Why Do People Visit Art Museums?
Examining Visitor Motivations and Visit Outcomes

Katherine N. Cotter

University of Pennsylvania

Anna Fekete

University of Vienna

Paul. J. Silvia

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

AUTHOR NOTE

Katherine N. Cotter, Positive Psychology Center, University of Pennsylvania; Anna Fekete, Department of Cognition, Emotion, and Methods in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Vienna; and Paul J. Silvia, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

We thank the Weatherspoon Art Museum, its staff, and its visitors for their assistance in this work.

Address correspondence to Katherine N. Cotter, Positive Psychology Center, University of Pennsylvania; katherinencotter@gmail.com.

Abstract

People visit museums with differing motivations. We use Falk's visitor identity model to examine visitors' motivation to visit an art museum. We assess (1) the prevalence of different motivation types; (2) how visit motivations and outcomes relate to visit satisfaction and length; and (3) the relation between visit motivations and fulfillment of expectations. We found that (1) visitors most strongly endorsed motivations and visit outcomes related to exploration and least strongly to facilitating another's visit; (2) visit outcomes predicted visit satisfaction and length more strongly than did visit motivations; and (3) visit outcomes largely met or exceeded the visitors' pre-visit expectations. The present findings suggest that outcomes of the visit matter more than motivations for visiting. We suggest that examining the entirety of a visit—pre-visit motivation and post-visit outcomes—may provide new insights about art museum visits that may be obscured when focusing on one of these aspects.

Keywords: *Art Museum, Motivation, Visit Satisfaction, Visitor experience, Field Study*

Why Do People Visit Art Museums? Examining Visitor Motivations

People visit museums with a seemingly infinite variety of motivations. Some wish to be entertained (Falk et al., 1998; Phelan et al., 2018), to check an Instagram-worthy experience off their list (Falk, 2006, 2008; Phelan et al., 2018), or to appease their partner and are dragged along (Brida et al., 2017). Others have learning goals (Falk et al., 1998; Pekarik & Schreiber, 2012; Phelan et al., 2018), pre-identified exhibits to view (Falk et al., 1998), or are simply curious about what a museum has to offer (Brida et al., 2017; Falk, 2006, 2008). These motivations shape our expectations for our museum experience and are vital to our understanding of the nature of museum visitation. In the present study, we used Falk's Identity-Centered Approach (Falk, 2006, 2008) to organize these diverse motivations and to investigate visitor's motivation in an art museum.

Falk's approach (2006, 2008) proposes identity-related motivation types derived from a content analysis of visitor interviews in a science center (Falk & Storksdieck, 2004) that originally aimed to investigate contextual learning. Visitors were interviewed before and immediately after their visit (Falk & Storksdieck, 2004, 2009). These qualitative and quantitative interviews involved personal meaning mapping through brainstorming; open-ended and multiple-choice questions regarding the content of the exhibition; and ratings on general interest, visit motivation, and previous experience (Falk & Storksdieck, 2004). The analysis of these interviews led to the development of Falk's Visitor Identity-Related Motivation Typology (Falk, 2006, 2008).

Falk's visitor identity model (Falk, 2006, 2008) contains five visitor identities: Explorers, Facilitators, Professionals/Hobbyists, Experience seekers, and Spiritual pilgrims/Rechargers. *Explorers* are driven by curiosity with a general interest to know more about the topics offered by the museum. They want interesting content that captures their attention and makes them learn. They describe themselves as curious people, science lovers, learners, and discoverers. *Facilitators* are guided by social motivations. They want to spend time

with those accompanying them on the visit and satisfy the needs of someone they care about, usually their significant other or children. They often visit because their companion initiated the visit and describe themselves as committed parents or partners. *Professionals/Hobbyists* follow their specific interest, so they select the institution as a destination where they can extend their background knowledge. They seek specific content and use the museum as a tool to fuel their interest. Often their main focus is not on the information itself but on how it is conveyed. *Experience seekers* have the desire to collect experiences, use the institution for recreational purposes, and to say they have “been there and done that.” They are motivated to fulfill expectations of others, and often their visit occurs because it was recommended by someone. They seek an enjoyable visit. *Spiritual pilgrims* (Falk, 2006, 2008) or *Rechargers* (Falk & Storksdieck, 2009) look for introspective, restorative experiences to reflect on themselves, rejuvenate, and experience awe. They are seeking a peaceful or inspiring visit. Their description of the museum is intertwined with respect or homage about the surrounding of the content or the place.

