

## **Master thesis**

### **Art museums engaging audiences on social media: the difference between established and recently opened museums**

Student name: Teodora Stankovic

Student number: 453102

Supervisor: Dr. Mart Willekens

Master Media Studies (Media, Culture and Society), Erasmus School of  
History, Culture and Communication, Erasmus University Rotterdam

25 June, 2018

Word count: 25352

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this research is to analyse the art museums in Moscow and their usage of social media platforms in order to engage the audiences and attract public. The study is focused on the changes in museums' life and their functions that happened as the result of shift from an 'old' to a 'new museology'. The proponents of new museology emphasize that museums are affected by the growing importance of their visitors and need to shift toward many-to-many communication. The main aim is to compare traditional museums with the history of more than a century with the new upcoming ones. The notion of Bildung and cultural institutions historically rooted devotion to the cultivation of the society is used as an important point of this comparison. Based on Bourdieu's social theory and the idea of struggle for organizational legitimacy it was assumed that the recently established cultural institutions that were introduced in the visitor-centered society would differ from the incumbents and may influence the changes in communication with the visitors. However, there are certain conventional procedures of the field that need to be followed in order to gain respect from the colleagues and audience. Therefore, the paper needs to see whether the difference between the new and traditional institutions is still significant. The analysis is based on the 4 interviews with museum representatives, who work on the development of social media marketing, as well as on 395 media posts, collected from Facebook and Instagram. The sequential multimethod design helps to cover the problem from different perspectives and acquire deeper knowledge of museum practices related to social media: analyse both the goals and actual content. The PR managers' perception of the social media goals revealed that the difference certainly exists, but both traditional and upcoming museums are influenced by the era of edutainment and need to work for wider more diverse audiences, than they were used in the past – the 'elitist' connotation of art museums is blurring. Besides, emerging museums have more freedom to experiment, be creative and innovative while established have strict reputation and more expectations toward their activities. The research also revealed that channel choice plays important role, because each platform has its specific audiences and same museum needs to elaborate different tactics and content for each media platform. Furthermore, museums, especially traditional ones, still do not use the full potential presented by social media and maintain quite formal communication.

Key words: museums; Russia; social media management; Web 2.0; marketing

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Theoretical framework.....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 New museology .....	9
2.2 The concept of 'Bildung' .....	10
2.3 Struggle for organizational legitimacy .....	11
2.4 Cultural capital .....	12
2.5 Target audiences .....	13
2.6 Art museums as 'difficult brands' .....	15
2.7 Cultural space.....	16
2.8 Social media marketing strategies .....	16
2.9 Different types of engagement .....	19
2.10 Individuals' interpretation of social media content.....	22
2.11 Traditional and recently established museums in Moscow.....	23
<b>3. Method.....</b>	<b>26</b>
3.1 Interviews.....	26
3.2 Quantitative content analysis.....	29
<b>4. Results .....</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 Interviews.....	33
4.2 Social media posts .....	45
4.3 The parallels between interviews and QCA .....	58
<b>5. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>62</b>
5.1 Discussions and limitations .....	66
<b>Reference List.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>78</b>

## **1. Introduction**

Museum logic has been reshaping over the past century, putting more focus on the audience and on community links. Cultural organizations are following this general global trend – they become more visitor-centred. Today museums are constantly pursuing new ways to reach a wider, more diverse public and build loyal relationship with them. What is more, people themselves are now seeking more information, better services, and “more human contact in museums” (Kotler & Kotler, 2000, p.272). Thus, the focus on the audience became mandatory and museums are faced with the need to integrate entertainment to get public recognition and be able to compete in the recreation field (Hanquinet & Savage, 2012).

The shift of museums into marketplace and changes of their traditional role led to the appearance of the concept ‘new museology’ characterised by the breakdown of barriers and the raise of audience-awareness (Ross, 2004). In the past museums were closely connected to the notion of Bildung - their main role was the cultivation and enlightenment of the society (Sheehan, 2000). However, today many authors talk about the fact that the narrative of high-culture and Bildung lost its credibility, there is a perceptible shift from simply educational role to different levels of entertainment (McIntyre, 2009; Pulh, Marteaux, & Mencarelli, 2008). Therefore, the hybrid concept – edutainment - gained its popularity (Addis, 2005).

Furthermore, the proponents of the theory of new museology emphasize that product quality of museums is affected by the growing importance of their visitors (Stam, 1993). The museums are in need of reform and for the traditional ones, that were used to one-to-many communication model and which already have strong position in the society, it implies the need of restructuring, modernization and corresponding to the new context. Stam (1993, p.281) discussed the necessity to implement modes of communication “familiar to modern audiences” – those modes changed, but the idea is still relevant. When it comes to social media strategies, it is interesting to examine whether new museums that are already established in era of new museology have different tactics and perspective on the usage of Web 2.0 platforms than traditional ones.

Growing competition from the institutions of leisure activities has already led many museums across the globe to modernization. The traditional relations between cultural organizations and their visitors are now mediated by more complex factors, such as emotional connectedness, trust, loyalty, respect, affinity, that need to be developed and promoted by the managers (Hartley & Harrison, 2007). Numerous researches have already been focused on the marketing strategies of the museums using both offline and online ways (Trant, 2006; Russo, Watkins, Kelly, & Chan, 2006; Kotler & Kotler 2000; Andrews & Asia,

1979). Recently, the social media started playing an important role in the discussion as their significance rises. New media tools and digital platforms led to the emergence of notion 'access culture' where people have more possibilities to be engaged in cultural participation (Valtysson, 2010). According to Pfefferle, as cited in Kidd (2011, p.68), "by giving individuals a real, personal connecting point with a previously "faceless" institution, those who interact with the museum on these networks feel more involved". What is more, social media helps to maintain a vivid cultural dialogue with museums' audiences in real time.

Art museums are often perceived as the elitist organizations which constraints their audience to a specific group in society (Zolberg, 1984). They are associated with means of gaining cultural capital, which is believed to be inherent only to people of higher socioeconomic status (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004). However, for clashing that stereotype, social media serve as a tool for the "democratization of knowledge and information" for wider audiences (Berthon, Pitt, Plangger, & Shapiro, 2012, p.263). Many experts, on the other hand, are concerned with social media as they are challenging traditional one-to-many information with interactive many-to-many communication model. Thus, PR managers are facing new problems and doubts, as they have to work in a completely new context without clearly established rules.

The art-museums directors all over the world are aware of going-on trends and work hard on creating new image of museum – the place where people feel welcomed, valuable and engaged. The initiatives as 'the Center for the Future of Museums', or the symposium 'Reprogramming the Art Museum' illustrate the interest of museums to change their traditions and habits in order to be more relevant for contemporary audiences. According to Carmen and María José (2008), museums that are ready for changes and innovativeness, together with orientation toward customers, have better position and chance to achieve their financial and social goals. In 2010 an interesting initiative 'Follow a museum' started on Twitter and now is repeated every year. Later, the usage of hashtag #followamuseum has also spread to other social media platforms and now unites hundred of institutions all over the world. The idea of the initiative is to attract more followers to museums' social pages and support new form of direct communication between visitors and museums. Another similar action was called #MuseumSelfie – visitors were invited to post pictures of themselves with any museum exhibit.

These kind of worldwide actions are excellent ways for museum to engage people. Users are asked to produce content that is promoting to others to visit the exhibitions and find out more information about the organization. Using social media for promotional campaigns

is ambiguous, because there are no certain rules and nobody can predict what would cause the increase in visitor rates (Heller Baird & Parasnis, 2011). However, there are some positive examples which serve as motivations for other museums to work on the development of their social media pages: in 2014 Tate Museum organized *1840's GIF Party* - they invited social media users to participate in a project which aim was to turn artworks into animated GIFs (The *Graphics Interchange Format*). At the end of the project, the Tate Collective's Tumblr got more than 25 thousand followers (Ohlson & Villaespesa, 2014). It is hard to say how much of the new followers visited the museum after that, or if all of them were attracted by this action, but this number is still spectacular. It shows the potential of social media to refine museum's brand image.

The research is going to focus on Moscow art museums and the content of their social media platforms. It is an interesting example because of the city's fast development and growing touristic sector. There are already plenty of places providing different opportunities for spending free time, while every year new ones are opened. Local art museums are also working hard on shaping their image in this changing context. For example, during the summer The Garage Museum has invited its visitors to take part in yoga lessons on the rooftop of their building. Such initiatives – both online and offline – prove that museums are motivated to build new, more open relations with their visitors.

