1), 20-31.
- Mayer, R. E. (2002). Rote versus meaningful learning. *Theory into practice*, 41(4), 226-232.  
[https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_4)
- Meissner, F., & Vertovec, S. (2014). 'Comparing super-diversity'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (38) (4): 541-555.
- Menko, A. (2018). Drempels en motieven niet-cultuur bezoekers Rotterdam, Labyrinth Onderzoek & Advies. 1-43.
- Merriman, N. (1989). "Museum visiting as a cultural phenomenon". In *The new museology*, Edited by: Vergo, P. 159–160. London: Reaktion Books.
- Packer, J., & Bond, N. (2010). Museums as restorative environments. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 53(4), 421-436.
- Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. A. (2014). Social exclusion/inclusion: Foucault's analytics of

- exclusion, the political ecology of social inclusion and the legitimation of inclusive education. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 1(1), 99-115.
- Raad voor Cultuur. (2012). *Cultuureducatie: leren, creëren, inspireren*. [Cultural education: learn, create, inspire.]
- Rotterdam Festivals. (2015). *We, Rotterdammers and culture*. Retrieved from <https://zakelijk.rotterdamfestivals.nl/Assets/Uploads/Documents/Engelse%20site/Samenvatting%20publicatie%20EN%20DEF.pdf>
- Sandell, R. . 2002 . Museums and the combating of social inequality: Roles, responsibilities, resistance . *In Museums, society, inequality*, 3 – 23 . London, New York: Routledge.
- Sandell, R. (1998). Museums as agents of social inclusion. *Museum management and curatorship*, 17(4), 401-418.
- Schep, M., van Boxtel, C., & Noordegraaf, J. (2018). Competent museum guides: defining competencies for use in art and history museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 33(1), 2-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2017.1387590>
- Scholten, P., Crul, M., & van de Laar, P. (Eds.). (2018). *Coming to terms with superdiversity: The case of Rotterdam*. Springer.
- Schreuder, C. (2018, February 28). *Inclusief zijn doe je niet alleen* [Being inclusive is not done alone]. Retrieved from [www.boijmans.nl/nieuws/inclusief-zijn-doe-je-niet-alleen](http://www.boijmans.nl/nieuws/inclusief-zijn-doe-je-niet-alleen)
- Simon, N. (2010). The participatory museum. *Museum 2.0*.
- Smithson, J. (2000). Using and analysing focus groups: limitations and possibilities. *International journal of social research methodology*, 3(2), 103-119.
- Screven, C., (1986), “exhibitions and Information centers: some principles and approaches”. *Curator*, Vol.1 29, no.2, 109-137.
- Shields, R. (ed.) (1992). *Life style shopping: The subject of consumption*, Routledge, London.
- Thyne, M. (2001). The importance of values research for nonprofit organisations: The motivation-based values of museum visitors. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(2), 116-130.
- Todd, S., & Lawson, R. (2001). Lifestyle segmentation and museum/gallery visiting behaviour. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 6(3), 269-277.
- Van Engelshoven, I. (2018). *Visiebrief Cultuur in een open samenleving [Opinionletter: cultuur in an open society]*. Ministerie van onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschap.
- Vasta, E. (2007). From ethnic minorities to ethnic majority policy: Multiculturalism and the

- shift to assimilationism in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 30(5), 713-740.
- Vertovec, S. (2007) 'Super-diversity and its implications'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (30) (6): 1024-1054.
- Vertovec, S. (2005) 'Opinion: Super-diversity revealed.' BBC News. September 20.  
Retrieved from [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/4266102.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4266102.stm)
- Vivek, S., D., Beatty, S. E., & Morgan, R. M. (2012). Customer engagement: Exploring customer relationships beyond purchase. *Journal of marketing theory and practice*, 20(2), 122-146.
- Vuyk, K. (2010). "The arts as an instrument? Notes on the controversy surrounding the value of art." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 16 (2): 173-183.
- Zijlstra, H. (2011). *Meer dan kwaliteit: een nieuwe visie op cultuurbeleid [More than quality: a new vision of cultural policy]*. Ministerie van onderwijs, cultuur en wetenschap.

## **Appendix A - Focus group outline**

*Deelnemers welkom heten & nog een keer uitleg geven over focus groep procedure*

### **Engagement questions**

#### *1. Vooroordelen over museum Boijmans Van Beuningen*

- A. Hoe bekend was je al met het museum voordat ik je uitnodigde? Had je er al eens van gehoord? Of was je er al eens geweest?
- B. Denk je dat dat invloed heeft gehad op je interesse om mee te gaan? Met andere woorden, als je het wel of niet van tevoren kende, denk je dat dat uitmaakte voor je deelname vandaag?

