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Writers, philosophers, anthropologists … but also journalists, filmmakers, musicians, painters … well before social-environmental psychologists, helped us to understand the meaning of places and the psychological and symbolic importance of the dimensions that they involve, in addition to characteristics which are purely functional.

The places where we live are not simple collections of dwellings intended to protect us. Our cities are more than bricks and mortar. They are also made of, and accommodate as well, immaterial materials, that is, symbolic human productions. This less visible part of cities is acutely described by Italo Calvino:

Cities are a collection of many things: memory, desires, signs of a language, cities are places of exchange, as they explain all the books of economic history, but these exchanges are not only trade in goods, they are exchanges of words, desires, memories. (Italo Calvino 1993: IX–X)

However, this symbolic and immaterial part of the city shows through the city itself, exuding from its walls and becoming tangible:

The feel and the fabric of the town or city is always present to citizens as it is to the visitors. Appreciated, seen, touched, smelled, penetrated, whether consciously or unconsciously, this fabric is a tangible representation of that intangible thing, the society that lives in it – and of its aspirations. (Rykwert 2002: 6)

As Ricoeur rightly pointed out, the feelings and impressions that endure from the contact with such specific places establish a link between individuals and those places:

The memories of having inhabited some house in some town or that of having travelled in some part of the world are particularly eloquent and telling […] In memories of this type, corporeal space is immediately linked with the surrounding space of the environment. (Ricoeur 2004: 148)
This relation between individuals and places consequently impacts on our ways of thinking, as Heidegger (1971) emphasised in his essay *Building Dwelling Thinking*. However, to understand this impact fully, it is necessary to grasp the phenomenon at the representational level, as suggested by Lombardi Satriani:

> The relations between representations and practices of the city fall outside the power of mental maps, even if built with maximum accuracy: these mental maps assume their meaning through ways of living, cultural models, and not only through visual acts. The representation of the city is inscribed in an ethno-history. (Lombardi Satriani 2004: 23)

Amongst social sciences, social psychology holds a prime position in the study of how individuals build their representations of cities.

**Social psychology as anchor for environmental psychology and psychology of tourism: a multi-theoretical perspective**

One of the multi-theoretical perspectives inspiring the study presented in this chapter derives from developments over the past three last decades of environmental psychology which have brought about a shift of attention from the study of how individuals visually perceive purely physical or natural aspects of the environment to the way in which these dimensions are loaded with social, cultural and symbolic meanings (Bechtel and Churchman 2002; Bell et al. 2001; Edgerton et al. 2007; Holahan 1986; Ittelson et al. 1974; Saegert and Winkel 1990). ‘Environmental perception’ in this context designates the set of processes by which individuals attribute meaning to their social and physical surroundings. These processes are dynamic and are characterized by an interchange which results in the perceptual ‘transformation’ of isolated material things into symbolically significant groups (Stokols 1981).

Traditional environmental psychology, however, has become a specialist area often divorced from social psychology: it is problem-oriented and therefore qualifies itself as an *applicable*, although not always *applied*, research field (Spencer 2007) through the multidisciplinary contributions of architects, town planners, geographers, botanists etc. The research presented in this chapter was intended to restore the social dimension, in that it was a study of the social psychology of the environment – an area which paradoxically has been insufficiently represented in the social psychology literature (Bonnes and Secchiaroli 1992; Kruse and Graumann 1991; Proshansky 1987; Stokols 1995). From our perspective, environmental social psychology not only deals with pressing social–environmental problems but also raises pertinent theoretical questions about social psychology itself. Our proposal calls for appreciation of the socio-normative and cultural–symbolic aspects of the environment, and it is inspired by the theory of social representations, which are different from decontextualized cognitions.

Aware of the difficulties of integrating these different areas, the research
project presented here arose from the need to combine theoretical constructs relative to the different areas of social psychology (such as social representations, identity and social memory), environmental psychology (in particular the construct of place-identity) and psychology of tourism (especially in regard to tourism destination imagery and experiences of first-visitors).

In particular, the theoretical construct of place-identity (Bruce Hull et al. 1994; Krupat 1983; Proshansky 1978; Proshansky et al. 1983; Relph 1976; Sarbin 1983) is an interesting heuristic object in this field because of the links that it implies among environmental, social and individual psychology, and more specifically, links among:

- *The study of Places*, as pertaining to a complex system of people/environment relations and not simply as physical settings (Bonnes and Secchiaroli 1992, 1995; Bonnes et al. 1991a, 1991b; Canter 1977; Kruse 1988, Legendre 2005; Lejano and Stokols, 2010; Orleans, 1973; Stokols and Altman 1987; Stokols and Shumaker 1981) and of the city image (Lynch 1960), as a semiotic object (Marrone and Pezzini 2006);

The social representations of the city are more than disembodied maps; they are mechanism whereby the bricks, streets, and physical geography of a place are endowed with social meaning. Such urban representations, therefore, help define the social order of the city, and the individual's place in it.

(Milgram 1984: 309);

- Various theories of the Self, which, although quite different each other, share the view that the self identity is developed by the individual as a function of his/her emotional–cognitive experiences of a wide range of objects in the physical–natural and social world. Therefore ‘self in context’ is a common presupposition of the social dimension in these theories and in the concept of place-identity (e.g. Banaji and Prentice 1994; Breakwell 1992, 2001, 2010; Burkitt 1991; Doise and Lorenzi-Cioldi 1991; Forgas and Williams 2003; Gergen 1971; Gergen and Davis 1985; Greenwald and Pratkanis 1984; Harter 1999; Horward and Callero 1991; Lapsley and Power 1987; Leary 2003; Markus and Kitayama 1991, 1994; Melucci 1996; Neisser 1988; Neisser and Jopling 1997; Palmonari 1987; Piolat et al. 1992; Rosenberg 1988; Rosenberg and Gara 1985; Sedikides and Brewer 2001; Yardley and Honess 1987; Zavalloni 1983, 2007; Zavalloni and Louis-Guerin 1984).

From another perspective, starting from ‘the insight that the distinction between interpersonal and intergroup behaviour could be explained by a parallel and underlying distinction between personal and social identity’ (Turner 1999: 10), the Social Identity Theory was originally formulated by Tajfel (1981, 1982) and later developed as Self-categorization theory by Turner (Turner et al. 1987; see also Abrams and Hogg 1990; Ellemers et al. 1999; Hogg and Abrams 1990). However ‘from quite early this conception was questioned by those who argued that these two self-systems might be orthogonal rather than bipolar, thus allowing the possibility that personal and social identities might be simultaneously significant’ (Brown and Capozza 2000: X).

As far as the level of social identity is concerned, the focus here is not strictly on the specific processes of intergroup differentiation that supposedly act as a function of ‘category membership’; that is, on the processes of positive evaluation of one’s own group and devaluation of the out-group in order to maintain a positive self-concept. The interesting point to be stressed is that also according to these paradigmatic approaches individuals perceive the environment as a function of the norms and cultural values of their reference groups or of the social groups to which they belong.

Nevertheless, even within the more restricted paradigmatic outlook, integration between Social Identity Theory (SIT) and Social Representations Theory (SRT) has been proposed by Breakwell (1993, 2001), Brewer (2001), Elejabarrieta (1994), Vala (1992, 1998), among others. A synthesis of these two approaches has so far been neglected in the literature, at least at the level of theoretical formalization, if not in research practice (where an example is provided by the work
of Di Giacomo 1981, 1985). In this perspective, group interests influence social representations, but these for their part contextualize, motivate and legitimate group actions.

Just as social identities are a product of group memberships, so they influence the individual’s involvement in the representational processes, to a large extent determining the exposure to, acceptance of, and use of social representations (Breakwell 1993, 2001, 2010). Developing the Identity Process Theory, Breakwell shows how individual psychological traits, taken as both subjective states and as self-consciousness or self-definition, also influence the exposition, acceptance and use of social representations, as well as influencing the individual’s disposition to participate in their production.

Another attempt to integrate the theories of Social Identity and Social Representations can be found in the empirical work of Vala (1992, 1998), who seeks to show how social groups, as cognitive products, represent the contexts in which social representations are constructed, and how representations of the social structure create categorization systems which allow social groups to be formed. The hypotheses formulated by Vala arise from consideration of the role of the anchoring process in the formation of social representations, and of the functional role played by the process itself at the level of the organization of social relations. Also Elejabarrieta (1994) has emphasized the role of social positioning as a way to link social identity and social representations.

Our conception of social positioning is more in line with the socio-dynamic approach to social representations of Doise et al. (1992) than with the categorization cognitive perspective based on the integration of the Social Identity and Social Representations theories (Augoustinos and Walker 1995). According to Licata (2003: 5.6) ‘Doise’s approach should rather be viewed as an alternative conceptualization of social identity process within SRT than as an integration of SIT’s elements into SRT’. Indeed, it has been criticized by scholars inspired mainly by Social Representations Theory (Duveen 2001; Duveen and Lloyd 1986, 1990, 1992; Howarth 2002; 2010) or by Social Identity Theory (Breakwell 2010) for the simplification of the construct of identity in the SIT as a product of category memberships and the evaluations attached to them. In this reductive approach, identity is a sort of ‘black box’, in the sense that it is merely assumed that individuals seek to achieve a positive social identity and, since social identity is defined in the theory as being derived from group memberships, this leads to attempts to differentiate between groups in such a way as to enhance the value derived from those groups to which we belong.

This premise induces Breakwell to declare

This is not a theory of identity – despite the name given to the theory – it was always a theory of intergroup discrimination and conflict. The need for a positive identity was simply asserted to be a basic motive and was then used to explain discriminatory behaviour.

(Breakwell 2010: 6.2)
By developing her own *Identity Process Theory*, in which social identity is not conceived as merely the part of identity derived from group memberships, but as a constellation of characteristic and psychological attributes which comprise the whole identity, Breakwell (2010: 6.6) emphasizes the vital role of social representational processes in shaping identity. At the same time, she suggests that identity processes may be significant in determining the evolution of social representations, given that they are important determinants affecting exposure to social representations and their acceptance and use.

Differently from the articles cited above, which seek to clarify how the paradigms of Social Representations and Social Identity Theory might be integrated, the research presented here was intended to create a further link between the levels of analysis and explanation of phenomena implicit in the social representation theoretical perspective and the place-identity construct. A link between both of these with *social identity* is anchored in the common assumption that individuals and groups constantly use interpretative categories and systems to classify the environment – codes which express norms and values whose origins are to be found in the social context. According to Milgram (1984: 309), ‘the person’s social identity is bound up with the neighbourhood in which he lives and the social connotations attached to that place’ (see also Greenbaum and Greenbaum 1981).

The construct of *place-identity* has gained popularity in environmental psychology over the past three decades: in fact, it has been indicated as one of the most important themes in this area, with impacts on some forms of deliberative planning and participatory design involving urban planners, landscape architects and local communities in order to transform existing places as well as to create new ones (see, for example, Groat 1995; Hague and Jenkins 2005; van-Staden 1987). It can be described as a substructure of self-identity characterized by clusters of cognitions, memories and affects concerning places experienced by the individual. It is an active personal construction, deriving from day-to-day experience of the physical environment mediated by subjective meanings and social norms, and characterized by the formulation of hierarchically organized and structured cognitions of the physical–social settings experienced. Its structural properties vary dynamically in relation to the individual’s social identity and lifestyle (Keller 1987; Korpela 1989, 1992; Massey 1994).

At the heart of this psychological structure is a sense of belonging, for ‘place-belongingness’ is not only one aspect of place-identity, but a necessary basis for it. Around this core the social, cultural and biological definitions and cognitions of place which become part of the person’s place-identity are built.

