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Abstract

This thesis researches the expectations and experiences of different age groups in Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales in Croatia. It is a multimedia and interactive visitor’s centre which celebrates fairy tales and their makers. To understand expectations and experiences and reconstruct pre-tour and post-tour narratives in this kind of tourism, several analyses were conducted: a discourse analysis of the museum’s official website, social media sites such as Facebook, Instagram and TripAdvisor, and three travel blogs. Furthermore, for an on-site museum analysis, two models were used: du Gay’s circuit of culture, and Kempiak’s heritage visitor experience model. Visitor’s expectations and experiences were also researched on-site through discursive interviews with two age groups: young adults and adults. Online reviews on Google, Facebook and TripAdvisor, and children’s entries from the visitor’s book were also analysed to understand visitor’s experiences. By examining these online and offline sources, as well the results from on-site research, this thesis answers the following research question: In what ways, and to what extent, are the expectations of different age groups met in Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales, if measured by their experiences?
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INTRODUCTION

Ever since I was a little girl, I always had a book in my hand. I liked to live in a different world, with the magic, fantasies, princesses, witches, gods, and people who were kind and good, and as such, fairy tales were my favourite to read. When I first started going to school, I was six years old, and I had already read all of the fairy tales available in the school library, while my classmates still struggled with learning how to read. On one occasion, I started searching for books in my grandma’s cupboard, hoping to find something other than Rapunzel and Cinderella. This is when I found an old book filled with already yellow pages, entitled ‘Croatian Tales of Long Ago’. I entered a whole new world of magical characters, wise moral lessons, sealing my love for reading.

Croatian fairy tale tourism has only recently developed as Croatian mythology is full of stories that have been later written as fairy tales and recently used for tourism purposes. There are several Croatian fairy tale writers, but one stands out among the others. Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić was a Croatian writer from a wealthy and famous Croatian family, born in 1874 in Ogulin, Croatia. She is known as the best Croatian writer for children, best known for her book ‘Croatian Tales of Long Ago’ published in 1916. Her work is often compared to Hans Christian Andersen and Tolkien because of the origin of her tales and creating new fairy tales, whilst using names and motifs from the Slavic mythology of Croats (Picot 2007). Brlić was nominated for the Nobel prize four times, and in 1937 she was also the first woman accepted into the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts as a Corresponding Member. Unfortunately, due to depression and physical illnesses, she committed suicide in 1938.

Attractions associated with a historical person are one of twenty-three types of heritage attractions identified by Prentice in 1994; ‘places associated with authors have the power to endure as they are kept alive by the writer’s works’ (Smith 2003, 83). Today, there is a museum dedicated to Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić in Ogulin called Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales. The museum, located within the medieval castle, is a multimedia and interactive visitor’s centre that presents the fairy tales not only of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, but also the fairy tales of many other writers from Croatia and the rest of the world. The museum also consists of a permanent multimedia exhibition, library, multifunctional space for workshops, and a souvenir shop. Programmes are organized throughout the year: storytelling, literary and visual expression, film, performance and fine arts, and design (Ivana’s House of Fairy tales 2019). The whole town of Ogulin is branded as ‘The City of Fairy Tales’, with the Ogulin region carrying the name ‘The Homeland of Fairy Tales’, while in Slavonski Brod, you can visit the house where
Ivana lived when she got married. Her work is an essential Croatian literary heritage and has been used for educative computer games, theatre plays, movies, cartoons, but most importantly, her work is obligatory reading for children in Croatian schools.

**Status questionis**

Analysing the literature concerning literary tourism, a number of aspects of literary tourism are important to distinguish: types of visitors and their motivations, landscape and literary places, identity, heritage, museums, performance, and authenticity.

A number of studies have been written about visitors, their motivations, perceptions, and responses to heritage, however most of these are outdated. Wickens writes a typology of tourists researching tourists in Chalkidiki in Greece, quoting Jafari that ‘focusing on the tourists themselves and their typological forms helps to explain why people are attracted to specific destinations’ (Jafari 1989,26–27; Wickens 2002). She found inspiration in Cohen’s work; his typology of the drifter, the explorer, the individual mass, and the organized mass are based on the degree of institutionalization of the tourist. Her typology consisted of five types: the cultural heritage type, the raver type, Shirley Valentine type, the heliolatrous type, and the Lord Byron type. The cultural heritage type identifies culture, nature, and history as the primary reasons for visiting a place. They expect hospitality, ‘real culture’ in terms of architecture, food, drink, music, language and folk art, and they search for authenticity in the ‘otherness’. The raver types seek thrill and sensual and hedonistic pleasures. Unlike the cultural type, their experience is confined primarily to the beaches and night clubs. The Shirley Valentine type are mostly women seeking for a pleasurable and romantic experience with a local. Their expectations are based on the stereotypical image of a Greek male created in the film ‘Shirley Valentine’ and other media representations of Greece, however it can be applied to other nationalities as well, e.g., Italians portrayed in the ‘Lizzie McGuire movie’, shot in 2003, that speaks to younger generations. The heliolatrous types are merely searching for sunshine. Their activities are revolving around the beach, and unlike the cultural type, they do not participate in any of the cultural excursions. The Lord Byron type is marked by its annual ritual return to the same place. Having a more intimate experience of local hospitality, with the same location each year brings them security.

Some authors have studied phenomena called the ‘literary pilgrim’. Pocock and Herbert use this term as an assumption that this type of visitor is ‘seeking to learn and to be educated in a
discerning way’ (Herbert 1995, 34). Hemme states that journeying and pilgrimages to places based on their literary association have a centuries-old tradition; it stretches back to religiously inspired travels and the European phenomenon of the Grand Tour. She also quotes Bendix: longing for new, authentic travel experiences is the typical tourist behaviour developed in the 18th century, which then searched for the sublime.

Wickens also writes about tourist motivations, quoting Dann, who suggested that motivation is both socially and psychologically determined and that the tourists’ home environment plays a crucial role in influencing their reasons to travel. In connection to Wickens’ study, she names three reasons: the need to escape, the desire for pleasure, and ontological security. Kempiak quotes McKercher and du Cros, who identified five main types of heritage visitors and their motivations: purposeful, serendipitous, sightseeing, casual, and incidental visitors. She highlights that motivations for visiting a heritage site vary, and that learning about heritage itself may not always be a primary motivating factor. Other motivational factors may also include the pleasure of viewing, education, information, relaxation, entertainment, and exercise. Kempiak also quotes Wu and Wall who identified a range of pull factors (value for money, an excellent environment for family activities, the creative and innovative displays in the museums and the tranquillity of the historical area) and push factors (education and learning, relaxation, creating positive leisure habits, relationship enhancement and extended family obligation).

Herbert writes about the motivations of literary tourists. Firstly, he states that heritage visitors are drawn from what Urry calls the ‘service class’ of professional and businesspeople in white-collar occupations. He also argues that visitors to literary places are more purposeful and have a more specific reason to make their visit than the general heritage visitor, although both will be attracted. Herbert also names four main reasons why people visit literary places: ‘first, because of place’s connections to the lives of writers; second, as the settings for novels; third, for some deeper motion linked to that writer or his work (e.g. nostalgia and recollections of childhood); and fourth, because of dramatic event in the writer’s life’ (Herbert 2001; Smith 2003, 85). Here, Herbert also states the importance of the influence of prior knowledge. He quotes Prentice and Light who note that even with prior knowledge, much on-site learning remained incorrect, and while many people visit historical sites with interest, only a few have detailed prior knowledge. Earl shows in his research that visitors use literary tourism for a very compelling reason - to maintain their cultural distinction and assert their cultural capital: ‘visiting the site enabled them to reaffirm their cultural differences in a time when generic images associated with the myth are readily accessible’ (Earl 2008, 402). Whilst a lot has been
written about tourism motivations, Crompton states that more is still known about the ‘who, when and where’ of tourism than about the ‘why’ (Crompton 1979; Herbert 2001).

There have also been studies written about the employees and their relation to the literary heritage and how it affects the management of the visitors’ and volunteers’ experiences. Volunteers are becoming increasingly significant within the heritage and tourism sectors, and in many attractions, they have a key role in the service delivery. Smith conducted research that carried out a sample of ‘literary heritage properties’ focusing on real-life building that was home or birthplace of an author. Various studies have shown that heritage volunteering attracts young, aspiring professionals, and older, retired people (e.g., Mattingly, 1984; Walter, 1995; BAFM, 1998; Holmes, 1999; Smith 2003). Smith concluded that volunteers are motivated mostly by their self-interest in volunteering task itself, or that they are ‘literary enthusiasts’, which was an important parallel between the volunteers and visitors. Many displayed common characteristics, however, they did not conceptualise their visit/volunteering only in relation to literary aspects, even though the literary focus was important for both of their experiences.

Landscape and literary places are another aspect of literary tourism that has been extensively researched. Smith quotes Kong and Tay who identify three geographical approaches to the literature study: regional, humanistic, and structural. These approaches consider the way literature and geography, including landscape and place, interact. They argue that by visiting literary places, people add to the understanding and appreciation of literature; ‘knowledge of literature sharpens our enjoyment of place’ (Ousby 1990, 10; Smith 2003). Herbert and Smith define ‘literary place’ as a place both associated with writers in their real lives and those who provide the settings for their works. Different rules apply for two broad types of literary places (Squire, 1994b; Herbert, 1995a,1995b, 1996; Smith 2003): real-life places, associated with the lives of writers e.g., Prince Edward Island, Canada, associated with Montgomery’s ‘Anne of Green Gables’ novels, and ‘imagined’ fairy tale places, like the Fangorn forest in J.R.R. Tolkien’s ‘The Lord of the Rings’. Some imagined places have their origins in the real world; however, some are more difficult to locate. This distinction is not clear-cut, with Herbert arguing that visitors are unlikely to make any distinction between the two worlds. Smith quotes Ousby who claims that by setting their work in real landscapes, authors impose unnecessary restraints on themselves, which may leave readers unsatisfied when they later visit and discover the inconsistency.

Ruiz gives an interesting view of the landscape. According to Ruiz, the landscape is an inspiration for ‘the intellectual development of humankind’. First, an individual author is
transformed through contact with nature, influencing others to follow in his footsteps, physically or philosophically. He gives an example of La Mancha; Cervantes’ intellectual transformation which is developed through his journey from Toledo to Seville. He contemplates his adventurous life and weaves it into the protagonist of his novel, Don Quijote. Today, the official Don Quijote literary route is a walking route, and it preserves the landscapes that could ‘offer future generations a tangible experience in situ related to his masterpiece’ (Ruiz 2013, 3). Similarly, Ruiz also talks about literary routes inspired by the landscape. They are a part of the quest for meaning in natural and cultural heritage values, and they contribute to cultural heritage tourism, combining the cultural value of the author and their inspirational landscapes, by attracting literary tourists in situ. Literary tourists are drawn to the authors, and Ruiz enhances the importance of interpretation centres. They educate tourists, and they work on the presentation e.g., lightning, text, visual art, and video. Different displays are essential to include in a literary route to satisfy literary tourists’ fascination with the physical attractiveness of the heritage. Today, unlike urban areas, rural areas require a different style to promote respect for flora, fauna, and culture on the route.