#### *2. Vooroordelen: voorbereiding*

- A. Heb je van tevoren op de museum website gekeken?
- B. Kijk je meestal voor je naar een museum gaat van tevoren op de website? Waarom bezoek je zo'n website wel of niet?
- C. Was de website duidelijk en vond je waar je naar op zoek was?
- D. Over het algemeen, volg je wat er gebeurt in museums? bijvoorbeeld wanneer er nieuwe tentoonstellingen zijn of wanneer er activiteiten zijn?
- E. Hoe houd je bij wat er gebeurt in museums?

### **Exploration questions**

Dan gaan we nu door met wat vragen over je verwachtingen voor het museum bezoek.

#### *3. Voldoening (persoonlijke ervaring)*

- a. Welke verwachtingen had je over het museum? Wat verwachtte je te zien en te ervaren?
- b. Hoe was je ervaring, kwam dat overeen met je verwachtingen?
- C. Waar kwamen die verwachtingen vandaan?

Dan gaan we nu door met vragen over je ervaring in het museum zelf.

#### *4. Sfeer (persoonlijke ervaring)*

- A. Hoe zou je de sfeer omschrijven tijdens je bezoek? (interactief?)
- B. Hoe voelde je je voor het bezoek?
- C. Hoe voelde je je tijdens het bezoek?
- D. Hoe gedroeg je je in het museum?
- E. Had je het idee dat je je op een bepaalde manier moest gedragen?

F. Voel je je na het museum bezoek anders dan daarvoor? Waardoor denk je dat je je nu zo voelt?

G. Moest je iets doen tijdens het museum bezoek? Waren er activiteiten of interactieve kunstwerken? Vond je dat anders dan kunstwerken waar je alleen naar mocht kijken?

H. Heb je het idee dat je iets hebt geleerd tijdens je museum bezoek? (Dat kan van alles zijn, zoals dingen over de kunst zelf, of over jezelf, van anderen...). (persoonlijk, meer relevant)

I. Vond je het een nuttige/waardevolle ervaring? Heb je het idee dat je iets hebt gehad aan dit museum bezoek?

5. *Voldoening in sociale context (persoonlijke ervaring)*

A. Heb je je bezoek gedeeld met anderen?

a. Zo ja, hoe heb je iets over het bezoek gedeeld?

b. Zo ja, wat heb je gedeeld over je bezoek?

B. Waarom heb je dat wel/niet gedaan?

C. Had je ervaring (dus of je het leuk vond of niet) invloed op of je er iets over zou delen?

D. Heb je tijdens je bezoek gepraat met andere bezoekers? Kenden je die bezoekers dan al? Waarover had je het dan (de kunst, je mening, hele andere dingen)?

Dankjewel, dan volgen er nu vragen over bezoekers van het museum, en wat jouw verwachtingen en ervaringen daarbij zijn.

6. *Gevoel van verbondenheid (socioculturele en cognitieve ervaring)*

A. Hoe zou je het type bezoeker dat normaal gesproken het museum bezoekt omschrijven?

B. Zag je het type bezoeker wat je beschreef ook daadwerkelijk tijdens je bezoek?

C. Denk je dat dit ook het type bezoeker is dat het museum probeert aan te trekken?

D. Denk je dat het museum ook wil dat een meer diverse/verschillende groep bezoekers hun museum bezoekt?

E. Hoe zie jezelf passen tussen de bezoekers die het museum probeert aan te trekken?

F. Hoe vergelijk je jezelf met het type bezoeker wat je net beschreef te verwachten in het museum? Dus: Ben je hetzelfde type bezoeker als wat je verwachtte te zien in het museum?

G. Waarom denk je dat dat hetzelfde/anders is? ("just not for me" -> why?)

Dan gaan we nu door met vragen over jouw verwachtingen en gedachten over de plannen voor het project Boijmans Op Zuid. Er zijn namelijk plannen om een kleiner, tijdelijk museum te openen boven winkelcentrum Zuidplein, dat zit in Rotterdam Zuid. Dit museum gaat namelijk een paar jaar dicht voor een renovatie, en wil dan alsnog de kunst kunnen tentoonstellen. Ik wil graag weten wat jullie, mensen die in datzelfde stadsgedeelte wonen, vinden van die plannen; daar gaan de komende vragen over. Is het duidelijk voor jullie wat Boijmans Op Zuid voor plan is? Zijn er nog vragen over?

*9. Ervaring in Rotterdam Zuid en verwachtingen van Boijmans Op Zuid (socio-cultureel en persoonlijk)*

A. Denk je dat Rotterdam Zuid en de bewoners in Zuid een bepaald imago hebben? Dat wil zeggen, denk je dat mensen een bepaald beeld vormen als ze ‘Rotterdam Zuid’ horen. Kan je uitleggen wat dat imago is?