(Korpela 1989: 246)

In this conceptualization of place-identity, an important role is played by the intersection of two fundamental dimensions of the psychological experience of the individual: space and time.
Space is understood not only in terms of the physical surroundings, architecture or landscape, but also as emotionally connotated, and imbued with social meanings through its functional and contextual roles. It is the source of opportunities for the satisfaction of individual needs and aims – what Stokols (1981) calls ‘environmental congruence’. In other words, space is understood more in terms of ‘place’ than as the ‘behavioural setting’ of Barker’s ecological psychology (1968, 1987). For example, in Canter’s place-theory (1977, 1984, 1986), place-identity is a further way to link social dimensions together: both those that are spatial (physical attributes) and those that are functional (activity-related). These dimensions are social in so far as they involve people’s descriptions, conceptions and representations of particular behaviour/activities in particular physical environments. (See also Fuhrer 1990, Kruse 1988, Rapaport 1990 and Wicker 1987.) Other studies have explored the three types of process determining the genesis of place-attachment (the positive evaluation of the quality of the place vis-à-vis one’s need; the meaning of the place for the person’s identity; long residence and familiarity: Giuliani et al. 2003), or they have prioritized the group-based or collective dimension of ‘identification with’ and of ‘attachment to’ places, such as the importance of certain sites for national or supra-national identity (Bonaiuto, Breakwell and Cano 1996; Devine-Wright and Lyons 1997; Lewicka 2008, 2010). Like almost all the other psychological constructs (attitude, memory, representations, etc.), also place-identity has been recently relocated by the discursive or narrative–descriptive approach as something that people create together through talk: a social construction that allows them to make sense of their connectivity to place and to guide their actions and projects accordingly. […] Not only does it acknowledge the relevance of places to their collective sense of self, but it also highlights the collective practices through which specific place identities are formed, reproduced and modified. […] Language becomes the force that binds people to places (cf. Tuan 1991). It is through language that everyday experiences of self-in-place form and mutate; moreover, it is through language that places themselves are imaginatively constituted in ways that carry implications for ‘who we are’ (or ‘Who we can claim to be’).

(Dixon and Durrheim 2000: 32)

From this perspective, place-identity becomes a resource for discursive action: the redefinition of place-identity by the discursive approach is intended to supersede the view of it as a medium for expressing place cognitions and attachments or for revealing self-categorization and differentiation, by disclosing the links between construction of place-identity and power relations: for example, revealing the normalized ideology of ‘sedentarism’ and the alternative notions of nomadism and pilgrimage (Hetherington 1996); or offering an account of the politics of place-identity (Keith 1991; Keith and Pile 1993; Rose 1996; Shields 1991); or building collective identities through practices of territorial personalization involving the use of architectural styles, layouts or forms of ornamentation,
or material organization of places: e.g. in the tangible form of boundaries, buffer zones and other distancing devices (Dixon et al. 1997).

**Time** is understood as a dimension involved in the sedimentation of past, present or mentally anticipated experiences related to the different places or social–environmental settings which are experienced cognitively or emotionally in a lifetime. Here, reference should be made to developments in the psychosocial literature on time (see inter-alia: Boyd and Zimbardo 2005; de Rosa 1988; de Rosa and Granieri 1994; de Rosa and Lo Bosco 1993; Reale 1988; Ricci-Bitti and Sarchielli 1985; Strathman and Joireman 2005; Tromsdorff 1983; Zimbardo and Boyd 1999). These studies hold that the individual’s perspective of time is a social construction influenced by how the social environment acts on the individual through interpersonal relationships (Belloni and Rampazi 1989; McGrath 1988, 2006; McGrath and Kelly 1986, 1992; McGrath and Tschan, 2004) and indirectly through the characteristics of the society and the values of membership or reference groups (Mercure and Pronovost, 1989; Mercure and Wallemacq, 1988; Tabboni, 1985, 1984). ‘Time’ is a dimension of life-space heavily involved in goal-directed action and structures of experience and behaviour. Both cognitive and affective elements combine to determine ways of orienting oneself with respect to time. These elements derive from subjective experience within socio-cultural frameworks (Gasparini 1990, 1997a, 1997b, 2000; Gell 1992; Mc Grath 1988, 2007; Mc Grath and Tschan 2004; Ramos 1991, 1992; Roche 2003; Rouquette and Guimelli 1994) and even geographical frameworks (Betta 1988; for a multidisciplinary bibliography see: Macey 1991 and the updated bibliography on Timeline from the website of the International Society for the Study of Time at the address: http://www.studyoftime.org/ContentPage.aspx?ID=9).

Space and time are therefore two fundamental dimensions which organize and structure place-identity. However, environmental psychology has to date concentrated primarily on the spatial dimension, although there has been a gradual shift from the purely physical perspective, focused on the visual–perceptual variables of the architectural tradition, to a perspective in which the value of other variables endowed with ever broader psycho-social and subjective meanings is taken into account. By contrast, the temporal dimension has been greatly neglected in empirical research on environmental psychology, mostly because of difficulties in operationalizing it. This scant consideration of temporal variables is also evident from the lack of attention paid to developmental factors (Carp 1987; Carp and Carp 1982; Wapner et al. 1983; Wohlwill and Heft 1987) or to temporal processes involved in the individual’s transactions with the environment (Altman and Rogoff 1987; Kantrowitz 1985; Stokols and Jacobi 1984; Wicker 1987), as already indicated by some reviews conducted in the 1980s and 1990s (Holahan 1986; Saegert and Winkel 1990).

On reviewing several hundreds of empirical and theoretical papers in order to answer the question ‘Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years?’ Lewicka (2010) shows that, of the three components of the tridimensional model of place attachment (Person–Process–Place) (Scannell and Gifford 2010), the Person component has attracted disproportionately more attention than
the Place and Process components, and at the same time, despite mobility and globalization processes, Place continues to be an object of strong attachments. Recent empirical studies have investigated the relations between place attachment and place-identity in first-year undergraduates in the particular transitional life stage from home to university (Chow and Healey 2008), or in samples differentiated according to birthplace and length of residence, showing that place attachment develops before place-identity, at least in the case of non-natives, whilst identity and attachment tend to coincide in natives (Hernandez et al. 2007).

In Proshansky’s model of place-identity, time is an important dimension in both the analysis and formation of place-identity. The empirical research presented in this chapter is a similar attempt to operationalize the temporal dimension of environmental experience, as a follow-up on previous work (de Rosa et al. 1988).

Furthermore, we attempt to link the psychology of tourism with environmental psychology by studying place-identity with reference to a place that individuals experience as tourists (first-visitors and for a limited period of time). As far as we are aware, this has not yet been attempted in the literature, which has considered place-identity either as ‘urban-identity’ (Kruse and Grauman 1991) or as a source of emotional security and stability for children (Korpela 1989, 1992); as emotionally laden depending on the place’s social functions (Keller 1987), or as anxiety – or stress – producing (Kurokawa and Seiwa 1986; Meyer 1987).

There were many elements in the 1980s that allowed consideration of the psychology of tourism as an emerging topic and a prospective new disciplinary area (de Rosa 1995): firstly, the frequent international and national conferences, the establishment of university degree, master and academic courses, the creation of bibliographical indexes of specific key words indicative of the contributions made by a literature increasingly identified as specialized, albeit standing at the intersection among various disciplinary areas of psychology (social psychology, environmental psychology, community psychology, psychology of individual differences, clinical psychology, general psychology, economic psychology, marketing and advertising, etc.) and of counterpart disciplines (sociology, economics, cultural anthropology, human geography) (Fridgen 1984; Neto and Freire 1990; Nunez 1977; Smith 1977).

Despite the significant growth of the literature on the subject, as shown by more recent systematic analyses of scientific production (Barrios et al. 2008; Cogno 1995; Casarin 1996; Dann 1996; Mura 2008; Ross 1998), the psychology of tourism – as an area emerging from applied social psychology of the environment – is still characterized more by the definition of its object of study in social, economic, and environmental terms than by the autonomy of theoretical methodological paradigms.

The review by de Rosa (1995) and subsequent update analyses (Mura 2008) of the last two decades of publications on psychology ‘of’ or ‘for’ tourism (this being the label preferred by Cesa-Bianchi 1991) show a literature extremely heterogeneous in publishing sources and a lack of paradigmatic coherence. At least at present, empirical researches refer more to contents than to the reference theories, which are still largely lacking. A classification of tourism as an object of inquiry and
within psycho-sociological studies of tourism has been proposed by Gullotta (1986), while the typology elaborated earlier by Pearce (1982), and entirely centred on tourist behaviour, referred to tourists themselves.

Gullotta (1986) proposes distinguishing ‘tourism’:

- In function of the places to which it refers, that is, the area of action–transaction between tourists and the environment (transit tourism, residential tourism with its internal differences characterized by the choice of accommodation, hotel, village, etc., mixed tourism, national tourism, international tourism);
- In function of the time length (week and long-term tourism, weekend tourism, excursions, one-day tourism);
- In function of its social characteristics (individual, family, or group tourism);
- In function of motivations: pure tourism (that is, intentionally undertaken for the purpose of exploration), accidental tourism (that is, undertaken during professional, commercial activities, etc.), social tourism (connected with associative activities or for family reasons, such as visiting relatives), study tourism (language courses abroad, master courses, etc.), conference tourism (which differs from the western one because conference organizers, wanting to arouse participant motivation, intentionally prefer places attractive to tourists), religious tourism (pilgrimages, etc.), sport tourism (when engaged in sport competitions either as athletes or spectators).

As regards study areas, Gullotta (1986: 44) recommended that research should be longitudinal (to capture the consistency/variability of psychological phenomena related to tourism across a wide time-span), contextual (aimed at the study of tourism behaviour relative to the specificities of the places and spaces where it takes place), comparative (i.e. comparing among different tourism contexts), hemic (considering the various perspectives of participants and, therefore, concerned not only with tourists but also their guides, tour operators, travel agencies, hoteliers, museum guides, bus and taxi drivers, souvenir vendors, etc.; that is, all those who, because of their frequent interactions with tourists of different nationalities, are affected, consciously or unconsciously, by the different relational styles of tourists). This analysis has also been enriched by a specific literature on the sociology of travel which analyses different types of travel experience and its socio-cultural transformations (De Botton 2003; Iannone et al. 2005; Leed 1991; Maffesoli 1997; Urry 1995).

In agreement with this wide range of inquiry, Gullotta suggests that methods should integrate approaches typical of anthropological research, like the discreet observation of participants (for example, through the researcher’s mimesis of tourists), with the more classical methods of social psychology, such as individual and group interviews (before, during, and after the tourist experience), and with the more or less structured questionnaires used by psychologists and sociologists of communication to analyse, for example, advertising and its varying persuasive effects. This last characterizes a specific area of study – environmental communication with its many channels – recognized by Perussia (1991b) as
one of the main factors determining tourist images. Among the many forms and channels of mass tourism communication, to be mentioned in particular is communication with deliberately persuasive purposes, i.e. all forms of advertising and promotional activities in general, as well as all the information to which the individual is exposed, even if it is not directly related to tourism (Guidicini and Savelli 1988).

Therefore, it [mass tourism communication] ranges among the brochures provided by travel agents, paid announcements in periodicals, television commercials, editorial services interspersed in news, tourist guides, leisure magazines geography schoolbooks, foreign news reports, literary travel reports, novels, and so on. Added to these public sources of information are private ones such as the accounts of friends and acquaintances, photographs of their holidays, personal experiences, etc. All these stimulating occasions are elaborated by the individual, who interprets and organizes them autonomously in his/her mnemonic structures. In particular, it has often been noted that photographs taken by tourists are very important in determining and confirming, through a continuously self-fed mechanism, a stereotypical and highly traditional image of locations.

(Perussia 1991a: 191–2)

Close consideration should also be made of the new forms of interactive personalized communication made possible by the evolution of the Web and the impressive and ever-increasing phenomenon of social networks, or the widespread practice of using newly-developed tools, like Google Earth, to preview the tourist’s itinerary virtually by means of tags left by other tourists regarding their experiences of the places concerned. As described in the conclusions, this latter phenomenon was the focus of one of the research programmes activated in 2009 at the European PhD on Social Representations and Communication Research Centre and Multimedia Lab, in synergy with the course on the Psychology of Communication and New Media at the Faculty of Psychology of the University of Rome La Sapienza. Similar research, using the largest ‘geotagged’ photograph database in the world, Flickr, has been undertaken by researchers in cooperation with the Yahoo! Research Lab. The intention has been to develop an end-to-end approach in constructing intra-city travel itineraries automatically by tapping a latent source reflecting ‘geo-temporal breadcrumbs’ left by millions of tourists, mapping photographs to the Points of Interest (POIs) of the city, and constructing individual timed paths in one-day itineraries. The findings of one of these experimental studies conducted using the Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) system (https://www.mturk.com) showed that ‘users perceive the automatically generated itineraries as being as good as (or even slightly better than) itineraries provided by professional tour companies’ and ‘that users are satisfied with the recommended transit and visit times for the POIs within the itineraries’ (De Choudhury et al. 2010: 1084).1

The literature associated with this study area makes it possible to monitor at various levels the constitution of a tourism experience beforehand in pre-action
and pre-lived phases. These are of considerable interest for investigation of the persuasive effects of decision-making strategies that involve individuals, groups, and families (Jenkins 1976) in choosing travel goals, the aim being to discover the ‘cultural background’ with which the tourist social subject (individual, group, or family) arrives at and is oriented in its destinations.

