

Paul CAPRIOTTI
(corresponding author)
paul.capriotti@urv.cat
Associate Professor
Universitat Rovira i Virgili
Department of Communication Studies
Tarragona (Spain)

Alfonso GONZÁLEZ HERRERO
alfonso_gonzalez@es.ibm.com
Communication Department
IBM
Madrid (Spain)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Museum Management and Curatorship* on 2013, available at
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09647775.2013.831246?tab=permissions&scroll=top>

From 1.0 Online Pressrooms to 2.0 Social Newsrooms at Museums Worldwide

Abstract

The main objective was to evaluate if museums around the world are migrating from a 1.0 Online Pressroom model to a 2.0 Social Media Newsroom model, adapting their website to a wide group of publics and not just to the media.

This article analyzes the websites of the 100 most visited museums worldwide, from 24

countries. It was applied a content analysis methodology, studying the characteristics of the sections devoted to news, the information resources used and interaction systems available on them.

The results show that museums still have a long way to come in terms of social media. The traditional technique of sharing news exclusively with journalists still persists. Most museums still think that their websites are a place to disseminate news and information, but not a place to interact and engage in dialogue with their publics.

It can help improve the understanding of how organizations disseminate information and engage in dialogue (or not) with their publics through their specific sections of news. It also contributes towards identifying the strengths and weaknesses of online communication policies and activities of organizations and to help improving their communication management, making entities more open and community-oriented.

The study reflects the outcomes of a 3-year research project. It presents a specific methodology that help researchers and practitioners to assess and improve the online tools to engage in dialogue with their publics.

Keywords: Online Communication, Corporate Communication, Public Relations, Dialogic Communication, Websites, Social Newsrooms, Pressrooms.

1. Introduction

Since its invention, the World Wide Web has rapidly evolved and become an extraordinary means of communication, both for individuals and organizations. During its first decade of existence it reached millions of people and established itself as the basis of global commerce in a marketplace where there are no temporal or geographic frontiers. It has also sped up the one-way communication between organizations and individuals, by allowing companies and institutions to showcase their brands, products, and services through their corporate Websites. The arrival of the Internet not only meant a new channel for the dissemination of information, but also allowed for important changes in the model of interaction between an organization and its publics (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Fuertes-Callen et al., 2014; Guillory & Sundar, 2014; Luarn et al., 2015).

The evolution of the Internet has also provoked profound changes in the business model of the traditional media. Nowadays, any company or institution can address its communications directly to any of its stakeholders through its Website without any previous journalistic filter being applied by the traditional media. Simultaneously, the exclusive role enjoyed by the media until just 20 years ago has now disappeared. The traditional press, radio and TV stations are not any longer the only outlets where citizens can obtain information. A myriad of other sources, such as bloggers or Twitter users, have now the ability to access and disseminate news that before could only be distributed by a selected group of journalists. The growing importance of the blogging and social platforms (such as Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.) has surpassed in many cases the degree of influence of the traditional press (Zerfass & Schramm, 2014). Organizations should be increasingly aware of the importance of designing their information materials for bloggers, Twitter users and the like and not just for the traditional press.

2. Purpose of the study

The purpose of this article is to analyze if the traditional “Online Press Rooms” are being transformed to “Online News Rooms” serving all audiences and not just the traditional media. This is, to what extent the information that just a few years ago was being shared almost exclusively with journalists is now being shared directly with the different publics, in search of a direct relationship with them, allowing feedback and a wider reach for the corporate messages that are now non-intermediated, since there is a lower need for media filtering and reinterpretation of news.

Specifically, this study also addresses to what extent –if any— that transformation is taking place in the museum industry. Corporate Communications and public relations have proved their capacity to contribute not only to corporations but also to non-corporate organizations (Zerfass et al., 2014). And for the last two decades museums have recognized the importance of communication to achieve their organizational goals (Hooper-Greenhill, 2000; Gürel & Kavak, 2010; Capriotti, 2013) and have increasingly incorporated professional communication tools, including those related to online communication (Lopez et al., 2010; Viñarás & Cabezuelo, 2012; Padilla-Menendez & Del Aguila-Obra, 2013; Humanes, 2013).

Thus, we ask: Are museums migrating from an Online Press Room model to a Social Media News Room model? That is, to what extent these institutions are now targeting their communication to a myriad of stakeholders and not just to the traditional media, not only by changing the name of the section at the website, but also by adapting their structure and content, and including interactive tools and social media platforms to this new purpose?

This work reflects the outcomes of a 3-year research project focused on the online communication tools used by the most visited 100 art museums around the world, representing 24 countries from America (23 museums), Europe (60) and Asia-Pacific (17).

3. Background: From 1.0 Online Press Rooms to 2.0 Social Media News Rooms

In the corporate communications field, the early Web –known today as Web 1.0— signified the beginning of a new tool of communication that helped organizations to directly address many of their stakeholders as well as the media. For that purpose, many corporations and public institutions designed special zones within their Websites that targeted specific publics according to the segment to which they belonged. For example, there were areas for investors, job seekers, business partners, as well as the press. The later were commonly known as “Online Press Rooms” and were designed to fulfill the information needs of journalists that worked in – what we can label as— the traditional or mainstream media. This is, it targeted journalists from print magazines, newspapers, radio and TV stations, which played a key role in reaching many of the organizational stakeholders.

The wide availability of the Internet and its subsequent generalized use by journalists fostered the creation of information hubs in the corporate Web sites during more than 15 years (1995-2010, the period of dominance for the 1.0 Online Press Room). Some studies (Brandsford, 2002) confirmed the usefulness of Online Press Rooms for media professionals, although many journalists felt that Online Press Rooms did not provide enough information or the materials they required (Callison, 2003; Ingenhoff & Koelling 2009; Moon & Hyun, 2014).