What is more, the research deals with the comparison of more “traditional” museums with a century-old history and already developed reputation – The State Tretyakov Gallery and The Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts (both state museums) - with the new ones, that were established already in the 21<sup>st</sup> century – the Garage and the Russian Impressionist Museum. New museums are emerging in the era of market-oriented society and the importance of the public is growing: they want to avoid elitist connotation and attract more diverse audience, including younger generations (Ross, 2004; Zolberg, 1984). Previous findings that would be discussed in theoretical framework lead to the hypothesis that new museums are more open to building the contacts with their potential audience through social media and enhancing their prestige online.

Thus, the aim of this research is to examine whether there is a difference between usage of social media by the traditional state museums and those upcoming ones that were already established in the era of Web 2.0 applications. It was decided to explore differences in PR managers' opinions, as well as to examine actual content activities of museums' social pages.

The questions that need to be answered subsequently are:

How do museums' PR managers perceive the goals of social media pages? Is there a difference in the objectives of managers working in the established museums comparing to those from upcoming institutions?

The sub-questions for this part are: What type of social media content is perceived as more important for different museums? What are the expectations of managers concerning audience's reception of different posts? What is their target audience?

The second part of the research would be devoted to content activities and main questions are: What type of content do art museums generate on their social media pages? And most importantly: Does the content published on the established museums' social media pages differ from the posts of the emerging museums? Besides, the research is done using sequential approach, thus the aim is also to see how managers' description of their media tactic is supported by actual content activities on the social media pages of the museums, more specifically on Facebook and Instagram.

**Academic relevance:** The patterns' of online media's usage by art museums is an important topic, but the sphere is changing constantly. In the literature, there is almost no evidence, methods or research instruments proving which online strategies are actually working successfully (Melendez & del Aguila-Obra, 2013; Effing & Spil, 2016). Despite that the necessity of changes to visitor-centred strategy is generally recognized, not all the museums managed to put it into practice (McCall & Gray, 2014). Especially, when it comes to older art museums that are often resistant to change and may be used to certain marketing tactics (Butler, 2000). The research is needed that will help to understand whether there is a difference between strategies that are used by long-standing organizations with respectable reputations and the new institutions that are just starting to develop. What is more, the typology of content activities, similar to one created by Kidd (2011) and Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), can be used as the primary stage for the comparison of the posts and their success. However, the research is engaged in conceptual development of the theory and its aim is to work on the further adaptation of those frames. For this purpose the multi-method is used and the situation is analysed from both the perspective of the museum workers and the actual content of social media.

**Social relevance:** Museums are seen to have main purposes of preserving heritage and educating the public. Especially, the art museums tend to be perceived as 'elite' places for high class. However, during last 50 years museums have been turning to visitor-oriented approach and subjected to modernization and usage of new trends. Museums role is shifting

from simply educational, to also recreational and entertaining (Taheri, Jafari, & O'Gorman, 2014). Social media platforms are one of the ways to reach wider public and to engage potential visitors. However, museums are not using social platforms as productive as they could (Kidd, 2011). Therefore, it is important to examine the content of the museums' social accounts, as well as try to understand what experts in that field think about their goals.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

### ***2.1 New museology***

The new museology refers to the transformation of museums, happening because of both internal and external changes, from being exclusive and socially divisive institutions to more reflexive, accessible and client-centred (Ross, 2004). Criticism of museums is not new, the similar tendencies can be observed in the society since the beginning of museology (Stam, 1993). The new museology gained its popularity mostly because of the perceived failings of these institutions and their isolation for elites (McCall & Gray, 2014).

Changes in the organization of community lead to the necessity of museums' modernization. The new concepts of market-oriented model, such as performance indicators and customer care, led to the most significant changes in museum logic during past decades. This tendency has just become even more explicit with the rise of new technologies.

According to Ross (2004, p.85), there is a shift in museum professionals' role from being 'legislator' to 'interpreter' of cultural meaning. However, the changes happening in museum world are not unambiguous and are not always easy to achieve. Ross (2004, p.85) emphasizes the presence of certain "forces of resistance" against the breakdown of long-established cultural boundaries and traditions, such as the value of cultural capital that was explained by Bourdieu as symbolic goods associated with social status and power in stratified society (Stam, 1993). The notion of cultural capital will be discussed in more details in section 2.4. However, because such traditional principles are changing, many museum professionals express their concern about the fact that image-making, promotions and populism became more important than traditional goals of cultural institutions. The research by Sandell (2003, as cited in Ross, 2004) suggests that new interpretative functions are often inconsistent with some of the museums' traditions such as subject division and classifications. Thus, despite all the changes, certain boundaries still serve to protect museums' monopoly on professional identity and cultural capital.

New museology requires social accountability and responsibility of the museum toward its audiences (McCall & Gray, 2014). According to Stam (1993, p.272), it also calls for an improved understanding of the significance of "Information Age", when the dissemination of various kinds of data regarding museum life and the exhibitions to the consumers becomes crucial. Media through circulation of information affects individuals' attitudes and practices (Stam, 1993). Even before the widespread usage of social media, the museums understood that in order to serve community and to preserve cultural trust they

need to connect with individuals. Stam (1993) cautions against negative reaction to media, emphasizing that importance of message about museum is equal to its collection. The managers also saw that there is an importance of vivid dialog and collaboration between the viewer and the museum, the need to encourage people to take part in the discussion (Kidd, 2011; Trant, 2006). The Internet and social media brought those possibilities to the whole new level. One of the innovations of social media platforms is their ability to sparkle cultural dialogue, developing new many-to-many communication model (Russo et al., 2006). Therefore, today cultural institutions are interested in modernization and growth in order to survive, but providing learning opportunities – Bildung, is still an important part of their life.

## ***2.2 The concept of 'Bildung'***

Bildung, which by different authors was translated to English as cultivation, edification or formation, is a concept challenged by the contemporary processes, such as globalization and pluralizations of cultures (Masschelein & Ricken, 2003; Nielsen, 1999; Nordenbo, 2002). The educational ideal, standing behind that notion, “emerged in Greek society and...became one of the central notions of the modern Western educational tradition” (Biesta, 2002, p. 378).

Bildung does not refer to external development of human behaviour and socialization, rather to the enlightenment of the human soul and mind, “making real the independence of human will and action” so that people would become free from any power (Biesta, 2002; Masschelein & Ricken, 2003). The example of the quite simplistic attitude toward Bildung are lists of what each person needs to know in order to be culturally literate compiled in the US by Hirsch in 1980s (Biesta, 2002). This is a simplified tactic, however, it represents the development of the idea the society needs to work on formation of modern citizen through an educational ideal. However, Roose (2008, p.243) states that we are witnessing “the waning of the notion of Bildung” and as a result the lower knowledge of the formerly perceived classical art.

In postmodern world traditional museums together with classical form of arts are loosing their cultural authority, all different kinds of art fighting for legitimacy (Belfiore & Bennett, 2007). Besides, the contemporary proponents of Bildung often complain about the loss of “sense for history”, “the zest for truth” and the willingness for “intellectual work” in the society (Løvlie & Standish, 2002, p.320). According to Laermans (1992), the narrative about Bildung and high-culture lost its credibility. Nielsen (1999) addresses the example of Denmark, stating that traditionally publicly subsidized cultural sphere was expected to

encourage popular education and the empowerment of the individual. The author talks about the inconsistency between that Bildung goal and the necessity of cultural institutions to become more visitor-oriented in the need of survival and growth. Besides, Nielsen (1999) posits that in accordance with Bildung the aesthetic process of experience should influence reflection on individuals and the world. Similarly, according to Laermans (1992, p.255), participation in the arts by visiting museums was historically considered as “the most suitable way to a personality”, which, he says, is not the case anymore. Therefore, museums that emerged in the past were focused on the educational mission and enjoyed teaching their visitors about the art (Sheehan, 2000).

All in all, for this research it would be assumed that today traditional museums are more prone to the educational ideal of Bildung and, thus, would be engaged more in promoting the cultivation of their visitors by different means. The link between the museum’s goals and the way users perceive the content of their social media platforms would be discussed in the section 2.10.

### ***2.3 Struggle for organizational legitimacy***

Much research in totally different fields – politics, economics - has been focused on the Bourdieu’s social theory and concept of legitimacy (Adler-Nissen, 2014; Nicholls, 2010). Main idea of those papers is that institutions are struggling for being recognized as legitimate in corresponding field in order to gain respect from the other participants and from the audience (Hurd, 2002). They use certain phrases, procedures, tactics that have a power because of the associations with the field and authoritativeness. Legitimacy helps upcoming institutions to understand which actions are “desirable, proper or appropriate” within society and such acquaintance can be crucial for their success (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009, p. 802). Thus, there is a distinction between ‘newcomers’ – organizations that are just developing their path, and ‘incumbents’ – dominant institutions that “function as the guardians of the current power arrangements of the field” (Bourdieu, 2000, as cited in De Clercq & Voronov, 2009, p.802).