Sometimes the bias of this psychological suitcase (packed with pre-knowledge, pre-images, pre-emotions, pre-judgements, etc.) with which a tourist arrives at his/her destination is such that (particularly in the case of highly cultural destinations: historic capitals and/or metropolises such as Rome, Paris, London, New York) influences the entire behaviour of action–relation–transaction with the place, often inducing tourists to confirm by knowing rather than exploring the reality (Gullotta 1986). Evidence of this has been found by research studies that note the tendency in tourists to photograph well-known elements of reality, such as those typically depicted on postcards showing prototypical monuments of capitals, such as the Colosseum, the Eiffel Tour, the Pantheon, the Brooklyn Bridge, etc. (Chalfen 1979), rather than the more secluded places that urge them to a discovery, an unexpected emotion, some unknown element.

Contributing to the creation of images of places and to their change are the mass media, postcards, the photographs and films produced by the tourists themselves, the principal artificers of the effect of confirmation and perpetuation of stereotypes of places: they go to places with the idea that there are no objects or artifacts that cannot be seen (for example, the Leaning Tower of Pisa), photograph them or film them and, on their return home, show them to friends and family.

(Mura 2008: 19)

Advertising (including e-branding strategies) relative to tourism is an expanding and increasingly specialized topic of research which has identified persuasive modalities and strategies according to specific psychological processes applied when the object ‘holiday’ appears in the psychological field of social subjects (individual, group, family) (Carta et al. 1991; de Rosa and Bocci 2001, 2002; Dewailly 1984; Fesenmaier et al. 1996; Grandi 1991; Gritti 1967; Guerin et al. 1977; Perussia 1984, 1986, 1991a, 1991b; Pinna et al. 1991; Pearce 2005).


Pictures that communicate messages of destinations, programs, and activities are the key to attracting and holding potential visitors who will, it is hoped, be motivated to make further inquiries and eventually a booking. Photographic
images may also evoke memories and return business, or stimulate word of mouth recommendations to potential visitors.

(Dewar, Li and Davis 2007: 35)

In light of these studies, questions have been addressed to psychologists by tourism professionals concerning the structures to subdivide in an efficient way and address to the targets of advertising messages. These questions cover the entirety of psychological involvement of social subjects with tourism, ranging from motivational components, through conceivable–representative–emotional ones and decision-making processes, to more specific experiential factors related to tourism.

To conclude this introduction we may state that – as at the beginning of other disciplinary fields like environmental and economic psychology – the theoretical and methodological paradigms able to provide a basis for empirical and experimental research in the emerging area of the psychology of tourism have progressively benefited from social psychology, which favours theoretical traditions and more consolidated research. Owing to the contribution made by the subject of the study as such to the specificity of each disciplinary sector in psychology (characterized by a circular relation among the subject, object and means of knowledge), as research progresses it is not only possible, but also desirable, that the psychology of tourism should gain increasing autonomy, thereby giving rise to specific theoretical paradigms and methodologies. There is obviously common ground between environmental psychology and the psychology of tourism within a multi-perspective disciplinary space – as represented in Figure 15.1 – anchored in the theoretical paradigms of social psychology itself.

![Figure 15.1](image_url)  
*Figure 15.1 Environmental Applied Social Psychology as multi-perspective disciplinary space*
Aims and hypotheses

The research reported in what follows had two fundamental aims:

1 To propose a way to operationalize the theoretical construct of place-identity (linking both spatial and temporal dimensions)
2 To contribute to the intercultural exploration of social representations of Rome and the social memory related to places: a socio-cultural object of great importance not only for Rome’s residents (as investigated in other studies: Ardone et al. 1987a, 1987b; Bonnes et al. 1991a, 1991b; de Rosa et al. 1988; Nenci et al. 2003) but also for visitors to the city, by virtue of the richness of its historical and cultural past.

Well known is the specific literary and artistic output in European, and particularly English and German, culture testifying to the importance of travelling through Italy and above all to Rome. The ‘Grand Tour’ flourished from about 1660 to the beginning of the nineteenth century, and it was an almost obligatory stage in the careers of artists, poets and writers, but also for the well-to-do (Venice, Florence and Rome being the typical itinerary for a honeymoon couple from the affluent social classes, as an educational rite of passage) (see for example: Bignamini and Homsby 2010; Bohls and Duncan 2005; Buzard 2002; Chaney 2000; De Seta 1992; Italian Ministry of Culture et al. 1988). Thus Rome and its historic centre are objects of knowledge which precede the personal experience of the modern-day tourist and result in selective exposure to the impact of the social–environmental reality, presumably to differing extents according to the tourist’s cultural background.

For both dimensions (place-identity and social representations of the environment), our aim was to identify possible connections with the subjects’ social identity, in particular as related to nationality and other population variables (age, sex, place of residence, and length of residence in that place).

More specifically with regard to place-identity, our main research aims were:

a To identify the most meaningful places for the subjects in various phases of the life cycle (childhood, adolescence, youth – i.e. the twenties – maturity). In particular, we expected that ‘home’ would prove to be the most important place overall for all subjects, regardless of variations from phase to phase of the life cycle and independently of the salience given to different phases by the subjects. The hypothesis that home constitutes a sort of central nucleus in the organization of place-identity is supported by the theoretical work of Altman and Werner (1985), Buttimer and Seamon (1980), Corigliano (1991), Duncan (1981, 1993), Giuliani (1989, 1991; Giuliani et al. 1988), Omata (1992), Pezen-Massebuau (1983), Proshansky et al. (1983), Relph (1976), Roux (1976), Tacon (1983), Tuan (1977, 1980) and also, paradoxically, by investigations of the ‘homeless’ (Dovey 1985; Moore and Canter 1991), temporary habitation (Ratiu 2005), and the ‘second home’ as an integral part of contemporary tourism and mobility (Hall and Muller 2004).
According to Buttimmer and Seamond (1980), place-identity and the ‘sense of belonging’ develop as a function of the extent to which the important activities in a person’s life are centred on or within the home. Proshansky et al. (1983) speak of ‘belonging to the place’ with reference to the individual’s great desire for, and emotional attachment to, his/her childhood home and its setting.

On the research side, Csikszentmihaly and Rochberg-Halton (1981), in an investigation of a sample of families in the United States, empirically reconstructed hierarchies of importance attributed to daily life objects. Although differentiated by generation (children, parents, grandparents), these hierarchies were united by the central position assigned to ‘home’ in each of the three cases by the subjects, who attributed it with ‘security’, a component of no little importance for the definition of personal identity.

More recently, Manzo has pointed out that empirical research, influenced by the notion of ‘home’, consequently focuses on residential settings, positive affect and a depoliticized view of individual experiences. This has limited our understanding of a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon. Recent literature demonstrates a need to better incorporate the full magnitude of human experiences into the current discourse on people–place relationships.

(Manzo 2003: 47)

Looking at the ‘Home beyond the House’, Cloutier-Fisher and Harvey have investigated the experiences of place among members of a retirement community, discovering that

for new retirees, there exists a zone between the home and community, that can be viewed as a geographic space comprised of overlapping and interwoven personal, social and physical domains. This zone between the physical house and the surrounding community can be construed as having certain elastic qualities and permeable boundaries that blur the distinctions between home and community.

(Cloutier-Fisher and Harvey 2009: 246)

b To analyse any differences between significant places indicated by the subjects as functions of population variables such as nationality, age, sex, place of residence and length of residence there. We also expected to find differences among the significant places indicated for different phases of the life cycle, since, according to Proshansky et al. (1983: 65), ‘even the most enduring cognitive components of place-identity will change to some degree over the length of the lifecycle’.

Although the absence of specific literature on this topic from a cross-cultural perspective meant that our hypotheses were essentially exploratory and non-directional, we expected to find differences in particular for the cross-cultural variable in the organization of place-identity among different
nationality groups. On the basis of Proshansky’s work, in fact, the socio-cultural determinants in the structuring of place-identity are expressed both in the form of fundamental ‘uniformity’ that derives from belonging to a certain culture and as ‘differentiation’ within that same culture between individuals belonging to different social groups.

Meanings of spaces and places are not universally shared [...] Attached to the physical settings that substantively define place-identity are not only the general social proprieties that come from the broad uniformities in a culture, but also those that serve to distinguish different groups in the culture: racial, ethnic, social, national and religious groups in a given culture should reveal not only different use and experience with space and place, but corresponding variations in the social values, meanings and ideas which underlie the use of those spaces.

(Proshansky et al. 1983: 63–4)

From this perspective, Giuliani (2004) has investigated the residential preferences and attachment across the lifespan, seeking to answer the questions “To what extent do places where people live meet their needs and desires? Family life and social life are changing dramatically in many areas of the world. How are these changes reflected in the meaning people attribute to their residence and the way they assess it?”.

c To determine the subjective salience of each phase of the life cycle, i.e. the temporal dimension implicit in the concept of place-identity. We expected to find significant differences as functions of population variables in the salience of the phases of the life cycle on the basis of studies emphasizing socio-cultural determinants in the organization of the temporal dimension, as discussed in the Introduction (Fraser 1987; McGrath 1988, 2007; Mercure and Pronovost 1989; Mercure and Wallemacq 1988; Nuttin 1983; Ramos 1991, 1992; Ricci-Bitti and Sarchielli 1985; Tabboni 1985/1988; Tromsdorff and Lamm 1980; Zimbardo and Boyd 1999).

With regard to the social representations of Rome, our aims were:

a To reveal the places in Rome of greatest significance to first-time visitors from different countries, investigating the reasons behind such choices and analyzing any differences found with reference to the subjects’ population characteristics. We hypothesized that such differences would exist, basing our hypothesis (also of an exploratory nature in the absence of similar research in environmental psychology), on the literature on social representations of the environment, which emphasizes the influence of cultural codes in the reading of the surrounding environment (Jodelet 1982a, 1982b; Milgram 1984; Pailhous 1984).

b To analyse, cross-culturally, the evaluations implicit in lists of adjectives produced by the subjects about Rome and its historic centre. In particular, the aim was to compare descriptions elicited before the subjects saw Rome
(what we term the ‘imaginal’ level) and after they had seen Rome (experiential level). We expected to find significant differences between these two levels, basing our hypothesis on the theories which give importance to the transformative impact of action and experience on representational systems (Aric 1994; Flament 1987, 1989, 1994; Guimelli 1994; Purkhardt 1993, 2002; von Cranach 1992). Following these theories, a devaluation in the image of the city of Rome as a whole was expected after direct contact with the chaotic metropolis.

Furthermore, it was hypothesized that the representation of the historic centre would become more positively consistent with time (before/after the tourists’ visit to the city), because it forms the core of the representation. The historic centre as the nucleus of the representation has been demonstrated in other research on social representations of metropolitan contexts (Jodelet 1982a, 1982b; Milgram 1984; Pailhous 1984), including the city of Rome (Bonnes and Secchiaroli 1983; Bonnes et al. 1987). Our hypothesis was also supported by the literature on social representations, which emphasizes the archaic nature, stability and invariability of the figurative nucleus with respect to peripheral elements present in the representational system (Moscovici 1976, 1988, 1992; see also de Rosa 1987, de Rosa and Farr 2001), also independently from the ‘structural’ paradigm and its specific methodologies for testing the centrality of elements (Aric 1993, 1994, 2003; Aric and Tafani 2009).