Further to this, a literary route that has been a subject of different studies is the German Fairy Tale Route that connects places like Hanau where the Grimm brothers were born, and Bremen, where the famous tale of ‘The Bremen Town Musicians’ takes place. It is a route that invites travellers to ‘the homeland of fairies and princes’ and to a romantic landscape experience that inspired the Brothers Grimm. Hemme wrote a critical study that deals with more aspects than just landscape, but instead deals with the German identity. She writes that the Fairy Tale Route shows discrepancies between touristic and scholarly assumptions regarding folktales. Seemingly German, Grimm tales are migrating tales that can be traced back to East Asia and the Middle East. Nevertheless, tourism specialists and inhabitants of the region still connect the Grimm materials with locales. In fact, many of the 65 towns along the route have adopted a tale or a legend, plays, creating special sweets or holding fairy tale festivals, in which they identify with it, and they provide a tourism concept. The important national landscape she describes is the Reinhard’s Forest, which draws its cultural, historical marketing from centuries worth of cultural meaning and interpretations. It has a pre-existing landscape narrative that is closely connected to the German search for national and cultural identity (Lehmann 1999; Lehmann & Schriewer 2000; Hemme 2005). Hemme states that during the era of romanticism, the forest was seen as a landscape of soul, and it was fixated as the most important scenery of fairy tales and legends. Whilst it was not crafted to be political, rising nationalist sentiment began to
instrumentalise these images. Today, a guide dressed as a knight Dietrich hosts tours in the forest, communicating knowledge about narratives in other cultures by choosing material from international folk literature, and bringing new elements into the forest which create a competitive advantage. However, crucially, he shows tourists the ‘Tree of Generations’: its lower trunk is almost dead, but it loudly speaks and symbolises the grandparents, and the honouring of roots.

In connection with identity rises the importance of heritage and heritage tourism. According to Timothy, tourists nowadays are less interested in the conventional mass holidays, and instead, they are demanding a more memorable and engaging travel experience. Kempiak quotes Richards who defined heritage tourism as ‘the movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs’ (2001, 37; Kempiak 2017). Kempiak also quotes Poria, Butler, and Airey, who argued that the primary motivation to visit a site is based on the heritage characteristics of a place, according to the visitors’ perception of their heritage. Timothy says that the heritage attractions should be considered at four levels: world, national, local, and personal.

In terms of identity and heritage, museums are, according to Yoshida, considered as a place of ‘representation, preservation and conservation of the tangible cultural property of the past’ (2004, 109). He states that from this point of view, there seems to be little room for museums to contribute to the preservation of intangible cultural heritage. However, he also says that in fact, a museum is not only a depot for tangible cultural heritage, but a space to create and transfer the intangible cultural heritage as well. Since the mid-nineteenth century, European countries began to establish ethnographic museums one after another, with the general rule being that the curators and researchers were to collect objects. As such, in these cases, museums took the initiative to select what should be preserved and exhibited. Dickinson says that the earliest national museums were built as a part of the larger project of building the imperial nations themselves; ‘first national museums were the outcome of two phenomena essential to their development: Enlightenment and empire’ (2018, 463). Yoshida claims that until recently, there was a strong tendency among the exhibitions to focus on distinctive features of other cultures by ignoring globally shared cultural elements, but it challenged cultural museums to incorporate the voice of the peoples. As such, a growing trend occurs, in which museum are organizing exhibitions to represent the subject culture, as well as their own culture. Dickinson says that museal objects serve as anchors for national narratives, and that contemporary
museums are working to reduce the physical distance between visitor and object by removing glass and other physical barriers, as well as the textual explanations to bring artefacts and visitors into direct contact. Yoshida concludes that museums have often been criticized for creating one-sided images of cultures by displaying stereotypical objects, but he says that if we change the way of representing cultures, the museum can function as an arena where people meet and develop their pride and identity, learn about their tradition and hand it down to the next generation. Dickinson quotes Weiser, who said that the museum is an outcome and a production of pre-existing nation, and the museum’s audiences come to the site already positioned as citizens of the nation- museums serves as ‘glue’ to national identity.

In connection to national identity, museums can also be connected to technology and digital media. Smith and Iversen claim that social media platforms and other technologies contribute to reconnecting audiences’ everyday lives to heritage matters in new ways, by reinforcing the museum as a place to reflect on the past, understand the present, and envision a shared future. They also quote Castells, who pointed out that museums act as important cultural connectors in the information era by having the capacity to generate new and hybrid forms of cultural communication and by making use of new forms of digital technology. Walczak says that virtual reality and augmented reality technologies offer an ideal presentation medium for museums and other cultural heritage institutions. In this way, the connections and intersections between the museum and audiences are no longer linear, authoritative models of communication, but rather a dialogue and social participation in the present. Users are able to interact with digital content in the museum as easily and naturally as they can with real-world objects. Shaw and Krug quote Buckingham, who says that ‘digital generations’, although comprised of adopters of new technologies, are actually less interested in technology itself and more in communication and information that it provides. Smith and Iversen claim that social media acts as a strong mean of transforming museum communication from formal knowledge production to living intersections between museums and audiences’ everyday lives. Shaw and Krug also used social media in connection to their research on young people and virtual museums. They claim that it is fundamentally important that museum space offers young people opportunity for participation, sharing, conversations, and influence. Through social media, people can consume, play, interact, generate content, give and receive criticism, react and respond, but more importantly, explore culture and heritage in a meaningful manner.

Similarly, another exciting aspect researched in the literature is the aspect of performance. Light studied tourism in Transylvania, the ‘home of Count Dracula’. He researched tourism as a
performance act, with Crouch also arguing that it is important to understand what tourists do and how they make sense of these actions. It is an approach that ‘puts tourists themselves – rather than the producers, providers, and marketers of the tourist industry – centre stage when seeking to understand tourism’ (Franklin, 2003; Bærenholdt et al., 2004, Light 2009, 240). Light says that space is central for tourist practices, as he quotes Edensor who identifies two types of tourist space. Firstly, ‘enclavic’, which is almost entirely regulated around tourist consumption and tourists tend to regulate their performances accordingly, and ‘heterogeneous’, which is more open so that tourism overlaps with a wide range of other activities and tourist performances are less proscribed and more spontaneous. To understand the visitors’ performances, it is important to know what they ‘brought with them’, such as a range of ‘prior knowledge, expectations, fantasies, and mythologies of their destinations that are circulating within their home culture’ (Craik 1997, 118; Light 2009). For example, Transylvania has become a synonym for Gothic horror, vampires and everything supernatural, and it attracts a wide variety of tourists, some in search of the literary origins of Dracula, or some in search of the supernatural and unusual. However, central to the experience as a whole is the role of imagination. Imagining that it is an authentic experience that enhances the satisfaction, is one aspect that needs to be researched more in the term of literary tourism.

One question commonly asked in studies of literary places is of authenticity: whether they are genuine and whether they faithfully represent reality. Herbert states that literary place may start from an unambiguous fact, however presentation and interpretation may deal as much with myths as with realities. Similarly, according to Fawcett and Cormack, authenticity in literary tourism is shaped both by biographical facts and real places associated with the author and fictional settings and characters. Authenticity then becomes a subjective experience, a combination of the developers’ intentions, consumers’ interpretation, and the interactions among them. Fawcett and Cormack bring another point to the discussion: authenticity no longer exists in the sense of realness. ‘Mass-produced images of touristic objects and experiences always pre-exist the ‘real’ ‘(Fawcett and Cormack 2001, 689). Herbert quotes Samuel who recognized the problematic nature of authenticity: he claims that there was no such thing as the authentic past, but that ‘historians, in common with heritage conservationists and managers, reinvent the past by reconciling past and present, memory and myth, written record and spoken word’ Samuel 1994; Herbert 2001, 317).
Theoretical framework

In connection to the topic of this thesis, it is essential to consider other aspects of national identity in museums, experiences and narratives, technology, nostalgia, and childhood.

According to McLean, national cultures construct identities by ‘producing meanings about the nation with which we can identify, meanings which are contained in the stories which are told about it, memories which connect its present with its past, and images which are constructed of it’ (2007). In this case, a museum is a significant presenter and repository of a nation’s culture which connects the past to the present through stories about the artefacts of past cultures. McLean quotes Kaplan who emphasises the fact that museums are social institutions, products, and agents of political and social change, which leads to the conclusion that periods of significant growth in museums can be related to upsurges of nationalism and a sense of national identity. McLean continues her work by exploring du Gay’s five major cultural processes in a model called the circuit of culture: identity, representation, production, consumption, and regulation. These five processes interrelate, and du Gay argues that only this way can the meaning of an artefact or an object be explained.

Bruner writes about pre-tour, on tour and post-tour, however in terms of narratives. He says that by narrative, he means stories told by one person to another, stories in fictional texts, but also master narratives about destinations, sites, and people. Similarly, he calls them, in terms of pre-tour, pre-understandings. The master narrative is a ‘perceptual framework that works as a filter which excludes as much as it includes and offers the tourist an interpretative frame within which to understand the destination culture’ (Bruner 2005, 4). Pre-tour narratives are what the tourist understands from his generalized cultural discourse, but the story may be reinforced by friends who were on a similar trip, by tour agents, travel writers, brochures, guidebooks, and the internet. As such, there are no tourists who go to a place without any conception, pre-tour narratives are already in their consciousness. On ‘tour’, there is a flood of new narratives from local tour guides, handouts, markers at the site, postcards, pamphlets, and new stories. These stories modify and enhance the pre-tour narratives and form the basis of what will be told after the trip ends. Sources of information vary by mode of travel: group tours get their narratives from tour agents, guides, and sometimes performers and the storytellers, while backpackers have an additional source of other backpackers and guides. Travelers also use the internet to search for up-to-date information, as well as for communication and their contribution to the site they are visiting. Bruner says new technologies enable fast access to current information and sharing stories. Pre-tour narratives shape the tour; however, tourists do
not merely repeat what is in the brochure. Instead, tourists personalize the master narratives and make them their own. Yet, in some cases, some travellers surrender themselves to what is presented to them. They do not quest for coherent narratives, and they are accepting of what is given. This may be connected to the fact that some destinations have such firmly established pre-tour narratives that are difficult to escape, as they seem to envelop the entire society. In this way, government tourist bureaus, tourists, and even local people understand and accept the master narratives told about them. After travellers return home, their experience diminishes to memory, photographs and souvenirs gain significance, and master narratives become even more personal ones.

Other important aspects researched are technology and nostalgia. Brittan quotes Borgmann, who says that the application of modern technology is the only way to provide opportunities in a democratic society, whilst at the same time, it determines our character. In other words, when applied at every level of the social context in which we find ourselves, modern technology enforces a set of values and pursuit of happiness. Brittan also names three propositions about technology. These suggest that equation of goodness with happiness; that technology is bad, and that technology leads to happiness. Borgmann rejects the third proposition, saying that avowed happiness appears to decline as technological affluence rises. He explains that those who clamour for technology do not yet know that it does not deliver as they have been misled by Western capitalism that once they have computers, CD players, and other technology, they will be happy. Another aspect he mentions is that technology imposes itself so much that one may resist in theory, but to do so in practice became impossible. He also mentions happiness in connection to satisfaction: as soon as an object is within our grasp, we desire another, and here he connects technology to the nostalgia that many people feel for ‘pre-technological’ objects and activities. He says that whatever dissatisfaction is felt with the technology is achieved at the present moment, and people tend to look to the past for happiness that is not within grasp. However, the engine of the new nostalgia is exactly technology. Our computers, smartphones, and the internet fuel our nostalgic temper by archiving and showing every image, song, book, and memory, making each of those instantly available.

Halligan writes about nostalgia in a different manner connected with consumerism. Nostalgic properties of a consumer item speak to one’s memories and emotions, which is the way of establishing the consumerism language that is most familiar and believable for the consumers. He states that with advances in visual technology comes the opportunity to summon up the past, but also to summon up the imagined idyll of the past that consumers are longing for. Halligan
also connects nostalgia to generations who have lived in a favourable economic climate generated by their parents: higher levels of education and health, a proliferation of consumables, and no military conscription are just a few benefits. Yet, the phenomenon of nostalgia is present. Forms of popular culture, like pop groups, television shows, and candies, are recycled and brought back. Halligan puts it in a perspective of Eastern Bloc where the phenomenon of Ostalgie appears: a longing for the life of socialism before the close of the Cold War. A similar phenomenon, Yugonostalgia, appears in some former Yugoslavian republics, especially Croatia, where longing for the prosperity of socialism and Josip Broz Tito is quite a common thing. Batcho looked at nostalgia from a psychological angle. She pointed out that there are two types of nostalgia, historical and personal. Longing for our past is referred to as personal and longing and preferring a distant era is termed historical nostalgia. She states in her research that nostalgia is especially likely to occur during periods of transition, like maturing into adulthood or aging into retirement, or during dislocation resulting from military conflict and moving to a new country, but also during technological progression. Another psychologist, Iver, argues that nostalgia was once a clinically recognised illness, yet today is acknowledged as an indicator of good psychic health.