The process of institutionalization can be characterized by the compliance with the legitimated practices in the field, or, on the contrary, new organizations bring up some changes that become ubiquitous (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009). When organizations are with accuracy reproducing behaviour of conventional predecessors it is called isomorphism (Long, & Driscoll, 2008). According to authors (2008), isomorphism leads to homogeneity of structure, organizations are commended for being similar. It is a kind of social contract that

helps newcomers to act in conformity with expectations. Bourdieu has developed the notion of ‘symbolic domination’ that emphasized the ability of incumbents to reinforce their powerful stance while others are complying with them (as cited in De Clercq & Voronov, 2009). Despite the fact that art is an open system, art organizations can be sometimes resistant to change (Butler, 2000). Besides, incorporating innovations is often associated with challenges and uncertainty, which prevents organizations from taking active position despite future rewards (Han, Kim, & Srivastava, 1998).

Long and Driscoll (2008, p. 184) highlighted the cognitive form of legitimacy that is achieved “through cultural alignment and imitation of that which is already deemed to be legitimate, without active agency by the organization”. There are certain field-prescribed rules of behaviour in different fields – in this case cultural - and habitus of the museum agents is influencing newcomers to conform to them and meet the expectations of field incumbents. Therefore, if new institutions are completely adapted to the field traditions and behave in a traditional way – they have a “sens pratique, a ‘feel for the game’” (Adler-Nissen, 2014, p.661). However, newcomers may also decide to behave artfully, improvise, and stand out of the imaginary guidelines (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009).

Fields are not stable and newcomers can contribute to their construction and gain more power (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009). Especially, it is relevant for this research, because social media and digitalization are still developing and changes are inevitable. Despite the fact that newcomers need to situate themselves in relation to established rules of the field, they also are helping to modernize it (Adler-Nissen, 2014). Besides, according to Adler-Nissen (2014), sometimes field incumbents are prone to embrace new activities that are beneficial for them and can enhance their own success. Therefore, for this study the focus is on the cultural field and the aim of the comparison is to see whether museums-newcomers and traditional ones are using same strategies in the social media engagement, or there are some differences and inconsistencies.

## ***2.4 Cultural capital***

The art museums were historically seen as one of the ways to gain cultural capital – as it was already mentioned, the notion was presented by Bourdieu, who found “strong associations among family socioeconomic status, educational achievement and attainment, and cultural practices and tastes” (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004, p.170). Certain consumers are distinguished not by the possession of wealth, but of “the symbolic competence”, defined by Bourdieu as ‘cultural capital’. That notion depends on education, prerogative to find

meaning in the museums commodities and familiarity with high-cultured arts (Ross, 2004, p. 100; DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004). According to Bourdieu, some individuals may be frustrated by the work of art if they “lack the specific code” to interpret them (Stam, 1993).

Thus, the presence of cultural barriers, which reinforce elite monopoly on cultural capital, is not to yet be demolished. According to (Belfiore & Bennett, 2007, p. 136), “the arts” is often the object of thinly disguised hostility, forever associated with elitism and pretensions of social superiority”. Despite the fact that the stereotype of the elite character of art museums still persists, their PR managers have strong need to encourage different groups of people to participate in the art events – visit their institutions. Thus, bringing art to general public despite its diversity is an important issue (Butler, 2000).

Roose (2015) talks about the nature of cultural capital in modern society, emphasizing it is still important and explains relationship between social inequality and cultural consumption, while the notion is also subject to constant changes. The author (2015) concludes that cultural capital is not universal; it may vary, for example, among age groups. Thus, today the society witnesses a process of redefining the hierarchy of activities that are more or less valuable and for whom (Roose, 2015).

Even if museums’ audience is still characterized by relative socio-demographic homogeneity, but the individual’s tastes, preferences and intentions for visit are innumerable (Daenekindt, S & Roose, 2017). Besides, according to Taheri et al. (2014) there are also the differences related to participation patterns of the audience - between ‘omnivores-univores’ and ‘passive-active’ consumers– shortly the frequency of cultural consumption – that play an important role for implementing marketing strategies (Taheri et al., 2014). The challenge for the managers is that they need to contact diverse audiences simultaneously by limited quantity of media platforms.

## ***2.5 Target audiences***

Lennon and Graham (2001) argue museums need to shake their exclusionary and elitist reputation in order to turn to the wider market, for example, by being more entertaining while also providing necessary education. Today in general there is a trend toward “the demystification of cultural or educational events” as being designated to certain social class or particular age group (McIntyre, 2009, p.157). The social media is one of the sources through which it can be achieved.

As it was discussed, in the past art museums were often constrained to elite group of society and their cultivation – “upper-income and educated households” (Blattberg &

Broderick, 1991, p.331; Sheehan, 2000). The museum collection being presented as ‘work of art’ implies for many people the need to have special erudition in order to understand it (Daenekindt & Roose, 2017). Blattberg and Broderick (1991) in their research about marketing of arts museum state that today it is important to be creative and try to interest both current usual visitors, as well as new diverse ones. Therefore, cultural organizations need to build a full understanding of their specific target audience if they want to boost their satisfaction (Carmen & María José, 2008).

Looking for a specific strategy and deciding upon published content that your target audience will enjoy is quite a complex challenge. Internet and digitalization led to higher competition between producers of culture and their declining importance - people can reach more information at home through their own devices (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004; Pulh et al., 2008). Online environment is changing constantly and it is hard to keep up with those changes. For organizations it is not enough to simply be present online “for the sake of maintaining control over the brand discussion”, many factors must be taken in account and knowing your target audience is extremely important (Booth & Matic, 2011; Effing & Spil, 2016). The social media marketing is gaining importance, it would be discussed in the section 2.8. Unfortunately, managers often feel the inability to predict the audience’s reaction and the quantity of those affected (Russo et al., 2006).

One of the examples for the potential successful extension of visitors for the museums are teenagers. According to Andrews and Asia (1979), young people are regarded by the art museums as one of the hardest reaching audiences. Despite the fact that today the usage of social media platforms made it much easier to get to young people, the real impact of their use-value is still questionable (Kidd, 2011). Though, it is important to remember that social media are not constrained to communication with younger generations: people aged 35—44 years old have been increasingly using them (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

It could be assumed that upcoming museums influenced by new museology would be more oriented toward diverse audience, including younger generations and people that historically were not part of the ‘elite’ group possessing cultural capital. Therefore, the aim of this study is also to examine whether traditional and recently established museums have the same ideas about the audience they are engaging and whether it is possible to do it via social media.

## ***2.6 Art museums as ‘difficult brands’***

The cultural sector in general is affected by the necessity to keep up with new ways of communication with people. This research is focused more specifically on art museums. Traditionally, art museums are seen as necessary components of “well-furnished state” (Duncan, 2005, p.475). According to Duncan (2005), art museums are very complex institutions with dozens of different purposes – including political and ideological – that became citizens’ rituals. Museums have traditionally possessed recognized authority within the society, which gives them a right to choose a way of cultural interpretation (Russo et al., 2008). Therefore, model of one-to-many communication - via exhibition and publications – has always been their main way to reach out the audiences. However, even these museums need to adjust to contemporary changes brought by new museology. The shift toward the pursuit for wider access made the cultural organizations constantly seek interest from audience in order to increase attendance rates and successfully compete with other recreational organizations (McCall & Gray, 2014).

Art sector is a perfect example for examining organizational challenges in the context of “new economy” (Butler, 2000). According to Hartley and Harrison (2007), in order to increase their viability, art museums’ managers need to develop stronger bonds with consumers, more concretely to work on long-term relationships, trust and sense of connectedness with their audience. Thus, economic and social importance of arts’ domain and the lack of information about its particularities lead to the increasing necessity of “professional development in the management of the arts” (Butler, 2000). The nature and distinctive features of arts and cultural brands make for them even harder to adjust to the modern changes – that is why they are recognized as ‘difficult brands’. According to Hartley and Harrison (2007), the main characteristics of such brands is their constrained availability and uncertain outcomes (as cited in Preece & Johnson, 2011). In other words, people depend on the fixed time and place that museums suggest for the visits, as well as on the fact that they cannot predict their own reception of the exhibition and its content before the visit – they are relying on the professionalism without assurance they would enjoy their experience. Museums can also benefit from that position of providing unique opportunity if they manage to make people interested in their organization even between the particular exhibitions or events (Preece & Johnson, 2011).