As confirmation of the strong interrelations between ‘physical territories, social territories and mental territories’ (Rouquette 2006) in shaping social representations of the environment, the centre cannot be reduced to its geometric location in the city map. An empirical confirmation is provided by Marchand (2003), who has compared the image of the centre in the urban structures of two different French cities: Rennes (a historic town that has evolved on the radiocentric model, where the centre is in the geographical centre of a city that has developed in successive strata) and Le Havre (a new town, where the centre, completely bombed during the Second World War and rebuilt in the 1950s, does not correspond to the geographical centre of the city because it has developed according to the semi-radiocentric model from the port, where the sea and the cliff constitute more pertinent spatial landmarks and symbols of the town).

In Rennes as in Le Havre, the centre is expected as being the heart and the soul of the city; the dwellers expect this place to give a particular rhythm to the town, ‘*un état d’esprit*’ (a state of mind), to be a microcosm of the city; the centre confers the image of the city and gives it a unique character. It constitutes a landmark, both spatial and conceptual. It allows people to locate themselves in the town and articulates the other urban functions around it. We see it as the place which differentiates urban space from urbanized space.

(Marchand 2003: 23)
The research results clearly show that

The centre of Le Havre is not as attractive as the centre of Rennes for the inhabitants; it constitutes an anchoring point in Rennes only. The urban structure seems to play a major bond. The configuration of the centre of Rennes makes it a gathering place, whereas the centre of Le Havre, which is characterized by weak concentration and does not have the density which characterizes traditional centres, does not satisfy the aspiration in social terms.

(Marchand 2003: 23)

c To reveal cross-cultural differences in the social representations of our first-visitors’ ‘Ideal City’, by comparing descriptions obtained through free associations using adjectives. We anticipated differences to emerge as a result of different expectational structures regarding ‘places’ inherent in different cultural contexts.

**Method**

**Pilot Studies**

Prior to the research reported here, which extended cross-culturally, two pilot studies were carried out in order to clarify the method. The first study involved fifty university students and their family nuclei; the second, 100 subjects equally distributed between residents of the historic centre of Rome and residents of a mid-suburban area of the city. The subjects of these pilot studies were selected in order to investigate the relationship between, on the one hand, identification processes with different places evoked as ‘attachment objects’, and on the other, the relation between shared or variable representational models of the environment with respect to the social identity of the subjects (i.e. membership of the same family nucleus and the generational level covered within it, birth and/or length of residence in the same city or district, social status).

Once the methodology had been defined in light of these pilot studies, the project developed in two directions. The first, already published, investigated residents’ social representations of the area of Rome where they lived, linked with the study of place-identity (Nenci and de Rosa 1993; Nenci et al. 2003). The second, presented in this paper, investigated the social representations of Rome and its historic centre held by non-residents (first-visitors), after having weighed the articulation of significant places in different phases of the lifecycle as these related to place-identity. This study was the first research wave for subsequent developments, as briefly described in the conclusions.
Sample

The sample consisted of 180 subjects from six different countries, chosen from first-time visitors to Rome: Europeans (Italians not resident in Rome, Spanish, English, French and German nationals) and non-Europeans (Japanese).\(^2\)

The choice of sample resulted from an interest in conducting intercultural comparisons among (i) ways of perceiving the importance of ‘places of life’ in the various phases of the lifecycle, (ii) the representations of a great historical-cultural place like the city of Rome, and above all its historic centre, of subjects from different European countries (including Italy), and then (iii) between these subjects and ones from a non-European country – in this case an Asiatic country far removed from Rome in terms of both geographical and cultural distance.

We would have liked to extend our sample to include nationals of other non-European countries, for example ones in North and South America. To this end, we prepared a questionnaire in Portuguese for possible administration to Brazilian tourists. However, in the end we were forced to forgo such ambitions by the extreme logistical difficulties of contacting subjects possessing all the characteristics that we required (first-time visitors to Rome, who intended to stay for a minimum of two weeks, further distinguished by sex, age and length of residence in place of origin).

The participants were recruited from Italian language schools for foreigners, lists of hotel guests and travel agents. They were interviewed upon arrival at the airport (i.e. before they had seen Rome) and at the end of their stay in Rome (the average length of stay being two weeks).

The six nationality groups were all of equal size (i.e. thirty subjects). They were also more or less equally distributed as far as the other population variables were concerned: i.e. sex, age (less/more than 24 years old), and length of residence in place of origin (less/more than 20 years). This last variable was held under control in order to evaluate the possible relations between the structure of places indicated in place-identity and different degrees of ‘residential stability’ among the subjects. All subjects belonged to the upper-middle social class.

Instrument

The instrument, created according to the goals of the investigation and validated in the pilot studies, divided into two parts, respectively investigating place-identity and social representations:

The first part of the questionnaire consisted of three sections to identify:

a The first 10 significant places, in order of importance for the respondent, in each phase of his/her life cycle (childhood, adolescence, youth, maturity);

b The most significant place for respondents over the entire life span and the reason for this choice;

c The relative importance each phase of the life cycle for the respondents, as shown by how they divided up a modified timeline scaled from 1 to 50 into metric–perceptual segments representing each phase of their lives, starting from birth.
The second part was subdivided into four sections:

a The first, administered to first-visitors upon arrival in Rome, asked for their image of Rome and its historic centre (at the imaginal level) by means of free association using adjectives (the first ten adjectives that came to mind).

The other three sections, administered at the end of the stay, included:

b The respondents’ evaluations (again using free associations with adjectives) of Rome and its historic centre at the experiential level (after having seen it and lived in it);

c The ten most significant places in Rome for the respondents in order of importance, and the choice, from among the places listed, of the one they deemed absolutely the most important and why;

d Descriptions (again using free associations of adjectives) of their Ideal City.

The questionnaire was administered in the participant’s own language (Italian, Spanish, English, German, French, Japanese).

Categorization of the places and data analysis design

Because the timeline was a scaled grid from 1 to 50, it was easily subjected to analysis, since the area of each segment corresponded to the metric–perceptual importance of that stage in the subject’s life. Hence the width of each phase was measured and incorporated directly into the statistical analysis.

The free associations related to the places evoked were organized according to a series of categorical criteria based on content analysis, before proceeding to statistical analysis (described below).

For the most meaningful places in the person’s life cycle, broader categories were created to synthesize the information obtained for places indicated as the most significant overall, and for those which were most significant with respect to each phase of the life cycle (according to the frequencies with which they were mentioned).

Before these places, freely elicited from the subjects, were analysed using the SPAD-N version of the SPAD program (Lebart et al. 1987; see also Greenacre 1984, Benzecri 1992), they were grouped into seven comprehensive categories including both prototypical places (i.e. unnamed ones lying at a higher level of abstraction, such as ‘city’, ‘square’, ‘museum’) and specifically named places (such as Paris, Piazza di Spagna, Capitoline Museums):

1 Geographical places for nations, cities, countries (e.g. Rome, Paris, my country, my mother’s city, etc.);

2 Urban places for neighbourhoods, roads, squares, streets (e.g. my neighbourhood, via del Corso, my town square, etc.);

3 Home for all places with a habitative function (e.g. childhood home, home, others’ home, hotel, etc.);
4 Physical–natural places for ‘green’ areas (e.g. parks, Villa Pamphili, gardens, also park bench, etc.);
5 Artistic–architectural places for monuments, works of art, museums (e.g. Colosseum, museum, Vatican Museums, Sistine Chapel, etc.);
6 Institutional places for work, school, and bureaucratic places and their annexes (e.g. nursery, elementary school, office, office desk, hospital, etc.);
7 Socio-recreational places for environments where people meet, where leisure activities and entertainment take place (e.g. discotheque, bar, cinema, theatre, etc.).

Regarding the reasons given for the choice of these places, twelve sub-categories, based on frequency and content analyses, summarized under the four following headings, were created:

- Six reasons linked to the self, namely: affective attachment; emotions; introspective space; personal independence; achievement at work; personal interests;
- Two reasons linked to the family, namely: family education; family warmth;
- Three reasons linked to the socio-interpersonal context, namely: friendship ties; possibilities for socializing; entertainment;
- One reason linked to the physical–natural context, namely contact with nature.

Regarding the most significant places in Rome, the places indicated by the subjects, in order of frequency at least greater than 1 and a percentage greater than 5 per cent, were ordered in a frequency chart and table of percentages before being analysed using the same SPAD-N version of the SPAD program.

The reasons expressed by each person for their choice of the most significant place in Rome were reclassified into the following thirteen sub-categories, under the following four headings, according to content analysis of the entire list of reasons given:

- Four reasons linked to the self: affective attachment; emotions; personal religiosity; personal cultural enrichment;
- Two reasons linked to the socio-interpersonal context: entertainment; socializing;
- Five reasons linked to the socio-cultural context: the place as a symbol of culture, of religious faith, as representative of an era or as showing the reality of the city; historical roots;
- Two reasons linked to the physical–natural context: habitual route; contact with nature.

With regard to evaluations of the city of Rome, its historic centre, and the Ideal City, gathered through free associations using adjectives, eight dimensions were identified by content analysis. These dimensions are:

1 Aesthetic and artistic–architectural for adjectives relating to aesthetic and historical characteristics of the city (e.g. beautiful, fascinating, historical, etc.);
Visuo-perceptual for adjectives pertaining to physical and spatial characteristics of the environment (e.g. large, broad, small, etc.);  
Colour for adjectives relating to colours;  
Functional for adjectives relating to how the city worked and its efficiency (e.g. organized, disorganized, chaotic, etc.);  
Economic for adjectives such as rich, poor, commercial, etc.;  
Socio-interpersonal for adjectives referring to the ‘human’ aspect of the city (e.g. welcoming, friendly)  
Evaluative for all adjectives expressing value judgments, ethical judgments (e.g. immoral, uninhabitable, inhuman, etc.);  
Emotional for all adjectives expressing an emotion provoked by the city (e.g. surprising, exciting, romantic, etc.).

Data were analysed using:

- Techniques of multidimensional analyses (multiple correspondence analysis, carried out using the SPAD-N program), for the seven categories (for three phases of the life cycle), the twenty-eight places of Rome and the eight dimensions described above;  
- Inferential techniques (analyses of variance, carried out using the ANOVA statistical technique of the SPSS package), for the timeline;  
- Comparative techniques (calculation of chi-squares) for the eight adjectival dimensions described above.

Results and discussion

Place-identity

The first aim was to identify the most significant places for subjects during various phases of the life cycle, the hypothesis being that the home constitutes a sort of central nucleus in the organization of place-identity, based on several theoretical conceptions and experimental studies.

The results of our study (see Table 15.1) show that in actual fact, ‘home’ is the place of primary importance only in relation to the phase of childhood, and it is linked to physical–natural places (which come second, third and fourth) in a network of habitational and open places. Urban places never appear among the first four most significant places for each phase of the life cycle from childhood to maturity.

Both home and physical–natural places disappear from the other stages of the life cycle: for these, subjects expressed a different network of institutional places (related to work or school) and social–recreational places.

Nevertheless, when the data relative to the most significant place overall were analysed without accounting for stages in the life cycle, home once again took first place over all other places. It thus seemingly reaffirmed its central role in the organization of place-identity (see Table 15.2).
In short, when the subject was asked to focus on individual stages in his/her life, home lost importance in favour of other settings, but when the individual analysed the entire span of his/her life on replying to a specific question, home reacquired great significance and figured as the central organizing nucleus of place-identity.

This result can be explained by referring to the work of authors such as Relph (1976), who considers the home as a place of maximum personal importance in the life of an individual, ‘the central reference point of human existence.’ Feldman (1990), Giuliani (1989, 1991, 2004) and Giuliani et al. (1988) instead focus on the aspect of ‘continuity–stability’ or ‘openness to change’ in studying people’s attachment to their homes (Corigliano 1991). They emphasize that people establish psychological (cognitive–affective) ties not so much with a specific and familiar domestic environment as with types of environmental settings which provide analogous characteristics in whatever geographical area. For these authors, playing the crucial role in this respect is not individual familiarization with a physical setting but above all the collective practices and possibilities for action provided within that setting.