An important connection has been drawn between nostalgia and childhood in Squire’s study. She researched Beatrix Potter’s work and tourism sites related to her. She quotes Drabble, who has described Potter’s books as an ‘opening a window into an imaginative world which does not fade with childhood’ (1987, 265; Squire 1994). Although Potter is associated with childhood, attractions connected to her are primarily visited by the adults. This kind of experience ‘brings back memories of childhood’, allows adults to tangibly reconnect with aspects of their child-life, even their memories associated with their children or their imagined memories. It also lets them indulge in dreams and idylls that are pushed aside once they return home to their everyday lives. Squire also quotes Williams, who argued that this kind of nostalgia is transferal between parent and child and subsequently enacted through tourism.

To understand the connection between the fairy tale tourism in Croatia and its visitors, the following research question is formed: In what ways and to what extent are the expectations of different age groups met in Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales, if measured by their experiences? To answer this question more efficiently, some sub-questions have been formed: In what ways are visitors’ narratives and expectations shaped by the museum’s promotion on their web page? How are visitors’ narratives and expectations shaped by other sources, e.g., blogs and social media? In what way is the museum’s narrative shaping visitors’ experiences? How does the
museum deal with other narratives, like national identity and nostalgia? Since nothing has been written about Ivana’s house of fairy tales in terms of visitors, their expectations and experiences, and the aspects museum deal with, this thesis will bring new insight into the understanding of fairy tale tourism.

Methodology

The methodology used for this research is extensive, with the comparison of results of the research allowing considerable insight into how different age groups react to and perceive Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales. These results show what kind of attractions are liked and needed, what should be the target group, as well as showing how the museum deals with specific aspects like identity and nostalgia.

The first part of the research includes an extensive and in-depth analysis of literature written on literary tourism aspects like tourist typology, literary tourists, tourist motivations, volunteers in literary tourism, landscape and literary places, literary routes, performance, authenticity, national identity, technology, nostalgia, and childhood. Pre-tour narratives are reconstructed by discourse analysis of the museum’s official webpage, social media sites Facebook, Instagram and TripAdvisor, and three travel blogs. Two essential theories have been identified and used in the later shown on-site analysis of the museum: du Guy’s circuit of culture and Kempiak’s model of the heritage visitor experience.

In du Guy’s circuit of culture model, as briefly mentioned in the theoretical framework, five cultural processes interrelate: representation, identification, production, consumption, regulation.
Figure 1. The circuit of culture model

Source: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317415427_PhD_Thesis_-_Perspectives_on_proximity_tourism_in_Fryslan/figures?lo=1

Representation is a process by which members of culture produce meaning. It is not derived directly from the object, but from how the object is represented, and it can then take on a range of cultural meanings. In museums, meanings are created through classification and display, and they are not only concerned with objects, but also with ideas. Elements of the exhibitions combine to articulate meanings and represent culture. Production refers to the processes involved in producing the artefact. It refers to the culture of production itself, its ‘way of life’, involving cultural intermediaries who produce meanings through encoding artefacts: designers of the museum building, exhibition designers, and marketing experts. Instead of preserving, displaying, interpreting and communicating objects, curators can reflect people’s selves to them through objects, as well as give meaning to object through juxtaposition to the persona, national and international context. Consumption is seen as being the very centre of which we construct our identities; we become what we consume. Museums are dependent for their survival on the public, so they must appeal to them by making the exhibition meaningful. The more dependent museums are on the public, the degree of influence of the public over the museum increases. Regulation means that the object is both public and private; public refers to the formal institutions, while private means the realm of the personal. It also refers to the removal of boundaries between the public and the private. Museums reinforce and promote the dominant power base and exclude minority groups, which are marginalised in society. Identity is often claimed to be fixed and unchanged to create a sense of belongingness, while in fact, it is relational, and the difference is established by marking concerning others. McLean quotes Hall, who suggests five elements that combine to tell the narrative of national culture. The first
element is the narrative of the nation as it is told and retold in national history, literature, media, and popular culture. Secondly, he names origins, continuity, tradition, and timelessness of the national character. Next, he names the invention of tradition and the foundational myths which locate the origin of the nation. In this way, in emerging nations, museums play a significant role in reinventing these identities. The fifth element he identifies is the idea that national identity is grounded in ‘folk’ original people, which is illustrated by the popularity of folk museums in Europe in the twentieth century. McLean also quotes Urry who argues that museums offer rituals, artefacts of past generations, which help people regain a lost sense of place.

In connection with du Gay’s model, another important model has been used: Kempiak’s model of the heritage visitor experience. She quotes Chen and Chen, who claim that the tourism industry and heritage tourism sector are strongly associated with the consumption of experience. She suggests a model divided into three parts: pre visitation, in situ visitation and post visitation, which may lead to revisit. This model illustrates that visitors can be motivated by a variety of ‘pull’ and ‘push’ factors that influence their intentions to visit a heritage attraction. Pre visitation experience depends on several factors. Kempiak quotes different authors who identified pre-visit information, opening times, parking facilities, accessibility of the site and signage, as well as the planning stage of the visit, museum websites, pre-visit instructional materials, etc. In situ visitation experience is influenced by four different factors: information, communication, engagement, and atmospherics.

![Figure 2. The heritage visitor experience- conceptual framework](source)

Primarily, information is the core of the purpose of heritage attractions. In this way, the provision of information enables visitors to obtain new or expand already existing knowledge (Calver and Page 2013; Kempiak 2017). Guidebooks, brochures, and leaflets available on site play an essential role, whilst it is crucial that site management provides key information in a variety of languages. However, it is important to note that the site should be designed in a way that does not ‘overload’ visitors with the information. In terms of communication, Kempiak states the value of interpretative media, like information and display boards, which stimulates visitors’ learning process and makes their experience more memorable. Interactive exhibitions are perceived as more attractive and tourists are more likely to spend more time exploring the interactive display, rather than observing a traditional static gallery. When it comes to engagement, Kempiak states that educational facilities positively influence visitors’ behaviour by creating a more engaging experience. Acquisition of knowledge may enhance overall tourist satisfaction. Atmospherics are often referred to as the service which helps visitors gain ‘the sense of the place’: physical environment, spatial layout, and functionality, colours, brightness, sizes, shapes, volumes, smells and temperature are just some of the factors many authors argued on. The post-visit stage is an inseparable part of the experience when visitors assess various elements of their experience and their overall satisfaction such as visit duration, which is connected to the amount of information and the type of travel arrangements, acquisition of knowledge which is connected to motivational factors of visitors who do not always desire to learn but to have fun, and the satisfaction which is strongly related to service quality and value. The last stage is a possibility of a revisit; Kempiak argues that it is crucial to create a meaningful and memorable experience which may result in visitors’ loyalty and competitive advantage.

Primary research was conducted in Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales in Ogulin, Croatia on two consecutive Saturdays, 30th of March and 6th of April 2019. The research was structured as a form of short discursive interviews divided into two parts: before and after the visit to the museum. Four questions were asked before the respondent entered the museum, and the other seven were asked after their visit. This research structure, including the on-site museum narrative analysis that was done before the interviews were conducted, was chosen to explore what the visitors expected before their visit, and what their experiences were after their visit. These included questions concerning the visitor’s previous knowledge of the museum, their reasons to visit, their expectations, as well as their experiences and different aspects of the experience, like what they liked or how they felt. Interviews were chosen as a research method due to their ability to bring more in-depth investigation of the theme. These interviews allowed
me to visually see their reactions, and if the respondents are telling the truth. I was also able to ask sub-questions and explain if something was not clear. Interviews were also recorded to enable a more in-depth analysis of every response once I had all the responses from both before and after their visit.

I expected to interview at least ten respondents for each of the four age groups: children aged 5 to 12, teenagers aged 13 to 17, young adults aged 18 to 30, and adults aged 30 and more. The problem occurred when there were no teenagers to interview, and in both days, only two children were visiting the museum, and they were not cooperative enough for the interviews to be useable. I ended up with only ten responses from young adults and ten for adults which were analysed to see the differences between these two age groups. All respondents were Croatian due to the lack of international visitors, and I did not take gender into account. I also expected to observe visitors during the tour, but as there was not a sufficient number of visitors, it felt awkward to walk and watch visitors, so I excluded this aspect of the research. Children’s experiences were then analysed through entries in the visitors’ book that is available in the museum, and discourse analysis was once again used to analyse experiences through online reviews on Google, TripAdvisor, and Facebook.

The research was performed in a friendly yet serious manner. The lady that worked at the entrance first introduced me, briefly explained what I am doing, and asked the visitors if they wanted to participate in my research. When the visitors heard it is for a thesis at a foreign university, they were all very interested in what I am doing, and they all agreed to participate. I interviewed visitors one by one, and I stepped to the side so that others could not hear or intervene, reintroduced myself again and asked them if they are comfortable with me recording them. I asked the first set of questions concerning their expectations and prior knowledge and explained that I would also have questions after they visit the museum. Once they got out of the museum, I continued in the same manner. I asked the second set of questions, letting them speak and not interfering or giving my own opinion. The questions were proposed openly, so as to not influence the direction visitor’s answers would go. Once the interview was finished, I thanked them, and almost all of them asked me afterwards what exactly I am studying and what kind of research it is and wished me luck. After the on-site research, I re-listened to the interviews, wrote down their answers in an excel table, and grouped them thematically into clusters for a more accessible analysis.

Whilst at first parts of this research seem isolated, they were formed to complement one another. The analysis of the museum discourse was done to understand the narratives that are formed by
the museum on site, complementing the narratives researched and analysed through social
media and other websites that worked on the museum’s promotion. Understanding the
narratives and the museum discourse is crucial to understand visitor’s expectations and
experiences. Their expectations depend on the narratives they either created on their own, or
they found online or in other sources, like schools. Models that were used for the on-site
analysis could also be adapted to analyse the interviews, whilst the theoretical framework can
also be applied to all parts of the research.

This thesis is split into different chapters. Firstly, a pre-tour analysis of the official webpage of
the museum, social media sites, and travel blogs will be presented. After that, the thesis
continues with an on-site analysis of the museum, as well as the visitor’s research analysis that
will be split into two parts: before and after the visit to the museum. Lastly, an analysis of online
reviews from different social media will be presented, which will lead to the conclusion of this
thesis.

1. PRE-TOUR ANALYSIS

Narratives and pre-tour expectations were reconstructed by discourse analysis of social media
sites, official internet page of the Ivana’s house of fairy tales, and three travel blogs that mention
the museum. Online sources were chosen because of the increasing number of internet users in
all age groups. According to Statista, there were 3.9 billion internet users worldwide, as well as
2.53 billion smartphone users in 2018. According to Batinić, due to internet appearance, there
have been changes in the tourism business. Each serious subject in the tourism industry has a
website as the internet offers the possibility of expansion and rapid data transfer; contemporary
tourism businesses are characterized by the implementation of various online booking systems;
organization and distribution costs are decreased; new online intermediaries are created, and
the internet allows high-quality and effective marketing. Guidebooks were planned to be added
to the analysis as the counterpart to online resources, but the museum was not mentioned in any
guidebooks for Croatia that were available for the analysis\(^1\).