Repeated interactions, as well as long-term relationships are seen as the key factors in building trust toward the products (Laroche, Habibi, Richard, & Sankaranarayanan, 2012). Such emotional connection with difficult brands can be established with the help of the fact

that people are willing to participate in activities that increase their sense of belonging to a group of like-minded people (with similar interests). The engagement through social media can be one of the ways to overcome those obstacles of difficult brand, to unite people and create “small worlds” (Preece & Johnson, 2011, p.19). Audience engagement also helps to reduce negative responses because people have better understanding of the product. This type of engagement would be discussed more in-depth in 2.9 section.

## ***2.7 Cultural space***

According to Davies (2006), discursive practices are not only located in space, they are producing space. Following Foucault’s theory and work ‘Of Other Spaces’, the author (2006) conceptualizes Internet as an environment of cultural space. Thus, on-line communities, and in this case social media group pages, can also be regarded as space-creators. For example, there are a lot of metaphors used in relation to Internet that are reinforcing body presence, such as ‘guest’, ‘home page’, ‘chatroom’.

New technologies and practices are redefining a sense of space (Davies, 2006); thus, social media can influence it even more profoundly than websites. Besides, when talking about the particular website Wiccan, Davies (2006, p. 60) emphasizes that “the binaries of online and offline” are blurred, it is a coherent community. Some research posit that online content have positive effect on visiting a museum (Thomas & Carey, 2005).

Amid those changes, society can observe the shift toward the development of “open museum based on the paradigm of collaboration and open access to culture” that exists both in online and offline world (Dupuy, Juanals, & Minel, 2015). This research is analysing museum’ social media platforms as a cultural space and one of their sources of engaging audiences.

## ***2.8 Social media marketing strategies***

The influence of new technologies and “virtual content sharing” on the way big companies and organizations are connecting to the public is huge (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p.60). The success of social media can be explained by their main characteristics: they are “highly accessible (easy to get to) and scalable (can be used to reach large numbers)” (Berthon et al., 2012, p. 263). Thus, if institutions understand the opportunities offered by technological applications, it would “increase the value of what they can offer to the consumer” (Addis, 2005, p.734). Additionally, the success of the social media platforms as an engaging tool can be explained by the fact that consumers perceived them as a more

trustworthy source of information than traditional promoting channels (Mangold & Faulds, 2009).

According to Effing and Spil (2016, p.2), social media marketing strategy is a “goal-directed planning process for creating user generated content (UGC), driven by a group of Internet applications, to create a unique and valuable competitive position”. What is more, the authors have defined main elements that need to be explored for the evaluation of social media strategy, such as target audience, channel choice, goals, resources, policies, monitoring and content activities. Most of them are going to be covered in this research; they served as a basis for the interviews’ coding.

One of the biggest innovative opportunities arising from the interactive nature of social media platforms is their ability to establish contacts between organizations and their audiences. It is now possible to involve customers, or in the case of museums potential visitors, to generate new content. Building engagement, defined by Sashi (2012, p.265) as “an intimate long-term relationship with the customer”, became an important goal for the communication managers. The Wright and Hinson's research (2008) illustrates that many experts emphasize the speed of information dissemination using social media. Thus, nowadays organizations need much less time to communicate necessary information to their public and build relationships with them, which helps to overcome the same factors that made them being perceived as ‘difficult brands’.

Besides, researchers distinguish the role of social media based brand community in positively influencing the brand trust (Laroche, Habibi, & Richard, 2013). Brand trust is defined by Chaudhuri and Holbrook as “the willingness of the average consumer to rely on the ability of the brand to perform its stated function” (2001, as cited in Laroche et al., 2013). Level of trust, in its turn, is indeed crucial for contemporary brand as it plays main role in establishing loyal customers. Thus, social media is a new tool that allows companies not only to establish rapports with their clients, but also to deepen that relationship.

Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) in their article analyse the challenges and opportunities of the social media: the work is written only 8 years ago, though already many changes have been overcome. The authors publish advices for companies in order to make successful social media strategy such as: choose carefully media application, ensure activity alignment, media plan integration, be active, interesting, humble, honest and not too formal in order to avoid being too distant from the consumers. For this research it is going to be investigated if managers share the same opinion about the basic rules for their social media decisions: so, are those strategies also useful for art museums?

What is more, even among social platforms there is no homogeneity and easy rules that need to be followed. One of the hardest challenges for museums' PR managers with the usage of Web 2.0 platforms is their changing nature. It is not enough just to be present online – if museum's page is not managed and becomes out-dated, the audience quickly loses its interest and it would be even worse for its reputation than its total absence (Kidd, 2011; Waters, Burnett, Lamm, & Lucas, 2009).

Therefore, Kidd's (2011) findings about museums' online marketing strategies illustrate that social media platform can provide much more possibilities for development than those that are usually used. The author believes that the manager must carefully examine the advantageous ways for using the social media. Some museums still find it hard to realize that users are important cultural participants in many-to-many communication model – neglecting the significance of participatory communication (Russo et al., 2008).

Another barrier that hinders successful implementation of social media strategy for museums is that often employees lack necessary IT and communication skills (Berthon et al., 2012). Thus, while managers can be trained for the promotion of the cultural organizations through other channels, the social media strategy can still be lagging behind. In this research PR managers are seen as the main experts in cultural organizations, whose role is to set the goals and monitor progress - essential parts for any kind of museums' marketing strategies (Kotler & Kotler, 2000). Organizations need not only to communicate their messages, but also to listen positive or negative responses in order to be aware of the existing sentiments and understand which content “enables practitioners to turn an unhappy consumer into a brand advocate” (Booth & Matic, 2011, p.185).

Nevertheless, there is still an increased concern about the extent to which these conclusions about the necessity of museums re-evaluation and changes have actually been put into practice (McCall & Gray, 2014). According to the authors (2014), the greatest difficulty is the possibility of various interpretations “by those who have the responsibility for implementing” new tactics and strategies. Therefore, this research is not simply focused on the manager's perspective, but also on the actual content of museums' social media pages. Social media is a whole new world, that forces museum to broaden their activities and be engaged in something not always similar to their primarily role of preserving heritage and educating the society.

When the social media started developing, many companies saw it as a threat for habitual business models, were discomforted by the new challenges (Li, 2010; Drury, 2008). For this research it would be interesting to investigate the comparison of the established

museums, which existed already for decades and have long-standing reputation with new museums that from the beginning are introduced in contemporary context and have a stronger need to create new relationships with the audience.

## ***2.9 Different types of engagement***

The various activities on social media, performed by the brand, that would be discussed further, make contemporary customers be more aware of the product, have certain knowledge of it and, therefore, increases predictability of the brand (Laroche et al., 2012). Social media platforms indeed can enable people to feel involvement and recognition, which brings significance to their relationship with corresponding organization (Fletcher & Lee, 2012). Cultural streams did not only lead to increase in cultural participation, they changed its nature and blurred the line between production and consumption (Valtysson, 2010). What is more, the content of new media platforms is playing an important role both for organizations - help to access wider audiences and, thus, increase wealth and power, as well as for public as a mean for constructing communication and virtual communities (Valtysson, 2010). Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) in their research about NGOs' usage of social media platforms developed the useful typology of content functions. According to the authors, "each tweet serves primarily to either spread information, foster dialogue and build community, or mobilize supporters". Butler (2000) suggested that arts have, to a certain extent, similarities with non-profit and public service contexts, thus, the typology could be used for the research.

Moreover, Kidd (2011) made a research about frames used by museums in their social media pages and to some extent they are overlapping with those established by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012). Frames are providing context for the organizations in which they shape particular content on their platforms. Kidd (2011) distinguished 3 main strategies: firstly, marketing frame, that includes social media posts about particular events, informs people about the institution and its activities, thus, simply generates content related to the brand. Besides, museums use inclusivity frame, which goal is to "build and sustain communities of interest around an institution" (Kidd, 2011, p.69). Finally, the collaborative frame is about the co-production and includes calls for visitors to generate their own content related to museums (Kidd, 2011). Thus, based on this research the following sections were created:

### ***Marketing posts***

Museums post messages that are "informing people about upcoming events and

exhibitions” and creating a brand image among their potential audience (Kidd, 2011). The aim of those posts is to increase number of visitors to the museum and to make it’s mentioning more widespread in the media. Lennon and Graham (2001) explain that nowadays the educational interpretation is not the only role that museums have: managers also need to understand importance of market and acknowledge commercial role in leisure. Thus, marketing on social media can be one of the signs of new museology.

### *Educating posts*

As for the spread of information, according to Trant (2006), cultural institutions “have been experimenting with and using technology to communicate knowledge about their collections over the past five decades”. Though, the author focuses more on economic reason for using Web: the museums use their sites mostly for publishing their collections and presenting information about it (Trant, 2006). Berthon et al. (2012, p.261) state “organizations rushed to have an Internet presence by converting their corporate brochures to simple websites”. That’s why quite often websites are indeed used as databases, the online enumeration of museums’ collections.

Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) discussed the importance of spreading information about NGOs: for the PR managers and their strategies it could mean that in order to make the audience more interested in the products and services they need to provide engaging pre-visit information and social media can be the easiest mean to do that. Thus, this category for Kidd’s (2011) typology is between marketing and inclusivity frames: museums are sharing interesting information that may both serve as the invitation to visit the museum and discover more about it, but also to evoke interest and discussion in online communities.

Social media also brought a lot of uncertainty to regular communication models for museums, when they appeared there was no clear strategy for using them (Russo et al., 2006). There is an interesting study, conducted by Taheri, Jafari and O’Gorman (2014) that focuses on visitor engagement scale, stating that the level of visitors’ interest in his or her experience, for example while visiting museum, is directly proportional to the prior knowledge about the place and exhibition. Motivated consumers that have higher familiarity and expertise in topic are more committed to the institution. Besides, Kuflik et al. (2011) state that people often feel constrained in museum because of an unknown territory, despite their willingness to learn new things. For them, prior familiarization through social media with museums’ exhibition and some information, for example, about its history, can be a way of feeling more confident during the visit.

### *Posts promoting dialogue*

Furthermore, social media platforms are enabling conversations among the audience and building relationships (Booth & Matic, 2011). The research of American museums' social media usage conducted by Fletcher and Lee (2012) illustrates the importance of their innovative character, though emphasizes their greater future potential and the fact that their impact should be better understood by the professionals. They emphasized dialogic engagement as the most effective consequence of social media and of the transition from one-way to many-to-many communication model. That is why managers are looking for the marketing strategies that would make the audience feel the personalized approach and interest in their participation. People are using social media, among other things, in order to gain social capital, they join communities in order to feel socially connected and fulfil their need for sense of belongingness (Laroche et al., 2013; McEwan & Sobre-Denton, 2011).

Moreover, there is a tendency shifting from individual to collective forms of cultural consumption – individuals enjoy social contact together with cultural experience (Pulh et al., 2008). Besides, people are not obliged anymore to go to actual physical spaces of museums. According to Kuflik et al. (2011, p. 254) “interaction among visitors may enhance learning in the museum environment, as well as the whole visit experience”. Social media platforms can have similar result, as they may foster dialogue among online users about the exhibition that they visited or would like to visit. These conclusions go in line with the second type of categorization, created by Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) and with inclusivity frame, created by Kidd (2011).

Besides, engaging audiences and building community links also allows managers to gather important information about the public opinions and attitudes. Followers, leaving their feedback, can be valuable source of information (Laroche et al., 2012). That proves the necessity to monitor the reaction caused by the published content (Effing and Spil, 2016). The organizations can better understand public expectations and tastes and provide more relevant output that would create higher levels of engagement.

### *Posts promoting user-generated content*

Finally, museums need to mobilize supporters and include appeals to consumers and visitors to generate messages on their own media pages related to the museums and their archives. That “creative partnership” (Kidd, 2011, p. 72) can help museums to involve visitors more deeply in their lives, to engage them in telling others stories about the history,

exhibitions. People become not simply observers of the content, but rather the creators of their own thoughts and experiences linked to the museum's essence.

According to Booth and Matic (2011, p.185), consumers nowadays are “brand’s storytellers and the new brand ambassadors”. Museum visitors use their networks to disseminate information to the world about the exhibitions and other activities and organizations need to understand how to use it in order to promote the image of their brand. Thus, social media platforms made audience participation more widespread: modern consumers demand “active part to play in aesthetic experience” (Pulh et al., 2008).

### ***2.10 Individuals’ interpretation of social media content***

Despite the importance of narratives and frames, used on social media pages by museums’ workers, the way audience interpret them is also crucial. Individuals’ engagement is affected by the particular way they use the media (Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, 2012). Besides, online museums’ visitors, just as those who are present physically, are brought by various purposes and, thus, have different expectations (Kravchyna, V., & Hastings, 2002). The “frame alignment” implies a condition when the information, published by organization, preserves same or at least similar meaning for the users and is successfully perceived. Interpretations of content are not easy to divine, as they are “fluid, ambiguous, subjective and not necessarily conscious” (Kidd, 2011, p.66). According to Becker (1984), there are explicit and clearly defined audience segments with different levels of knowledge and experience with the art (as cited in Roose, 2008).

Besides, Luarn, Lin and Chiu (2015) state that PR managers need to understand the ways individuals’ usage of social media platforms is influenced by the content of the brand page. In that way it would be possible for them to “determine which type of engagement they want to encourage” (Luarn et al., 2015, p.515). The analysis of the motives consumers have for using social media corresponds with the typology of content activities that were described in this research: Stafford, Stafford and Schkade distinguish 3 main rationales – “information, entertainment and social aspect” (2004, as cited in Heinonen, 2011). Therefore, the aim of the brand is to decide which content to publish and make sure it matches with at least one of the consumers’ motives.

Followers can engage with posts by liking, sharing and commenting them and all these actions potentially promote the information about this company (Wallace, Buil, & de Chernatony, 2014; Luarn et al., 2015). Thus, successful information is the one that is endorsed by customers in different ways because “post with many likes and shares may

indicate that its content is of interest” while “high number of comments...suggests that users invested their time to share their opinions” (Luarn et al., 2015, p.510).

Consumption of art in general implies edutainment – an individual “is enjoying himself and learning at the same time” (Addis, 2005). However, new technologies, and social media in particular, transformed this process, for example, by making it more interactive and flexible (Addis, 2005). Thus, new technologies make it even more important for cultural organizations to take into account the public diversity and differences in their understanding of the published information. Frame alignment is very important so that the same content can be similarly perceived by the users.

The research, conducted by Hargittai and Walejko (2008), illustrates that people’s socioeconomic status is central to their creation of content, and, thus, their behaviour on social media platforms. What is more, the authors posit that access to technology is no more playing crucial role in discussion about digital divide. Instead, they prove that those with higher digital literacy and better level of know-how will be differently influenced by time spent online (Hargittai & Walejko, 2008). Therefore, museums remain a “contested space” for various social groups asserting equal access and representation (Ross, 2004). Additionally, consumers themselves become more unpredictable and their behaviour becomes unstable (Pulh et al., 2008). Thus, managers need to take many conditions in account in order to find their target audiences, engage more people using social media platforms and make sure the content is understood as intended.

The aim of the research is to see whether there is a difference between traditional and new museums in the type of engagement they choose, as well as if same strategies are successful for all of them. In order to measure the success of particular engagement it was decided to use social media metrics - number of “likes”, “comments” and/or “shares”, depending on which social network is examined. Those measures are easily achievable and represent “manifest variable of a brand engagement” (Wallace et al., 2014, p.33).

### ***2.11 Traditional and recently established museums in Moscow***

Moscow is a big fast-developing city with more than 12 million inhabitants, as well as about 20 million tourists coming each year, according to official city hall’s website (Statdata, 2017; Mos.ru, 2017). Museums are often “key attractions” for the tourists, institutions that promote image of the city and region (Balloffet, Courvoisier, & Lagier, 2014). As you can see the growing flow of the people going to Moscow leads to enormous potential numbers of visitors for its museums.

The research is focused on quite popular museums: the Art Newspaper Russia (TANR) publishes every year list of the most visited museums in Moscow and Saint Petersburg. The last one was published in May 2017 and, thus, includes numbers for 2016: looking only for the Russia's capital the first 2 places are the Tretyakov Gallery and the Pushkin Museum with the Garage in the 8<sup>th</sup> place. However, it is hard to make any conclusions based only on such numbers. For example, the last museum included in this research – the Russian Impressionist Museum, was founded only in 2016. Thus, the list just gives an approximate idea of their significance for the city.

For the research, Moscow is an interesting case as it is a post-industrial city that is now in transition to market economy and consumption culture (Färber & Gdaniec, 2006). Therefore, it could be a curious example, because city museums are starting to struggle more for society's attention and time. The authors (2006) also talk about Russia's growing inclusion in the globalised economy. It means that the problems that Moscow museums are faced with could be easily observed in other parts of the world.

Both state museums were initially private, however were nationalised by the Soviet government. Thus, already for many decades they are used to being non-profit organizations under the state control; today they are governed by the Ministry of Culture (<https://www.mkrf.ru>). According to Barczak, Kahn and Moss (2006), the distinctive feature of non-profit organization is that its main focus is its social mission, thus, state museums would be expected to be more interested in their educational role and less affected by contemporary market changes.