It is of interest to compare the results of these first research waves with those found by the follow-up and extended studies that we carried out almost twenty years later. This will enable us not only to take the temporal dimension into account at the level of the participants’ life-cycle, but also to adopt a longitudinal and cultural perspective, given the substantial changes in lifestyles also regarding practices related to the home and its relation with other functional places like work settings.

Analysis of the frequencies associated with the twelve categories of reasons for the choice of the most significant place overall revealed a hierarchy: the reasons given most often by the subjects were, in order, ‘affective attachment to the place’ (23.6 per cent); ‘family warmth, the security which the place gives’ (17.6 per cent); ‘personal independence, growth, the way toward maturity’ which the place represents (8.5 per cent); ‘entertainment, pleasure’ to be enjoyed in the place (8.5 per cent); the fact that the place represents ‘a space for reflecting, for introspection’ (6.7 per cent), ‘an environment where it is possible to socialize’ (6.1 per cent), ‘to achieve in one’s professional life’ (4.8 per cent) ‘develop one’s interests’ (4.8 per cent); ‘because it recalls family upbringing, one’s roots’ (4.8 per cent); ‘for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15.1</th>
<th>The first four most important places for each phase of the lifecycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st place</td>
<td>home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd place</td>
<td>physical–natural places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd place</td>
<td>physical–natural places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th place</td>
<td>physical–natural places</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
emotions the place elicits’ (4.8 per cent); ‘because it allows contact with nature’ (4.8 per cent) and ‘because it recalls friendship and memories’ (4.2 per cent).

These results also evidence that affective significance is attributed to the home (as an object of attachment) as well as security (family warmth), confirming the findings of Csikszentmihaly and Rochberg-Halton (1981) and the tenets of place-identity theory.

The second aim of this research was to identify any differences due to population variables (in particular nationality) in the subjects’ expression of significant places.

The expected result was that there would be significant differences as functions of the variables considered; according to Proshansky, the substance and structural properties of place-identity (the content of cognitions and their degree of interrelationship) vary with sex, age, social class and other social descriptors of the individual.

Again according to Proshansky, the place-identity categories contain something more than the memories, feelings and interpretations relating to every physical setting in the real world ‘used’ by the individual; they also contain social definitions, i.e. norms, behaviours, rules and regulations relating to the use of these settings. This means that the place-identity of ethnic, social, national, and religious groups not only reveals different uses and experiences of space and place, but also variations corresponding to values, meanings and social representations underlying the use of these spaces. This consideration induced us to analyse whether differences in ways of ‘living in space’ really existed between groups of tourists from different countries.

The results of multiple correspondence analyses (using SPAD-N) revealed three factorial axes. The active variables used were the seven categories comprising the places indicated by the subjects as the most significant in the three most salient phases of the life cycle (childhood, adolescence and youth). The illustrative variables used were age, sex, nationality, residential mobility with respect to birthplace and the length of residence in place of origin.3

Graphs 2 and 3 illustrate the bi-dimensional spaces obtained from articulation of the 1st factor with the 2nd (graph 2) and the 2nd factor with the 3rd (graph 3) using SPAD-N.

The results shown in Figure 15.2 indicate that the first factorial axis (inertia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important place</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional places</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical places</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical–natural places</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio–recreational places</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban places</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic–architectural places</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.2 The most important places (in absolute) named by the subjects in order of frequency
Figure 15.2 Graphical representation of the first and second factorial axes resulting from MCA of the first 6 important places in the lives of the subjects.
Annamaria Silvana de Rosa

4 can be interpreted as ‘safe places versus adventurous places’, which differentiates significantly between the groups of tourists. In fact there is a stark contrast in the importance of more enclosed, ‘safe’ environments (such as the home) and wider, more adventurous geographical places (such as the world) between the Italians (T = 4.2), who prefer safe places, and the French (T = –2.2) and Japanese (T = -5.2), who prefer geographical places.

The second factorial axis (inertia = 26.75 per cent) can be interpreted as ‘closed places versus open places’, and once again it discriminates significantly amongst the tourists. In fact, with respect to preferences for ‘house’ or ‘green areas’, a contrast emerged between the English (T = –3.0) who prefer the first and the Japanese (T = 4.1) who prefer the second. Other research on place-identity (Sime and Kimura 1988) has already revealed the Japanese appreciation of green spaces, and found that they attribute a cultural meaning to green spaces markedly different from that given by British nationals and North-Americans.

One final observation can be made regarding the different nationalities: of the six countries considered, some are closer to each other geographically and some farther away. In confirmation of the hypothesized differences, the greatest distance is between Italians and Japanese, and it is interesting to note that this geographical distance is also reflected in a distance between expressed preferences for places. In fact, there is a much greater contrast between the Italians and the Japanese than between any other groups as regards the choice of closed or open environments.

The third factorial axis (inertia = 13.37 per cent) can be interpreted as ‘importance/non-importance of urban places’ (streets, town squares, districts). The distribution of the groups on this axis once again shows the influence of factors linked to social identity in the organization of place-identity. In fact, a significant difference emerged from the data between men (T = –2.2), who prefer urban places, and women (T = 2.2), who attach no importance to them.

With regard to the two indicators ‘residential mobility/stability’ included in the research design, the variable ‘residence in a place different from the place of birth (or in the same place)’ and the variable ‘length of residence in city of origin’ have a strong influence on the representations of places, highlighting a contrast between subjects with a higher level of residential mobility and those who are more ‘stable’ in this respect. In fact, both those who are no longer resident in their birthplace (on the 1st axis T = –2.4; on the 3rd axis T = –3.3) and those who have lived in the same city for less than 20 years – defined ‘short-medium term’ residents (on the 1st axis T = –2.9; on the 3rd axis T = 2.4) – tend to show a greater preference for open places, without boundaries, such as ‘the world’ (see Figure 15.2: geographical places), and physical–natural places in childhood (Figure 15.3). By contrast, both residents still living in their place of birth and long-term residents (i.e. those who have been living in the same city for more than twenty years) show a definite preference for the home in all phases of the life cycle (on the 1st axis T = 2.2; on the 3rd axis T = 2.7) (Figures 15.2 and 15.3). This may signify that long-term residents ‘have had time’ to develop that sense of ‘belonging to the place’ of which Proshansky et al. (1983) speak, or that in any case long-term
II' FACTOR:
Eigenvalue = 0.1032
Percentage of explained variance = 26.75%

III' FACTOR:
Eigenvalue = 0.0889
Percentage of explained variance = 13.37%

Figure 15.3 Graphical representation of the second and third factorial axes resulting from MCA of the first 6 important places in the lives of the subjects
residents are people who structure an attachment relation to a place so as to direct their life-styles and circumscribe life-spaces, limiting their exploratory territorial behaviour in terms of ‘environmental closure’.

Again on the topic of place-identity, our final objective was to analyse the subjective salience of each phase of the life cycle by means of a between-subjects comparison of the width of each phase indicated on the timeline.

The hypothesis was that significant differences would emerge as functions of the population variables with respect to the width of the life cycle phases on the basis of recent literature on this subject, as mentioned in the introduction.

The results of analyses of variance showed that:

a The nationality variable only influences the phases of childhood (F = 3.332; p = 0.007) and adolescence (F = 2.930; p = 0.015). On analytically evaluating the intergroup differences using Student’s t test, it emerged that the Japanese and Germans tend to make the childhood phase wider in comparison with the other groups (minimum difference = 4.17); while the Spanish tend to enlarge the phase of adolescence (minimum difference = 3.27) (see Figure 15.4).

![Figure 15.4](attachment:image.png)

Figure 15.4 Mean amplitudes (measured in degrees) of the four phases of the life cycle by nationality of the subjects

b The age variable significantly influences the width given to adolescence (F = 11.368; p = 0.01), youth (F = 7.5; p = 0.007) and maturity (F = 4.339; p = 0.041), in the sense that young people (less than twenty-four years old) make these phases larger; this is in line with the literature on time which shows an expansion of the temporal perspective and the notion of time in young people (see Figure 15.5).
c The sex variable has an effect only on the width of the adolescent phase ($F = 4.010; p = 0.047$), in that females consider it to be greater than males do (see Figure 15.6).

These results confirm that the temporal perspective is not only an individual multidimensional construct, but is a psychological dimension strongly affected by socio-cultural variables.

**Social Representations**

The results obtained were consistent with the theoretical framework adopted, which emphasized the symbolic–cultural significance people attribute to the environment. The role of ‘interface’ can be attributed to the process which leads...
Annamaria Silvana de Rosa

to an organized representation of the surrounding world; it links and, at the same
time, reflects characteristics of the relationships among individuals, environments
and group or collective behaviour.

On the basis of the theoretical perspectives expressed in the introduction, we
hypothesized a different ‘social representation of the surrounding environment’
for subjects and groups with different types of ‘cultural baggage’ and environ-
mental experiences.

Table 15.3  The 38 most important places in Rome listed by the subjects in order of
frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>places</th>
<th>frequencies</th>
<th>percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colosseum</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza Navona</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza di Spagna</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Borghese</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantheon</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatican City</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trastevere</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>museums</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana di Trevi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Centre</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza Venezia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo dei fiori</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza del Popolo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tevere</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Pamphili</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistine Chapel</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinità dei Monti</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Appia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catacombs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castel S. Angelo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via del Corso</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termini Station</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John Lateran</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eur</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gianicolo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terme di Caracalla</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clemente</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isola Tiberina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piazza Repubblica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Maria Maggiore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porta Portese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regard to the first objective (revealing the most important places in Rome for all subjects as well as for groups differentiated by the variables chosen), the results obtained for the choice of place considered to be absolutely the most significant, independent of population variables, show that subjects choose the most famous places in Rome (the Colosseum, St. Peter’s, the Forum) (see Table 15.3).

However, and this may seem strange for transient tourists, one of the most significant places in Rome indicated by the subjects was the ‘home’. It should be pointed out, however, that since we are dealing with a tourist population, ‘home’, as it appears in the above list, refers to any place which serves the purpose of ‘habitation’. It therefore includes hotels, hostels, friends’ home, relatives’ home, etc. We arrived at this definition which is obviously fairly arbitrary, for two reasons. First, the special nature of our sample group, who as first-time visitors to Rome did not have a house of their own in the city; although they often used this category in their responses – clarifying what they meant by it when we prompted them. Second, the reasons given by the subjects themselves, who emphasized the emotional valence and personal importance of the place which served the functions of their own home (i.e. environmental closure – ‘refuge’, ‘security’, ‘rest’ – or environmental openness – ‘place to receive friends’, ‘place to be received by friends’) and which distinguished such a place from other places of the city proper.

This result confirms the importance of the home as a symbol of the self that guarantees the continuity and distinctiveness of the private sphere, as corroborated by our results on place-identity presented in the preceding section. It also confirms the importance of psychological (cognitive–affective) ties established with types of environmental settings, which serve to ensure certain fundamental analogous characteristics (be they habitational or residential) in any geographical area.

The distribution of frequencies of the reasons behind the choice of places shows that the most common reason lies in the category of ‘emotions’ (24.4 per cent), revealing the extent to which feelings and sensations can ‘colour’ a place. In second place are reasons linked to ‘historical roots’ (17.2 per cent): this demonstrates an interest in the great symbols of the past and the historical–cultural impact of ancient Rome. Next comes another reason involving the individual’s self in terms of ‘affective attachment’ (9.4 per cent). It therefore seems that each place and monument cited was chosen because of an emotion evoked by looking at it or by a deep tie that the individual felt with it for various reasons, all derived from emotional involvement – thereby confirming the findings of the literature in this area (Cooper Marcus 1976; Giuliani 1991; Lee 1990; Shumaker and Taylor 1983).

Concerning the aim of providing evidence for the hypothesis that the choice of the most important place in Rome would differ amongst groups distinguished by different population characteristics, since these would affect the representations of the city visited, the results confirmed a strong effect of nationality and age and a weaker effect of sex. In relation to aggregations of places in the various representational levels, it is interesting to see how the various nationalities (and other population variables) are distributed.
Multiple correspondence analyses (MCA) of the twenty-nine places in Rome listed by the 180 subjects produced five factorial axes: these are illustrated in Figures 15.7, 15.8, 15.9 and 15.10.