\(^1\) Guidebooks analysed were Lonely planet, National Geographic, and Time Out
1.1. Official Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales webpage

The official internet page of the museum begins with entries from the visitor’s book. To open the menu on the page, you will see at least one entry from the book. Apart from the visitor’s book, the first thing you see is a short introduction of the museum which states that ‘Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales is a unique multimedia and interactive visitor’s centre which celebrates fairy tales and their makers’ (Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales 2019). The page itself is colourful yet dark with green and yellow tones, and the pictures in the back are showing children walking around the museum, smiling or running. Two menu sections offer workshops, exhibitions, and projects, as well as an ‘About us’ section and ‘Plan your visit’ section. The project section shows a unique project still in progress that will form a database of fairy tales from all around Europe (so far, only some of Ivana’s works have been uploaded). Another project is the interactive map of theme routes that lead visitors through different attractions in the region while maintaining the fairy tale-like atmosphere. There are four different routes that are currently available only in Croatian: two biking routes, a botanical route, and a fairy tale route that leads through locations that are connected to Ivana’s life and her stories. Workshops are either creative or educative, adapted to different age groups, and they are always changing with activities such as puzzles, drawing contests, scavenger hunts and searches for magical objects, writing workshops, crown games, quizzes, board games, etc.

The ‘Exhibition’ section shortly explains that the exhibition is based on the principles of knowledge, creativity and the use of new technologies, as well as giving an overview of attractions in the exhibition: the magic forest, enchanted castle hallways, magic mirror, the fireplace, fairy tale library, and the chamber of mystery. The magic forest is described as a gateway into the world of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić where the trees narrate episodes from Ivana’s life, as well as stories from her books, and it is a place where ‘clever heads and capable hands can put together a real fairy tale’. Enchanted castle hallways are the place where a visitor can get busy with exploring fairy tales: what are they, who writes, collects and narrates them, and what are they about. The magic mirror of Bjesomar is described as a secret corner of the castle which reveals the ‘wondrous inner image of all who walk into it’. Only those who listen carefully can get a ‘monstrous’ picture as a keepsake. The fireplace is a ‘warm’ corner of the house where visitors can listen to fairy tales in the ‘Fairy tale jukebox’. Fairy tale library is where visitors can find numerous books of fairy tales and about them, and special attention is given to collecting valuable first editions of fairy tales. The chamber of mystery is described as a multifunctional space located in the centre of the enchanted castle. Here, visitors can watch
three educational animated movies or play an interactive game, however it can also serve as a stage for theatrical productions, concerts, and other events. McLean states in her article that the meaning of a museum object is derived from the way in which the object is represented, and these descriptions are very well written. They are telling just enough to let the readers know what kind of content and objects to expect from the exhibition, yet they are written in a mysterious magical manner to interest the readers into creating their narrative and invite them for a visit to see how that content is represented, and is it magical as it sounds. McLean also states that by visiting the museum, readers will decode and encode the museum’s exhibition and create their palimpsest of meanings, which is encouraged in this museum.

The ‘Mission and vision’ section is the most crucial part of the website. Here, the museum states a few very important points. The mission is to ‘celebrate the writings of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and to use fairy tales to inspire a love of reading, knowledge, and creative expression’ (Ivana’s house of fairy tales 2019). The museum states one more important goal in their mission section: by promoting the knowledge of fairy tales they will encourage intercultural exchange and enhance the cultural and tourist prosperity of Ogulin, while actively contributing to the development of the city and improving the quality of life of its inhabitants. In connection with their mission, the museum states its vision to see Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales becoming one of the most popular cultural and tourist attractions in Croatia, and Ogulin becoming one of the most desirable places to live in Croatia. They believe that generations of children that have and will grow up in the ‘Homeland of Fairy Tales’ within an inspiring, multicultural, fairy tale surrounding will have positive effects on their personal and professional development, as well as on their sense of pride, creativity, and innovativeness. Thanks to several new and creative workplaces, these generations have and will decide to stay in their hometown where numerous small and medium businesses have been started, particularly within the service sector, which complements the offer of Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales. Day-trippers. However, visitors from all over Europe have started and will continue coming to the museum. The European dimension of the museum is also evident in the dynamic international cooperation realised through numerous EU-funded projects. The museum has become a part of the curriculum of educational institutions, and with its business model that is successful, with the centre inspiring a number of similar attractions connected with the ‘Homeland of Fairy Tales’ in both Ogulin and Croatia. The museum also states four values that form the basis of the museum’s activities: excellence in creativity and innovativeness, knowledge, partnership and networking, and spirit of place. The first important aspect is multiculturality and the European dimension of the museum. The museum carries the name of a Croatian writer, and Ivana’s works are an essential part of
Croatian literary heritage that has been included in the curriculum in schools as mandatory reading for more than 50 years. However, the museum, in its opening sentence, says that it celebrates fairy tales and their makers, meaning that they are not a museum dedicated only to Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and Croatian literary heritage, also stating the European dimension and multiculturality as the more important aspects than the Croatian national identity in that sense. All European nations with different cultural backgrounds are invited, and everyone can get ‘inspired’; hence, the intercultural exchange and prosperity for Ogulin. The site also mentions numerous, but unnamed EU-funded projects through which international cooperation has been realised: the value of partnership and networking is the foundation for developing creativity, increasing the knowledge, and expanding museum’s professional and living horizons. As such, the museum is working on more of a European identity than a Croatian identity. Going back to McLean, she says that even though identity is often claimed to be fixed and unchanged to create a sense of belongingness, it is actually a relational matter that creates symbolical relation to others. In this case, it is a matter of relation to other Europeans, and a sense of belongingness to Europe rather than to just Croatia, and that way we go back to the importance of multiculturality for tourism development of not only Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales but the whole region and Ogulin as well.

The aspect that is predominantly connected to Croatian identity is the tourist development of Ogulin, focusing on revitalisation of a region that has been witnessing depopulation since the Croatian War of Independence in 1991 (Croatian Bureau of Statistics 2019). The aftermath of the war led to emigration, which was even more enhanced because of a large population of Serbs living in this region that still constitutes around 20 % of the Ogulin population. Through the years, depopulation became a huge problem, and with that came other issues such as the aging of the population, lack of jobs, and brain drain phenomenon. The museum states in their vision that the opening of the museum started to encourage openings of numerous small and medium businesses which led to new workplaces for future generations that will not migrate, but choose to stay in their hometown where they grew up in an inspiring, multicultural surroundings. By growing up in this new kind of surrounding, new generations would be happier, more open-minded to multiculturality, their fellow citizens and foreign tourists, which would lead to Ogulin becoming one of the leading cultural locations for tourists, but also becoming a prosperous place to live in. The value that the museum mentions that is connected to this is the spirit of place that Croatians are known for. By bringing up the positive feelings and positive influences like this museum in a culturally rich but a financially and demographically poor region, the true spirit of the region and Ogulin’s inhabitants would
become visible. In this way, hospitality, goodness and modesty of the people whose heritage was influenced by so many different historical events and local happenings, but also the magical beauty of the natural heritage that brings out the magical spirit which gave the whole region its name: the ‘Homeland of fairy tales’.

The final aspect that is important to discuss is the aspect of technology. Through the museum’s webpage, it is mentioned multiple times that it is an interactive multimedia centre where new technologies are used to enhance excellence in creativity and innovativeness, particularly for programmes and museographic interpretations of fairy tale heritage and acquiring and transmitting knowledge. Most of the parts of the exhibition are described as interactive and modern: talking trees, fairy tale jukebox, animated movies, and interactive games are just some of them. The webpage also mentions two important modern technology projects: the fairy tale database and the interactive routes. Even though the webpage does not directly mention the feeling of nostalgia, through the use of technology it becomes inevitable. As previously discussed in the introduction, visual technology creates an opportunity to ‘summon’ the past, and the nostalgic properties of an object, in this case, the modern technology exhibition, are speaking directly to visitor’s memories and emotions.

The final promotional ‘product’ that this webpage offers is multifaceted. The museum promotes itself as an interactive multimedia centre with pictures of children, colourful images, and children’s entries from the visitor’s book that are the first apparent clues that it is a museum fitted for children. Similarly, the narrative they are promoting is that it is not only a museum about Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and her fairy tales, but about fairy tales of international writers as well. In this way, the museum speaks to international visitors. However, when delving into a more in-depth analysis of the mission and the vision of this museum, it becomes evident that the museum wants to create a more serious layer to it. It works on a multicultural level at which it promotes international collaboration and tolerance, knowledge, technology, but also prosperity for the local population, and in that aspect, it is a centre for adults.

1.2. Social media sites

Social media sites included in this analysis were Facebook, Instagram, and TripAdvisor, chosen because of their popularity. According to Statista, in the first quarter of 2019 there were 2.38 billion active Facebook users, and in 2018 there were one billion active Instagram users and 730 million reviews and opinions on TripAdvisor. As mentioned in the introduction, Bruner says that travellers use the internet to search for up-to-date information, for communication, but
also for their contribution to the site they are visiting, which for this analysis, is the most important aspect. Facebook and TripAdvisor were also used for later analysis of online reviews. The museum doesn’t have an Instagram page; it has only been briefly promoted through three pictures on the official Instagram page of the Ogulin Tourist board in 2016. The three pictures are showing the inside of the museum: two pictures are showing people, and one is showing a part of the museum. In one of the pictures there are children with a lady dressed as Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić. She is the official guide in the museum, and in the picture, she is sitting in front of the virtual fireplace, telling children a tale, or a story about Ivana, and children are listening to her. This photo is dark but warm, with the fireplace giving a warm feeling, and the children are focused on the guide. The other picture is showing visitors of different ages standing in the magic forest in front of the talking trees. This photo is also dark with green shades, and it has a mystical, magical feeling to it, like a real forest. The third picture does not show visitors, but the tree of fairy tale writers; it is one of the most important parts of the exhibition. These pictures are using hashtags #storytelling, #storyteller, #fairytale, #family, #ivanabrlicmazuranic, #visitorscenter #visitcroatia, #heritage, #nonmaterialheritage, but also writer’s names #christianandersen, #märchen, #brothersgrimm, and #charlesperrault. Hashtags with names are showing the idea behind the museum’s vision: the names of European writers show the European dimension in the museum. They also indirectly attract foreign visitors; when searching for these writer’s names on Instagram, this photo appears next to other posts showing other European locations connected to fairy tales, as well as drawings, pictures, and videos connected to the writers, and it awakens the interest amongst the users. Other hashtags are focusing on representing the museum, what goes on in it and what to expect from it. It is a fairy tale museum that represents Croatian literary heritage, with a warm home-like family atmosphere on one side (the fireplace photo), fairy tale-like magical atmosphere on the other side (the magical forest photo), and at the same time being a modern educational visitors centre with an international character (the tree of writers photo).

When searching for the hashtags #ivaninakucabajke, #ivaninakućabajke, #ivaninakucabajki, #ivaninakućabajki and #ivanashouseoffairytales on Instagram, there are 62 public posts available, as well as 39 public posts that are tagged in the location Ivanina kuća bajke/Ivana’s house of fairy tales. They are photos from the inside of the museum, its attractions and people in the museum, and they are all posted by Croatian people. Photos that are showing people are mostly people taking selfies in the magic forest, or they had others take photos of them in the magic forest or the talking trees. These photos are dark with green shades, just like the promotional photo that the Ogulins tourist board posted. In the photos people are smiling, they
are either alone, with their family and children, or with their friends. Some people also pose on the front porch of the museum in front of the placard so that it is visible on the photo that they are visiting Ivana’s house of fairy tales. Photos that are not of people are mostly showing the tree of writers, either from afar or up close, and some parts of the exhibition on the enchanted castle hallways. There are also some pictures of Bjesomar and his mirror, and some pictures of the animated movies and these photos are also mostly dark, as the whole museum is very dark with limited lighting. On these posts people were using similar hashtags as on the three promotional photos from the Ogulin tourist board: #fairytale, #familyday, #familytrip, #croatianandersen, #heritage, but also #returntochildhood, #nostalgia, #creative, #magical and #fantasy. The posts are showing that people who posted these photos were satisfied with the museum, showing their followers and others that they had fun, posting photos of parts of the museum that they found were the best, such as the tree of writers, or the most ‘photogenic’, such as the magic forest. Their descriptions and hashtags are creating a narrative of a family place, a magical and creative place that brought up nostalgic childhood feelings.