At that time, several authors studied how organizational Web pages were being used to serve the media. For example, Esrock and Leichty (1999) observed how Websites could be used

to communicate with the media as well as with a multiplicity of audiences in a variety of information formats. Callison (2003) studied all *Fortune* 500 Company Web sites and revealed that the majority of Websites did not have dedicated Press Rooms at the time of the study where media content was centralized. Also Heinze and Hu (2006) undertook a 6-year longitudinal survey of the websites of Standard & Poor's 500 companies and observed these firms had gone through remarkable transformation and evolution in their web presence during the evaluation period of 1997–2003, signified by increasing levels of information, interactivity, and service offered at their websites. From an international perspective, González-Herrero and Ruiz de Valbuena (2006) compared how corporations from France, Denmark, France, Germany, Norway, Singapore, Spain, the United Kingdom and the United States used their Websites to serve the media. Further afield, Kirat (2007) has studied the use of Internet by media relations departments in the United Arab Emirates. Researchers have also studied how other types of organizations have implemented Online Press Rooms. For example, Kang and Norton (2004) explored US nonprofit organizations' Web sites to determine the extent the organizations utilize the Web to accomplish organizational goals. Ingenhoff and Koelling (2009) have explored the potential of Web sites as an online-communication tool of Swiss NPOs, concluding that the potential of the Internet for dialogic communication is not used efficiently by most NPOs.

Thus, at the time of the so-called Web 1.0, corporate Web pages were designed in several zones or micro-sites, each of them targeting a different public (including journalists). The Online Press Room was mainly created as one-way communication tool, oriented to deliver and disseminate information to the traditional mass media. Today, many of these Web areas segmented by publics still exist.

But the reality was that each of the publics of an organization could also navigate across the entire Web page and access most of its information. In fact, usually they could access to all

the information in the Website, except in the very rare cases where registration and a password were required for a specific area or micro-site within the corporate Web page.

The arrival of the so-called Web 2.0, characterized by the social media phenomena, has provoked, however, fundamental changes in the role websites play for organizations. They are now more than simple ways to distribute one-way information and have become key elements to generate useful dialogue and interaction with the key publics of the organization (Kent & Taylor, 1998; Capriotti & Moreno, 2007; Jo & Jung, 2005; Bonson & Ratkai, 2013; Fuertes-Callen et al., 2014; Guillory & Sundar, 2014).

Kent and Taylor (1998) provided a strategic framework, based on a dialogic communication theory, to facilitate relationship building with publics through the World Wide Web. Dialogic communication is today a basic and essential expectation in the online communication of any organization, and it can be seen as an ongoing interaction between organizations and their publics using Internet tools, which enables information, comments, opinions, assessment and experiences to be exchanged on a continuous basis. Several studies have focused on the dialogic potential of organization's Web sites (Kim et al., 2010; McAllister-Spooner, 2009; Guillory & Sundar, 2014). In the museum industry, Capriotti & Pardo Kuklinski (2012) analyzed dialogic communication through the Internet in Spanish museums.

In relation with the Online Press Rooms, Park and Reber (2008) and Pettigrew and Reber (2010; 2011) studied the use of dialogic components of *Fortune* 500 company Website Press Rooms, showing incipient use of dialogic features for journalists. Reber and Kim (2006) concluded that activist websites did not provide strong dialogic features for journalists, but dialogic features were more available for them than for the general public. Capriotti & Gonzalez-Herrero (2013) analyzed Spanish museums to affirm that their online Press Rooms are basically oriented to disseminate information, but not to engage in dialogue with journalists.

But, in recent years, most organizations have realized that it makes no sense to segment their Web pages so strictly by audience, since most of the information they share on their Web sites is likely to be seen –and is in fact seen-- by a variety of individuals from different stakeholder groups. That is the reason why nowadays, in the Web 2.0 period, what were once called Online “Press Rooms” are increasingly becoming online or social media “News Rooms”. IBM, Lilly, NASA or Red Bull are examples of this trend. Also companies such as Press-feed or Mynewsdesk, which provide digital PR services, offer today “Social Media News Rooms” to their clients instead of online “Press Rooms”. Finally, some studies (Yoo & Kim, 2013; Zerfass & Schramm, 2014) have confirmed this trend of a new way of naming these pages.

But this is far more relevant than just a name change. It means a subtle but profound (and strategic) change in the conception of the former Online Press Rooms. It relates to the profound changes occurred in recent years, when the traditional media and –particularly-- the press have suffered a decline. On the one side, the 90-year old media business model has suffered the impact of digital technologies and newspapers are still struggling today to adapt themselves to a new reader that demands written and audiovisual news on a continuous 24-hour wheel. On the other hand, the traditional media have seen the rise of a variety of new “competitors” and information brokers. Some of them are simply digital media, that is, news organizations that use exclusively digital platforms to distribute their news; others also act under a professional structure, but claim to have more independence and flexibility, such as the many blogs that are being run in a pretty much journalistic model. Finally, other providers of information are simply individuals who take advantage of the lack of barriers on the Internet to disseminate news or their perspective. With these new outlets, the news (in the form of text or images) has become more viral than ever and receivers that before were organized as audiences of specific media are

now organized in social media communities around certain bloggers, Twitter handles and the like.

In this way, a major reason for changing the name to Social Media News Rooms –or, simply, News Rooms-- is to accommodate the needs not just of the traditional press, but also the needs of bloggers and social media influencers as well as the general public.

The 2.0 Online News Rooms serve anyone who wants to be up to date regarding the organization's news, regardless of their purpose or profession. Certainly, these online zones still offer many of the elements required by professional journalists (high quality pictures, press releases, organizational profiles, etc.), but some elements of the formerly called "Online Press Rooms" are being slightly transformed to appeal to a wider audience now. For example, some companies (e.g. Dupont, IBM, NASA or Red Bull) no longer use the term "press releases". Instead they use the name "news releases" or simply "news", acknowledging that organizations can reach any of their stakeholders directly and that, in fact, many individuals navigate the organization's Web site in search for news and have the ability to disseminate this news further (via Twitter, Facebook and the like).