The first factorial axis (inertia = 44.63 per cent) can be unequivocally interpreted as a contrast between ‘artistic–architectural’ places (St Peter’s, Coliseum, Sistine Chapel) and social–functional settings (restaurants, language schools). The groups of tourists were very clearly differentiated in the choice of such places: in fact, the French (T = 2.2) and the adults (T = 2.2) are distributed on the positive

![Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 15.7* Graphical representation of the intersection of the first and second factorial axes resulting from Multiple Correspondence Analysis of the top 28 places of Rome.
semi-axis, preferring the artistic–architectural places, while the Spanish (T = -2.3) and the adolescents (T = -3.0) are distributed on the negative semi-axis, preferring social–functional settings (see Figure 15.7).

The second factorial axis (inertia = 18.6 per cent) results from the distribution along the positive semi-axis of ‘importance of places which are full of life’ identified in those piazzas and markets (like the Campo dei Fiori and Piazza Navona) typically used by residents as particularly lively social centres, and by tourists as meeting places marked by a special ‘local flavour’. In contrast to

---

**Figure 15.8** Graphical representation of the intersection of the second and third factorial axes resulting from Multiple Correspondence Analysis of the top 28 places of Rome.
these, lying on the negative semi-axis are the typical ‘guided-tour’ places, which can be identified from the typical itineraries suggested by tourist guides (e.g. the catacombs, museums and the Forum). Consistently with the differences recorded for the first factorial axis, the second axis also shows clear differences between groups of tourists; in fact, once again the Spanish ($T = 2.9$) and the Germans ($T = 3.2$) prefer ‘lively places’, clustering on the positive semi-axis, while the Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III’ FACTOR:</th>
<th>IV’ FACTOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue = 0.0501</td>
<td>Eigenvalue = 0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of explained variance = 11.16%</td>
<td>Percentage of explained variance = 7.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15.9 Graphical representation of the intersection of the third and fourth factorial axes resulting from Multiple Correspondence Analysis of the top 28 places of Rome.
(T = –4.9) favour ‘guided-tour’ places, expressing a mode of relating to places that is more transitory – ‘just passing through’ – and more closely directed by the tourist guides. Age and sex also influence the representational systems of urban places, revealing that adults (T = –3.0) and males (T = –2.7) prefer ‘guided-tour’ places whereas females (T = 2.7) prefer ‘lively places’ (see Figure 15.8).

The third factorial axis (inertia = 11.16 per cent) is created by the contrast between some of the representative ‘monumental’ places of the city (Trinità dei Monti, Piazza del Popolo, Castel Sant’ Angelo), and the most characteristic ‘piazza/lounge’ of the city (Piazza di Spagna – the Spanish Steps). The groups of tourists are differentiated along this axis as well: in fact, the English (T = 3.3) give importance to the monumental places, while the Spanish (T = –2.2) prefer the ‘piazza/lounge’, confirming the orientation towards use of the city as a place for socializing which emerged in the results previously described. The age variable

Figure 15.10 Graphical representation of the intersection of the fourth and fifth factorial axes resulting from Multiple Correspondence Analysis of the top 28 places of Rome.
show an analogous correspondence in the way it is differentiated: once again, adults (T = 2.0) prefer monumental places, while adolescents (T = –2.7) favour the City’s piazza-lounge par excellence – the Spanish Steps (Figure 15.9).

The fourth factorial axis (inertia = 7.44 per cent) is formed around the counter-positioning of some ‘characteristic quarters and streets of the City’ (the Lungotevere, via Appia, Trevi Fountain, Trastevere) and the ‘Pantheon’, which is most probably cited not so much as a monument but as one of the piazza-lounges of Rome (with the same function as the Spanish Steps in the 3rd factor, as compared with other characteristic places of the city). Again, the groups of tourists are differentiated according to nationality. The Japanese (T = –2.4) express a clear preference for typical tourist spots or places with a historical–monumental character, while the Spanish (T = 2.6) and the adolescents (T = 2.3) confirm their preference for the Pantheon piazza-lounge (as for the Spanish Steps) (see Figure 15.10).

Lastly, the ‘social and meeting places’ (home, Italian language school) – which already constituted the 1st factorial axis – reappear on the fifth axis (inertia = 5.58 per cent) in contrast with physical–natural places (Pamphili Gardens) preferred by the French (T = 2.6).

From the results presented so far, it is apparent that places in Rome are represented (and used) differently according to the needs of the visitor, and these needs seem to be different for each nationality and influenced by population characteristics.

This is consistent with the findings in the literature on the links between people and places, and in particular the social and ‘shared’ origin of such links in the representational and action systems of individuals, where the person is always considered as forming part of a social group/category and places are always objects of culturally formulated significance (Stokols and Shumaker 1981) – although as ‘fields of action’ they may be used differently according to different strategies for using the environment, in turn conditioned by people’s lifestyles (Bonnes and Secchiaroli 1992, 1995; Canter 1984; Fuhrer 1990). The sociocultural meanings associated with places are seen as the ‘glue’ that unites the groups with particular places. These places are no longer seen as simply functional and behavioural settings but as a combined product of individual–motivational aspects and shared aspects, both at the level of representational systems and at the level of action systems, intentionally guided by socially constructed goals.

It seems from the results that the most ‘classic’ tourists are the Japanese, who most appreciate visiting places in Rome, such as museums, catacombs, the Forum, churches, and monuments; the other tourists – particularly Spanish and German – seem to appreciate more places for socializing and living life to the full; the English favour places which show the city’s traditions and its folklore, and the French prefer ‘physical–natural’ places.

With regard to the aim of identifying significant differences in the perceptual organization of the city of Rome and its historic centre, once we had grouped the adjectives associated by the 180 subjects with these two areas into categories, we wanted to verify the hypothesis of cross-cultural differences in the ‘reading of
the surrounding environment’ through analysis of different degrees of salience accorded to the category dimensions. In particular, possible differences were sought between the ‘imaginal’ (before) level and the experiential (after) level in representations of Rome and its historic centre.

The subjects’ evaluations of the salience of dimensions relative to Rome, both at the imaginal and the experiential level, analysed by chi square showed no important differences except for two dimensions: 1) the ‘functional’ dimension – more salient at the experiential level; 2) the artistic–architectural dimension – more salient at the imaginal level (Figure 15.11).

One explanation for this may be that at the imaginal level of a city, the subject draws on knowledge gained through books and tourist guides, which primarily emphasize the artistic appearance of places and resort to the power of the figurative–visual code to represent historical monuments (which in these texts predominate over accounts of the social life of the city). Postcards that the subjects may in the past have received from friends and acquaintances visiting Rome almost always portray monumental aspects of the city and may have acted as vehicles of information reinforcing what was learnt at school.

After having visited the city, however, aspects of the city’s organization, the way structures work, the efficiency of the road network, the level of acoustic and atmospheric pollution, etc., are those that contribute most to the formation of the experiential level of an urban environment because they are the ones that are most directly experienced. A similar trend was found in the results for the historic centre of Rome (Figure 15.12).
However, the most interesting differences can be found in the salience of the various dimensions detected for each nationality in comparison with every other, as illustrated by the graphics based on correspondence analysis. Owing to space limitations, we will not present these graphics here but will restrict ourselves to some general comments.

Both at the imaginal and experiential level there seems to be a contrast between some dimensions which concern the ‘experienced’ characteristics of a city (i.e. its emotions, colours, functional aspects) and more ‘extrinsic’ dimensions (such as physical space and architectural aspects) (Sakalaki 1998). The dimensions concerning the ‘experienced’ characteristics were more often elicited from Italian, German and Spanish tourists; whereas the French and Japanese emphasized the more extrinsic, visuo-perceptual dimensions, in line with all the trends in the results (Figures 15.13, 15.14, 15.15, 15.16). Moreover, there is a difference between the sexes at the imaginal level, in that females gave greater importance to the social–interpersonal dimension of Rome and its historic centre relative to males.

With regard to the aim of demonstrating the hypothesized differences in the representation of the Ideal City, the results show that all subjects paid particular attention to functional and social–interpersonal aspects; whereas the artistic–architectural and the visuo-perceptual dimensions were more emphasized by the Japanese subjects; the colour dimension and the emotional dimension by the Italians; and the evaluative one by the Spanish and the Germans.
In summary, we can confirm that in this case there is a rather marked contrast between some nationalities in the different emphases given to various dimensions, and these differences are consistent with the results presented above and revealed through other sections of the questionnaire.

$\chi^2(5) = 46.7, p < 0.0001$

*Figure 15.13* Visuo-perceptual dimension relative to Rome (imaginal level).

$\chi^2(5) = 28.8, p < 0.0001$

*Figure 15.14* Visuo-perceptual dimension relative to Rome (experiential level).
Analyses of connotations (the positive, negative or neutral polarity given to the adjectives elicited) showed that all interviewees expressed positive opinions of Rome as they imagined it (before seeing it), except for the Germans, who expressed, in equal measure, negative and positive expectations about Rome (Figure 15.17).
At the experiential level, after having seen Rome, all subjects except for the Italians and French (the closest groups of subjects in terms of proximity and cultural experience with the Italian environment) expressed more negative than positive or neutral adjectives (Figure 15.18).

Thus, the Germans evaluated the city of Rome negatively both before and after having seen it; the Italians and French positively both before and after; while subjects with all other nationalities elicited adjectives with positive connotations before seeing Rome but afterwards they expressed more negative connotations.

The Germans’ negative judgements of the metropolis of Rome might seem a contradiction, given the cultural tradition of ‘travels in Italy’ referred to above with respect to German Romanticism (still alive today). However, it may be also related to their higher expectations anchored to the representation of the classical Rome compared with the capital city of Italy in the contemporary age. In fact, it should be noted that the negative evaluations referred only to Rome as a metropolis (and hence were more centred on the perception of the dysfunctional aspects of the great metropolis) and were not attached to Rome as a historic and monumental city – which is of course where the centre of interest of that cultural tradition lies. Furthermore the tradition of the ‘travel in Italy’ was born in an era when Rome had not yet been contaminated by the waste products of indiscriminate urbanization and the monstrous growth of the suburbs.

With respect to the historic centre, all nationalities, with the slight exception of the Spanish subjects, used more positive than negative or neutral adjectives at the experiential as well as the imaginal level. This included the Germans,
who despite their negative evaluation of the city as a whole, expressed positive connotations in their representation of the historic centre. (see Figures 15.19 and 15.20). This result not only confirms our hypothesis that the representation of the historic centre would become more positively consistent with time (before/after the tourists’ visit to the city), because it forms the nucleus of the representation, but it also emphasizes the positive impact on our first-visiters of the ‘experienced’ historic centre of Rome, even beyond what they imagined.

On the historic centre’s role as a stable ‘figurative nucleus’, both at the ‘imaginal’ and ‘experiential’ level, in the representations of the places in Rome by our first-visiters from all the different six countries, it is interesting to quote the Italian architect Leonardo Benevolo, one of the best-known historians of the European cities, when he identifies the role of the European cities in saving and transmitting the sum of values, in addition to their material heritage, as:

the identity of places where we live, the stability that gives meaning and depth to the different experiences of each generation, the permanence of a ‘center’ that does not change as rapidly as the periphery, and where we can then remove and share some memories too heavy to be carried by each individual.

(Benevolo 1993: 10)
Figure 15.19  The historic centre as ‘imagined’: comparison (by chi square) of frequencies of adjectival connotations (positive, negative and neutral) by nationality.

\[ \chi^2(10) = 67.98, \ p < 0.001 \]

Figure 15.20  The historic centre as ‘experienced’: comparison (by chi square) of frequencies of adjectival connotations (positive, negative and neutral) by nationality.

\[ \chi^2(10) = 62.32, \ p < 0.001 \]
Conclusions and research developments

Given the lack of precedents in research and considering the potential applicative implications of a research project of this type, even if purely descriptive, the results of the first research wave have served as a useful for further research.

