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ABSTRACT: Museums are developing a broader commitment to society. Strategic Communication can decisively contribute to the development of this new mission of museums.

The principal aim of this article is to study the importance given to communication by the museums, and to examine how they manage communication with their publics, analysing those aspects which are linked to the communication planning process of the institutions. The results show that communication has no strategic dimension in the museums, since it is conceived as a short-term tactical tool, and it is not considered as a key resource to engage in dialogue with their publics.

RESUMEN: Los museos están desarrollando un mayor compromiso con la sociedad. La Comunicación Estratégica puede contribuir decisivamente al desarrollo de su nueva misión.
El principal objetivo de esta investigación es estudiar la importancia otorgada a la comunicación por los museos y analizar cómo gestionan su comunicación, evaluando los aspectos relacionados con la planificación estratégica de la comunicación en dichas instituciones. Los resultados demuestran que la comunicación no tiene una dimensión estratégica en los museos, ya que es concebida como una herramienta táctica de corto plazo y no es considerada como un recurso clave para establecer una relación con sus públicos.
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1. Introduction

In the last decades, the cultural sector in general, and the museums in particular, are changing their traditional paradigm of management, compelled to combine cultural production with market needs. They ought to design new strategies to demonstrate their viability and to develop activities with diminishing public resources. And strategic communication becomes a key resource for cultural institutions since it is needed to attract visitors, to obtain private founding, to maintain employees, and to engage with local communities and society at large. Traditionally, the museums aimed principally at the acquisition, conservation, research and exposition of objects and were oriented to a reduced group of people and highly concerned with cultural interests and with pedagogic activities. They were closed entities, which focused on the objects and were isolated from their environment. In this perspective, centred on the management of objects, strategic communication does not have a relevant role for museums, since the relationships with their publics is not a priority for them.

However, a great number of authors suggest that in the last 40 years, the changes in the social needs (new social demands), in the political arena (new guidelines for culture management, less...
governmental and more private funding as well as demands for the professional management of entities) and in the cultural environment (growing competence in the field of culture and leisure) have forced the museums to redefine many aspects of their management and to face new challenges.

One of those changes is reflected in the transition from being used by a very small minority to an increasingly large-scale and widespread use. The most recent theoretical trends in the field of museology (mainly Critical Museology) suggest a modernisation of the role of the museums in society where they are becoming important cultural agents. Museums are becoming relevant cultural actors within their environment in two basic levels: as an agent of dissemination of national and international cultural and historic heritage, knowledge and tendencies, and as an agent of cultural sensibility toward the local cultural and historic heritage. In this way, they are key actors in the so-called “democratisation of culture”.

Thus, the field of museums is radically affected on its values, structures and processes: the entities are moving from a "modern" (informational/functional) museum to become a "postmodern" (relational/Purposive) museum. The museums enter into a new commitment with society trying to broaden their audiences and contribute to community advancement. Then, the mission of the museums is significantly changing: they have become entities of knowledge and leisure. Within this leisure environment, museums compete with other museums and with other leisure actors (shopping malls, theme parks, etc.) for the time of visitors in the UK.


10 Cfr. ALCALDE, Gabriel, RUEDA, Josep, op. cit.


people, and the need for a museum to be favourably differentiated and branded becomes a key issue\textsuperscript{14}. In this change of their management model, Falk\textsuperscript{15} affirms that "most museums exist in order to attract and serve visitors -as many as possible" (p. 20), and then, the relationships between the museums and their publics are as important as their collections\textsuperscript{16}. In this new context, a reference author like Hooper-Greenhill\textsuperscript{17} suggests that museums should be mainly considered as “communicators” (p. 12) that adopt consistent relational strategies with their publics. Strategic communication is, then, a relevant part of the daily global management of a museum and become a strategic function of it\textsuperscript{18}. In this way, the strategic management of communication can decisively contribute to the development of the new mission of the museums in many forms: by disseminating the cultural heritage of the museums\textsuperscript{19}, by managing the communication and the relationships between these institutions and their different publics\textsuperscript{20}, by helping the museums to differentiate them from other leisure and cultural actors\textsuperscript{21}, and by changing their publics’ attitudes to improve their reputation\textsuperscript{22}. But this new challenge is highly conditioned by a significant cultural barrier: the public negative attitude towards the museums based on the image of the museums as closed and elitist organisations\textsuperscript{23}.