TripAdvisor has a minimal amount of information on the museum, with the About section remaining empty. There are only 16 reviews that will be analysed later in this thesis, but the museum is ranked as #1 of seven things to do in Ogulin, and there are 22 photos posted by users. The first and the biggest photo you see when you open the museum’s site on TripAdvisor is a photo of the museum from the outside, and not even from the front site, but from the back side. Another seven pictures are showing the museum from the outside from different angles: front door, front porch with the placard, and the museum from afar. Two pictures are showing a child in the museum, posing in front of the tree of writers, and the rest of the pictures are showing the enchanted castle hallways, Bjesomar and his mirror, talking trees, and the fireplace; no photos are showing animated movies. These photos are of worse quality than the ones on Instagram. Some of them are blurry, and they are not posed, edited in Instagram filters, or chosen because they are ‘photogenic’. These pictures are showing the museum from different angles, but they don’t say a lot about the museum or the experiences the visitors had. As such, in this segment, the reviews are more important than the pictures.

The museum has had an official Facebook page since 2015 under the name Ivanina kuća bajki/ Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales with a number of 3,199 likes, 3,236 people following the museum, and 727 check-ins so far². The About section is written only in Croatian, and the text is very similar to the one on the webpage, stating that it is a multimedia and interactive visitor’s centre.

² Data was checked on 2nd of May 2019.
which tries to enhance the love for reading, knowledge, and creating. It also says that it is a museum with creative new technologies that celebrates fairy tales, not only of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić but of other Croatian and world-known writers. There is also the Events section, where museum’s events were posted such as Open days in 2018 when the entrance was free, Night of the museums\(^3\) in Ivana’s house of fairy tales in 2018, 2017, and 2016, Science festival in 2017, Ivana’s birthday in 2017, World storytelling day in 2017, Tell a fairy tale day in 2016, and Storytelling weekend in 2016. The reviews section will be analysed later on in this thesis. Apart from the photos, the museum posts about their other activities and news about the museum, like the acceptance of the museum into the Federation of European storytelling. FEST is in an international non-profit organisation based in Belgium that promotes the mobility of ideas and collaborations in and across Europe to enhance the empowerment of the world of storytelling; Ivana’s house of fairy tales became a member in 2018.

There are 452 photos posted by the page, and they are organized into albums: Ivana’s house of fairy tales, Ivana’s literary competition works, Best photo contest photos, Profile pictures, Second birthday of Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales, Cover photos, European museum of the year award, Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić’s birthday 2016, Mobile uploads, Meet and greet with writer Sanja Lovrenčić, Class with Ivana 2018, and Timeline photos. Mobile uploads and Timeline photos are albums of pictures from regular everyday visitors, workshops, and tours, as well as photos of Croatian president Kolinda Grabar-Kitarović visiting the museum in 2018, but also from museum presentations in the Ogulin municipality and Karlovac county, different conferences like the one about the revitalisation of intangible heritage in Šibenik in 2018, and various museum promotions like the one during the Advent festival in Zagreb also in 2018. These photos demonstrate the fun events happening in the museum or about the museum: literary events and contests, workshops for both children and adults, but also pictures from more momentous and serious events like the European museum of the year award. The photos are, like the ones on TripAdvisor, not edited, but are still chosen wisely. All the photos of children are happy, and all the workshop photos are showing busyness and fun, while on the other hand the pictures from more serious events are posed and are showing important people and important places for museum’s promotion. These photos, but also the events created by the page, give an image of a busy, nationally important, and an eventful place that is offering content for both children and adults, and that can be taken both seriously and fun.

---

\(^3\) The night of the museums is a national event in Croatia, happening every year on one Friday evening in February. Museums around Croatia are offering special program and workshops that evening, as well as free entrance.
1.3. Travel blogs

Travel blogs were chosen for the analysis because of the increasing popularity of blogs among young travellers looking for locations and sites that are not ‘sugar-coated’ but presented as they are. Three travel blogs are mentioning Ivana’s house of fairy tales: Croatia in your pocket, Mapping Croatia, and The red phone box travels.

‘Croatia in your pocket’ is a blog that is part of the more prominent travel portal In your pocket; invented by three German friends in 1991, this portal has several branches of blogs for different countries, where locals write blog posts with not only travel stories, but the stories about fashion, events, culture, gastronomy, and other uncategorized themes connected to Croatia. The blog post that mentions Ivana’s house of fairy tales was written on the 11th of January 2019, and it already gives out the idea of what to expect from the museum in the title: ‘Magic, Mystery & Morals — The Wonderful World of Croatian Fairy tales’. The article talks about the moral and ethical importance of stories for children, whilst also talking about Croatian fairy tales, Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, her stories, and her life. The article calls the museum an interactive centre that allows visitors to engage Ivana’s stories, gives an overview of attractions that you will see in the museum, and it says that it is an absolute ‘must-see’ for anyone in search of creative inspiration and true spirit of the Croatian nation. This true spirit that the writer mentions in this blog post can easily be connected to the spirit of place indicated on the webpage of the museum: it is about hospitality, goodness, modesty, and the magical beauty of the natural heritage.

Mapping Croatia is a Croatian blog site that gives offers ‘beyond main tourist attractions’. Their blog posts cover themes like Croatian islands, day trips, things to do, Croatian castles, etc. The blog post that mentions Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and her museum was written on Women’s day 8th of March 2019, and conveniently the title is ‘Women in Croatian history’. The article talks about other important Croatian women writers and other artists, and Ivana is the second woman mentioned in the article. The article tells a short story about her life and her most famous works, it compares her to other global fairy tale writers, and it mentions the museum as a unique interactive place that celebrates fairy tales and their makers.

The red phone box travels blog is the only blog that wrote about Ivana’s house of fairy tales that is not primarily a blog about Croatia, but about travels of a Croatian woman. The blog post called ‘My babymoon last year’ was posted on the 9th of August 2018, and it talks about her weekend experience in Croatian region Gorski kotar. She writes about other places she visited in that region, she writes about Ogulin, and she mentions the museum. She writes that the
museum is an interesting multimedia and interactive centre focusing not only on Ivana and her work but fairy tales in general. She also says that it is a fun experience for children and everyone that feels young at heart.

Comparing these three blogs, it is crucial to notice the similarities. All three posts wrote about the museum similarly, calling it an interactive centre about fairy tales. Through reading their descriptions, it is easily noticed that they took the specifications of the museum from its official webpage, which means that the same narrative of the museum is promoted through blogs as is on the webpage: it is an interactive multimedia centre that celebrates works of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, as well as fairy tales of other famous writers.

2. ON-SITE MUSEUM ANALYSIS

I visited the museum for the first time on the first day of the research, the 30th of March 2019. As I already mentioned in the methodology section, the museum lacked sufficient customers during my visit, so I had enough time and peace to explore, and it was not crowded. To do the on-site analysis of Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales, some elements of two theories and models which are essential for an on-site analysis will be used: du Gay’s circuit of culture and Kempiak’s model of the heritage visitor experience. What these two theories have in common is the way they are trying to understand how, for this case, heritage objects and the site, as well as heritage experiences are constructed, conceptualized, and consumed. To make the best use of these two models, the analysis will be split into parts of the museum, where for each part of the museum, different aspects of these models will be analysed.

Ogulin is a small city located in the wooded area of Croatia, within which the museum is the very centre of the city. It is situated in the courtyard of a medieval castle, which immediately, along with the forests, creates the fairy tale atmosphere. In terms of du Gay’s process of representation, but also Herbert’s view on landscape, Hemme states the importance of the meaning of a forest as a setting and imagined landscape for fairy tales, alongside knights, princesses, and castles. The landscape here plays an important role. Once you enter the courtyard, you see a little traditionally built house, and you enter the museum. The museum has a small entrance hall where you buy tickets and souvenirs on your way out later. The lady working at the counter expected me, she was friendly and smiling, not only to me but to other visitors as well. She also told me that another lady that works there dresses up as Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić to do organised tours, enhancing the engagement in the museum, as well as the
communication values of the museum. I asked her a few other questions, such as if many international tourists are coming and is it more crowded during the week or the weekend. However, she said that still after six years the majority of tourists are Croatians, but that they are trying hard to attract international tourists. She also told me that during the week they sometimes have schools visiting, and that weekends depend on the weather forecast: if it is sunny outside, they will not have as many visitors due to other activities possible around Ogulin, such as climbing the mountain Klek, cycling on different cycling routes, or relaxing and fishing on the lake Sabljaci.

Upon entering the museum’s exhibition, the first thing you notice is the atmospherics. The room turns dark, and the sounds become loud. The first part of the exhibition is the magic forest, and green tones and forest sounds create the atmosphere and the ‘sense of place’ that is a part of the pre-tour narrative as seen on the webpage and social media. There are no texts in this part of the museum; here, the talking trees will tell you stories about Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, her life, a story of a tree that lived in her courtyard, and some of her fairy tales. In the magic forest, there is also a magic mirror of Bjesomar, the emperor of wood demons. When you step in front of the mirror, Bjesomar appears on the mirror and starts talking to you, explaining who he is, and telling you about his forest. Once you get to know him, he says that he will make you a forest demon and tell you your unique magical ability, but you first must make a funny face. The mirror then takes your photo, and Bjesomar shows you how you would look like if you were a forest demon, explaining your unique magical ability. You can buy the photo of your forest demon and of you making a funny face in the souvenir shop. These two attractions serve a different purpose: talking trees are providers of information, in either Croatian, English or German, on Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and her work, which Kempiak states in her model are the core purpose of heritage attractions. On the other hand, the magic mirror provides no real information about the site or the object of the museum but serves as a communicational and engaging attraction to once again enhance the ‘sense of place’; as Kempiak argues, interpretative media create a more engaging and memorable experience.

The museum continues in a circular direction, and after the magic forest, you enter the enchanted castle hallways. Here, the atmospherics are a bit different. Lights suddenly turn brighter in yellow tones, with a big entanglement of text appearing on the walls. Here, a new narrative starts. On the walls in a circle, there is information on ‘What is what in fairy tales?’ and what a fairy tale actually is, how they come to life, and what their origins are. The text is dappled with modern drawings of different fairy tale characters, like witches, dragons, goblins,
etc. On the left wall, that continues through the museum in a circle, you can read a fairy tale about a royal cook who saves the princess from the evil dragon and ends up marrying her. I have not managed to find the origins of this tale, which leads me to believe that it was made up especially for the museum. As already mentioned in the introduction, McLean states that we can construct identities by producing meanings with which we can identify and memories which connect the present with the past. In this case, this fairy tale was constructed to create a meaning every visitor can identify with. It is a generic story with all the characteristics of all famous European fairy tales we know of, like castles, dragons, and princesses. This then connects to the multicultural aspect, as well as the European dimension of the museum mentioned in the webpage analysis. As such, the museum is creating an international European narrative, rather than a Croatian one.

Another part of the enchanted hallways can be connected to the European dimension of the museum: the tree of writers. Surprisingly not mentioned on the website, the tree of writers takes up a big piece of the wall, where a big title reads ‘Fairy tales, who writes them?’. Here, the central piece is an interactive screen where you can read something about a number of famous writers, but more importantly, out of the screen there are drawn branches spreading across the wall, on which are names and faces of writers like the Grimm brothers, Hans Christian Andersen, Charles Perrault, and Aleksandar Puškin, as well as Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić. Du Guy’s form of representation and production is not focusing on an object or an artefact here, but an idea: the tree represents genealogy of the European identity. Ivana is not only a part of Croatian heritage and identity, but she is a part of a European community, and by visiting the museum, everyone can be a part of Europe, and identify with this narrative. This can be connected to Hemme’s case study where the guide shows visitors the ‘Tree of generations’ to remind them of the importance of their roots, but he still includes the international folk material in his tour.