Therefore, one of the most important effects of such change is the integration of social and interactive elements into what has become a Social Media News Room, with the subsequent impact on their objectives and structure. In this evolution from Press Rooms to News Rooms, social media platforms have become critical. Woodall (2014) indicate that US journalists still prefer press releases in the Press Rooms for company news, but social media is increasingly being used as a research tool, with approximately a quarter of them using both Twitter and LinkedIn in their groundwork. Waters et al. (2010) showed how media relations are shifting to practices that are more relevant to a social media environment. Bajkiewicz et al. (2011) have also pointed out how the traditional media changes and the rise of social media are affecting PR

media relations and how PR professionals are increasingly using social media to communicate with the media. Zerfass and Schramm (2014) have studied how some corporations are aggregating the social media content provided by the organization through Facebook, Twitter, campaign microsites, etc., in the so called Social Media News Rooms. Armstrong and Gao (2010) studied how Twitter is used as a content dissemination tool within the news industry. Yoo and Kim (2013) have studied the use of online News Rooms on U.S. state tourism websites as well as the social media availability on those websites. In political communication, Lipinski and Neddenriep (2004) showed how public officials in the US Congress used social media not to bypass traditional news media, but as a new way to seek additional coverage from that media by making the congressional Web sites “media friendly”.

Thus, the evolution of Online Press Rooms to Online Social Media News Rooms implies three key challenges for organizations to inform the public about their news and engage in dialogue with their publics: on the one hand, the re-design of the section/s devoted to presenting the news on the website. On the other hand, the need to implement interactive tools to present and disseminate the information available in the section. Finally, the integration of interactive resources and social media platforms to contact (and be contacted by) people and expand communication options.

4. Research Methodology

The main objective of this work was to evaluate if art museums around the world are migrating from an Online Press Room model to a Social Media News Room model, adapting their website and targeting their communication to a wide group of publics and not just to the media, facing the challenges described in the previous section.

Thus, the corpus of our study was composed of the main art museums of the world. To define the sample, we used the criterion of annual visitors to the museums, and we decided to analyze the most visited art museums of the world. The sample was selected using the ranking of art museums developed by the prestigious magazine “The Art Newspaper” (<http://www.theartnewspaper.com/>), which annually prints a list of the most visited art museums in the world. To avoid a list with museums that only have a “one hit wonder” temporary exhibition, we had studied the lists published for five years (from 2008 to 2012, published from 2009 to 2013) and we selected museums that appear at least 3 times in the 5 years or twice in the last 3 years. The final sample included 100 museums from 24 countries, 60 of them from Europe, 23 from America, and 17 from the Asia/Pacific region. The official websites were identified using the most popular search engines and by typing the name of the museums on an Internet browser.

In order to achieve our goals, we established four research questions (RQs):

RQ1: Is there a section about museum news only dedicated to journalists or a section oriented to inform to a wider range of publics (general visitors, bloggers, and even journalists) on the museums' websites?

RQ2: If so, what are their main characteristics (name, structure, language and location)?

RQ3: What kind of information resources are used to present the contents?

RQ4: What contact and interaction systems are available on them?

To answer these research questions, we applied a content analysis methodology to the websites selected. The categories of analysis presented in this paper were developed and tested in previous research projects on media relations (Callison, 2003; Bajkiewicz et al., 2011; Zerfass & Schramm, 2014; González-Herrero, & Ruiz de Valbuena, 2006; Pettigrew & Reber, 2010, 2011), and on communication and public relations through the Internet (Capriotti and Moreno 2007).

This model has been used and quoted in several research studies in these fields and applied specifically to museums (Capriotti and Pardo Kuklinski 2012; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013). Data were retrieved and categorized according to these four research questions.

To answer RQ1, We identified the *Type of Section* available on the websites (Callison, 2003; Bajkiewicz et al.,2011; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013; Zerfass & Schramm, 2014; González-Herrero & Ruiz de Valbuena, 2006). We defined 3 options: 1) ‘Press Room’ (if the section is mainly focused on journalists), 2) ‘News Room’ (when the place is dedicated to a wider group of publics, which may include journalists, but also other visitors such as bloggers or the general public) and 3) ‘No Section’ (if there is no area with press or news materials). If any museum has more than one section, they were analyzed separately and counted twice.

To differentiate these sections, we do not take into account only the name of the section, but also the type of content included in it, and even any other words or phrases included that help to identify the section (for example, “journalists”, “visitors”, “media”, etc.). Thus, “Press Rooms”, typically are labelled as ‘Press’ or “Media” or “Communication”, and include press releases, backgrounders, high quality images and other specific elements related to the media. On the other hand, “News Rooms” are normally associated with the terms “News’, “Information”, etc., but include not only resources for journalists, but also other kind of resources or formats to inform about or present the news or topics (there are no “press” releases but “news” releases, there are links to social media networks, pictures are not necessarily in high quality, etc.) Which demonstrate that the section is being transformed to reach a wide group of publics and not only the media.

For RQ2, we developed four categories to analyze the formal characteristics defined for the sections dedicated to the news in the museums’ websites (Callison, 2003; Bajkiewicz et

al.,2011; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013; Pettigrew & Reber, 2010, 2011; Zerfass & Schramm, 2014).

We first reported the *name of the section* to evaluate how it was presented. The options were: 1) Press, 2) Communication, 3) News, 4) Communication and Press, 5) Others.

We also checked *the structure of the section*. Possible options were: 1) the section was specifically dedicated for the museum, 2) the section is shared with other museums or with other kinds of institutions.

Since 100 museums studied were from 24 countries, we also analyzed if the section was: 1) only in the local/national language or 2) also available in other languages (and, in that case, which ones).