Hence, it seems relevant to carry out a research study about the communication in the museums that contribute to answer two main questions: Is communication considered as a key resource for the museums? Are the museums managing strategically their communication? The main objective of this article is to analyse the importance given to communication by the museums, and to study how the museums plan and manage their communication with their publics. We assess the different aspects linked to the communication planning process of the museums in order to assess whether communication plays a strategic role in the museum management.

\textsuperscript{15} Cfr. FALK, John, Identity and the museum visitor experience, Left Cost Press, Wallnut Creek (USA), 2009.
\textsuperscript{17} Cfr. HOOPER-GREENHILL, Eilean, “Changing Values in the Art Museum…, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{18} Cfr. McLEAN, Fiona, op. cit.
\textsuperscript{21} Cfr. KOTLER, Neil, KOTLER, Philip, “Can museums be all things…, op. cit.; VAUGHAN, Roger, op. cit.
2. From Marketing Communication to Strategic Communication

2.1. Museums and Strategic Communication

Hooper-Greenhill\(^{24}\) affirms that communication plays a key role for the post-modern museum in developing a bidirectional relation with its publics, unlike the traditional museum which uses the communication only as a unidirectional tool to spread knowledge. Cornelissen\(^{25}\) points out that the strategic function of communication involves its contribution in decision making in the overall strategy, where communication is fully linked to long-term objectives. Thus, Strategic Communication can be defined as the management of all internal and external communications of an organisation in an integrated, synergic, coherent and consistent way which helps it to improve its reputation and manage their long-term relationships with its publics\(^{26}\). Applied to the cultural heritage (and to the museums in particular), Mateos Rusillo\(^{27}\) defines it as "la gestión cultural y comunicativa que media entre los recursos patrimoniales y la sociedad, para potencial un uso responsable, provechoso, atractivo y efectivo capaz de aunar la preservación de los bienes culturales con su disfrute integral por parte de la sociedad" (p.27). By using communication and Public Relations strategically, the museums can gain a valuable asset to manage long-term relationships with their publics\(^{28}\).

From a practitioner perspective, strategic communication and public relations have gained a growing importance in the field of museums over the last three decades. But this relevance has not been reflected in the field of academic and theoretical research in communication and public relations. A pioneering publication in the museum field was D. Adams’ book\(^{29}\), but in the last 30 years, there have not been significant studies in the international academic literature on strategic communication and public relations applied to museums. In fact, very few academic works can be found\(^{30}\). There are also few books in the specific topic of museums communication\(^{31}\) but they have a clear practitioner perspective. In Spanish, some books\(^{32}\)

\(^{29}\) Cfr. ADAMS, Donald, Museum Public Relations, American Association for State and Local History, Nashville (USA), 1983.
\(^{31}\) Cfr. ADAMS, Donald, op. cit.; RUNYARD, Sue; FRENCH, Ilva, op. cit.; FALK, John, op. cit.
specifically deals with the communication of museums, but again most of them are from a professional point of view. So, specific theoretical background in the field of strategic communication and public relations is limited.

The communication of the museums has mainly been studied from a marketing perspective. The majority of research is basically done from the management of cultural products and services focusing on defining cultural products/services and on marketing them to obtain more users/visitors, but also from a tourist marketing focus. In this context, strategic communication and Public Relations are considered a mere promotional tool to spread information about cultural products and services to obtain a defined positioning. They are reduced to a tactical dimension with a stereotypical focus: a group of communication tools and techniques whose purpose is to provide better information for visitors and to influence people to reach new audiences, and also to manage information in a potential crisis.