As the enchanted hallways continue, one small corner has a different atmosphere. It is darker, but with red tones and a fireplace, creating the warm and home-like atmosphere in the museum. The fireplace is an interactive screen on which fire demons domaći from Slavic mythology and Ivana’s tales appear. Around it are cupboards with books, and here you can sit and either listen to stories being told by different characters in the fireplace, or you can read the tales on your own. In one of the cupboards you can find old and precious editions of different stories and books behind the glass, like the first edition of the first Croatian picture book about health. These are the only real artefacts and objects in the museum, and they have a cultural meaning
of the historical importance. Similarly, other fairy tales that you can read are organized on those cupboards in folders, each folder is a different country. During my visit, I was able to find folders for Swedish, German, Polish, Portuguese, Irish, Scottish, Spanish, French, Danish, Greek, and Croatian tales. Unfortunately, I am unaware as to why other countries are not represented. It could be that some European countries do not have their tales, or that the museum has not collected their stories yet, but du Gay states that museums tend to reinforce and promote the dominant power base and exclude minority groups. In this case, museum promotes countries that are known for their writers and tales, like the Grimm brothers in Germany, or Andersen in Denmark, and excludes other countries that are less known in the fairy tale genre. Even neighbouring countries and countries which were once a part of Yugoslavia, or are today still an important minority in Croatia, like Serbia or Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The last part of the museum is the chamber of mystery, where the lights turn dark again to make the atmospherics appropriate for watching animated movies. Here, you can find a big screen, and a little interactive screen on which you can choose which animated movie you want to watch on the big screen: A magical escape about a brother and a sister, which is three minutes long and is appropriated for the youngest visitors, Ivana’s Ogulin adventure that is five minutes long, and There once was Ivana…, which is a ten minutes long interactive movie where you can pick questions about Ivana on the interactive screen, and the movie will answer them on the big screen. The animations are modern and very similar to the ones in the enchanted hallways. As someone who grew up on entirely differently designed cartoons from Zagreb animation school, which animated one of the most famous Ivana’s stories and the first Croatian novel for children, Lapitch the little shoemaker, I did not like these animated movies.

Once you finish your visit, you go back to the entrance, and you can buy souvenirs. Bruner states the importance of souvenirs in the post-tour narratives and experiences when master narratives become more personal, yet, the souvenir shop has a minimum offer. There are some books of different Croatian writers, and only one book is available in English. Other than books, there are postcards, stickers, magnets, shirts, and bags with the same designs of fairy tale characters as seen in the enchanted hallways. The only personal memory you can get from the museum is the already mentioned photo from the magic mirror: it creates a personal narrative, where everyone’s demon looks different, and everyone gets a different magical ability.

An important aspect that needs to be discussed are the feelings this museum brought out in me, a young Croatian adult with a master’s degree in geography education, a student in tourism and
culture master programme, and a folklore dancer with a huge interest in Croatian heritage but also heritage as a concept; a classic Wickens’s cultural heritage type. I had prior knowledge of Ivana and her works due to her importance in Croatian schools, but also due to my interest as a child when I had a CD-ROM with her stories and games connected to them. My excitement quickly turned into disappointment. As I already mentioned, I grew up on different imagery of her stories. Brittan says that technology fuels our nostalgia by making every image from our memory instantly available, however, I did not connect to these images provided by interactive technology due to them being completely different than images in my memory. It was different for my parents, who did not grow up on her imagery presented through cartoons and games. They only knew the stories, and their imagination, like Light states in his study, was the central element to the whole experience.

Another aspect in connection with du Gay’s model is my identification. As McLean claims that identity is relational, my Croatian identity felt ‘concealed’. If we consider Hall’s elements of the narrative of the national culture, almost none of them were present in the museum. The narrative of the Croatian nation, as well as the origins, continuity, tradition, and timelessness, were hidden: modern design and animations, central made-up fairy tale, and the constant accentuation of the European connections are ‘killing’ what one of the blogs analysed called the ‘true spirit of Croatian nation’. It also violates the Earl’s statement that literary visitors use literary places to maintain cultural distinction and assert the cultural capital. Generic images he mentions are here actually used to erase cultural differences. Notably, this congruences with the narrative on the museum’s webpage where they enhance the European dimension. I would have to say that in this case, it is my personal love and proudness for Croatian heritage that has ‘dimmed’ my objectivity towards the identities presented in the museum.

3. RESEARCH ANALYSIS

Interviews were held with two age groups: young adults younger than 30, and adults older than 30. These age groups are similar in some characteristics, however there are a number of distinctive contrasts. Young adults have either been very young, or have not been born, during the time of the Socialistic Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. Another characteristic was the assumption that the age group of young adults has not yet had children. According to Velde, first-time mothers in Europe are on average 29 years old. Interviewees were recorded and asked eleven short questions: four before they entered the museum, and seven after their visit. The
results will be analysed by each question, and the results for each age group will be compared for each question. The answers that were not simple (e.g., yes or no) were grouped thematically to make the analysis easier.

3.1. Pre-tour

The first question asked before the respondents entered the museum, was if they knew about the museum before their arrival to Ogulin (Figure 3). Seven young adults (70 %) and eight adults (80 %), 75 % of all respondents, said that they knew about the museum before they came to Ogulin. Only three young adults and two adults, 25 % of all respondents, said that they only learned about the museum once they came to Ogulin.

![Figure 3. Did you know about the museum before your arrival?](image)

Source: Research conducted in March and April 2019

When asked how they found out about the museum, three young adults (30 %) and 7 adults (70 %), 50 % of all respondents, said that they heard about it in the media. Two young adults and one adult, 15 % of all respondents, said they heard about it in their workplace (school or kindergarten), and two young adults said they heard about it at university or through their
family, and their responses were categorized as other, making it 10 % of all respondents (Figure 4).

Figure 4. How did you find out about the museum?
Source: Research conducted in March and April 2019

The third question that the respondents were asked before they entered the museum was why they came to visit the museum (Figure 5). Six young adults (60 %) and five adults (50 %), 55 % of all respondents, said that they were visiting Ogulin, so they decided to visit the museum as well, while one young adult and two adults, 20 % of all respondents, said that they were interested in the museum and its exhibition, and that it was the primary reason to visit Ogulin. One young adult and two adults, 15 % of all respondents, said that they came with family or a friend and that they had no real interest in the museum, while two young adults said that they went to the museum as a part of a work excursion (they work in a kindergarten). The ‘upon arrival’ category matches the number of people who did not know about the museum before they came to Ogulin, 25 % of all respondents.
When asked what they expect from the museum, different answers were given (Figure 6). Five young adults (50 %) and seven adults (70 %), 60 % of all respondents, said that they would like to get to know more about Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić herself and more about her life and her stories. Three young adults and three adults, 30 % of all respondents, said they expect to see something new and unusual, while two young adults, 10 % of all respondents, said that they expect something magical and creative.
When analysing responses for these four questions asked before their entrance to the museum, it is clear with what kind of prior knowledge, that Herbert argues for, visitors came to this museum: most respondents knew about the museum, with most of them saying that they heard about the museum in the media. Wickens states that at the macro level, visitors’ expectations are created by the marketing strategies which are reinforced by media representations. Since its opening, the museum has been in the media quite often for very positive reasons, and the one most important being the fact that it was nominated for the best European museum in 2016\(^4\). Another important aspect is that three respondents knew about the museum from their workplace; schools and kindergartens are a significant promotional factor for this museum due to Ivana’s work being mandatory reading in primary schools in Croatia, as well as through the museum’s promotion of itself on its webpage as a place that is included in the curriculum of educational institutions. It also shows in the percentage of 35% of visitors who work in schools or kindergartens. When asked what they expected from the museum, most of the respondents

\(^4\) European museum of the year is a reward that is annually rewarded to two kinds of museums: established museums that have undergone modernization or expansion during the past three years, or new museums opened to the public in the previous three years. In 2016, POLIN Museum of the History of Polish Jews in Warsaw won the award.
said that they expected to learn something about Ivana, her life and her fairy tales, confirming what Herbert states as the first reason why visitors come to literary places. Six people, 30% of all respondents, said that they expect something new and unusual, while two of them said that they expect something magical and creative. This shows an important part of the pre-tour narrative in terms of Bruner’s theory, in which the museum is promoted through their website and pictures on social media. It is promoted as a museum about Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, and that is what most of the people come to see, however it is also promoted as something magical and unusual, which is visible from the atmospherics shown on the aesthetics of the webpage, and social media pictures. All the visitors had their own narratives, created by different sources (schools and media), which were in their consciousness before they came to the museum. Despite this, a discordance appears once the respondents are asked why did they came to the museum: eleven people, 55% of all respondents, said that they were visiting Ogulin primarily, and then, later on, decided to visit the museum, three people said that they had no interest in the museum at all, and only four people, 30% of all respondents, came to the museum because they were actually interested in the museum itself. Kempiak noted that motivations for visiting heritage sites vary, and it also happened here. To most of the people, motivational factors were relaxation and pleasure of viewing other sites. In this case, the Ogulin itself, while only the small percentage had interest in learning about heritage itself. The problem here is not in the motivations of the visitors, but in the promotional efforts of the museum. Almost all of them knew about the museum, yet they were not interested enough to make it their primary reason of visiting Ogulin, but vice versa. This is where the promotional works of the museum for some reason fail.

When looking at the differences between the two age groups, it is visible that more adults knew about the museum, more adults heard about it from the media, and more adults were interested in the museum and Ivana’s life and stories in comparison to young adults. At first sight this is interesting since it is promoted as a modern interactive museum for younger generations, but at a second glance it makes sense as it could be connected to Squire’s study, which showed that although a site is associated with childhood, attractions are primarily attractive to adults because this kind of experience allows adults to tangibly reconnect with aspects of their child-life, and their memories, but also idylls that are pushed aside in their everyday life. Even though both age groups here are considered adults, the fact that young adults do not have children makes the distinction. They do not come to the museum with their children, they come for themselves. Another aspect is nostalgia. As Batcho notes, nostalgia is most likely to occur during periods
of transition, like maturing into adulthood, which in this case can be connected to the older age group maturing, having children and living stressful everyday lives, while some of the young adults might still be e.g., students living with their parents.

3.2. Post-tour

The first question that the respondents were asked after they finished touring the museum was if they liked it (Figure 7). Respondents who answered ‘not really, nah, no, nothing special, I don’t know’ were grouped as ‘no’. Nine young adults (90 %) and five adults (50 %), 70 % of all respondents, said that they liked the museum, while one young adult (10 %) and five adults (50 %), 30 % of all respondents, said that they did not like the museum.

![Figure 7. Did you like the museum?](image_url)

Source: Research conducted in March and April 2019

When asked what they liked the most in the museum, all ten adults and four young adults, 70 % of all respondents said that they liked the magic mirror the most (Figure 8). Three young adults said that they liked animated movies, with three young adults mentioning other things such as the book cupboard, audio fairy tales, and the magical atmosphere.
The next question was if there was something that they did not like in the museum, and the results are interesting (Figure 9). Some respondents gave several answers however the first answer was used for a more accessible analysis. Six young adults (60 %) and two adults (20 %), 40 % of all respondents, said that there was not a thing that they did not like in the museum. Interestingly, no young adults said that there was too much text to read in the museum. On the contrary, two young adults (20 %) said that the museum was too small. But, four adults (40 %) said that the museum had too much text to read, while none of the adults said that the museum was too small. One young adult and two adults, 15 % of all respondents, said that the museum was too dark in terms of lighting. One young adult said that the museum was not traditional but too modern for the theme, one adult said that she did not like the animated movies, and one adult said that the museum was boring. Their answers were categorized as other, making it 15 % of all respondents.
The next question the respondents were asked was what they would change in the museum (Figure 10). Some answers coincided with answers from the previous question. Five young adults (50\%) and two adults (20\%), 35\% of all respondents, said that they would add more content and make the museum bigger, while no young adults and four adults, 20\% of all respondents, said that they would like it to have less text. Significantly, a new aspect appeared here. Four young adults and two adults, 30\% of all respondents, said that they would add more souvenirs to the souvenirs shop. One young adult and one adult said that they would make the museum more interactive, and one adult said that she would change the animations to be more traditional. These answers were categorized as other, and they make 15\% of all respondents.
Figure 10. What would you change in the museum?