B. Denk je dat dit imago goed laat zien hoe Zuid echt is? Denk je dat het beeld bij Zuid enigszins, helemaal, of helemaal niet klopt?

C. We hebben het gehad over het imago van Rotterdam Zuid, maar hoe zou jij zelf de bewoners in Rotterdam Zuid omschrijven?

D. Denk je dat mensen in Rotterdam Zuid minder naar museums gaan dan mensen in andere stadsdelen van Rotterdam? Waarom denk je dat? (‘gewoon niet voor mij’ - waarom?).

E. Behalve het bezoeken van musea zijn er heel veel dingen die je kan doen die bij ‘cultuur’ horen, zoals traditionele gerechten koken, voetbal volgen, naar concerten gaan, naar het theater gaan, muziek luisteren, boeken lezen, de lijst is eindeloos en het één is niet beter dan het ander. Kun je wat activiteiten noemen die jij doet, die ook een culturele activiteit zijn?

F. Zo te horen maakt iedereen dus wel gebruik van cultuur, denk je dat de beschikbaarheid van zoiets invloed heeft op hoe veel en of je het doet? En denk je dat deze beschikbaarheid ook relevant is voor musea bezoeken?

Dankjewel, dan gaan we het nu weer hebben over jullie bezoek net, en kijken we ook naar wat misschien beter of anders had gekund. Boijmans Op Zuid staat namelijk nog niet vast, en jullie mening is van belang om te weten wat jullie er graag zouden ervaren.

*10. Verwachtingen van Boijmans Op Zuid (sociocultureel)*

- A. Wat kan er gedaan worden om je museum ervaring comfortabeler/fijner te maken? Dus in het meest ideale geval, hoe zou zo'n museum bezoek dan zijn?
- B. Zou de locatie van het museum voor jou uitmaken of je het bezoekt?
- C. Als het museum bij jou in de buurt is, zoals bij Boijmans Op Zuid zou gebeuren, zou je er dan sneller of makkelijker naartoe gaan?
- D. Stel dat Boijmans Op Zuid er straks is, zou je er dan echt naartoe gaan, zou je er vaker naartoe gaan dan een ander museum omdat het dichterbij zit?
- E. Denk je dat er iets kan worden gedaan om Boijmans Op Zuid aantrekkelijker te maken voor de mensen in Rotterdam Zuid zelf?
- F. Boijmans Op Zuid kost geld, denk je dat het een waardevolle investering is voor mensen in Rotterdam Zuid? Dus: denk je dat het ook iets oplevert voor mensen in Rotterdam Zuid?
- G. Denk je dat mensen in Rotterdam Zuid sneller naar een museum gaan als het in de buurt zit?
- H. Denk je dat er voor mensen die in Rotterdam Zuid wonen nog iets verandert door de komst van een nieuw museum (behalve dat het dichterbij ze in de buurt zit)?
- I. Denk je dat er ook wordt geïnvesteerd in de rest van Zuid of verwacht je niet dat dat zou gebeuren?

Dan gaan we nu door met de allerlaatste reeks vragen.

**Exit questions** (final possibility for discussion or final thoughts)

*11. Voldoening* (Sociale/persoonlijke ervaring)

- a. Waarom zou je Boijmans wel of niet nog eens willen bezoeken?
- B. Heb je het idee dat je iets hebt gehad aan dit museum bezoek?
- b. Zou je het museum liever bezoeken in je eentje of met iemand die je kent? Waarom?
- C. Zou je eerder/liever naar het museum gaan als je weet dat er een evenement is? (zoals tours, workshops, live optredens, gratis entree, ...).

*11. Afsluiting* (algemene ervaring)

- a. Is er iets wat ik nog niet heb vermeld in dit interview wat je wel zou willen bespreken?
- b. Heb je het idee dat je een volledige beschrijving hebt kunnen geven van je ervaring en verwachtingen?

*Heel erg bedankt voor jullie deelname, dan beëIndig ik bij deze onze focusgroep.*

## Appendix B - Questionnaire for participants

[filled in before the museum visit]

Naam	
Leeftijd	
Geslacht	
Werk/opleiding/bezigheid	
Geboorteplaats	
Nationaliteit	
Hoogst afgeronde (of huidige) opleiding	
Bezoek je het museum alleen of samen?	
Is dit je eerste bezoek aan het museum?	
Heb je in de afgelopen 12 maanden dit museum bezocht?	
Heb je in de afgelopen 12 maanden een museum bezocht in Rotterdam?	
Heb je in de afgelopen 12 maanden een museum bezocht in Nederland?	
Wat verwacht je van dit bezoek?	
Waar denk je aan bij het woord 'museum'?' (steekwoorden)	
Heb je de museum website bezocht vóór dit bezoek?	