Finally, the category of *section hierarchy* was established, which determined the hierarchical level at which the specific section was allocated (Capriotti & Moreno, 2007; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013). The information organization (that is, the way in which the content of a website is grouped and ordered) is a key point, since the manner in which information is organized on a website not only determines the usability and accessibility of its contents to visitors, but also how important a given topic is within the website. Four levels were established to that end: 1) 'Homepage', if the section was located on the homepage of a museum's website; 2) 'Level 2', if the sections were not on the homepage and the visitor/journalist/blogger needed one click to find it; 3) 'Level 3', if the section is reached by the visitor/journalist after two clicks, and 4) 'Level 3+' if the visitor/journalist needed three or more clicks to access it.

For RQ3 the category of *Presentation of Information Resources* was developed (Table 1), which showed the different tools used to present the information about the museums and their products, services and activities (Capriotti & Moreno, 2007; Capriotti & Pardo Kuklinski, 2012; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013). Two types of resources were identified. The first type was

‘Expositive resources’, those basically oriented to the dissemination of information, with a mainly passive and receptive visitor/journalist. This type of resource was classified as 1) ‘texts’ (plain texts, press releases, backgrounders, clippings), 2) ‘images’ (fixed images, photos, graphics, slide presentations) and 3) ‘audiovisual’ (audio and video). The second type were the ‘Interactive resources’ those that facilitate information through active interaction, with a mainly active and participative visitor/journalist. This type of resource was classified as 4) ‘Hyper-textual’: links that enable visitors to obtain complementary or in-depth information about the museum and its activities, artists, topics (among others) and 5) ‘Participative Resources’: those that need the action of the visitor (interactive graphics and charts, virtual visits, etc.). For all these resources we evaluated whether they exist (a) inside the specific section itself, or if there are links in the section to (b) other sections of the museum’s website or (c) to other websites of related topics or external social places (like Wikipedia, Flickr, YouTube, Google Art Project, Vimeo, Slideshare, Pinterest, Instagram, etc.)

TABLE 1

For RQ4 we defined a *Contact and Interaction Systems* category (Table 2), to assess the resources available on the website that allow the museum to be more or less proactive in delivering information to the visitors/journalists and that facilitate interaction with visitors who want to obtain further information or simply contact the museum (Capriotti & Moreno, 2007; Capriotti & Pardo Kuklinski, 2012; Capriotti & González Herrero, 2013). These data were classified into two types of resources: 1) *Offline Resources* (postal address, phone numbers, fax numbers and others) and 2) *Online Resources*. The last ones were classified into a) ‘passive contact resources’, which allowed visitors/journalists to request information from the organization, with no active involvement by the museum at this stage (that is, the request of information is “pulled” or originated by the visitors/journalists); b) ‘proactive contact resources’

by which the tools available in the sections enabled the museum to inform visitors/journalists about the institution and its activities on a proactive basis (where the information is “pushed” or generated from the museum) or c) ‘interactive contact resources’, that is, push/pull resources that combine pull/push possibilities to allow high interaction between the museums and the visitor/journalist.

TABLE 2

Once the research form had been designed, we conducted a test analysis on 20 museum websites of various sizes. This initial approach made it possible to assess the suitability of the research tool and led to us making slight modifications to the original form. After concluding the test the research team collected the data on the entire sample. The data obtained were treated with SPSS to obtain the results presented on the following section.

5. Results

5.1 Type of section

In relation to RQ1, it is observed that practically all the museums (96%) have at least one specific section devoted to informing the visitor (be that general visitors, journalists, bloggers, etc.)

TABLE 3

Table 3 shows that 82% of entities have only one section on their websites (mainly the Press Room), while 14% of museums have two sections for the news, combining the Press Rooms with the News Rooms. The sections have substantially different presence on the museums’ websites. While the Online Press Rooms have a relevant presence (56%), the Online

News Rooms for general visitors are present in around a quarter (26%) of the total. Taking into account the websites with 2 sections, Press Rooms are present in 70% and News Rooms in 40% of them.

From these results, we can observe that the majority of museums still think primarily of journalists when designing a specific area in their websites with information, while only a quarter of them have transformed or are in the process of transforming their informative areas to appeal a wider array of stakeholders, be these bloggers or simply general visitors.

5.2 Characteristics of the sections

About the characteristics of the Section identified in the websites (RQ2), we can analyze the results related to the name of the section, the type of section, the language of the section and the location of the section.

Regarding the name of the section (Table 4), the results show that the majority of areas have a logical label (“Press” for Press Rooms and “News” for News Rooms), with very few organizations using other terms. We must note, however, that about one third of the News Rooms also include labels related to media relations activities, such as “Press”. This is, although the content of these areas includes “news” and informative resources in a format that would appeal –both in terms of content and format-- to a large number of visitors, the old references to the media still remain. Nevertheless, the majority of denominations for these News Rooms are “News” (55%), followed by a variety of names such as “Information” or “What’s new” (included in “others”).

TABLE 4

About the Structure of section (Table 5), the results show that most museums have their own section devoted to inform journalists or general visitors on their own website. That is, 80% of Press Rooms and 90% of News Rooms are within the museums' web pages. In some other cases, however, these areas belong to another entity or parent institution. This is the case, for example, when there are several sites of the same museum in different cities or countries (such as Guggenheim Museums) or when the museums are run by a larger cultural entity (like CaixaForum in Spain, which belongs to Fundación la Caixa, or the Centre Cultural Banco do Brasil). 20% of Press Rooms and 10% of News Rooms would fall under that category.

TABLE 5

In conclusion, museums tend to develop their own communication areas within their websites. A large majority of them (more than 80%) do so; regardless of the denomination of that area, and only around 16% of them share those resources with other museums or institutions. There are slight differences depending on the type of space. For example, the museums autonomy is larger in News Rooms than in Online Press Rooms, which may indicate that traditional Press Rooms targeting a professional public require more specialized resources and, therefore, its objectives are better achieved via collaboration with third parties or a parent entity.