Source: Research conducted in March and April 2019

When asked how they felt in the museum, four young adults and four adults, 40 % of all respondents, said that they felt happy or good (Figure 11). Four young adults (40 %) and three adults (30 %), 35 % of all respondents, said that they felt nostalgic, and two young adults and one adult, 15 % of all respondents, said that they felt magical. One adult said that she felt disappointed, and one adult said that he felt bored. Their answers were categorized as other, and they make 10% of all respondents.
Next question the respondents were asked was if they thought the museum was primarily for children or adults (Figure 12). Interestingly, only one young adult, 5% of all respondents, thought it was a museum primarily for children, while one young adult and five adults, 30% of all respondents, thought it was a museum primarily for adults. Eight young adults (80%) and five adults (50%), 65% of all respondents, agreed that it was a museum for both age groups.
Figure 12. Do you think the museum is primarily for children or for adults?

Source: Research conducted in March and April 2019

The last question the respondents were asked was if they would like to revisit the museum (Figure 13). Seven young adults (70 %) said that they would like to visit the museum again, and the other three (30 %) said they would bring children from school or kindergartens where they work. Only three adults (30 %) said yes, and only one adult (10 %) said she would bring children from the school where she works. Not one young adult said that they would not like to visit the museum again, while six adults, 30 % of all respondents, said they would not like to visit the museum again.
When looking at the analysis of the questions asked after the respondents visited the museum, interesting results occur. Considering the simple question of liking and not liking the museum, opinions of young adults and adults were divided. While almost all young adults (90%) liked the museum, adults were not that amazed by it. Half of them liked it, and half of them did not. The main point of division between liking the museum and not liking it was the specific factor on which the distinction between two age groups was made: if the respondents had none, little or a lot of experience with children in their lives. Younger adults looked at the museum through different eyes than adults who either work in schools or kindergarten or who came to the museum with their children. Adults knew precisely what their children would like or what they would not like, while the young adults still looked at the museum for their satisfaction. It can be seen in the question of what they liked the most in the museum: an absolute hit in the museum is the magic mirror of Bjesomar, the king of forest demons. As the most interactive part of the museum where visitors actually get to interact with the screen, the magic mirror confirms Kempiak’s statement about the value of the interactive technology experience being more likeable and memorable. All the adults (100%) and 40% of young adults said that they liked the magic mirror the most, while the other things they mentioned were animated movies and audio fairy tales, things that adults thought of inappropriate for children. It is also visible in the
answers when respondents were asked if they thought the museum was primarily for children or adults. None of the adults said it was a museum for children, and 50% of them said it was a museum for adults, while almost all of the young adults (80%) thought it was a museum for both age groups, and one (10%) said it was a museum for adults. The same goes for the question if they would like to revisit the museum: 60% of adults said no, and only one adult that works in school said that she would like to bring children to the museum. This can be viewed alongside the question of what the respondents did not like in the museum where they were looking at different attention spans. 40% of adults said it had too much text for children and even for adults to concentrate, and 20% of adults said that the museum was too dark and that it would scare the children. As already mentioned in the introduction, Kempiak argued that the site should not be designed in a way which ‘overloads’ visitors with the information, yet young adults had the exact opposite answers than adults. 60% of them could not find a single thing they did not like, while 20% of them thought that the museum was too small and that it lacked in content. The same goes for the question of what they would change in the museum: young adults were focusing on adding more content and more souvenirs, while 40% of adults said to lessen the amount of text.

Another important aspect of this analysis is the aspect of feelings brought up by this museum. 40% of both young adults and adults said that they felt happy and good, 40% of young adults and 30% of adults said that they felt nostalgic, but only 20% of young adults and 10% of adults said that they felt magical. In terms of the theoretical concept of nostalgia, we can go back to Batcho and Halligan. For visitors in this museum, nostalgia appears as a form of personal nostalgia and longing for their childhood, which in this specific case connects to historical nostalgia as well. Childhoods of adults in Croatia are closely related to Yugoslavia, where Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić could have almost been considered as a part of pop culture which Halligan talks about. Other feelings and words like magical and creative are a part of the narrative that the museum is trying to sell and promote, so it is unfortunate that only three people said that they felt magical. Noteworthy are two adults who said that they felt bored and disappointed, highlighting that this is where the experiences differ the most from the expectations.

Other aspects that I as a researcher dealt with in the on-site analysis, like the national identity, were not mentioned in the interviews. Since the questions were formed as open questions to avoid possible manipulations of visitors’ answers, the aspect of the national identity was not
dealt with in a deeper way because none of the visitors mentioned it or questioned their national identity.

To conclude, expectations and experiences are different and were met to different extents for these two age groups, and they depend on some, at first unnoticeable, but very simple factors. These factors include if the respondents were younger and closer to children’s age themselves, if the respondents had none, any or a lot of experience with kids, either their own or working in schools and kindergartens, and of course it depends on the way the museum promotes itself through their webpage and social media, it depends on narratives that visitors created themselves through their prior knowledge, and narratives that are shown in the promotion and in the museum itself which bring out different feelings in different age groups.

4. VISITOR’S BOOK ANALYSIS

In Ivana’s house of fairy tales, the visitor’s book does not exist in the form of a book. It is a touch screen where visitors can write down their thoughts, put their name and age in. Most of the entries are from children, some from adults and some from elders who wrote about nostalgia, but for this analysis, only children’s entries will be used, and elder’s entries will just be mentioned.

To analyse children’s experiences of the museum, fifty entries from the years 2019 so far, and 2018 were used (Figure 12). All the entries are from children aged five to eleven. None of the entries were negative, but they do differ in content. Seventeen children used words like great, cool, awesome, and lovely in their entries, and those were the most straightforward entries, using only one word. Eleven children mentioned the magic mirror, how cool or funny Bjesomar was, and how they liked the magical abilities that Bjesomar told them about. Four children said that they thought the museum was interesting, and three said they liked it because they have someone in the family (mother, aunt, sister) named Ivana. Three children also said the museum was scary at first, with three saying it was magical, three saying they wish they could come back again, and two children saying the museum was fun because they were with their friends. Four children said other things like it was very strange, they wish they never had to leave the museum or that they are staying in the museum, and that they will miss the museum once they leave.
Figure 14. Things appearing in children's entries in the Visitor’s book in Ivana's house of fairy tales in 2018 and 2019 so far (13th April 2019)

Source: Ivana’s House of Fairy Tales Visitor’s book

It is interesting to analyse what children said about the museum because it gives a good insight into what makes this kind of tourism and these kinds of museums fun and likeable for them. Primarily, they need to have a ‘thing’, in this case, Bjesomar’s magic mirror, that they will find fascinating, and that will make them laugh, and at the same time stay interesting for long enough to remember it as the best thing in the museum, which eleven children mentioned in their entries. They also need to connect it to something or someone familiar. In this case, to the name of Ivana, or if they are older, to her work that they do for obligatory reading in schools, or to their friends with whom they visited the museum. It is crucial for them to share their good experiences with their family or friends, either at that moment or to tell them afterwards. They even wish to come back to the museum to possibly bring their friends to show them how much of a good time they had. Some of the children said that the museum was scary at first, and some said it was magical, showing the dark ambience of the museum that the adults complained about brings out a new set of emotions in children, something that they only experience while reading fairy tales or watching cartoons, and they like it.

It is essential to notice the difference between children’s experiences expressed through these entries, and adults’ experiences where they mentioned that the museum is not appropriate for children. Adults referred to too much text for children to read and also less of interactive content, and to some extent, they are right. Younger children will not read any of the texts presented in the museum, they will only watch the animated movies, and they will go in front
of the magic mirror. By experiencing only these parts of the museum that are actually appropriated for children, they will have fun, and they will like the museum. Older children and teenagers, who are already attending school and who already know something about Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and her fairy tales, will try to read the texts written on the walls of the museum, and here is where the adults are right: this will be too much content for them. As they grew up with modern technology, and their need for technology and interactive materials is higher than it was before, they will get bored. Brittan states as soon as an object is within our grasp, we desire for another, and it is where the technology brings dissatisfaction and boredom. He also states that technology fuels the boredom by making every image, song, or a thing we desire instantly available, and it is another reason why too much text will bore them: it takes too much time, and the action is not instantly done. As they grow older into young adults, the results showed, they will start liking the museum again, finding the texts interesting, and finding the museum magical again, the feeling of nostalgia will start to appear. That same feeling of nostalgia is also visible in ten entries from elders that were visiting the museum. All of them, aged 55+, said that they felt as if they were back to being kids as if they were in a dream and that they felt moved and touched by the museum. For them, maybe even subconsciously, the phenomenon of Yugonostalgia appears: it is comparable to Halligan’s Ostalgie for Eastern Bloc, which in this case means their longing for ‘simpler times’ and their childhood in Yugoslavia. There is also a small congruence with young adults in their case. They experienced the museum for themselves, and not for their children, and that is why the nostalgia and happiness appear.

5. ONLINE REVIEWS ANALYSIS

To see if there are any differences between experiences of the museum immediately after their visit and experiences after some time has passed, online reviews will be analysed such as Google reviews, Facebook reviews, and TripAdvisor reviews. The date the reviews were analysed was the 2nd of May 2019, and the reviews date back to 2017.
On Google, there are 250 reviews, and the average rating of the museum is 4.6. On Facebook, there are 58 reviews, and the average grade is 5.0. On TripAdvisor, there are sixteen reviews, and the average grade is 4.85.

### 5.1. Average grades

On Google, seven people rated the museum with only one star, none rated it with two, and fifteen people rated the museum with three stars (Figure 15). 195 people rated the museum with five stars, and 33 people rated it with four stars. On Facebook, there are no ratings of one, two and three stars, and only one person rated the museum with four stars. The other 57 people rated the museum with five stars. On TripAdvisor, there were also no ratings of one, two and three stars, but there were four people who rated the museum with four stars and twelve people who rated the museum with five stars.

*Figure 15. Grades of Ivana's house of fairy tales on Google, Facebook and TripAdvisor*

Source: [https://www.facebook.com/pg/Ivanina-ku%C4%87a-bajke-Ivanas-House-of-Fairy-Tales-215173795339513/reviews/?ref=page_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pg/Ivanina-ku%C4%87a-bajke-Ivanas-House-of-Fairy-Tales-215173795339513/reviews/?ref=page_internal), [https://www.google.com/search?q=ivanina+ku%C4%87a+bajke&oq=ivanin&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l2j69i57j69i60j69i65.4077j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#lrd=0x476473f6abe154e3:0x5dbfb5fa784b1476.1...](https://www.google.com/search?q=ivanina+ku%C4%87a+bajke&oq=ivanin&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l2j69i57j69i60j69i65.4077j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8#lrd=0x476473f6abe154e3:0x5dbfb5fa784b1476.1...).

---

5 On TripAdvisor webpage the rating is circled to 5.0, but when calculating the average of grades, the true average is 4.75.
When looking at grades given to the museum on these three social media sites, it is important to notice the difference in numbers of grades given by visitors on each site. Google, as the first site that opens when you open your internet browser, has the most reviews, 250 of them, and there are some one-star grades, as well as three-star grades. If an adult wants to leave a comment or a review, Google is the first option to do it. The second option is Facebook. According to Pew Research centre, almost 70% of adults in the United States of America are Facebook users, with almost three-quarters of those using it on a daily basis. Numbers are probably somewhat smaller in Croatia, but they are still high. All the reviews on Facebook are positive, and only one person rated it with four stars instead of five. Notably, if an adult really liked the museum, Facebook would be the most public way to let everyone know about it. The third option is TripAdvisor, and it had the smallest amount of grades, yet the smallest percentage of five-star grades. TripAdvisor is used by a bit more experienced adult travellers who, if they want to leave a review, will leave a review on this kind of pages for other travellers rather than general public. In this way, this is why there is a smaller number of reviews in general, but also a smaller percentage of five-star ratings. Differences appearing between grades on different social media sites are still not changing the main idea you get when you look at the reviews, as the museum has a great, almost perfect grade on every analysed site.