On the other hand, Legger pointed out that despite of the importance assigned to the several publics of the museums, this relevance has not been implemented in researching this variety of groups, but it has been focused on users/visitors. The study of publics is mainly focused on one main public: the users or visitors. Welsh as well as Mateos Rusillo affirm that the museums should establish relationships with a wide variety of publics (such as employees, local government, social and cultural organisations, opinion leaders, the media, the local government, social and cultural organisations). The majority of research is basically done from the management of cultural products and services focusing on defining cultural products/services and on marketing them to obtain more users/visitors, but also from a tourist marketing focus. In this context, strategic communication and Public Relations are considered a mere promotional tool to spread information about cultural products and services to obtain a defined positioning. They are reduced to a tactical dimension with a stereotypical focus: a group of communication tools and techniques whose purpose is to provide better information for visitors and to influence people to reach new audiences, and also to manage information in a potential crisis.

32 Cfr. VALDÉS, María del Carmen, op. cit.; GOMEZ DE LA IGLE gia, Roberto, op. cit.; MATEOS RUSILLO, Santos, La Comunicación Global..., op. cit.; VACAS, Trinidad, BONILLA, Eusebio, op. cit.; MATEOS RUSILLO, Santos, Manual de comunicación para museos, Trea, Gijón, 2012.
35 Cfr. McLEAN, Fiona, op. cit.; KOTLER, Neil, KOTLER, Philip, Museum strategy and marketing... op. cit.; RUNYARD, Sue, FRENCH, Ilva, op. cit.
37 Cfr. ADAMS, Donald, op. cit.; KOTLER, Neil, KOTLER, Philip, Museum strategy and marketing... op. cit.; RUNYARD, Sue, FRENCH, Ilva, op. cit.
41 Cfr. MATEOS RUSILLO, Santos, Manual de comunicación... op. cit.
community, among others) who can affect the activities and the degree of success of the mission of the institutions, and then, the study of publics should not be only limited or focused on the systematic research of current visitors and possible (future) new users. Each of those different groups expects and requires particular forms of communication that will be able to help to establish long-term relationships with all of them and contribute to achieve the museums' goals.

2.2. The Strategic Communication management process

The strategic planning of the communication of a museum involves the process of planning its whole communicative action in order to establish long-term relationships with its publics, which will collaborate in the museum’s achievement of its principal objectives. The theoretical and professional models of the Corporate Communication and Public Relations offer a variety of proposals related to the strategic planning of communication but both of them present a similar strategic planning structure: beginning with the research of the publics and the communication of an organisation, passing on to the adequate planning of its strategies and tactics, and finally applying and evaluating the actions. The general model of strategic planning of the communication, composed of four stages (research, planning, implementation and evaluation), is the most frequently used in the field of Corporate Communication and Public Relations. This is due to various factors: it is a basic formula which synthesizes the most extensive proposals; it is the most operative model since it reflects the daily practice of professionals; it also relates to the general model of strategic management of organisations. This four stages model is used for products, services, enterprises, institutions or organisations and can also be applied to both the museums (as entities) and their products or cultural services. The above mentioned model of the strategic management of communication can be shortly described in the following stages:

42 Cfr. WELSH, Peter, op. cit.
43 Cfr. LEGGET, Jane, op. cit.
45 Cfr. MATILLA, Kathy, op. cit.
1) Research: it constitutes the first stage of the strategic planning of communication. It involves a systematic search for information in order to comprehend the environment and the whole process of communication between an organisation and its publics. It establishes the foundation to adequately plan the future activities. In the field of museums, the study of publics is basically centred on taking visitor surveys\textsuperscript{49} which analyse only one main public (users/visitors), at an individual or family level\textsuperscript{50} or studying school visitors\textsuperscript{51}. A lot of research has been done on the members of this main public (and its sub-segments)\textsuperscript{52} and their interests and motivations\textsuperscript{53}, while research on other kinds of publics has mainly been oriented towards finding new users/visitors or gaining influence among current users\textsuperscript{54}. So, some key question arises (also related to step four -evaluation-): Are museums researching their own communication? Are they only focusing on visitors or widening their surveys to other publics?