However, according to Carmen and María José (2008), the “importance of market orientation and innovation for organizational performance is not restricted to profit organizations but also applies to non-profit”. Besides, Chekova (2004) in her research about organizational structure of Russian State Museums highlights that in the 90s the sector has endured enormous changes. The hard economic situation led to organizational reconstitution, and structures in museums became “appropriate for large state museums in transitional economies” (Chekova, 2004, p.53). It was back then that the state museums in Russia started to get involved much more in marketing and ceased to be completely governmentally controlled. Thus, today their activities for attracting new visitors can be much more easily compared with private museums. The private for-profit museums are still quite rare in Russia, although today interest in private collections is growing, especially from the younger generations (Absalyamova & Absalyamov, 2015).

Competition is a natural occurring concept; Kotler and Kotler (2000) state that many

museums are worried about their 'rivals' from the entertainment and cultural sectors, even restaurants and shops. What is more, the competition between museums themselves also rises with the appearance of the new ones – people have more similar options to choose for their leisure time. Thus, the competition leads to more work on attraction of new visitors, museums need to look for alternative ways to reach audiences (Blattberg & Broderick, 1991). How people would spend their leisure time depends highly on the new strategies to get their attention.

In this context of competition and global market changes towards the audience orientation, the private independent museums are put in harder position due to the direct influence on the ways of working (Ross, 2004). Nevertheless, state museums are also often challenged by the demands for measuring their service, raising income and visitors' numbers (Ross, 2004). Blattberg and Broderick (1991) in their research about museums' marketing strategies were discussing that managers need to re-evaluate old strategies in order to attract more visitors. The challenge is that historically all the companies were in powerful position of controlling their image and did not need to devote so much effort to communicate with the audience, while nowadays presence on a social media becomes more important (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Besides, cultural institutions, even those traditional and state ones, have budgetary reasons for raising their attendance rates in order to gain funding (Balloffet et al., 2014). Consequently, they are forced to master their skills in new activities that were not customary for them and that are not directly related to their main activities of preserving cultural heritage and cultivating the society.

However, it is not only crucial to understand new challenges, but also to work on the implementation of those strategies (McCall & Gray, 2014). Traditional museums have already developed offline and online (websites) marketing strategies even before the proliferation of social media platforms and are already well-known, while the new ones are just starting the promotion of their brand, but are introduced straight away in modern context. Art may be an open system, but organizations are closed: they are "controlled, systematised, resistant to change" (Butler, 2000, p.350). At the same time, often the changes in the ways museums are communicating with their potential audiences need to be implemented necessarily in order to survive in adverse conditions. Therefore, this controversy makes it stimulating for this study to focus on the comparison of different museums' social media strategies and their actual practices.

### **3. Method**

The purpose of this research is to explore the development of social media strategies by the museums' PR managers, as well as to examine the content activities of these cultural organizations on their social media pages. Moreover, the main aim is to see whether there is a difference in usage of social media platforms between well-established museums and the upcoming ones. The potential origin of such difference is explained by the struggle for organizational legitimacy. According to this theory, newcomers organizations often prefer to follow prescribed rules of behaviour, choosing similar patterns of behaviour to their older colleagues in order to gain recognition (Adler-Nissen, 2014). On the other hand, the changes in the field, development of new museology, can influence both traditional museums and their younger colleagues. Thus, comparison is necessary in order to see which of these outcomes is true.

The information is going to be collected using sequential mixed method: it is going to be the integration of qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (content analysis) research. In this research 2 methods are complementary to each other: the content analysis "seeks elaboration, enhancement, illustration, clarification of the results from" interviews (Bryman, 2006, p.105). The usage of different methods can help to conduct a more comprehensive study about the Moscow art museums and their social media pages. According to Silverman (2011), the usage of multiple methods helps to compare the findings of same phenomena from different perspectives and, thus, increase the validity of the research. In this case, content analysis is due to examine whether managers' strategies are implemented as intended, as well as illustrate which of the tactics are actually being successful. Thus, the research is at the same time engaged in comparison of several cases, but also of the data analysis of interviews and social media posts, which would make it more credible.

Lastly, it is important to take into account discrepancies between the chosen cases in comparative research (Peterson, 2005). For instance, the Garage is a contemporary art museum, thus, the target audience or the methods used to promote its brand could differ from those of more traditional fine art museum. Thus, the interviews are a useful tool for the discussion of possible factors that would affect the results.

#### ***3.1 Interviews***

Firstly, it was decided to make face-to-face interviews with the PR managers, who are in charge of making marketing plans. The questions that needed to be answered by this part were: How do museums' PR managers perceive the goals of social media pages? Is there a

difference in the objectives of managers working in the established museums compared to those from upcoming institutions? Qualitative interviews allow the researcher to understand the world from others' perspective (Mikecz, 2012). Managers were contacted through museums' social media pages and agreed to take part in the research. After the research is done, its copy would be sent to all 4 of them.

According to Stam (1993), the changes in the museum logic are often expressed through organizational changes, for example, creation of new roles. Today, museums often hire not just PR managers, but even proper professionals in the field of social media. Interviewees are seen as experts in their field, thus there were certain challenges inherent to interviewing them. The researcher could easily lose control of the conversation and that is why the preparation before the interview was important.

To begin with, it was decided that the interviews are going to be semi-structured. Thus, questions need to be planned in advance only partly; there is no strict structure (Hoffman, Shadbolt, Burton, & Klein, 1995). According to authors, interviewer can prepare a list of domain-specific probe questions, thus a prior knowledge would be necessary. However, the researcher needs to understand the context of the discussion well, to listen carefully and frame subsequent questions in order to make the conversation useful for the future research (Babbie, 2013). Especially, because this data would be used for the development of coding frame for the content analysis.

The interview guide was based on the literature reviews and included 4 main topics: general questions about social media role, target audience, content activities and the process of monitoring (Appendix 1). As it was discussed previously, the purpose of the interviews is to get acquainted with the goals that are set for the social media content, as well as to discuss how and why such decisions are made. What is more, during the interviews, the process of monitoring the social engagement was discussed. According to Effing and Spil (2016) social media practices need to be backed by specific purposes in order to be effective and successful. The aim of the interviews is to see what content managers emphasize as important, to distinguish it and then examine during content analysis whether it can be seen in at the present. Furthermore, the aim of the interviews is to see whether the representatives from older well-established museums have different goals from the ones working in emerging institutions. The existence of the prior literature that serves as a basis for the coding scheme also raises the validity of the research.

Thus, the sub-questions that would try to be answered during the conversations are: What type of social media content is perceived as more important for different museums?

Why? What is the purpose of particular post (about event, about exposition, about the history of museum, post with the questions to the public)? What do PR managers expect from them? Do museums have specific target group in mind to reach through social media? In order to get more precise answers suitable for chosen cases, the researcher may bring real examples from museums' social media pages and ask the respondents to clarify their meaning.

### *Sample*

The researcher used purposive sampling, in order to select the museums, based on their focus – art museums. What is more, it was important to consider their history for making comparison: two of them are well-established museums and are also the most visited ones in Moscow: the Tretyakov Gallery and The Pushkin State Museum of Fine Art. The Museum Garage of Contemporary Art and Russian Impressionism Museum were both founded already in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and represent the upcoming institutions. All 4 museums are partners of International Council of Museums, the biggest organization in this sphere, whose code of ethics “establishes minimum standards for professional practices and achievements for museums and their employees” (ICOM, n.d.). These museums are working on the compliance with international standards; take part in annual international events such as MuseumWeek or Museum nights. Therefore, despite that the results of the research are describing in details the development and implementation of social media strategies in these 4 museums, the paper could be interesting for other the cultural industry representatives both in Russia and other countries as the base for analysing the goals and content of their organizations.

### *Data analysis*

These conversations were transcribed and then partly translated from Russian to English by the researcher, who tried to ensure that translations are as close as possible to the initial meanings. For that purpose, the interviews were recorded with the agreement of the participants. What is more, the research diary was used that includes immediate field notes with information about the interview and other useful ideas.

After the transcription, the interviews were studied using thematic analysis – the researcher carefully read the data and looked for themes that are important for the description of the phenomena under study (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Most of the created codes matched the topics that were discussed in the theoretical framework. However, the new patterns can be recognized within the data, which can lead to the creation of new categories.

That is why the researcher used deductive-inductive thematic analysis procedure (Frith & Gleeson, 2004): data was carefully examined, identifying and grouping together units of text that were discussed in the theory, as well as those that are relevant to the research topic. Thus, the researcher went through 3 phases: open, axial and thematic coding (Boeije, 2010). During the first part - open coding - texts were segmented into meaningful parts, but then they were compared with the theory and some of them assigned with theoretical notions. Thus, in this part mainly the deductive reasoning was used, as the general topics that were brought up during the conversations came from the theory. It is important to note that “the same unit of text could be included in more than one category” (Frith & Gleeson, 2004, p.42). Besides, the selected units were divided as phrases, sentences or even paragraphs – it depended on each case and its meaning.