Almost all museums' websites (99%) undertake their communication areas in their local languages (Table 6). There is only one exception (The Van Gogh Museum) which has its website, which is in English instead of Dutch, the local language.

TABLE 6

In addition to the local language, English is also used in about a third of cases. The English percentage is a bit higher in those museums that have Online News Rooms (almost 40% versus 31% of Press Rooms), which may be an indicator of how such areas target a wider group

of visitors and not just professional –local-- journalists. Spanish also has a relevant presence as a second language and it is being used in 6% of the institutions, while other languages (French, German, etc.) have a presence on these sections accounting for only 4.5% of cases. The Spanish language is mainly used, however, as a second language by museums in Spain, where a good number of them design the websites both in Spanish and in the regional language, such as Catalan, Euskera, etc. Out of Spain, the use of Spanish in the websites of museums is non-existent.

The results about the use of foreign languages are surprising. Taking into account that the majority of the 100 museums studied are well known around the world (and visited physically and virtually by millions of people) the results show that the sections dedicated to informing visitors are mainly designed for local/national publics and not for the wide range of people around the world.

In terms of the hierarchical position of online Press Rooms (Table 7), we can see significant differences among the types of sections. The Online News Rooms have the greatest presence on the museums' homepage (the section is on the homepage in almost 58% of the websites) and the other 42% of them are situated at the second level. On the other hand, the Online Press Rooms are primarily located in the second level (with 77% of presence at this level) but an important quantity of museums (20%) locates their Press Room at a third level of the website.

TABLE 7

Results indicate, therefore, that when the information is intended for a wider group of visitors it is placed in the homepage, while when it is intended for a professional public (journalists) the information is placed at a second or third level within the web page.

5.3 Presentation of information resources

The results about the presentation of information resources (RQ3) clearly show that the information in the museums is presented by means of mainly one-way or expositive tools (Table 8). There are basically 4 tools or resources used in these sections: Short Texts and Long Texts (both present in almost all museums), and Images/Photos and Links (both with presence in around half of the museums' websites).

TABLE 8

Overall, the main expositive resources used are press releases and short texts (99%) followed by background or long texts (88.5%). Images are used by almost 57% of museums, while audio-visual and other expositive tools are found in very few sections (videos in only 12% of cases, and the others in less than 10% -newsletters, audio, presentations, press clippings and interactive resources-). Virtual visits have no presence at all in these sections.

Interactive resources are clearly used less than expositive ones, and have significant differences among them. Internal/External Links (useful resources for obtaining more in-depth information about the museum, the artists, issues, activities, etc.) are used in 50% of the sections. Links are the most common way of providing further information using the multiple sources on the World Wide Web, but half of the art museums surveyed do not take advantage of this tool. Finally, other interactive resources (interactive charts, virtual visits, etc.) are practically non-existent, with less than 2% cases taking advantage of them.

Looking at differences between "Press Rooms" and "News Rooms" we find some interesting data. For example, while all sections have Short Texts at a similar level (almost all museums), Long Texts are more available in Press Rooms (more than 90%) than in News Rooms (almost 73%), suggesting that these long-form materials are designed for journalists. Similar

results appear with Images/Photos, which are used in 67% of Press Rooms, but in only 22.7% of News Rooms (this result could be explained by the fact that most pictures included are high resolution images mainly targeted to the mass media). The use of Links (a key element of the WWW) in both Press Rooms and News Rooms is only prevalent in around half of the museums surveyed. Videos have little presence in both types of sections (around 15% in Press Rooms and 8% in News Rooms). The rest of Audio-visual and Interactive tools have a very poor presence, with less than 10% of presence. All these results show that Press Rooms tend to use more resources and deliver more information than News Rooms.

TABLE 9

When we analyzed where the Information Resources are located (Table 9), we found that the great majority of museums offer the tools inside the specific informative section. Most museums store their materials within their own Press Rooms or news rooms, with only one clear exception: links to internal or external sources. Almost 50% of the museums offer internal links (to other places in the museum's website) and 25% of the institutions have external links (to other websites related to similar topics or other platforms like Wikipedia, etc.) that allow the entities to expand the information shared. In this way, while some museums are taking advantage of all the opportunities for greater dissemination of information and interaction with stakeholders provided by the resources available on the World Wide Web and the social media platforms, other museums are not.

Overall, online Press Rooms seem to be more developed than news rooms, suggesting that museums dedicate more resources to these areas targeting a professional public (journalists). The percentages of all materials within the site are higher in all categories, with the only exception of "internal/external links". Online Press Rooms have more written documents,

pictures, audio, video, etc. than do News Rooms, which again suggest more resources are being used in their development and maintenance.

5.4 Contact and Interaction Systems

Regarding contact and feedback systems (RQ4), the museums mainly prioritize offline tools and traditional online resources for contact and feedback (Table 10). Results show that the tools more frequently found in those sections are phone numbers (a traditional form of offline contact) and e-mail (a traditional, basic, online resource) which are present in around two thirds of the sections. The rest of the tools or resources mentioned are present in less than one third of the websites.

TABLE 10

The offline resources are the group of tools with the wider presence. Phone Numbers are available in 66% of Press Rooms and news rooms. Postal Address and Fax (the other traditional information tools) are available in around 30% and 20% of the sections respectively.

Regarding the online resources, the “push” contact tools have more presence than “pull” and “interactive” ones. Proactive (push) contact tools are used in around 20% of websites. A total of 23% of sections provide subscription to online newsletters or news bulletins, and 17% of websites have content syndication tools (a more modern system for obtaining permanent and updated information). Among the passive (pull) contact systems, E-mail is the only one with a significant presence. Information Request Forms only appear in 13% of sections, while other contact systems such as Message Platforms and Message Boards) have no presence at all. With regards to the interactive tools (mainly social networks tools, a key resource for modern information and contact systems), they have a token presence (around 5% only), which is a bit

surprising, since they are tools being used by millions of people around the world to get and share information, be in contact and engage in dialogue with brands, companies and institutions.