5.2. Written reviews

Out of 250 reviews on Google, 122 reviews had both a grade and a written review. Eighteen out of 58 reviews had both a grade and a written review, and all of the sixteen reviews on TripAdvisor had both a grade and a written review. For this part of the analysis, ten reviews that were categorized by Google and Facebook as ‘most helpful’ and ‘most relevant’ for five-star ratings on Google and Facebook were used, also ten four-star ratings from Google, as well as the ten five-star and four four-star reviews from TripAdvisor. The one four-star rating from Facebook and seven three-star ratings from Google cannot be used in this analysis because they were only a grade review. TripAdvisor reviews were in English, while the reviews used from Google and Facebook were in Croatian. Reviews are, as answers from the interviews with visitors in the museum, grouped thematically to make the analysis easier.
Looking at reviews on Google, 25% of reviews said that the museum is great for both adults and children, and 15% said it was a great museum for children. Both great staff in the museum and the magical mirror of Bjesomar were mentioned by 10% of reviews, 5% of reviews said that the museum was magical, and 15% of reviews mentioned nostalgia and childhood memories. 20% of reviews mentioned complaints like the lack of content and the museum being too small, as well as one complaint on the sounds in the museum being too loud. Reviews on Facebook are as different as they are similar: 25% of reviews said that the museum is great for both age groups, and 15% said that it was a great museum for children. However, 50% of reviews mentioned great staff, and 20% of reviews mentioned magical feelings. Both the magical mirror and the feeling of nostalgia were mentioned in 10% of reviews, and none of the Facebook reviews had any complaints. For TripAdvisor, some aspects were similar. 21% of reviews said that it was a museum for both adults and children, and 16% of reviews said it was a great museum for children. None of the reviews mentioned staff or the magical feelings, but both the magical mirror of Bjesomar and the feeling of nostalgia were mentioned in 21% of reviews. Also, 21% of reviews mentioned complaints like the museum being too small and lacking content, but also the souvenir shop lacking books and more souvenirs. Looking at all the reviews together, the most mentioned thing is that it is a museum for both age groups, 20% of all reviews. 16% of reviews mention great staff, feeling nostalgic and complaints. 14% of reviews mention the magic mirror being the best part, 11% of reviews say that it is a museum for children, and only 7% of reviews mention the magical atmosphere and feeling.
Analysing the written reviews and comparing them with the answers of respondents in the museum, there are some similarities and some differences. Most of the people agree on the fact that it is a museum for either both age groups, or a museum for children, but none of the online results said that it was a museum for adults. Interestingly, none of the respondents in the museum mentioned the staff. Due to a lack of people in the museum during days that the research was conducted, there were no guided tours in the museum, while when there are bigger groups, a lady from the museum dresses up as Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić, and then the whole museum gets a different atmosphere. Kempiak argued the importance of engagement and atmospherics, which are highlighted with this point. People also agreed that the magic mirror is the top attraction in the museum, and they also agreed on the feelings of nostalgia and feeling magical, but it was less expressed in the online reviews. There are also similarities in complaints and things that the respondents said they did not like in the museum. Both online reviews and respondents in the museum mentioned the lack of content and the museum being too small, as well as the lack of souvenirs, while only the online reviews mentioned the sounds being too
loud. It is only comparable to respondents mentioning the museum being too dark and boring. To conclude, online reviews are mostly congruent with experiences from respondent in the museum, however the overall experiences are better in online reviews. Generally, it is because people are more likely to write good reviews than bad reviews online because they are public and they stay available, while if they are being asked in anonymity, they will speak their mind and maybe give a worse review, which can be seen through this research.

**CONCLUSION**

After conducting and analysing the research, few conclusions were drawn. Analysing and reconstructing the pre-tour narratives through social media, travel blogs and museum’s official webpage, but also with the help of an extensive literature research, I answered all of my sub-questions and went into even more in-depth analysis of aspects like childhood, nostalgia, technology and identity. I found that, even though deficient in some terms e.g., the lack of an official Instagram page, the museum has done a very clear and multifaceted promotion of their narratives. It is an interactive multimedia centre that focuses on international fairy tales and Ivana’s work, attracts both children and adults, and deals with different important aspects like the multiculturality and internationality, more specifically with the European identity. Despite this, as I learned on-site, there are not many international visitors coming, which was also visible in the analysed reviews from Google, TripAdvisor, and Facebook. All Facebook reviews were from Croatian people, while only a small amount of reviews on Google and TripAdvisor were from other nations, like Germans and Italians.

Continuing the on-site analysis, I found that the museum’s on-site narratives mostly coincide with the narrative on the internet, yet I felt disappointed. I did manage to deal with aspects of my theoretical framework, whose features were all visible and researchable to me in the museum: technology, nostalgia, childhood, and national identity, but expectations and experiences of me as a member of the young adult age group differed. In terms of Bruner’s theory, my pre-tour narratives were heavily modified into one master narrative by the museum itself, not by guides or other groups that were there, and by the situation that I found there. My hopes and wishes for nostalgia and magic were not fulfilled. The technology and multimedia in the museum did not work in terms of nostalgia for me, maybe because technology was not that present in the museum apart from the magic mirror and animated movies, or maybe because, to me, it is not a part of the historical nostalgia Batcho and Halligan wrote about because I am too
young to feel the Yugonostalgia in connection with my childhood. It could also be, because I came to the museum to do my research, not for fun, that I could not relax, get away from everyday life and enter into a world of idylls that Squire talked about. The narrative on Croatian heritage and the ‘true spirit of the Croatian nation’ which I expected did not match the narrative in the museum. On the contrary, I noticed the internationality of the museum and the creation of the European identity, which can be connected to McLean quoting Kaplan who said that museums are social institutions and agents of political and social change, here not in terms of national identity but in terms of creating an European identity of a country that can still be considered as a new member of the European Union.

Looking at the research analysis, I found many contradictions between two groups, and my initial thought that the two age groups interviewed, young adults and adults, will have different expectations and experiences, was confirmed. The research showed that their answers depended on the existence and the number of experiences with children in their lives, as well as on their narratives created pre-visiting the museum. While young adults expected to learn something new in a magical atmosphere, and later on liked the museum, and their expectations were met, some adults looked at the museum differently. They came to the museum with expectations similar to young adults, believing it is a children’s museum and were disappointed because their children, or the children they teach, either did not like it, or will not like it if they were ever to take them to the museum. Interestingly, while analysing children’s entries in the visitor’s book, I found that the adults were wrong as well as they were right: all the entries I analysed were positive, with children being happy, amazed with the magic mirror, feeling magical, and wanting to come back, possibly with friends. Children are generally satisfied with the museum because they have gained something memorable from it: the magic mirror. The magic mirror was also an absolute hit for me as a visitor, the rest of my family that visited the museum with me, and other adults interviewed. The magic mirror goes back to technology aspect that can be connected to nostalgia that both some young adults and adults mentioned. As Brittan mentioned, technology archives our memories and shows them to us almost instantly, and by talking to Bjesomar in front of the mirror, or watching animated movies of stories they know, adults went back into their childhood, which as I talked about before, for Croatians means going back to both personal nostalgia and historical Yugonostalgia, when Ivana’s works were a part of the popular culture. Visitors that were able to ‘unwind’ from everyday life, found their way to their memories of Ivana’s work and were able to tangibly reconnect with their childhood, which was visible in the comments that they felt nostalgic and magical, which confirms Squire’s
study. Adults were right when it came to the amount of content: younger children would not focus on reading the texts, but on the interactive technology parts of the exhibition, while the texts are written primarily for adults whose memories will be activated through them.

Considering the reviews on Google, TripAdvisor and Facebook, I found that they mostly congruent with the interviews I held, but the overall experiences are better in online reviews. Generally, it is because people are more likely to write good reviews than bad reviews online because they are public, and they stay available, while if they are being asked in anonymity, they will speak their mind and maybe give a worse review, which was visible in my research. It is also connected to Bruner’s theory: once the visitors come back home, they will create their own master narrative through photographs and souvenirs, in this case the photography they took in the mirror, but they will also connect their pre-tour narratives they created before with the narratives they picked up on-site. Their experiences diminish to memory, and they tend to forget bad things and remember only the memorable good ones, which is visible in the things that were mentioned both right after the tour and in the online reviews: feeling magical and nostalgic, as well as the famous Bjesomar’s mirror.

As I mentioned before, parts of my research may seem separate, but were made to complement each other. The on-site analysis was done as an essential part of this research, that was supposed to help me and give me insight as a researcher to understand the narratives and aspects that were mentioned before (technology, nostalgia, identity, childhood) that the museum deals with, and the understanding of that was supposed to complement the understanding of the interviews I conducted. Since I dealt with some aspects that I thought were an important part of the museum’s narrative, I wanted to see if other visitors would see them and mention them too. It turned out that my opinions were congruent with some of the visitors’ opinions, but some others thought completely different, which was visible in their answers. While I thought the museum was not for children, and I was disappointed with the lack of nostalgic feelings and the lack of ‘Croatian spirit’ in the museum, some visitors thought it was a perfect place for children, they felt nostalgic, but interestingly, the question of identity was not even mentioned in any of the interviews I held.

Reflecting on my own research, I am aware that there are limitations which could be overcome in future research. Firstly, as planned in the initial research proposal, a great addition to the research would have been the interviews with children and teenagers. Their view on the museum and its narratives would have given a new dimension into the understanding of the
differences between different age groups and the importance of interactive technology. To be able to get enough interviews for a sufficient analysis, I should allocated more time to spend in the museum to see if more visitors would come, but also search for, for example, schools who took children, maybe even teenagers, to the museum, and interview them. In terms of interview questions, I should have added an aspect of questioning the prior knowledge of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić and her work. That would have given an insight into how other sources, but the webpage and social media, affected the pre-narratives for the visitors. Also, since the questions were open-ended, I probably have not ended with the results I wanted, because not all the aspects I dealt with in the on-site analysis were touched upon in the interviews, like the question of national identity or internationality. However, I think there are also strong aspects of my research. Since I did not have the interviews of younger age groups, I managed to provide a stronger focus on the differences between very similar and in the same time different age groups, whose different experiences are showing an interesting insight into the understanding of the fairy tale tourism. I also included many different aspects which affected the pre-narratives and expectations, on-site narratives, experiences, and post-narratives and made the case stronger. Social media, webpage, travel blogs, on-site analysis, visitor’s book, and online reviews all confirmed the same statement and hypothesis I started the research with.

A vast potential for future research exists. There are a few essential aspects which I had analysed in my literature review for a better understanding of the theme, but I have not included in my research because it would have been too much. First is the matter of authenticity. Whilst authenticity in literary tourism is a theme discussed thoroughly, in terms of fairy tale tourism, there is almost no scientific literature. Questions such as ‘what authenticity means in fairy tale tourism’ and ‘what do visitors expect in terms of authenticity in fairy tale tourism’ are just some of the questions that still need to be researched, and there can be a whole thesis written exclusively about the question of authenticity. Another important aspect which I only superficially analysed for the same reason as the authenticity matter is the importance of landscape in fairy tale tourism. In this way, further research can be done on the connection between fairy tale routes in Croatia and the fairy tale landscape of Ogulin which carries the name ‘Homeland of fairy tales’, but also on the importance of Ogulin landscape in forming visitors’ narratives before their visit. Further and more in-depth research can be done about the identity issue in the museum. Whilst I considered this through the on-site analysis, none of the visitors mentioned it so it was excluded as an aspect in the interviews’ analysis, and future research can explore how visitors’ view it, and how they feel about it. The identity issue can
also be analysed for both Croatian and international visitors to see how and if they feel differently about the European identity of the museum.

The importance of Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić might not be understandable to someone who is not Croatian, but to me, she is one of the symbols of my childhood, someone whose stories I grew up with and whose works formed me as a heritage lover, with interest in fantasy and magic, and a forever child in heart. To be able to identify with Ivana’s work to me is equivalent to being happy, and ‘when you’re happy, even the Sun is rushing to be with you’ (Ivana Brlić-Mažuranić 1916).
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