**Ik geef toestemming voor het maken van observaties tijdens het museumbezoek, en voor een audio-opname van het focusgroep gesprek**

naam

handtekening

datum

**Ik wil de financiële vergoeding van 20 euro ontvangen op rekeningnummer:**

**Deze rekening staat op naam van:**

### Appendix C - Observation form

Characteristics of viewing behavior and exhibition experience within a 2 minute observation			
<b><u>Duration of looking at an art work (seconds)</u></b>	<u>&lt;10</u>	<u>10 - 120</u>	<u>&gt;120</u>
	Total:	Total:	Total
<b><u>Reading majority of the signs</u></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
	Total:	Total:	
<b><u>Taking pictures</u></b>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
	Total:	Total:	
<b><u>Using art to stimulate conversation</u></b>	<u>Yes, also with strangers</u>	<u>Yes, only with people they know</u>	<u>No</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total:</u>
<b><u>Overall attitude/behavior during the museum visit</u></b>	Relaxed/uninterested (on phone, sitting on benches without looking around, etc.)	Active/tense (looking around a lot, rushed pace, fidgeting with hands, complaining to others, looking at what others do etc.)	Engaged/interested/calm (slow pace, concentrated, looking at art from varying distances, discussing their thoughts with others, seek personal significance, active stance)
	Total:	Total	Total:

## Appendix D - Participant information overviews

Name	Pip
Age	17
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Gymnasium VWO 6 (high school)
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	Gymnasium (high school)
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Together
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	Looking at art and learning from the stories that artists have for them.
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Art, collection of art works, tranquility, stories, thoughts
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No.

Name	Fred
Age	28
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	Unemployed
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	MBO - 3
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	Yes
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	I expect to see a lot of art.
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	art
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Kevin
Age	22
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	Bachelor bestuurskunde (university)
Place of birth	Goes, Zeeland
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	VWO/bachelor 1 <sup>st</sup> year
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	Yes
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	A lot of art, in terms of visitors mostly tourists
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	History and art.
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	Yes (for directions to the museum)

Name	Shanice
Age	21
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Studies Creative Business (HBO) and works as graphic designer (freelance)
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	Lifestyle (niveau 4) – (HBO) C I B
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	I expect a relaxed/calm tour, with a lot of tourists.
What do you think of when you hear the word ‘museum’?	Art, educational, nice lighting
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Julius
Age	19
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	VWO (high school)
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	VWO (high school)
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Together
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	Changing the view of Rotterdam through the arts.
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Art, tranquility, thoughts, connotations, impressions.
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Robin
Age	21
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Student (Research master - univerversity)
Place of birth	Zwijndrecht
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	University (bachelor)
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	Modern art, a more older audience
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Art, gallery, antiquity, culture.
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Jeffrey
Age	24
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	HBO – Dutch law / job at the municipal waste collection facility
Place of birth	Dordrecht
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	HBO – Dutch law
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	Little [expectations], don't know which exhibition there is, calm
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Old people, art, fun
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Marianne
Age	22
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Job: administrative employee + accountant
Place of birth	Arnhem
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	MBO – 4
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No, 1 visit when I was +/- 10 years old
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	Inspiration and history
What do you think of when you hear the word ‘museum’?	Collection, old and modern, influences, representing culture
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Alima
Age	29
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Art teacher at a high school / English
Place of birth	Papendrecht
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	WO Master (university) art history
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	I expect a relaxed atmosphere and a lot of visitors
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Art, audio tour, guide, yuppies, silence
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Ricardo
Age	23
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	Job: Footlocker (store)
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Colombian
Highest completed or current level of education	Mavo (high school)
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	A lot of art
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Art statues paintings
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Jonathan
Age	20
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	International event management (HBO)
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	HBO
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Together (Jonathan stated "together" because he visits the museum with the group of participants)
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	Together
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	Not applicable
What do you think of when you hear the word "museum"?	People, all cultures
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Najib
Age	23
Gender	Male
Job/education/occupation	Job: Security
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	MBO – 3
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Together (Najib stated “together” because he visits the museum with the group of participants)
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	No
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	No
What are your expectations for this visit?	I think it will be busy in the museum
What do you think of when you hear the word “museum”?	Art
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No

Name	Aurora
Age	18
Gender	Female
Job/education/occupation	Volunteer at Rotown
Place of birth	Rotterdam
Nationality	Dutch
Highest completed or current level of education	Theater HAVO/VWO
Are you visiting the museum alone or with someone?	Alone
Is this your first visit to Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen?	No
Did you visit this museum in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in Rotterdam in the past 12 months?	Yes
Did you visit a museum in the Netherlands in the past 12 months?	Yes
What are your expectations for this visit?	An exhibition that focuses on Bauhaus, and that I am very interested in
What do you think of when you hear the word 'museum'?	Big, 'strak' (neat), interesting, boring, calm, a mixture of old and new
Did you check the museum website before your visit?	No