Analyzing the differences between Press Rooms and News Rooms we can observe how Press Rooms include contact tools in a higher proportion than News Rooms do, with the unique exception of Content Syndication where News Rooms have a higher incidence: 26% of them versus 10% of Press Rooms. In the Press Rooms, Phone Numbers and Emails have a more relevant presence (around 80% of websites), but the other forms of offline contact (postal address and fax) are present in less than one third of sections, and online resources (like subscription to newsletters and information request forms) are available in 20% of Press Rooms. Other systems or tools have a token presence (less than 10%). In the News Rooms there are fewer resources to contact the museums, with all the tools with a low presence (below 50%). The main tools offered are email and phone numbers (around 45%) followed by the postal address (32%). Content syndication and subscriptions to newsletters have a significant presence (around 25%). The other tools have a very poor presence in this section, with less than 10%.

These results show that Press Rooms offer more resources and tools to contact and interact with museums, which suggest, again, that the museums studied have a more expert team dedicated to serve a professional public (the journalists) than in the case of News Rooms, which are designed to serve a wider group of publics with probably lower demand for additional information.

It is also interesting to point out that the use of social networks is very low: around 5% in Press Rooms and News Rooms in the most known platforms (Twitter and Facebook). In fact, News Rooms seem to be designed to disseminate information, but not to interact with the publics of the museum. We can conclude, therefore, that these sections in the museums are really far

from being considered “Social Media News Rooms” as it was described in the theoretical background.

6. Conclusions and Further Research

The research clearly shows that informative web areas of art museums worldwide still have a long way to go in order to be considered social media advanced. The traditional way of sharing news (directly to journalists) still persists in a majority of them.

Our analysis has found that “Press Rooms” are still more common than “News Rooms” and that their structure and characteristics are still oriented to specific stakeholders and not to a wider audience.

The presentation of information in these sections of the art museums websites is mainly done by means of traditional expositive tools such as texts and images (press releases, background texts etc.), with a low implementation of audio-visual and interactive resources (except internal and external links, which are used by half of the entities).

The analysis of the contact and interaction systems in these sections shows that museums still use primarily traditional offline and online tools to deliver information or interact with their publics. The implementation of interactive tools and social networks is still very low.

The results about the specific types of sections (Press Rooms and News Rooms) clearly indicate that in both of them the resources for presenting the information are basically expositive and the use of online contact and interaction systems are very low. But Press Rooms use more tools and systems to present the information and interact with the visitors to the website, while News Rooms are mainly oriented towards merely spreading information, not engaging in dialogue with the publics of the museums. In this way, Press Rooms seem to be better designed

to match the needs of the specific target public (journalists) than News Rooms (oriented to a wider group of publics: general visitors, bloggers, journalists, etc.).

Therefore, we can conclude that art museums worldwide are still in an initial phase of implementing modern Social Media News Rooms as they are actually conceived. The results indicate that most museums still think that these sections of their websites are a place to disseminate news and information about the institution and its activities, but not a place to interact and engage in dialogue with their publics.

Museums need to confront the three challenges suggested in the theoretical section of this article: (a) the structure and characteristics of the sections need to evolve to serve not only a specific public but to inform anyone who wants to be up to date regarding the organization's news, (b) more interactive tools and resources to present the information must be implemented, and (c) the use of more social and interactive systems to contact and engage in dialogue should be realized.

Finally, we would like to look at the contributions and limitations of this study. The study presents a specific methodology suitable for analyzing the specific sections devoted to present news on the organizations websites, and it was applied to a large number of art museums around the world. From an academic point of view, this work can help improve our understanding of how museums disseminate information and engage in dialogue (or not) with their publics through their specific sections of news. Hence it can be used by other researchers in specific cities, regions or countries to analyze this kind of organizations, and to promote the comparison of results. From a practitioner perspective, the results of this study can also contribute towards identifying some of the strengths and weaknesses of digital communication policies and activities of museums –as well as other type of organizations- and to help improving their communication management, and to make entities more open and community-oriented. On the

other hand, the implementation of that methodology to a specific type of organization such as museums implies the need to test the methodology with other type of entities: private organizations (that is, businesses) and other public institutions (like local, regional or national government departments or agencies), in order to confirm if the results and trends found in museums are being identified in other kinds of organizations.

Acknowledgements

This paper is part of the R+D competitive project about “The Digital Communication of the Cultural Heritage of Museums” (CSO2011-25163), granted by the Ministry of Education and Science of Spain.

7. References

- Armstrong, C.L. & Gao, F. (2010). Now Tweet This: How News Organizations Use Twitter. *Electronic News*, 4 (4), 218-235.
- Bajkiewicz, T. E., Kraus, J. J. & Hong, S. Y. (2011). The impact of News Room changes and the rise of social media on the practice of media relations. *Public Relations Review*, 37 (3) 329–331.
- Bonson, E., & Ratkai, M. (2013). A set of metrics to assess stakeholder engagement and social legitimacy on a corporate Facebook page. *Online Information Review*, 37(5), 787-803.
- Brandsford, K. (2002). Better, smarter Internet media relations. *Public Relations Tactics*, 9 (7), 6.