2) Planning: with the obtained information the process of communication planning is initiated. Kotler et al.\textsuperscript{55} establish a 6-step process of the communication planning in museums. Capriotti\textsuperscript{56} applied the communication planning process to the communication planning of cultural heritage. And Gómez de la Iglesia\textsuperscript{57} described the steps to plan a communication campaign in museums. In this stage, some key aspects should be defined, such as the definition of the objectives, the identification of the publics with which to communicate, the selection and programming of the activities to be carried out. In this way, some questions should be addressed: Have museums established long-term or/and communication programmes? Are they managing their communication plans in an integrated form?

3) Implementation: it means carrying out of the activities defined in the previous stage as well as the control of their evolution in the attainment of the established objectives. Kotler et al.\textsuperscript{58} present 4 basic promotional methods and tools for museums: advertising, sales promotion, direct marketing (including here e-communication) and public relations. McLean\textsuperscript{59} identifies seven main promotion tools: corporate identity, personal selling, promotional literature, direct mail, sales promotion, advertising and public relations. Mateos Rusillo\textsuperscript{60} point out that the main communication techniques in museums are advertising and public relations, marketing communications (direct marketing and street marketing), visual identity and e-communication. So, two relevant questions are needed in this stage: What tools and techniques are museums effectively using to communicate with their publics? What type of content are they delivering to their publics?

4) Evaluation: it implies the measurement and assessment of the entire action carried out in the previous stage. In this way, we will be able to establish to which extent the program of communication is successful. This is the last step of the whole strategic process of
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communication. Komatsuka\textsuperscript{61} affirms that listening their audiences is a key point for museums and Kawashima\textsuperscript{62} resumed the most important aspects dealt with in the research done on publics: the description of the current visitor (characterizing the current visitor profile), the prediction of visitors (establishing a segmentation of visitors by demographic and psychographic aspects), the patterns of behaviour during the visit (describing the interests and needs of visitors during their visit) and the post-visit phase (the level of satisfaction experienced and the kind of benefit visitors have derived from the visit). In this stage, the question is: are museums doing evaluative research of their communication activities? Besides the global process of the communication planning, there is a key issue that contribute to evaluate the importance done to strategic communication in the museums: the assignment of the necessary communication structures and resources. Some authors\textsuperscript{63} indicate that this is a key point in the strategic management of organizations. Mateos Rusillo\textsuperscript{64} suggests that the communication department is a key player to develop the planning and implementation of the strategic communication in the museums. So, it is needed to know how the museums are managing their communication departments or areas.

3. Methodology

This research was conducted in Catalonia, an autonomous region in the North-East of Spain, with a population of six million people (slightly higher than Denmark) and an area of 3200 km\textsuperscript{2} (similar to Belgium).

The corpus of the study is composed of all the museums in Catalonia: about 425 institutions, according to Junta de Museus, the governmental authority for the museums in Catalonia\textsuperscript{65}. The selected sample comprises all the museums in Catalonia with more than 1000 visitors in 2007 and in 2008: 270 institutions (63.5\% of the total universe) of different types of the museums (public and private; large, medium and small institutions). This sample has 34 institutions of more than 100,000 visitors a year; 42 entities between 25,000 and 100,000 visitors a year and 194 museums which have fewer than 25,000 visitors a year. It includes the most representative and visited museums of Catalonia, such as the Picasso Museum, Dalí Museum, Miró Museum, Museum of Contemporary Art of Barcelona (MACBA), National Museum of Art of Catalonia (MNAC), among others (see Annex A).