It is important to note that people may have other motivations for their visits. For instance, national shrines, memorials, or ethnic museums might attract *Respectful pilgrims* motivated by duty or an obligation to honor the memory (Bond & Falk, 2013; Falk, 2011) and *Community seekers* (Falk, 2011) or *Affinity seekers* (Bond & Falk, 2013) when the museum speaks to the heritage or personhood of the visitor. These visitor categories are flexible, and overlapping combinations of visit motivations may occur (Falk, 2006). Visitor identity-related motivations may vary between visits and can change over time but tend to be consistent with how visitors define themselves. Because visitors enter the museum with specific motivations and expectations, their satisfaction with the visit may depend upon whether these expectations are fulfilled. If the expectations and motivations of the visitor are well-suited to the offerings of the institution, people will be satisfied with their visit (Falk, 2016; Pekarik et al., 1999).

In the present study, we use Falk's visitor identity model (Falk, 2006, 2008) to examine visitor motivations at the Weatherspoon Art Museum in Greensboro, North Carolina. This work is largely exploratory and has three aims. First, we will examine the prevalence of each motivation type in a sample of art museum visitors. Prior work using this model has found that different types of institutions (e.g., zoos, gardens, art museums) show different patterns of visitor motivation, with *Explorers* being the most prevalent motivation for art museum visitors (Trainer et al., 2012); the present study also provides the opportunity to replicate this finding.

Second, we will examine how visit motivation and visit outcomes relate to two common metrics associated with museum visits—visit satisfaction and length. Prior work has found associations between visit motivations and visit experiences, such as visit duration (Brida et al., 2017; Falk et al., 1998) and degree of learning from the visit (Falk et al., 1998), suggesting that motivations can influence engagement with museum offerings. Given that motivations and experiences do not always align (Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015), however, looking at these aspects of a visit separately is necessary.

Finally, we will examine whether people's visit motivations and expectations are fulfilled. For much of the work using Falk's model, the emphasis has been on what motivations and expectations visitors bring with them (e.g., Falk, 2016; Trainer et al., 2012). Less work has examined the extent to which these expectations were ultimately met. One study found that often people's expectations for their visit did not match their experiences in the museum (Kirchberg & Tröndle, 2015), suggesting that examining both expectations and experiences is necessary for a complete account of museum visitation.

Method

Participants and Procedure

One-hundred and sixty-three visitors to the Weatherspoon Art Museum agreed to take part in the study—four visitors completed only the pre-visit survey and were thus excluded from analyses. Visitors were, on average, 40.13 years old ($SD = 19.64$, $range = 18 - 88$) and

predominantly female (55.97%, Male: 38.36%, Other: 1.26%). Most visitors (55.35%) had not previously visited the museum.

Data were collected on Saturdays and Sundays because the museum tended to have the most visitors on weekends. Visitors were approached upon entering the museum, provided with a description of the study, and asked whether they would be willing to take part. Participants completed a short survey prior to beginning their visit and viewing any art. After completing the pre-visit survey, visitors were free to complete their visit in whatever manner they wished (e.g., viewing artwork in any order, viewing only some exhibits, staying as long as they wished). After completing their visit, visitors completed a second survey about their experience in the museum. Participants completed the survey electronically on 7" Android tablets ($n = 95$) or using paper forms ($n = 64$). As compensation, visitors were offered their choice of souvenirs (e.g., art notecards, stickers) donated by the museum gift shop.

Weatherspoon Art Museum

The Weatherspoon Art Museum, located in Greensboro, NC, USA, is an art museum with a focus on modern and contemporary American art. It is located on the corner of the campus of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and it is open to the public, with free parking and admission, six days a week. The museum has six galleries on two floors and an outdoor sculpture garden, all of which were open to visitors during the data collection period. In one gallery, the museum regularly has a temporary exhibit changing approximately every 3 months and exhibits their permanent collection in the remaining galleries. It serves over 35,000 visitors annually (Weatherspoon Art Museum, n.d.).

Measures

Pre-visit survey. Prior to beginning their visit, participants completed a survey regarding the reasons why they chose to visit the museum in addition to providing demographic information (see Appendix). The visit motivation questionnaire contained 11 items—two items for each motivation category proposed by Falk (2006, 2008; Explorer, Facilitator, Experience-

Seeker, Professional/Hobbyist, and Spiritual Pilgrim/Recharger) and one item asking whether their visit was related to someone else wanting to visit the museum. These items were developed for the present study to capture the core components of the categories proposed by Falk. All items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale (*Not at all related to my motivation to visit* to *Completely related to my motivation to visit*). Participants also completed other items unrelated to the present study's aims.