- Callison, C. (2003). Media relations and the Internet: how Fortune 500 company web sites assist journalists in news gathering. *Public Relations Review*, 29 (1), 29–41.
- Capriotti, P. (2013). Managing Strategic Communication in Museums: the case of Catalan museums. *Comunicación y sociedad/Communication & Society*, 26 (3), 98-116.
- Capriotti, P. and Moreno, A. (2007). Corporate citizenship and public relations: the importance and interactivity of social responsibility issues on corporate websites. *Public Relations Review*, 33 (1), 84-91.
- Capriotti, P., & Pardo Kuklinski, H. (2012). Assessing dialogic communication through the Internet in Spanish museums. *Public Relations Review*, 38 (4), 619-626.
- Capriotti, P. & González Herrero, A. (2013). Managing media relations in museums through the Internet: a model of analysis for online Press Rooms in museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 28 (4), 413-429.
- Esrock, S. L., & Leichty, G. B. (1999). Corporate World Wide Web pages: Serving the news media and other publics. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 76 (3), 456-467.
- Fuertes-Callén, Y., Cuellar-Fernández, B., & Pelayo-Velázquez, M. (2014). Determinants of online corporate reporting in three Latin American markets: The role of web presence development. *Online Information Review*, 38(6), 806-831.
- González-Herrero, A. & Ruiz de Valbuena, M. (2006). Trends in online media relations: Web-based corporate press rooms in leading international companies. *Public Relations Review*, 32 (3), 267–275.
- Guillory, J. E., & Sundar, S. S. (2014). How Does Web Site Interactivity Affect Our Perceptions of an Organization? *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 26 (1), 44-61.
- Gürel, E. & Kavak, B. (2010). A conceptual model for public relations in museums. *European Journal of Marketing*, 44 (1-2), 42-65.

- Heinze, N. & Hu. Q. (2006). The evolution of corporate web presence: A longitudinal study of large American companies . *International Journal of Information Management*, 26 (4), 313–325.
- Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2000). Changing Values in the Art Museum: rethinking communication and learning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 6 (1), 9-31.
- Humanes, A. S. (2013). La Gestión de la Comunicación Externa Online con los Visitantes en los Museos y Centros de Arte Malagueños. *Revista Internacional de Relaciones Públicas*, 3(6), 197-216.
- Ingenhoff, D., & Koelling, A. M. (2009). The potential of Web sites as a relationship building tool for charitable fundraising NPOs. *Public Relations Review*, 35 (1), 66-73.
- Jo, S. & Jung, J. (2005). A cross-cultural study of the world wide web and public relations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 10 (1), 24-40
- Kang, S. & Norton, H. E. (2004). Nonprofit organizations’ use of the World Wide Web: are they sufficiently fulfilling organizational goals? *Public Relations Review*, 30 (3), 279–284.
- Kent, M. L. & Taylor, M. (1998). Building dialogic relationships through the world wide web. *Public Relations Review*, 24 (3), 321–334.
- Kim, S., Park J.H, & Wertz, E.K. (2010). Expectation gaps between stakeholders and web-based corporate public relations efforts: focusing on Fortune 500 corporate web sites. *Public Relations Review*, 36 (3), 215-221.
- Kirat, M. (2007). Promoting online media relations: Public relations departments' use of Internet in the UAE. *Public Relations Review*, 33(2), 166-174.
- Lipinski, D. & Neddenriep, G. (2004). Using “New” Media to Get “Old” Media Coverage. How Members of Congress Utilize Their Web Sites to Court Journalists. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 9 (1), 7-21.

- López, X., Margapoti, I., Maragliano, R. & Bove, G. (2010). The presence of Web 2.0 tools on museum websites: a comparative study between England, France, Spain, Italy, and the USA. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 25 (2), 235-249.
- Luarn, P., Lin, Y. F., & Chiu, Y. P. (2015). Influence of Facebook brand-page posts on online engagement. *Online Information Review*, 39(4), 505-519.
- McAllister-Spooner, S. (2009). Fulfilling the dialogic promise: A ten-year reflective survey on dialogic Internet principles. *Public Relations Review*, 35 (3), 320–322.
- Moon, S. J., & Hyun, K. D. (2014). Online Media Relations as an Information Subsidy: Quality of Fortune 500 Companies' Websites and Relationships to Media Salience. *Mass Communication and Society*, 17 (2), 258-273.
- Padilla-Meléndez, A., & Del Águila-Obra, A.R. (2013). Web and social media usage by museums: Online value creation. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33, 892–898.
- Park, H., & Reber, B. H. (2008). Relationship building and the use of Web sites: How Fortune 500 corporations use their Web sites to build relationships. *Public Relations Review*, 34 (4), 409-411.
- Pettigrew, J. E. & Reber, B.H. (2010). The New Dynamic in Corporate Media Relations: How Fortune 500 Companies Are Using Virtual Press Rooms to Engage the press. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22 (4), 404-428.
- Pettigrew, J. E., & Reber, B. H. (2011). Journalists' opinions and attitudes about dialogic components of corporate websites. *Public Relations Review*, 37 (4), 422-424.
- Reber, B. H. & Kim, J.K. (2006). How Activist Groups Use Websites in Media Relations: Evaluating Online Press Rooms. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18 (4), 313-333.

- Schulte, B. (2009). The Distribution Revolution-How news organizations are intensifying their use of social networking venues like Twitter and Facebook to circulate their stories and connect with their communities. *American Journalism Review (AJR)*, 35 (5), 22.
- Viñarás, M. & Cabezuelo, F. (2012). Claves para la participación y generación de contenido en las redes sociales: estudio de caso del Museo del Prado en Facebook. *AdComunica*, 3, 87-103.
- Waters, R.D. Tindall, N.T.J., & Morton, T.S. (2010). Media Catching and the Journalist–Public Relations Practitioner Relationship: How Social Media are Changing the Practice of Media Relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 22, (3) 241-264.
- Woodall, I. (2014). The Practice of Media Relations has Changed; Have You Changed With It? *2014 Business Wire Media Survey Results*. Retrieved from:
<http://go.businesswire.com/business-wire-media-survey-results>
- Yoo, K.-H., & Kim, J. R. (2013). How US state tourism offices use online News Rooms and social media in media relations. *Public Relations Review*, 39 (5), 534-541.
- Zerfass, A., & Schramm, D. M. (2014). Social Media News Rooms in public relations: A conceptual framework and corporate practices in three countries. *Public Relations Review*, 40 (1), 79-91.
- Zerfass, A., Tench, R., Verčič, D., Verhoeven, P. & Moreno, A. (2014). *European Communication Monitor 2014*. Retrieved from
<http://www.zerfass.de/ECM-WEBSITE/media/ECM2014-Results-ChartVersion.pdf>