Catalonia was selected for the research because (together with Madrid), it is the region with the largest amount and highest quality of museums in Spain, and because it is one of the most active Spanish regions in terms of museum activities. It also includes a wide variety of museums (public and private; large, medium and small institutions). Although the museums of Catalonia could not be considered as "geographically representative" of all Spain, in terms of the "type of museums" analyzed it should be considered as "highly representative" to let the researchers testing the designed methodology, as a previous step to study the whole country or

\textsuperscript{61} Cfr. KOMATSUKA, Carol, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{63} Cfr. HAX, Arnoldo, MAJLUF, Nicolás, \textit{op. cit.}; JOHNSON, Gerry, SCHOLES, Kevan, \textit{op. cit.}; WHEELEN, Thomas, HUNGER, David, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{64} Cfr. MATEOS RUSILLO, Santos, \textit{Manual de comunicación...} \textit{op. cit.}
even to apply the methodology at the international level. In this way, it could be considered as a preliminary research.

In order to achieve our main goal, we have established four research questions (RQs). The first one is related to the resources devoted to the communication departments/areas in the museums, and the last three are linked to the communication planning process. They are the following:

RQ1: Communication resources: Is there a communication department/area in the museums? If so, what are its main characteristics and resources?
RQ2: Communication research/evaluation: Do the museums develop formative and/or evaluative research surveys to analyse and evaluate their own communication activities and the publics’ opinion about them?
RQ3: Communication planning: Do the museums establish communication plans for the institution and/or their activities? If so, how are they managing their communication programmes?
RQ4: Communication implementation: How are the museums developing and implementing their communication programmes?

In order to gather information and answer these research questions a quantitative research method was applied using a questionnaire survey. The survey was directed to the person in charge of the communication department/area of the museums and implemented through an online platform.

The questionnaire was organised in four main parts following the RQs. The first part aimed at obtaining basic information about the resources devoted to the departments/areas which manage the communication of the museums (RQ1) asking whether there is a specific department/area of communication. And if so, how many people work there, to whom it reports and if it has its own budget. The second part was oriented towards studying whether the museums were researching and evaluating their publics and their own communication (RQ2). We asked the question whether opinion surveys about the visitors and the local/regional community were carried out. We also interrogated if the messages designed by the museum and the communication channels used were investigated. We also inquired whether the information concerning the museum appeared in the mass media or on the Internet was evaluated. The third part intended to gain understanding about how the museums were planning their communication efforts (RQ3). A series of questions were formed in order to find out what type of communication planning was implemented, to whom it was mainly directed and how the communication actions were planned. Finally, the fourth part was dedicated to assess how the museums implemented and developed their communication programmes (RQ4). The following questions were asked: what main communication tools or techniques were implemented? For what type of public were the communication actions carried out? What sort of information was delivered by the museums? Besides all these aspects, the questionnaire also included control and classification questions.

Once the research questionnaire was designed, it was tested during the month of January 2009 with ten people representing institutions of various sizes. This initial approach made it possible to assess the suitability of the research tool and resulted in slight modifications in the questionnaire form. And once the necessary modifications and changes were made the actual data collection process was conducted during nine months (from March to November 2009). The information obtained was codified in Excel coding sheets.

4. Results
We obtained 111 answers representing 26% of the museums in Catalonia and 41% of the selected sample (see Annex A). This includes 21 institutions of more than 100,000 visitors a year (61.8% of the sample); 30 entities between 25,000 and 100,000 visitors a year (71.5% of the sample) and 60 museums which have 25,000 visitors a year or less (30.9% of the sample). The results are highly representative of large and medium museums (between 60% and 70% of answers, respectively), but they cannot be considered as totally representative of small museums, since the level of answer obtained is around 30%. So, the results should be considered as only indicative of the situation of the small entities. This difference in the level of answer between the large/medium institutions and the small ones could be due to the importance and the role assigned to communication: those entities that see communication as a key resource (large and medium ones) are more interested in comparing and benchmarking their communication activities with others, to see if they are going in the correct way. The results of the RQ1 (Table 1) show that the role of communication in the museums has no major relevance within the structure of the institutions. It can be observed that more than half of the museums (54%) are not equipped with a person responsible for communication. Moreover, we should highlight that there is a high percentage of directors of the museums who play the role of communicators. Thus, only one-third of the museums provide a specific person who is in charge of communication. Of them, the majority of the people in charge of communication hierarchically depend on the director of a museum while the remaining practitioners are dependent on other functional areas of the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dept of Communication</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Person in charge…</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reporting to…</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>Specific Practitioner</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>Museum Director</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other functional area</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum Director</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The areas of communication mainly dispose of one person (35% of the museums) or two people (28%). Nevertheless, 61% of the museums do not provide any professional person who would be working full-time exclusively for the communication activities. Only 19% disposes of such a person whereas 11% employs two people who are exclusively in charge of the communication tasks.