Post-visit survey. Upon completing their visit, participants completed a second questionnaire about their experience in the museum (see Appendix). Participants first rated their satisfaction with the visit on a 5-point Likert scale (*Extremely dissatisfied* to *Extremely satisfied*). Participants then responded to 9 items that mirrored the motivation items completed in the pre-visit survey. The items were worded to reflect whether outcomes related to the motivations were experienced during the visit. Note that there was only one outcome item related to the Facilitator motivation category and no item related to visiting due to another person's interest as simply visiting the museum fulfills the motivation to visit due to another's interest. Participants also completed items related to their emotional experiences that were unrelated to the present study's aims and are not discussed further.

Visit length. Visit length was recorded as the amount of time, in minutes, between completing the pre-visit survey and beginning the post-visit survey either through via the electronic survey on the tablets or manually by researchers. This eliminated any differences due to survey completion time.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive statistics and correlations for demographic variables and visit motivations, outcomes, satisfaction, and length are available in Table 1. Overall, people indicated high levels of satisfaction with their visit ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 1.09$) and spent, on average, 50.31 minutes in the museum ($SD = 21.56$, $range = 14.00$ to 102.00). Visit satisfaction and length were not

correlated. Most participants (55.35%) had not previously visited the museum, and prior visitation to the museum was not associated with visit satisfaction or length.

People endorsed a variety of motivations for visiting the museum. Visitors most strongly endorsed motivations related to the Explorer category and least strongly endorsed motivations related to the Facilitator category. Sixty-six (approximately 40%) participants reported that their reason for visiting was not related to another person wishing to come to the museum. None of the motivations were correlated with visit satisfaction (see Table 1); the motivations to be inspired and to relax were weakly and positively correlated with visit length ($r_s = .17$ and $.16$, respectively).

Similarly, people reported a variety of visit outcomes. Visitors more strongly endorsed outcomes related to the Explorer and Professional/Hobbyist categories and least strongly endorsed outcomes related to the Facilitator category. Four outcomes were positively correlated with visit satisfaction—satisfying curiosity, satisfying a professional interest, feeling relaxed, and having a spiritual experience—and visit length was positively related to all Explorer and Experience-Seeker items and feeling relaxed. These patterns of correlations suggest that visit satisfaction and length are more closely associated with what people experience during their visit rather than the reasons that motivated the visit.

Predicting Visit Satisfaction and Length

Our second aim is to better understand the relationship between visit motivations and outcomes and visit satisfaction and length. To do so, we conducted a series of regression analyses using each pair of motivation–outcome items (see Tables 2 and 3 for full results). In each analysis, the motivation and outcome items and their interaction were used to predict visit satisfaction (Table 2) and visit length (Table 3). Responses were mean centered prior to analysis. The *stats* (R Core Team, 2020) *lm()* function for multiple regression, *lm.beta* (Behrendt, 2014) *lm.beta()* function to obtain standardized coefficients, and *heplots* (Fox, Friendly, & Monette,

2018) `etasq()` function to obtain effect sizes were used to complete analyses in R (R Core Team, 2020).

Overall, visit satisfaction was better predicted by what people got from their visit than what their motivations were for visiting the museum. The degree to which people's curiosity and professional interests were satisfied, felt relaxed after the visit, or had a spiritual experience positively predicted their satisfaction with the visit. Interestingly, the degree to which people's motivation was to have a spiritual experience was a negative predictor of visit satisfaction. None of the interaction effects were statistically significant, and all significant relationships were small effects ($\eta^2_p < 0.09$).

Visit length followed a similar pattern—people's outcomes predicted visit length more consistently than visit motivations. The degree to which people satisfied a personal interest, would recommend the museum to others, will tell others they visited the museum, and felt relaxed were positive predictors of how long people spent in the museum. None of the visit motivations were statistically significant predictors of visit length. One of the interaction effects—guiding someone else's visit—was significant (see Figure 1) and indicated that for people with above average levels of motivation to guide a visit, visit length increased as levels of guiding a visit increased; for people with average or below average levels of motivation to guide a visit, visit length decreased as levels of guiding a visit increased. In other words, people who were highly motivated to guide a visit stayed longer when guiding a visit was related to their museum experience. People who were not expecting to guide a visit had shorter visits when guiding a visit was related to their museum experience. All significant relationships were small effects ($\eta^2_p < 0.09$).