Thereby, 9 main categories were created that would be discussed in results section: traditional and emerging museums, goals of the social media platforms, integrated campaign, channel choice, target audiences, content, user-generated content, monitoring and many-to-many communication.

### *3.2 Quantitative content analysis*

In the second phase, the researcher conducted quantitative content analysis (QCA), as it is suitable for the study of recorded communications, such as social media posts (Babbie, 2013). According to Kidd (2011), museums’ managers need not only to understand the importance of social media marketing strategies, but also to achieve appropriate framing of their content if they want to increase audience’s participation. Thus, QCA is used to examine the actual information that is published on social media pages of different museums and to see whether it is consistent with the museums’ goals. Besides, in order to measure the success of the particular social media tactic the number of likes, comments and shares (only for Facebook) was identified. Effing and Spil (2016) in their research emphasized the importance of monitoring audiences’ reaction in order to develop successful marketing strategy. The main questions that need to be answered are: What type of content do art museums generate on their social media pages? Does the content published on the established museums’ social media pages differ from the posts of the emerging museums?

#### *Sample*

All 4 museums are present on many different platforms, which is necessary in order to appeal to different types of visitors (Kidd, 2010; Effing & Spil, 2016). However, for this

research it was decided to focus on Facebook and Instagram, as these platforms unite all 4 organizations, while, for example, Russian Impressionist Museum is not registered on Twitter. Moreover, both platforms are interesting examples of Web 2.0 applications. According to Alexa ratings (2018), Facebook is in the 3<sup>rd</sup> place among the most visited websites. Because of its widespread usage it has been the most popular social media platform for advertisers and marketers (Alhabash, McAlister, Hagerstrom, Quilliam, Rifon, & Richards, 2013). Moreover, Instagram counts more than 500 million users and is considered “the second most popular social media network in the world” (DeMers, 2017). Finally, as it would be seen further, all of the interviewees identified these 2 platforms as the most successful for their museums.

The systematic sampling was used in order to gather necessary data: within the scope of the research it was initially chosen to explore for each museum about 100 social media posts (50 for each platform). QCA included the latest posts of the museums starting from the 1<sup>st</sup> of March, as that was the month when interviews were conducted, thus, data for interviews and QCA was taken from the approximately same time period.

The advantage of content analysis in general is its unobtrusiveness – the data under examination was not influenced by the researcher in the process of gathering (Babbie, 2013). What is more, Babbie (2013, p.344) emphasizes the reliability as a strong point of QCA – because of the “concreteness of materials studied”, the process can be repeated as many times as it is necessary. In this particular research, the specific defined themes would be searched for, thus the manifest, not latent meaning, would be important, which increases reliability of the study. The weak point is that the latest posts may not represent all the types of engagement for particular museum; however, taking into account the time provided for the research, their number helps in achieving a higher level of reliability.

### *Data analysis*

The study is using subsequent multi method, thus QCA was conducted only after the analysis of the interviews. The additional value of using QCA is to check whether museums are following the goals stated by the managers, as well as to see whether they are doing it successfully. The important question for this part is: How do content activities on social media pages support the goals stated by PR managers?

What is more, the thematic analysis of the interviews was also used for this part. Thus, the coding frame is based on both the categories derived from the results of the interview analysis and those from the theory. The initial base for the development of the

posts typology was used from the research by Kidd (2011) together with the ones from the Lovejoy and Saxton' article (2012). 4 types of posts are going to be discussed further: those that spread information about art; build community; invite for content creation and the ones that are simply promoting the brand and its events. However, once again, a new coding frame, applicable for this specific study, was made in a mix between data-driven and concept-driven approaches. "Research results are necessarily a vast simplification of the flow of human activity", therefore, it is important to keep in mind the influence of all the steps (Peterson, 2005, p.269). The more detailed information about coding in QCA would be discussed in results, because it would be finished only after the analysis of interviews.

In the research proportions of posts published by 4 museums were compared, thus, z-tests are used in order to see if the difference is significant. The test was chosen since all those dependent variables are dichotomous codes illustrating if posts have certain characteristic. The first step was to compare types of museums – traditional and upcoming, then all 4 of them, so the researcher can also see whether long-established or new museums differ from each other. As Peterson (2005) noted, it is important to take into account all the characteristics of the sampled research objects and discrepancies that may occur between them. The results may be distorted by the factors that are not considered but may have caused the observed differences. That is why, for example, it was already discussed that newcomers organizations are private, while traditional are both state museums.

Unfortunately, in the scope of the research it would be impossible to analyse the engagement in detail – meaning that not each of the comments would be taken into account. However, as Gummerus, Liljander, Weman and Pihlström (2012) stressed the relevance of website metrics - number of "likes" and "comments" for quantifying engagement of consumers, and the same time main goal of marketing strategies is the attraction of the audience, this research would use such metrics to measure the success of the posts. "The presentation of measures of activity offers users the opportunity for self-valuation" (Gerlitz & Lury, 2014) - in this case PR managers can actually see how their online audience responds to the content they post and which of the posts they prefer. These characteristics have a positive effect on the validity of the research and help measure the success of the chosen ways of engagement. When comparing the numerical characteristics it is also important to take into account the differences in number of followers (Table 1).

**Table 1: number of followers in March 2018**

<b>Museum/ Number of followers</b>	<b>Facebook</b>	<b>Instagram</b>
The Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts	107,844	102,000
The State Tretyakov Gallery	120,984	172,000
Garage	111,787	115,000
Russian Impressionist Museum	14,351	16,800

The codebook for QCA would then consist of the following aspects: number of likes, comments, shares (only in Facebook) and views (for videos), as well as 10 dichotomous variables related to the type of post' content (see Appendix 2).

## **4. Results**

### **4.1 Interviews**

The research was done using sequential method, thus, firstly the results of the interviews are going to be described. The sample of the art museum's representatives that were interviewed included 4 social media managers. The same guideline with the questions was used, though as those were semi-structured interviews, the conversations lasted for different amount of time – from 25 to 50 minutes.

#### *Traditional and emerging museums*

Firstly, the researcher discussed with the interviewees how the characteristics and position of their museum in the society – its history and traditions – influences the choice of media strategy. According to Bourdieu's theory of struggle for legitimacy, it could be expected that new organizations try to comply with the traditional rules in order to gain respect from the other participants and from the audience (Hurd, 2002). At the same time, the state of affairs is not static and the newcomers may influence established rules and bring new changes (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009).

Generally, all the museums saw both weak and strong points of their reputation in the society. The manager of the Tretyakov Gallery, one of the oldest in Russia, says that for their public on social media even avant-garde art was perceived as something too untraditional and inappropriate: "We are, no matter what, trying to hold the bar high, and some museums maybe do it more correctly and level down the standards; they can make jokes – but we don't, though, once again, it is dictated by your audience, it is not suitable for ours... We have quite official social media platforms and we don't allow ourselves much" (social media representative, the Tretyakov Gallery). It proves that there are certain habitual routines and 'proper' actions that incumbents of the field are following (Adler-Nissen, 2014; De Clercq & Voronov, 2009). What is more, it matches with the fact that aesthetic artefacts need to be accepted by the "formal system of recognition", though in this case of social media not from the institution, but from the audience (Nielsen, 1999, p.191). Therefore, usually established museums are constrained by the preferences of their audience if they want to keep it loyal, because it has rooted expectations of what is recognised as successful aesthetic experience.

Similarly, the social media manager of the Pushkin Museum, another traditional one, says that this formality prevents them from doing something too experimental because of the museum's reputation and established style. At the same time, she confessed that the name of their museum is already brand in itself that many people know and like: "wide loyal audience due to brand and the history of the museum, of course, helps" (SMR, Pushkin museum).

Besides, managers of both established museums posit that the strong point of their social media is that they have a huge amount of potential content to share with their followers. According to manager of the Tretyakov Gallery: “We have that important resource – knowledge, huge collection – a lot of things that you can give to the world and you need to do something about that”. She mentioned that for the newer and smaller museums it is not that easy as they have less content. The representative of another state museum also shared that point of view: “Mainly, our problem is overabundance of content, which means we have too much of information and we need to squeeze in everything” (SMR, Pushkin museum).

As for the opinion of those newcomers, the representative of the RIM also emphasized both the advantages and disadvantages of their position: often audience does not have any knowledge about their museum as it was established in 2016: “It is easy for us, because we can allow ourselves to surprise people, to use different formats of communication with the audience and we benefit from that because people are interested in new things” (SMR, RIM). Often in struggle for legitimacy developing organizations are trying to align with established rules and imitate others behaviour (Long & Driscoll, 2008), thus the position of the Russian Impressionism museums seems opposite – they enjoy being innovative and challenging rules.