One finding in particular emerges from the, albeit selective, results presented in this chapter. Apart from stereotyped representations of first impressions of Rome and the proto-typicality of certain key areas of the historic centre acting as anchors for representations, the idea–souvenir of Rome that tourists take away with their baggage of memories differs for each group of people. Similarly to what Love and Sheldon (1998: 174) found concerning souvenirs as messengers of meanings, tourists imbue their souvenirs with ‘embracing experiences before, during and after the time souvenirs are acquired’, making intangible experiences tangible, anchoring the extraordinary in the ordinary and familiar (Gordon 1986; see also: Anderson and Littrell 1995, 1996; Kim and Littrell 1999, 2001; Littrell et al. 1994; Pinelli 2010; Woronuk 2008). The social representations of the Eternal City for our first-visitors reconstructed its shapes, colours and urban/architectural and social aspects in many different ways: tourists were attracted differently by artistic, social, functional, economic and emotional aspects depending on both their socio-demographic characteristics and their nationality. The latter, as shown in the first set of results, was significantly linked to the cultural construction of different ways of organising place-identity, indicating that not only do gender and stage of life have an effect on the developmental structuring of ‘identification with places of attachment’ typologies, but so too does nationality. Of course, these results cannot be generalized, given that it is impossible for an individual researcher to conduct a study of this kind on representative cross-national samples. They must therefore be prudentely assumed as an interesting baseline for further researches.

In light of the considerations made in the literature presented here and elsewhere (de Rosa 1995; Mura 2008), the results of this research attest to the broad interrelationship among dimensions linked to place-identity, social representations of the environment, and elements unique to the social identity of subjects from six different European and non-European countries which influence in some respect not only their encounter and transaction with the capital city but also their evocation of the significant places after their visit.

In particular, the cross-cultural perspective adopted in this study has enabled us to show notable and interesting differences among groups as regards both indicators of place-identity and social representations of Rome, its historic centre and the Ideal City. The influence of the cross-cultural variable, articulated with the effects produced by other population variables, such as sex, age, length of residence and residential mobility, confirm the importance of sociocultural factors in the perception of the environment and in the construction of place-identity.

Obviously, in order to formulate directional hypotheses and to offer a more explanatory rather than descriptive interpretation of the results, it would be necessary to know a great deal more about the ‘cultural baggage’ that the tourists
brought with them to Rome. Such information would include specific details on
the preparations that they made for the journey (tourist guides consulted, sugges-
tions made by travel agents, search for information on websites, in discussion
forums or social networks, etc.) as well as more general cultural knowledge (the
city as it features in literature, films, the press and the artistic heritage of
the country, or more simply in conversations with friends and acquaintances who
had already been to Rome).

From the perspective of the cultural media communication, the link between
tourism and imaginative literature about cities and places (in its various forms, from
prose to the visual arts, films, television, advertising, videos, songs, etc.) has been
long recognized, although not studied with sufficiently systematic and integrated
form in empirical field research. For example, recognition of the specific pervasive
influence on tourism imaging, destination marketing and place promotion by
films and television series – whose protagonists or significant scenarios are famous
capitals or important places ‘on-location’ and ‘off-location’ (films produced
in studios) – was the genesis of Beeton’s (2005) book Film-Induced Tourism.
Unfortunately, the focus is restricted to specific sites where films and television
series have been filmed in Australia, the United Kingdom and New Zealand, as
well as on production studios including film-related theme parks, as case studies
to analyse tourist activity associated with the film industry because, as the author
recognizes, ‘there is such a limited amount of work in this field’ (Beeton 2005: 3).

There is a large body of literature on cities and places as icons and figures
of the memory (Assmann 1995) in the field of the arts or other media (cinema,
popular songs, etc.). However these sources are usually entirely unrelated to the
topic of tourism or to the concerns of environmental social psychology. Despite
their unrelated nature, we consider consultation of these sources on the social
imagery of cities as very stimulating for a researcher interested in the role of
communication in building social representations and social memory (Bartlett
1932; Halbwachs 1925, 1950; see also Arruda and de Alba 2007; Assman 1995;
de Alba 2002, 2004; de Rosa 2006a; de Rosa and Mormino 1997, 2000; Devin-
Wright and Lyons 1997; Haas 2002; Haas and Jodelet 1999; Jodelet 1992;
Ricoeur 2004). Obviously, in an empirical research design it is not easy to opera-
tionalize tools for exact measurements in response to the following question: To
what extent do famous films by Fellini and Rossellini with Rome as their setting
or protagonist, or songs like ‘Arrivederci Roma’ or ‘Roma nun fa la stupida stasera!’
or images from school textbooks and art exhibitions, or DVDs on its secrets (Augias
2009) or tourist catalogues, postcards and souvenirs or memories of friends’ and
relatives’ journeys affect the first encounter with the Italian capital? However, an
answer to this question would furnish better understanding of what first-visitors
to Rome feel when they declare that it ‘is more like experiencing the Eternal City
again than experiencing it for the first time’. Films ‘offer up inter-textual links
to the past, thereby acting as a point of intersection between the memories of
filmmakers, viewer and the broader collective sphere’ (McNeill 2010: 87).

Consider, for instance, this brief introduction to an article entitled ‘First Time
in Rome’ by Laura Lica and published in the magazine Tarom Skyteam (fall 2010):
Movie directors were and still are forever in love with Rome. Due to them … or because of them, there are few people with TV access who have not seen images of the Colosseum in gladiator films, the Trevi Fountain in Fellini's undying 'La Dolce Vita', Piazza Navona in 'The Talented Mr. Ripley', 'princess' Audrey Hepburn's 'Roman Holiday' and thousands of other images in the most diverse films, from 'Un Americano a Roma' to Tarkovsky’s ‘Nostalghia’. Even if you never set foot on Italian soil, it’s almost impossible not to have imprinted on your retina at least some of the most precious architectonic jewels that Rome has been wearing so elegantly for two thousands of years. Just like a beautiful woman you’ve seen in magazines, on TV or in the movies, before meeting her face to face. But just like with great divas, reality goes way beyond imagination.

(Laura Lica in Tarom Skyteam fall 2010)

Detailed information about the ‘cultural baggage’ that our first-visitors brought with them to Rome was beyond access in our first research wave described in this chapter. The pre-knowledge dimension was one of the areas that we have improved in our subsequent studies, also enriching our methodological tools, stimulating interest in comparing the imagined and experienced places in the packing and unpacking of the suitcases before and after the impact with the tourist destination.

There are a number of research developments that we have pursued and which are currently being further expanded from the study described here. These ambitious research programmes – articulated on several levels and which have required the coordination of large research groups in which a number of post-doctoral, doctoral and undergraduate students have actively participated – concern various interrelated research lines intended to:

a. Extend the first research wave temporally and geographically from Rome to Paris, in a new research programme launched de Rosa in 2002 and undertaken in co-operation with d’Ambrosio, entitled ‘Rome–Paris: Urban transformation and images of two twin-cities’ (de Rosa 2006c). In particular, the aim of the interrelated studies conducted from 2002 to 2006 was to analyse the psycho-social impact of urban transformations on the images and on the transactions of residents and non-residents (tourists) with the two metropolitan contexts by means of:

a.1 Follow-up on the research carried out by Milgram and Jodelet (1976) on the social representations and psychological map of Paris.10

a.2 Follow-up of de Rosa’s first research wave activated in 1992 concerning the social representations of Rome by first-visitor tourists.11

a.3 Analysis of the images of Rome co-constructed by Romans (native and non-native) and commuters via focus groups.12

a.4 Analysis of the social representations of Paris seen from above and below the surface shared by Paris public transport officials (metro and bus drivers).13
a.5 Analysis of the ‘cross-images’ of the two historic capitals (Rome for the Parisians and Paris for the Romans), to be integrated with an unpublished study carried out by Jodelet on Parisians in Rome.14

b Extend the first research wave and its follow-up temporally and geographically from 2006 and 2010 from Rome and Paris to other historic capital cities: Brussels, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Warsaw, Vienna (see Figure 15.21). The extension has concerned the two directions pursued by the interrelated research programmes:

b.1 The first aimed at mapping and comparing both representational and experiential imagery dimensions of first-visitor interacting with the cities (de Rosa 2010a, 2010b; de Rosa and d’Ambrosio 2010, 2011; de Rosa et al. 2012);

b.2 The second aimed at exploring the contribution of new internet-based communication systems to psychosocial research in different forms and through different channels, with the focus on communication applied to the field of tourism (see points c and d below), expanding the agenda for future research by environmental psychologists in the internet era outlined by Stokols and Montero (2002) and Misra and Stokols (2011);

c Analyse the institutional communication strategies implemented by the municipalities of the two cities on the basis of mass communication through traditional and new media,15 Especial attention has been paid to the new

---

A pluri-annual research program:
time-span and spatial extension

- 1992 -1995 First research wave on Social Representations of ROME as IMAGINED and EXPERIENCED by FIRST-VISITORS from 6 COUNTRIES

- 2002 -2006: FOLLOW-UP in Rome with extension to Paris, also integrating Milgran and Jodelet (1976) seminal study


- 2009: Extension to WARSAW

- 2010: Extension to BRUSSELS

Figure 15.21 Research developments: from the first research wave on Rome to the cross-cultural analysis on nine European capitals.
forms of communication and city web-marketing via the longitudinal analysis of the municipal websites of historic European capitals, considered as the ‘visiting cards’ that the cities offer to citizens and tourists. Starting from a comparison between the websites of Rome and Paris (analysed lengthwise in time by comparing the versions downloaded in 2003 and 2004) and of Paris (downloaded in April 2004), the analyses highlighted aspects relative to contents, structure, and various technical elements important from the user’s point of view (graphics, interactivity and usability in particular), emphasizing strengths and weaknesses. Besides their descriptive value and possible function in guiding web professionals and a city’s institutional communication managers, the results have a historical value (given the volatility and dynamicity of websites, like many other Internet environments) with respect to the evolution of web 2.0 scenarios, assuming a particular interest for further comparative analysis with 2010 web sites, currently under investigation (de Rosa et al. 2012). The municipal websites of Brussels, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Warsaw, and Vienna are currently under analysis, thus extending this research line in parallel with the extension of the first research wave to the other historic European capitals;

d Explore ‘virtual tours’ made by means of Google Earth, ‘flying’ over the same nine historic European capitals (Brussels, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Warsaw, Vienna) as unknown tourism destinations for ‘potential first-visitors’ and as ‘experienced cities’ for ‘past visitors’. The goals of these new interrelated research lines are:

d.1 To compare the preferred paths and places selected by the ‘virtual tourists’ (both potential first-visitors and past visitors) with the preferred paths and places chosen by the ‘real first-visitors’ interviewed during our field studies in the nine historic European capitals on the basis of their imagined (before their visit) and experienced (after their visit) places;

d.2 To investigate differences between virtual explorations conducted with a low information strategy (by activating only the ‘street’ and ‘street view’ levels) and with a high information strategy (by also activating the geographic web level, and using the ‘Panoramio’ function and its repositories of images published by previous Google Earth users, ‘Wikipedia’ and its windows including images and historical information from the online encyclopaedia, and ‘places’. These make it possible to visualize information and images about principal places of interest – with the exception of the application related to commercial enterprises);

d.3 To investigate the differences between the exploratory strategies in virtual tours conducted by ‘potential first-visitors’ and ‘past visitors’;

e Explore free conversations on the same nine historic European capitals – chosen as tourist target destinations – among members of different ‘social networks’: Facebook (in groups, fan pages, personal profiles) and Yahoo
Answer (travel category), differentiated between ‘potential first-visitors’ and ‘past visitors’. The purpose of the study is to identify:

1. The main places of the historic European capitals investigated as ‘objects’ of social representations;
2. The evaluations made of these capitals by the members of the web communities during their free exchanges;
3. Comparison between the lists of ‘places’ mentioned as most significant and the city ‘evaluations’ made by the real first-visitors of our field study and those mentioned by the members of the web communities in their free online interactions;
4. Any differences between the platforms of the two social networks.