Match Between Motivations and Outcomes

Our third aim was to examine the extent to which people's motivations and expectations for their visit matched their experiences. One method to accomplish this is to examine the discrepancy between visitor's pre-visit motivation ratings and their post-visit outcome ratings

for each item pair. For visitors who gave the same ratings (e.g., indicating that relaxing was somewhat related to their visit motivation and somewhat related to their visit experience), it suggests the visitor got what they expected. For visitors whose motivation rating is less than their experience rating (e.g., indicating relaxing was not related to their visit motivation but that it was somewhat related to their visit experience), it suggests the visitor got more out of their visit than expected. For visitors whose motivation rating is greater than their experience rating (e.g., indicating relaxing was somewhat related to their visit motivation but that it was not related to their visit experience), it suggests the visitors got less out of their visit than expected.

Overall, people infrequently got less out of their visit than expected, and in a few domains many visitors got more out of their visit than expected (see Figure 2). Within the Explorer domain, most visitors got what they expected and in many cases more than they expected. For 26.58% of visitors, they were less able to satisfy their curiosity than they had expected. Within the Facilitator domain, the majority of visitors got what they expected (70.97%). Within the Professional/Hobbyist domain, a large majority (84.81%) of visitors were more able to satisfy a professional interest than anticipated, and most visitors were inspired to the level they expected, with many visitors (32.91%) being more inspired than expected. Within the Experience-Seeker domain, most participants got more out of their visit than expected, most notably 84.18% of visitors indicated lower levels of intention to tell others they visited the museum prior to their visit than after having seen the museum's exhibits. Finally, within the Recharger domain, many visitors were either more relaxed than expected (43.04%) or as relaxed as expected (39.87%), and most visitors had a spiritual experience to the degree expected (55.35%).

Discussion

The present study used Falk's visitor identity model (2006, 2008) to explore motivations of visitors to the Weatherspoon Art Museum. Our exploratory work had three general aims: (1)

To determine what types of motivations were most prevalent among visitors; (2) To see whether visitor motivations and visit outcomes predicted visit satisfaction and length; and (3)

To examine the extent to which people's visit motivations matched their visit outcomes.

Visitors endorsed the full range of visit motivations examined. People most strongly endorsed motivations related to exploration—curiosity and interest in the museum's offerings—which replicates Trainer et al.'s (2012) findings that Explorer-related motivations are the most common type in art museum visitors. Visitors least strongly endorsed motivations related to facilitating another's visit—showing others the museum and guiding a visit. Mirroring the motivations, people also reported greater Explorer-related visit outcomes and did not report high levels of Facilitator-related outcomes. The low level of Facilitator-oriented visitors in our art museum visitor sample is in contrast with studies of visitors in other leisure institutions such as zoos or botanical gardens that primarily attract people with Facilitator-related motivations (Falk et al., 2008; Trainer et al., 2012). Interestingly, aquarium visitors—similar to the art museum visitors in the present study—most frequently endorse Explorer-related motivations (Falk et al., 2008), suggesting that different types of leisure institutions attract different kinds of visitors. This Facilitator finding may be, in part, due to differences in the audience attracted to such institutions—Facilitator-oriented visitors who are interested in guiding another's visit may be more prevalent in institutions in which children visitors or family visits are more common. This may be a candidate for further research.

The second focus of this work was examining how motivations and outcomes related to visit satisfaction and length. In general, outcomes were more predictive of visit satisfaction and length than people's visit motivations. This may suggest that visitor's motivations may be a greater influence in what brings people to visit a museum but that these factors are less important in shaping the nature of visits, in line with Falk et al.'s (1999) finding that people's visit motivations were not associated with their strategies when visiting a museum. Falk et al.

(1999) did, however, find that motivations were associated with learning-related outcomes, something not assessed in the present study.

The final focus of our project was to see how well people's outcomes matched their initial visit motivations and expectations. For all motivation types, outcomes matched or exceeded their initial expectations for the majority of visitors. Outcomes related to Experience-Seeker motivations most frequently exceeded expectations, and outcomes related to Recharger motivations most frequently were under expectations. Although in the present study, visitor's expectations were generally met or exceeded, there were instances in which visitors did not get what they expected or intended for their visit. By applying Falk's framework, we can obtain a more granular understanding of intentions for visits and their relation to visitor outcomes.