As far as the economic resources are concerned, it should be pointed out that 51.3% of the museums provide a specific budget destined for the communication activities. The majority of these budgets are between 1000 and 30,000 Euros per year although most of the museums (40.9%) dispose of the budgets between 3000 and 6000 Euros a year.

As for RQ2 (Table 2), the results demonstrate that the museums do not make a great effort in order to investigate and evaluate their image or their communication skills. In relation to the study of the publics, we observed that the majority of the museums focus on the analysis of the opinion of their visitors (64% of cases) while very few entities evaluate the regional/local community (28.5% of the museums). Hence, the museums principally dispose of the opinion of those people who visit the institution but they do not tend to obtain the information concerning the opinion of those who do not visit the museum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Research</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publics Research</td>
<td>Visitors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108
With regard to the research about the communication carried out by the museums, we can demonstrate that the majority of the entities do not make surveys of this sort (between 55% and 65% of the museums). In relation to the research of their own communication (the information delivered by the museum), the percentage of this type of investigation is very low. We observed that the implemented channels of communication rather than the transmitted information are more frequently analysed. The investigation and analysis of the published information about the museum (what is said about the entity) also reveal that such evaluation is scarce, although the information appeared in the traditional mass media is more studied than the one available on the Internet.

In relation to RQ3 which is about communication planning in the museums, the results indicate that a high percentage of the museums do not have any long term communication planning (only 15% of them do have such type of planning), while an important number of the institutions (71%) do plan their communication activities annually. It is relevant to point out that the communication planning is mainly focused on planning a set of concrete activities of the museum separately (almost 56% of cases), whilst the coordinated management of the entire communicative action is reduced to 30% of the entities.

The results related to RQ4 referring to the implementation of the communication by the museums allow us to investigate those publics with whom the communication activities took place (Table 3). We can see that the schools as well as the local/regional communities received an important communicative action (more than 70% of the entities). Tourists and the mass media received smaller attention (approximately 50% of the museums). The social/cultural entities, the Friends of the Museum associations as well as the experts on the subject were in a lower level (between 30% and 40% of the institutions). Finally, it should be pointed out that very few institutions carry out communication activities with the employees (only 5% of them).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publics</th>
<th>Communication Actions (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/Regional Community</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural/Social Organisations</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experts of the subject</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Museums Associations</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Institutions</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can also observe that almost all the museums use a variety of tools or activities in order to communicate with their publics (Table 4), although the majority of the museums are primarily implementing low-budget communication tools and techniques which let them reach a great number of people. Among the most frequently used communication actions towards external publics are the organisation of events, the use of the Internet as well as the elaboration of graphic and audiovisual material (between 95% and 100% of the entities). The media relations is also frequently used (93%) as well as the database communication (90%) or the outdoor advertising (88%). It is also relevant to point out that a great number of entities (80%) advertise
in media which requires significant financial investment. The explanation of this is that most advertisements are placed in local media and the museums frequently have governmental support and funding for this purpose.

Table 4: Main tools of communication in the museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities/Tools of Communication</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Communication</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of Events</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic and Audiovisual Material</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Communication</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Advertising</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media Advertising</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Communication</strong></td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Meetings</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Meetings</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intranet</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice boards</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Newsletter</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions Box</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, 90% of entities carry out some kind of Internal Communication activities. Personal and direct meetings (66%), the email (50%) and team meetings (32%) are the most frequently used tools or actions although they are not used on a massive scale. Some communication instruments are of secondary importance (such as the intranet or notice boards, with results between 15% and 20%). Other activities are a minority (less than 10%) such as the suggestions box or the internal magazines/newsletters). Hence, it can be proven that the internal communication is fundamentally oriented towards personal and direct interaction between members of an institution. This may be due to the fact that the majority of studied museums do not have many employees and thus it is not necessary to implement tools of ‘massive’ diffusion on the internal level.