TABLES

<i>Category</i>	<i>Type of Resources</i>		<i>Tools</i>
Presentation of Information Resources	Expositive	Texts	Releases, backgrounders, etc.
		Images	Images, Pictures, Graphics
		Audiovisual	Audios Videos
	Interactive	Hyper-Textual	Links
		Participative	Interactive Charts, Virtual Visits

Table 1: Presentation of Information Resources

<i>Categories</i>		<i>Type of Tool</i>	<i>Tools</i>	
Contact and Interaction Systems	Offline Resources		Postal Address	
			Phone Numbers	
			Fax Numbers	
			Others	
	Online Resources	Passive Contact Resources ('pull')		E-mail
				Voice IP (Skype, Viber, etc.)
				Message Platforms
				Information Request Forms
		Proactive Contact Resources ('push')		Subscription to Newsletter
				Content Syndication (RSS, Atom, etc.)
		Interactive Contact Resources ('pull/push')		Chat online "live"
				Twitter
	Facebook			
	Others	Others		

Table 2: Contact and Interaction Systems

	<i>%</i>
Online Press Room	56.0
Online News Room	26.0
TOTAL (only 1 section)	82.0
Online Press Room + Online News Room	14.0
TOTAL (2 sections)	14.0
No Section	4.0
TOTAL	100

Table 3: Type de Section

	<i>Online Press Rooms</i>		<i>Online News Rooms</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Press	58	82.86	11	27.50	69	62.72
Communication	7	10.00	1	2.50	8	7.27
Communication & Press	2	2.86	1	2.50	3	2.72
News	2	2.86	22	55.00	24	21.81
Others	1	1.43	5	12.50	6	5.45
TOTAL	70	100	40	100	110	100

Table 4: Name of the Section

	<i>Online Press Rooms</i>		<i>Online News Rooms</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Dedicated to the own Museum	56	80.00	36	90.00	92	83.63
Shared with other Museums/Institutions	14	20.00	4	10.00	18	16.36
TOTAL	70	100	40	100	110	100

Table 5: Structure of the Section

	<i>Online Press Rooms</i>		<i>Online News Rooms</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Local	69	98.57	40	100	109	99.00
English	22	31.43	16	40.00	38	34.55
Spanish	6	8.57	1	2.50	7	6.36
French	1	1.43	1	2.50	2	1.81
Others	2	2.86	1	2.50	3	2.72

Table 6: Language of the Sections

	<i>Online Press Rooms</i>		<i>Online News Rooms</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	
	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Homepage	1	1.43	23	57.50	24	21.28
2 nd Level	54	77.14	17	42.50	71	64.54
3 rd Level	14	20.00	0	0	14	12.72
+3 rd Level	1	1.43	0	0	1	0.90
TOTAL	70	100	40	100	110	100

Table 7: Location of the Section

<i>Types of Resources</i>	<i>Resources</i>	<i>Online Press Rooms</i>		<i>Online News Rooms</i>		<i>TOTAL</i>	
		<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Expositive	Press Releases / Short Texts	69	98.57	40	100	109	99.09
	Background / Long Texts	64	91.43	29	72.50	93	84.54
	Press Clippings	6	8.57	3	7.50	9	8.18
	Newsletter (available online)	3	4.29	3	7.50	6	5.45
	Images/Pictures	47	67.14	15	37.50	62	56.36
	Audio	6	8.57	0	0.00	6	5.45
	Videos	10	14.29	3	7.50	13	11.81
	Presentations (PPT, PDF, etc.)	4	5.71	2	5.00	6	5.45
Interactive	Links (internal/external)	29	41.43	24	60.00	53	48.18
	Interactive Resources	2	2.86	0	0.00	2	1.81
	Virtual Visits	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Table 8: Presentation of Information Resources

Types of Resources	Resources	TOTAL		Inside the News Room or Press Room		In other Place of the Museum Website (links)		In Other External Websites of Social Platforms (links)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Expositive	Press Releases / Short Texts	109	99.09	109	99.09	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Backgrounders / Long Texts	93	84.54	93	84.54	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Press Clippings	9	8.18	9	8.18	0	0.00	1	0.90
	Newsletter (available online)	6	5.45	6	5.45	0	0.00	0	0.00
	Images/Pictures	62	56.36	54	49.09	7	6.36	1	0.90
	Audios	6	5.45	5	4.54	0	0.00	1	0.90
	Videos	13	11.81	11	10.00	0	0.00	2	1.81
	Presentations (PPT, PDF, etc.)	6	5.45	6	5.45	0	0.00	0	0.00
Interactive	Links (internal/external)	53	48.18	21	19.09	49	44.54	27	25.71
	Interactive Resources	2	1.81	0	0.00	2	1.81	0	0.00
	Virtual Visits	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00

Table 9: Location of Information Resources at the Section

Types of Systems		Systems	Online Press Rooms		Online News Rooms		TOTAL	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Offline		Postal Address	24	34.29	13	32.50	37	33.63
		Phone Numbers	56	80.00	17	42.50	73	66.36
		Fax	18	25.71	3	7.50	21	19.09
Online	Passive Contact Tools (Pull)	E-mail	54	77.14	18	45.00	72	65.45
		Voice IP	1	1.43	0	0.00	1	0.90
		Message Platforms	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
		Information Request Forms	14	20.00	0	0.00	14	12.72
	Proactive Contact Tools (Push)	Subscription to Newsletter	15	21.43	8	20.00	23	20.90
		Content Syndication	7	10.00	12	25.92	19	17.27
	Interactive Contact Tools (Pull/Push)	Online "live" chat	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
		Twitter	4	5.71	2	5.00	6	5.45
		Facebook	4	5.71	3	7.50	7	6.36

Table 10: Interaction and Contact/Feedback Systems