Falk's model can also be used as a tool applied by museums to tailor their programming to appeal to various visitor identities and motivations. Different types of institutions attract visitors with different motivations (Falk, 2016), with art museums tending to attract larger proportions of Explorers compared to other types of institutions (Falk, 2016; Trainer et al., 2012). Since Explorers are driven by curiosity and interest, the best ways to address their need for learning and cognitive engagement should be investigated in more detail. Future work should also explore what programs or types of exhibits appeal to visitors with each of the motivation types so institutions can best address the interests of their visitors. Museums do, however, attract visitors with mixed motivations, something that is not often addressed. Therefore, this mixed audience should be more thoroughly examined so that the appropriate types of programming can be made available to satisfy their entry motivations and expectations (Falk, 2016).

Overall, the present findings indicate that people enter art museums with a variety of motivations and leave the museum experiencing a variety of outcomes. In much of Falk's work, he has emphasized the reasons why people enter a museum, and suggested visitor type categories. But our work suggests a focus solely on the motivations does not tell the whole

story—what people took away from their experience was more predictive of visit satisfaction and length than their motivations. Focusing on the entirety of a visit, rather than just what motivated people to visit or what they took away, will provide new insights about the psychology of art museums.

References

- Behrendt, S. (2014). lm.beta: Add standardized regression coefficients to lm-objects.
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lm.beta>
- Bond, N., & Falk, J. H. (2013). Tourism and identity-related motivations: Why am I here (and not there)? *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15(5), 430–442.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.1886>
- Brida, J. G., Nogare, C. D., & Scuderi, R. (2017). Learning at the museum: Factors influencing visit length. *Tourism Economics*, 23(2), 281-294.
- Falk, J. H. (2006). An identity-centered approach to understanding museum learning. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 49(2), 151–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2006.tb00209.x>
- Falk, J. H. (2008). Viewing art museum visitors through the lens of identity. *Visual Arts Research*, 34(2), 25–34.
- Falk, J. H. (2011). Contextualizing Falk's identity-related visitor motivation model. *Visitor Studies*, 14(2), 141–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2011.608002>
- Falk, J. H. (2016). Museum audiences: A visitor-centered perspective. *Society and Leisure*, 39(3), 357–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2016.1243830>
- Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2000). *Learning from museums: Visitor experiences and the making of meaning*. AltaMira.
- Falk, J. H., Heimlich, J., & Bronnenkant, K. (2008). Using identity-related visit motivations as a tool for understanding adult zoo and aquarium visitors' meaning-making. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 51(1), 55–79. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2008.tb00294.x>
- Falk, J. H., Moussouri, T., & Coulson, D. (1998). The effect of visitors' agendas on museum learning. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 41(2), 107-120.
- Falk, J. H., & Storksdieck, M. (2004). Understanding the long-term impacts of a science center visit: Final report to the National Science Foundation, Grant# 0125545.

- Falk, J. H., & Storksdieck, M. (2009). Science learning in a leisure setting. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 47(2). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20319>
- Fox, J., Friendly, M., & Monette, G. (2018). heplots: Visualizing tests in multivariate models. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=heplots>
- Kirchberg, V., & Tröndle, M. (2015). The museum experience: Mapping the experience of fine art. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 58(2), 169-193.
- Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2002). Motivational factors and the visitor experience: A comparison of three sites. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 45(3), 183-198. doi:10.1111/j.2151-6952.2002.tb00055.x
- Pekarik, A. J., Doering, Z. D., & Karns, D. A. (1999). Exploring satisfying experiences in museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 42(2), 152-173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1999.tb01137.x>
- Pekarik, A. J., & Schreiber, J. B. (2012). The power of expectation. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 55(4), 487-496.
- R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Phelan, S., Bauer, J., & Lewalter, D. (2018). Visit motivations: Development of a short scale for comparison across sites. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 33(1), 25-41.
- Trainer, L., Steele-Inama, M., & Christopher, A. (2012). Uncovering visitor identity: A citywide utilization of the Falk visitor-identity model. *Journal of Museum Education*, 37(1), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10598650.2012.11510722>
- Weatherspoon Art Museum (n.d.). *History*. <https://weatherspoonart.org/history/>