Finally, as for what type of information is disseminated (Table 5), it is clear that the museums inform mainly about the specific activities organised by the institution. Thus, concrete activities (such as conferences, courses, workshops, etc.) and temporary exhibitions are disseminated on a much larger scale (more than 85% of the museums), while the institutional information (the information related to the daily management of the museum) and the information concerning the permanent collection of the entity is spread to a lesser extent (58% only). There is a certain logic behind such results since new or innovative activities tend to require much more communicative effort on the part of the museums in order to make their proposals known to the different publics or to attract visitors.

Table 5: Types of Information in the Museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Information</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Information</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Collection Information</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Exhibitions Information</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Museum Activities Information</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Conclusions and Further Research
We can conclude that the Corporate Communication has no strategic value for the investigated museums: the communication is not planned or managed in a holistic or systematic manner, neither is it considered a key resource for the museums to engage in dialogue with their publics. The results clearly demonstrate that the communication planning is short-term centred (annual planning), while very few institutions work with long-term plans. The communication management focuses on a daily dissemination of the activities of the museums rather than on the management of the relation with the different publics of the entity. Moreover, the investigation as well as the evaluation of the strategic planning of the communication (the first and the last step in the strategic process) receives very little attention from the museums in spite of the fact that they are essential in orientating strategic decisions. We also observed that the museums have a very narrow vision of the publics and there is no clear identification of the set of relevant publics for the institutions. The communication planning focuses principally on their external publics, in particular on current and potential users/visitors either on the individual or group oriented level (local and/or regional people) or on the institutional level (schools). That is to say, these institutions consider that “the public” is basically the target user/visitor of the museums. This could have a direct influence on the planning and implementation of the communication in the museums. Furthermore, the communication is implemented mainly as management of a set of specific activities for each situation and is principally centred on the transmission of specific/ephemeral activities (temporary exhibitions and concrete activities) of the museums. The entities combine several techniques and tools of communication in order to optimise their budget and impact. The majority of implemented activities do not require a great investment of money and they let the entities reach a significant number of people. Thus, there is no integrated, synergetic, coherent and consistent vision of the Corporate Communication as it had already been proposed in the theoretical background. It should be also highlighted that there are no strong and consolidated structures of communication in the museums. There are few specific departments of communication with very limited budgets, or the communication functions are integrated within other functional areas of the institution. Besides, there are few professionals fully dedicated to the communication and in the majority of cases the professionals share their dedication to the communication with other functions (such as didactics, conservation or even the management of the museum). This point suggests a lack of professionalization of the communication areas of departments in Catalan museums, at least in a great part of entities. All these aspects undoubtedly contribute to the fact that the communication does not play any important role in the daily functioning of the museum. Therefore, the communication in the studied museums is perceived as a short-term tactical and instrumental tool used to disseminate the activities of the entities among their potential visitors. All aspects which have been pointed out in this research suggest that the communication management in the museums lacks a strategic institutional vision being treated mainly as a tactical activity in the