The lists of the places identified are currently being analysed with the same system of categorization used in the first research wave. The preliminary results show the strong dominance – among the ‘potential first-visitors’ – of the prototypical places categorized as ‘artistic–architectonic’ (Big Ben for London, Tour Eiffel for Paris, Belem Tower for Lisbon, Alexander Cathedral for Vienna, etc.), while ‘urbanistic’ and ‘naturalistic’ places prevail among the ‘past visitors’. In regard to the differences between the two platforms, the first results show the prevalence of emotional aspects related to the travels and places in past visitors belonging to the Facebook social network sharing their emotional experiences of the places with potential visitors. By contrast, in the conversations of the members connected via Yahoo Answer the informational character and the tendency to provide detailed and practical information about the destination tourist city prevail, as a way to share their representational maps of the cities visited with the potential future visitors. Research of this kind, based on free conversations among members of social networks, is highly important from the ecological perspective of non-intrusive research in natural contexts (although they are on-line and virtual environments). The aim is to move further from the current state-of-the-art developed under influences from sociology, mathematics and computer sciences in the field of social network analysis SNA as an approach to investigating the social structure (Furth 2010), and to use social media to mine and analyse the meaningful conversations co-produced during the on-line interactions of their members. Research aimed at detecting the social influence via interpersonal exchanges is even more interesting, if we consider that our results show that the interpersonal communication (and word of mouth) is the most influential among the different knowledge sources about tourist destination cities (schoolbooks, literature, films, songs, internet, press media, tourism brochures, and documentaries, being the other sources of information).

There are a number of further possible directions for our research on the social representations of the environment held by tourists and by residents. Mentioned here are only few of them connected with some of the main focuses or results of the first research wave presented in this chapter:
a In order to develop the theoretical model of place-identity further, new lines of research are required to yield better understanding of how the place-identity of individuals (or socially identifiable groups) is structured over a life-time through the interlocking of meanings of various space-time experiences. The study of experiences closely interwoven in the course of the life cycle (such as moving house, decorating a new home; type of life as a function of choice of habitat: city centre or suburbs, town or country; styles of choosing travel itineraries, where to go on holiday, etc.) are only some examples of the many directions that empirical investigations might usefully take. More in particular, if place-identity is considered not as an isolated construct but in its relation with the social representations of a tourist destination, a development of our research would be to extend our study from ‘first-visitors’ to ‘repeat visitors’ to the same European capital cities, the specific aim being to investigate not only different representations, images and styles of transaction with the places but also the role that the experiences of such places may have played in the construction of the visitors’ identities and their memories.

b From a more cognitivist perspective, another research line would explore systematically and with experimental rigour the links between motivational components and social cognition. The purpose would be to determine the relation between, on the one hand, how information derived from the environment and the relative representational models are processed, and on the other, styles of action on and relations with the environment itself. An example project could be study of the ‘need for closure’ as a dimension of motivated cognition (see Kruglanski, 2004; Van Hiel and Mervielde 2003) with styles of environmental ‘openness/closedness’ that subjects reveal through representational models and ways of acting on a place.

c Another line of inquiry could be inter-cultural research aimed at identifying the normative determinants of such links, for example with the purpose of understanding whether there are deep cultural factors that induce social or national groups to privilege a style of ‘using’ the environment (in terms of both action and representation) that is planned and controlled, or alternatively that is predisposed to openness and change. Only when such knowledge has been systematically accumulated from large national population samples will we be able to advance non-arbitrary interpretations about the ‘cultural style’ whereby our Japanese tourists used the city of Rome in a systematic, planned way whereas the Spanish ones preferred places where uncertainty and the human and social factor prevailed over the more stable and reassuring faces of monuments. From the cross-cultural perspective it would also be very interesting to enlarge our research population to include other extra-European tourists (until now limited to Japanese in the first research wave and to Americans in the follow-up studies) – for example by investigating first-visitors from China, a country which in the past ten years has recorded a 21 per cent increase in spending on international tourism (and which is therefore also an interesting target for the European tourist industry) or from the other three BRIC countries (Brazil, India, Russia) with expanding economies.
A different direction would be to compare the impact of cities with historic centres (especially the European capitals, but not only these: consider, for example, Beijing and its ‘Forbidden City’) and newly-built cities beyond the metropolis, with their anthropologies (Basham 1978; Bauman 2005; Canevacci 1994; Davis 2002; Eames and Goode 1977; Giordano 2005; Lindon et al. 2006; Rodwin and Hollister 1984).

Numerous research programmes might ensue the following questions:

- How different will be the process of comparison between the imagined and the experienced impact with a historical capital city such as Rome, Paris, London, Madrid or Vienna, on the one hand, and entirely planned cities, like Brasilia or Canberra, on the other?
- What is the role of time and history in transforming urban places (Mumford 1961, 1966) into seductive places (Rykwert 2002), ‘icon places’ as opposed to the ‘non-places’ described by Augé (1995)? The ‘lieux de la mémoire’, according to Nora (1994: 187), refer to questions about historical identity to the same extent that commemorations refer to the staging of symbolic events and the heritage refers to forms of cultural policies (Tsiomis et al. 1998)
- What is the distinctive relationship between a historic capital city and its ‘state’ (as a political entity) or its ‘nation’ (as the collective socio-cultural identity of citizens), compared with that of a newly-built capital city?

It is well known that

the history of European cities and the history of Europe, to a large extent, are one and the same adventure […] The European cities constitute a dense area on a fairly restricted territory: this is the mark left by the entire world, which in the seventeenth century moved to conquer the rest of the planet. When these cities grew enormously during the industrial age, their relationship with the countryside entered crisis, but they remain a valuable reference, an object of desire […]

(Benevolo 1993: 269)

The attractiveness of Europe’s historical heritage, and in particular of its capital cities, together with its diverse landscapes, continues to be a driver of the European economy (the third socio-economic sector). In the period 2008-10 – despite the global financial crisis and the damage caused to the European tourism industry by the interruption of air traffic in April and May due to clouds of volcanic ash from Iceland – Europe was still the first tourist destination in the world (www.ec.europa.eu/eurostat), and – according to estimates by the WTO World Tourism Barometer (vol. 8, January 2010) – there were no significant changes in the rankings of the top ten tourist destinations by arrivals and revenues (with France still global leader for international arrivals and Spain in second position for revenues, and third for arrivals behind the USA).
Development of research in the above-mentioned directions (as well as many potential others) could indeed contribute to the expansion of tourism social science (Tribe and Xiao 2011) from the perspective of an environmental applied social psychology in which the constructs of place-identity and social representations (which are at the same time a construct, a theory and a meta-theoretical view of the entire discipline) will perform a crucial explanatory role, yielding new knowledge of significant societal value.

Expanding knowledge from the visitors’ perspective will also aid understanding of the city from the perspective of its residents – conceiving it ‘as a dynamic and three-dimensional figure, to follow and inflect its process of self-generation, to knit and extend its fabric’, which ‘requires a human discipline, an understanding of how built forms are transformed into image by experience’ (Rykwert 2002: 246). As shown by the architects and urban designers, Nara Iwata and Vicente del Río (2004: 180), as regards the city planning process in Rio de Janeiro and the image of its waterfront, ‘the construction of the imagery of the cities and the urban interventions are interdependent and prove the relationship between political practices and city forms and its social representations’. Which is another way to show Social Representations in action and construction in the social arena faced with the social demand.

Notes

1 Mining regional representative photographs from consumer-generated geotagged ones has become an interesting area of research, generating ‘a novel method to select representative photographs for typical regions in the worldwide dimension, which helps detect cultural differences over the world regarding given concepts’ (Yanai and Bingyu 2010: 315). From this perspective these map-based geotagged photographs have been recognized as valuable and rich resources not only for browsing and finding individual concepts, but also for understanding how specific objects (for example photographs of typical foods belonging to the general category ‘noodle’ appear in the forms of ‘ramen’ in Japan, ‘spaghetti’ in the European area, Taiwanese style noodles and spicy Thai noodles in the South East Asia) or scene concepts (for example a ‘waterfall’ appears more powerful in photographs from South America and more beautiful in the Asian areas) distributed and different over the world.

The inclusion of unnamed urban ‘places’ (like squares, parks, monuments, etc.) within the scene concept category of analysis the tourist-generated geotagged photos might be a good resource with which to detect specific ‘labelled’ places and their landmarks selected by the producers of the photographs.

However, from our point of view an interesting development of research in this area would be not only to map regional differences in the objects’ representations (finding stereotypical cultural artefacts around the world: i.e. spaghetti in Italy and Taiwanese style noodles in Taiwan or the Coliseum in Rome and the Pantheon in Athens), but also to analyse the rich iconic materials in relation to the cultural differences of the target populations of the geotagged photos-producers (i.e. residents, tourists, first-visitors with different nationalities etc.), according to our research hypotheses.

2 The data collection was carried out with the collaboration of the undergraduate students Alessandra Calogero and Tiziana Antonelli, whose assistance is acknowledged (see de Rosa et al. 1995a).

3 Each category was subjected to analysis in two modalities: presence and absence,
according to whether the subject had indicated three or fewer places as significant (in the first three phases of the lifecycle: the ‘maturity’ phase was discounted in the analysis due to the scarcity of places attributed to it by the subjects) from the given list of the 21 variables under consideration. The presence or absence of the variable was considered as an index of importance or non-importance that the subject attributed to that place.

Therefore, MCA was carried out on a matrix formed by 180 subjects x 21 variables. Two of the initial variables had to be discarded (frequency less than 5 per cent): 1) artistic–architectural places in childhood, 2) artistic–architectural places in adolescence. This in itself is significant because it shows the lack of salience of the cultural component in the construction of place-identity in the first phases of the subject’s life.

Percentages of inertia were re-evaluated using Benzecri’s ‘optimistic’ formula (Benzecri 1979). On the basis of the ‘optimistic’ formula (using eigenvalues greater than 1/p, where p = number of variables) we only used the eigenvalues greater than 0.0526 (= 1/19, where 19 is the number of variables left after elimination of the 2 variables listed above), namely the eigenvalues from the 1st to the 7th, re-evaluated according to the above formula. Once re-evaluated, the first four factors together explained 96.7 per cent of the total inertia, while the contribution of the following axes became insignificant. Therefore, with the first four factors the original matrix was greatly simplified without losing too much information.

The SPAD procedure plots the co-ordinated and test values for all the modalities of the illustrative variables. The T value is the distance from the origin expressed in squared mean deviations. When T > 2 for an axis, the position occupied by point-modality on the axis is considered significant at the 0.05 level.

Initially, thirty-eight places were mentioned, but nine of them were discarded (frequency less than 5 per cent): Porta Portese, Santa Maria Maggiore, Piazza della Repubblica, Tiberian Island, St Clement’s, Caracalla’s Baths, Gianicolo, Ostia, EUR.

There could be an additional explanation linked to a bias: Spanish people may prefer ‘piazza di Spagna’ because its place refers to the name of their country.

See for example – among others – the five editions of the specialized cinema retrospective ‘Le città visibili’ (The visible cities) with 30 or more films for each of the dedicated European capital cities: Paris, Berlin, Madrid, Vienna, London and Rome, this last with special homage paid to Anna Magnani, organized by the Centro Sperimentale di Cinematografia (Experimental Cinematography Centre) the most important institution in Italy for teaching, research and experimentation in the field of cinematography in Rome. The full program can be retrieved from the website: <http://www.snc.it/events_detail.jsp?IDAREA=9&ID_EVENT=378&GTEMPLATE=events.jsp>.

In 1955 the Rome and Paris municipalities formally signed a ‘Twin-Cities’ agreement. The twinning subsequently gave rise to to various activities including many cultural initiatives. Since the agreement’s renewal, important share events have taken place such as the Nuit Blanche in Paris and the Notte Bianca in Rome, or Paris Plage in Paris and the Seaside on the Tiber in Rome.

This part was carried out also with the collaboration of the undergraduate student Roberta Fonte whose assistance with the data collection is acknowledged. This part was carried out also with the collaboration of the undergraduate students Valentina Leandri and Emma Albarello we acknowledge for data collection. This part was carried out also with the collaboration of the undergraduate Giulia Montemurro whose assistance with the data collection is acknowledged. This part was carried out also with the collaboration of the undergraduate student Flavia Caioli whose assistance with the data collection is acknowledged. This part was carried out also with the collaboration of the undergraduate students Raffaella Russo and Federica Salvato whose assistance with the data collection is acknowledged. This part of the comprehensive project, led by de Rosa, was developed in collaboration...
with Elena Bocci and Massimiliano Picone together with Sara Saurini and Ilaria Botti, whose assistance with the data collection is acknowledged.
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