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics and correlations

	<i>M (SD)</i>	Range	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Satisfaction	4.29 (1.09)	1 – 5	1							
2. Visit Length (minutes)	50.31 (21.56)	14 – 102	.10	1						
3. Age (years)	40.13 (19.64)	18 – 88	-.15	.05	1					
4. Gender	F: 55.97%, M: 38.36%		-.02	-.03	-.08	1				
5. Prior Visit	Y: 44.65%, N: 55.35%		-.12	-.06	.17*	.08	1			
Motivations										
6. Curiosity	3.22 (0.90)	1 – 4	.02	.13	.04	.03	-.15	1		
7. Interested in Museum	3.13 (1.00)	1 – 4	-.06	.12	.19*	-.00	.19*	.60***	1	
8. Show Others	2.05 (1.15)	1 – 4	.09	-.02	.01	-.00	.30***	.05	.17*	1
9. Guide Visit	1.47 (0.88)	1 – 4	.13	.00	.05	.16*	.23**	-.06	.11	.63***
10. Prof. Interest	1.54 (0.96)	1 – 4	-.02	-.06	.16*	.04	.29***	.02	.21**	.08
11. Be Inspired	2.45 (1.15)	1 – 4	-.00	.17*	.21**	.00	.32***	.28***	.34***	.08
12. Heard Good Things	2.72 (1.13)	1 – 4	-.06	.12	-.02	.01	.19*	.26***	.28***	.18*
13. Say I've Been	1.59 (0.97)	1 – 4	.10	.12	-.17*	.13	-.21**	.17*	.08	.05
14. Relax	2.71 (1.06)	1 – 4	.04	.16*	-.00	.11	.16*	.31***	.28***	.10
15. Spiritual Experience	1.95 (1.04)	1 – 4	.00	.02	.16*	.12	.19*	.21**	.23**	.08
16. Someone Else Wanted to Visit	2.23 (1.21)	1 – 4	.11	-.03	-.12	.01	-.12	-.08	-.25**	-.04
Outcomes										
17. Satisfied Curiosity	3.33 (0.82)	1 – 4	.16*	.19*	.11	.08	.10	.34***	.31***	.12
18. Interested in Museum	3.49 (0.79)	1 – 4	.06	.24**	.03	-.00	.08	.32***	.45***	.22**
19. Guided Visit	1.61 (1.04)	1 – 4	.11	-.01	-.01	.11	.23**	-.15	-.11	.51***
20. Satisfied Prof. Interest	3.33 (0.80)	1 – 4	.23**	.15	-.01	.09	.16*	.25**	.33***	.06
21. Was Inspired	2.70 (1.13)	1 – 4	.08	.10	.10	.20*	.25**	.23**	.25**	.09
22. Recommend Museum	3.47 (0.79)	1 – 4	.13	.34***	.14	.02	.20*	.33***	.42***	.23**
23. Say I've Been	3.48 (0.79)	1 – 4	.03	.29***	.12	.05	.13	.29***	.33***	.14
24. Relaxed	3.10 (0.96)	1 – 4	.19*	.26***	-.02	.02	.09	.27***	.30***	.18*
25. Spiritual Experience	1.79 (1.01)	1 – 4	.24**	.08	.07	.12	.13	.15	.16*	.17*

	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.	15.	16.	17.	18.
1. Satisfaction										
2. Visit Length										
3. Age										
4. Gender										
5. Prior Visit										
Motivations										
6. Curiosity										
7. Interested in Museum										
8. Show Others										
9. Guide Visit	1									
10. Prof. Interest	.30***	1								
11. Be Inspired	.11	.40***	1							
12. Heard Good Things	.14	.12	.25**	1						
13. Say I've Been	.13	.18*	.02	.22**	1					
14. Relax	.09	.18*	.50***	.27***	.12	1				
15. Spiritual Experience	.13	.39***	.51***	.21**	.21**	.45***	1			
16. Someone Else Wanted to Visit	-.03	-.07	-.19**	.01	.25**	-.04	.05	1		
Outcomes										
17. Satisfied Curiosity	.03	.03	.24**	.18*	.11	.12	.06	-.11	1	
18. Interested in Museum	.14	.04	.19*	.34***	.12	.18*	.13	-.13	.47***	1
19. Guided Visit	.57***	.24**	.01	.05	.15	.03	.12	.10	.03	.12
20. Satisfied Prof. Interest	.10	.04	.24**	.23**	.09	.13	.13	-.13	.59***	.54***
21. Was Inspired	.10	.18*	.52***	.22**	.04	.34***	.36***	-.05	.30***	.21**
22. Recommend Museum	.17*	.02	.34***	.24**	.05	.27***	.16*	-.08	.38***	.49***
23. Say I've Been	.15	-.02	.16*	.23**	.06	.24**	.08	.05	.36***	.42***
24. Relaxed	.14	.03	.24**	.20*	.07	.42***	.18*	-.04	.31***	.40***
25. Spiritual Experience	.26***	.26***	.26***	.12	.15	.20*	.56***	.04	.25**	.24**