promotional support for each concrete activity carried out by the museum. Finally, we would like to look at the contributions and limitations of this study. Although the scope and depth of the study enables us to make a series of considerations and suggest specific conclusions on the museums’ communication, the results obtained in Catalonía cannot be directly extrapolated to all Spain neither at the international level. This work shows the results obtained from data of 2009. So, conclusions refer to the situation of museums in this moment. At the time of publishing this article, 4 years later, perhaps it is necessary to think about if the situation has changed, since the economic crisis in Spain is going deeper. It is possible that communication structures and budgets are downsizing, and the use of free (or almost free) tools of communication is gaining presence (like social media tools), since most of these institutions.
are founded basically through public contributions. It is also needed a deeper analysis of the impact of the Internet in museums’ communication. Previous research about the museum industry\(^6\) conclude that the role of the Internet in museums is increasingly relevant and confirm that the relationship between museums and publics is changing towards more interactive and collaborative forms. Besides this, this work presents a specific methodology suitable for analysing the strategic planning of the communication in the museums. It can be used by other researchers in other regions or countries to analyse these kinds of organisations which facilitates the comparison of results. The results of this study can also contribute towards identifying some of the strengths and weaknesses of communication practices of the museums and help to improve their communication management. Thus, the study of the museums in Spain and in other countries should be the next step in this research which would provide a broad-based and comprehensive perspective of the current situation and future challenges for the museums’ communication.
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Annex A: Museums who answered the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CosmoCaixa</th>
<th>M. del Castell de Peralada</th>
<th>M. Municipal Vicenc Ros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CaixaForum
M. Picasso
Teatre M. Dali
Centre Cultural Caixa de Catalunya. La Pedrera
Fundació Joan Miró
M. Nacional d'Art de Catalunya (MNAC)
M. d'Història de Tarragona
M. d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA)
M. d'Història de la Ciutat (Barcelona)
Fundació Fran Daurel. Col·lecció d'Art Contemporani
M. d'Arqueologia de Catalunya
M. Maritim de Barcelona
M. Egipci de Barcelona. Fundació Arqueològica
M. d'Història de Catalunya
M. Diocesà de Tarragona
M. de Ciències Naturals (Barcelona)
M. d'Història dels Jueus
M. del Cinema. Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol
M. d'Arqueologia de Catalunya
M. d'Art de Girona
M. de l'Institut de Paleontologia Miquel Crusafont Sabadell
M. de l'Institut de Paleontologia Miquel Crusafont Sabadell
Fundació Pau Casals (Vila Casals / M. Pau Casals)
M. Frederic Marès
M. d'Història dels Jueus
M. AGBAR. M. de les Aigües
M. del Cinema. Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol
M. del Joguet de Catalunya
M. de Badalona
M. d'Art de Girona
M. del Joguet de Catalunya
M. de Badalona
Cova Museu de la Font Major
M. de l'Embotit
Centre d'Interpretació de la Vall de Boi
M. d'Història de la JOguina. Col·lecció Tomàs Pla
M. Etnològic Barcelona
M. de Lleida, Diocesà i Comarcal
M. del Ferrocarril
M. d'Art Modern de Tarragona
Teatre M. Dali
Centre Cultural Caixa de Catalunya. La Pedrera
Fundació Joan Miró
M. Nacional d'Art de Catalunya (MNAC)
M. d'Història de Tarragona
M. d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA)
M. d'Història de la Ciutat (Barcelona)
Fundació Fran Daurel. Col·lecció d'Art Contemporani
M. d'Arqueologia de Catalunya
M. Maritim de Barcelona
M. Egipci de Barcelona. Fundació Arqueològica
M. d'Història de Catalunya
M. Diocesà de Tarragona
M. de Ciències Naturals (Barcelona)
M. d'Història dels Jueus
M. del Cinema. Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol
M. d'Arqueologia de Catalunya
M. d'Art de Girona
M. de l'Institut de Paleontologia Miquel Crusafont Sabadell
M. de l'Institut de Paleontologia Miquel Crusafont Sabadell
Fundació Pau Casals (Vila Casals / M. Pau Casals)
M. Frederic Marès
M. d'Història dels Jueus
M. AGBAR. M. de les Aigües
M. del Cinema. Col·lecció Tomàs Mallol
M. del Joguet de Catalunya
M. de Badalona
Cova Museu de la Font Major
M. de l'Embotit
Centre d'Interpretació de la Vall de Boi
M. d'Història de la JOguina. Col·lecció Tomàs Pla
M. Etnològic Barcelona
M. de Lleida, Diocesà i Comarcal