	19.	20.	21.	22.	23.	24.	25.
1. Satisfaction							
2. Visit Length							
3. Age							
4. Gender							
5. Prior Visit							
Motivations							
6. Curiosity							
7. Interested in Museum							
8. Show Others							
9. Guide Visit							
10. Prof. Interest							
11. Be Inspired							
12. Heard Good Things							
13. Say I've Been							
14. Relax							
15. Spiritual Experience							
16. Someone Else Wanted to Visit							
Outcomes							
17. Satisfied Curiosity							
18. Interested in Museum							
19. Guided Visit	1						
20. Satisfied Prof. Interest	.09	1					
21. Was Inspired	.10	.37***	1				
22. Recommend Museum	.09	.54***	.44***	1			
23. Say I've Been	.05	.41***	.27***	.64***	1		
24. Relaxed	.18*	.40***	.38***	.50***	.50***	1	
25. Spiritual Experience	.16*	.32***	.32***	.25**	.16	.33***	1

Note. Gender dichotomized (M = 0/F = 1) for correlations. Prior visit was coded Yes = 1/No = 0 for correlations.

Table 2.

Visit motivations and outcomes predicting visit satisfaction

Predictor	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
Explorer – Curiosity						
Pre-Visit	-0.05	0.10	-0.04	-0.49	0.63	0.00
Post-Visit	0.25	0.12	0.19	2.05*	0.04	0.03
Pre-Post Interaction	0.04	0.11	0.04	0.42	0.68	0.00
Explorer – Interest						
Pre-Visit	-0.11	0.10	-0.10	-1.16	0.25	0.01
Post-Visit	0.23	0.13	0.17	1.78	0.08	0.01
Pre-Post Interaction	0.15	0.11	0.12	1.32	0.19	0.01
Facilitator – Guide						
Pre-Visit	0.23	0.14	0.19	1.72	0.09	0.01
Post-Visit	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.88	0.38	0.00
Pre-Post Interaction	-0.13	0.09	-0.17	-1.53	0.13	0.02
Prof. – Interest						
Pre-Visit	-0.03	0.09	-0.03	-0.45	0.66	0.00
Post-Visit	0.33	0.11	0.24	3.08**	0.002	0.05
Pre-Post Interaction	0.21	0.11	0.15	1.92	0.06	0.02
Prof. – Inspired						
Pre-Visit	-0.05	0.09	-0.05	-0.58	0.57	0.00
Post-Visit	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.86	0.39	0.01
Pre-Post Interaction	-0.11	0.07	-0.13	-1.63	0.11	0.02
Exp. Seeker – Heard About						
Pre-Visit	-0.09	0.08	-0.10	-1.16	0.25	0.01
Post-Visit	0.20	0.12	0.15	1.69	0.09	0.02
Pre-Post Interaction	-0.05	0.11	-0.04	-0.44	0.66	0.00
Exp. Seeker – Say Been						
Pre-Visit	0.11	0.09	0.10	1.20	0.23	0.01
Post-Visit	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.22	0.83	0.00
Pre-Post Interaction	0.04	0.11	0.03	0.37	0.71	0.00

Recharger – Relax						
Pre-Visit	-0.06	0.09	-0.05	-0.61	0.54	0.00
Post-Visit	0.24	0.11	0.21	2.30*	0.02	0.04
Pre-Post Interaction	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.12	0.00
Recharger – Spiritual						
Pre-Visit	-0.21	0.10	-0.20	-2.17*	0.03	0.03
Post-Visit	0.35	0.11	0.33	3.23**	0.002	0.08
Pre-Post Interaction	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.64	0.52	0.00

Table 3.

Visit motivations and outcomes predicting visit length

Predictor	<i>b</i>	SE	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2_p
Explorer – Curiosity						
Pre-Visit	1.66	2.02	0.07	0.52	0.41	0.00
Post-Visit	4.05	2.40	0.15	1.69	0.09	0.03
Pre-Post Interaction	-1.07	2.13	-0.04	-0.50	0.62	0.00
Explorer – Interest						
Pre-Visit	0.63	1.88	0.03	0.33	0.74	0.00
Post-Visit	7.42	2.54	0.27	2.92**	0.004	0.04
Pre-Post Interaction	2.67	2.24	0.10	1.19	0.24	0.01
Facilitator – Guide						
Pre-Visit	-4.24	2.71	-0.17	-1.57	0.12	0.00
Post-Visit	-0.55	2.07	-0.03	-0.26	0.79	0.00
Pre-Post Interaction	4.37	1.70	0.29	2.58*	0.01	0.04
Prof. – Interest						
Pre-Visit	-1.51	1.79	-0.07	-0.84	0.40	0.00
Post-Visit	4.16	2.14	0.16	1.95	.05	0.02
Pre-Post Interaction	1.20	2.22	0.04	0.54	0.59	0.00
Prof. – Inspired						
Pre-Visit	2.79	1.74	0.15	1.61	0.11	0.02
Post-Visit	0.56	1.81	0.03	0.31	0.76	0.00
Pre-Post Interaction	0.17	1.40	0.01	0.12	0.90	0.00
Exp. Seeker – Heard About						
Pre-Visit	0.46	1.49	0.02	0.31	0.76	0.00
Post-Visit	10.05	2.21	0.37	4.55***	< .001	0.11
Pre-Post Interaction	2.96	2.05	0.11	1.44	0.15	0.01
Exp. Seeker – Say Been						
Pre-Visit	2.13	1.72	0.10	1.24	0.22	0.01
Post-Visit	7.65	2.12	0.28	3.61***	< .001	0.08
Pre-Post Interaction	2.370	2.10	0.09	1.13	0.26	0.01

Recharger – Relax						
Pre-Visit	1.30	1.73	0.06	0.75	0.46	0.00
Post-Visit	5.93	2.00	0.26	2.96**	0.003	0.04
Pre-Post Interaction	2.21	1.68	0.11	1.32	0.19	0.01
Recharger – Spiritual						
Pre-Visit	-0.62	2.02	-0.03	-0.31	0.76	0.00
Post-Visit	2.18	2.24	0.10	0.97	0.33	0.01
Pre-Post Interaction	-0.23	1.66	-0.01	-0.14	0.89	0.00

Figure 1. Interaction for guiding visit predicting visit length.

Note. Both predictors were mean-centered.

Figure 2. Alignment of motivations and outcomes.

Note. Matched = Rating pre visit was same as rating post visit; Over = Rating pre visit was lower than rating post visit (i.e., got more than they expected); Under = Rating pre visit was higher than rating post visit (i.e., got less than they expected).

Appendix.
Museum Visit Questionnaire

Pre-Visit Survey

Variable	Item	Response Scale
Age	How old are you (in years)?	<i>Free response</i>
Gender	How would you describe your gender?	<i>Female, Male, Prefer to self-describe, Prefer not to state</i>
Prior Visit	Have you visited the Weatherspoon Art Museum before?	<i>Yes, No</i>
Curiosity	I am visiting out of curiosity	<i>4-point Likert scale; Not at all related to my motivation to visit to Completely related to my motivation to visit</i>
Interested in Museum	I am visiting because I'm interested in what the museum offers	
Show Others	I am visiting to show other people the museum	
Guide Visit	I am visiting to guide someone else through their visit	
Prof. Interest	I am visiting out of a professional interest	
Be Inspired	I am visiting to get ideas or be inspired	
Heard Good Things	I am visiting because I heard good things about the museum	
Say I've Been	I am visiting so that I can say I've been to the museum	
Relax	I am visiting to relax or recharge	
Spiritual Experience	I am visiting to have a spiritual experience	
Someone Else Wanted to Visit	I am visiting because someone else wanted to go	

Post-Visit Survey

Variable	Item	Response Scale
Visit Satisfaction	How satisfied are you with today's visit?	<i>5-point Likert scale; Extremely dissatisfied to Extremely satisfied</i>
Satisfied Curiosity	I satisfied my curiosity	<i>4-point Likert scale; Not related to my visit to Completely related to my visit</i>
Interested in Museum	I was interested in what the museum offered	
Guided Visit	I successfully guided someone's visit to the museum	

Satisfied Prof. Interest	I satisfied my professional interest	
Was Inspired	I was able to get new ideas or be inspired	
Recommend Museum	I will recommend the museum to others	
Say I've Been	I will tell other people that I visited the museum	
Relaxed	I was able to relax and recharge	
Spiritual Experience	I had a spiritual experience	