Talking about the difficulties, the interviewee mentioned more practical things related to social media, that they needed to start to gain number of the followers starting from the zero. She emphasized it was not easy because of the “degree of trust” that is much lower for incoming museums than for those ones that people are already familiar with: “Of course, museums with a hundred-year history... have already earned a certain reputation among the professional community and among ordinary visitors” (SMR, RIM). It is consistent with the previous research, which emphasizes the role of social media, in building brand community: level of trust is seen as a key factor leading to the increased amount of customers devoted to the specific brand (Laroche et al., 2013). Therefore, the interviewee is referring to the brand loyalty and the fact that long-established institutions already have a certain amount of individuals that are devoted to their performance and frequently visit them, while new organizations need to develop such base.

The representative of the Garage was also quite positive about their position for the development of the social media strategy, though with a reason specific for that museum: “Of course, large number of activities give great freedom in terms of developing content and creation of some interesting things in social media and online promotion” (SMR, Garage). The manager emphasized that the museum is not focused only on its exhibition activities,

they have publishing program and educational in general, for example, they collaborate with one of the Moscow universities. For social media, it means that they could cover different topics.

Therefore, it can be seen that all of the managers are acknowledging the fact that the environment, certain characteristics of the museum and how it is perceived in the society – its position – play certain role on the development of their marketing strategy, including activities on social media. What is interesting is that all of them emphasized both advantages and disadvantages of being either traditional, or upcoming museums. The advantage of upcoming museums is that they have freedom to experiment and be creative and innovative. For example, according to managers, upcoming organizations are characterised by the versatility of activities, even those that are not directly related to the exhibitions, which makes their news feed more diversified. Same conveniences are the disadvantages for the traditional museums because they have strict reputation. However, the established organizations also have higher level of trust towards their brand and also more experience and knowledge from previous years that can be shared today.

#### *Goals of the social media platforms*

Furthermore, the researcher asked questions related to the presence in social media world, about specific goals that museums are following, the importance of this kind of communication for the cultural institutions. Effing and Spil (2016) defined strategy in social media as a goal-directed process, though reasons for using social media platforms can be numerous, starting from the competition between organizations (p.2) to speed of information dissemination (Wright and Hinson, 2008). One of the important advantages of the digital innovations is discussed by Kidd (2011), who emphasizes the significance of more personal approach, which can easily be obtained in social media. Thus, the interviewees were asked to define what are their specific goals, what results they are trying to achieve through those networks.

To begin with, the Tretyakov Gallery is an interesting example because of its ‘Concept of development’ – the document published on the museum’s website in 2016 that has a lot of information about future development including social media strategy. According to its manager: “the Tretyakov Gallery is implementing now new concept that implies usage of every possible platform and all possible channels of communication in order to disseminate its premises” (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery).

The majority of the managers – of Pushkin State Museum, the Garage and the RIM – emphasized that the usage of social media platforms helps to deal with diversified problems – both social and financial. As it was already discussed, traditionally museums mission was more socially oriented, which included preserving culture and educating the public, characterised by the notion of *Bildung* (Sheehan, 2000). However, nowadays financial part also plays important role and marketing strategies are actively adopted from for-profit businesses (Carmen & María José, 2008). Thus, social media can be seen as a tool that helps to improve the performance in both spheres. According to the manager of the Pushkin museum, “on the one hand, we let people know what is going on at our place, so they would come to the museum, on the other hand it is just about public image, because a lot of our followers are from different countries and cities that won’t be able to come every day”.

Manager also justifies the point of Kotler and Kotler (2000) that museums are often worried about their ‘rivals’ from cultural sector, by saying that it would be “unreasonable” not to use this channel, while other institutions are actively engaging their audiences and the competition is rising (SMR, Pushkin museum). Therefore, it shows that not only newcomers are trying to comply with the tactics and habits of the colleague-organizations in order to achieve success (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009). Certain desirable actions and rules are developing in course of time and influence the incumbents – today the presence in the social media world is an obligation for a successful promotion of cultural organization.

Besides, the versatility of the goals that can be achieved using social media is similarly explained by the Garage: “It turns out that the ultimate goal, roughly speaking, is to bring a person directly to the museum, so that he/she can use all this information and organize themselves to come... And on the other hand, it is important to us in addition to this goal to be globally engaged in education, acquaintance of people with contemporary art and culture” (SMR, Garage). Thus, once again it proves that museums today are working on the balance between the ideal of *Bildung*, cultivation of the population, and development of consumption - simply promoting visits and museum as a brand. She also highlights the point, discussed by Berthon et al. (2012), that social media instruments are highly accessible and anyone can use them to promote services or products.

Lastly, the Russian Impressionism Museum in social media works on building “brand loyalty” and “brand awareness” – the goal is simply to get the audience familiar with the museum’s life and remind those interested about its activities. Additionally, the PR manager emphasized that social media platforms can be used for marketing: “We update the exhibitions 3-4 times a year... and sell tickets to them and one of the important tools, of

course, are social media networks” (SMR, RIM). However, as it would be seen further in the analysis, when talking about the content of the page representative of the Russian Impressionism Museum did mention the educational posts as the integral part of their activities.

From the interviews the Tretyakov Gallery seemed the most attached to the traditional concept of museum, which implies dedication to *Bildung* and cultivation of the visitors. The others interviewees, including manager of Pushkin museum, were more openly speaking about marketing role of the social media, the importance of attracting new customers. However, most of them at least mentioned the importance of both educational and marketing content. It could be said that edutainment is the right description of their goals. At the same time, Balloffet et al. (2014, p. 4) present the main goal of the museums, defined by International Council of museums, as “the conservation of and research on collections for the education and enjoyment of the public”. Therefore, applying this principle to social media pages we can say that for museum managers it is common to try finding the balance between education and entertainment of their customers. Thus, the advantage of QCA is that it would be possible to make more valid judgments about the goals that they are pursuing based on their actions.

### *Integrated campaign*

At the same time, many of the interviewees emphasized that the influence of the social media platforms cannot be separated from other means of communication with the audience, because PR is a complex of tools. Manager of the RIM explained this by the imagined situation when people follow museum on social media and get certain “level of confidence”, which is then influenced by “traditional mean in the form of a TV report or page in a glossy magazine, and then they decide they would definitely come” (SMR, RIM). Therefore, for customers those ways of getting information would not be separate, they are both part of the “corporate image” they receive about museum (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010, p.65). The Russian Impressionism Museum representative said that TV and other old-fashioned communication tools still get wider reach and bring more visitors. That point actually contradicts the opinion of Mangold and Faulds (2009), who posit that usefulness of social media includes the higher levels of trust among consumers than in traditional promoting channels.

Manager of the Tretyakov Gallery also says that online media are not an isolated project, rather one of the channels of communications with its peculiarities. Talking about

marketing posts, the interviewee from the Tretyakov Gallery stated that “basically, we can see when we launch some ad how often people go to the ticket website – but it is ridiculously small. So we don’t use social media as announcement feed, because it would be pointless”. Thus, according to her, the direct impact of the posts on the behaviour of the audience is minimal.

The representative of the other state museum called it “integrated campaign” – when both online and offline tools are directed simultaneously on informing the audience, emphasizing that TV still plays major role (SMR, Pushkin museum). According to Mangold and Faulds (2009, p.357), integrated marketing communications control the various elements of the promotional mix and help to achieve “unified customer-focused message”. Therefore, in a way, it is complicated to distinguish social media strategy from other PR tools that are interlacing.

The interviews reveal that museum sphere is still quite traditional, which habits are not always easily influenced by the contemporary changes. While a lot of previous research talks about the superior position of social media for brand marketing (Laroche et al., 2012; Mangold & Faulds, 2009), many managers still emphasized the influence of the other traditional sources, which can be explained by the characteristics of the museums’ audience.

### *Channel choice*

For companies and their social media strategies it is extremely important to choose the right channel that is suitable for their particular audience in order to use it successfully (Effing & Spil, 2016; Kaplan and Haenlein, 2010). The interviewees were asked which social media platforms they prefer and see as the most applicable for their museum. From all 4 interviews, it was clear that Facebook and Instagram are the most popular, thus, relevant for content analysis. Same conclusions can be seen in other research, Facebook being one of the major strategic tactics for marketing and advertising professionals already for many years (Alhabash et al., 2013).

What is more, many of the interviewees mentioned the importance of understanding that different groups of people often use different social media platforms. The Tretyakov Gallery uses a strategy that implies the informal division of the different groups of people to separate platforms: “Different media are for different audiences, we divided our public: Facebook is for professional museum cultural information... and Instagram is simply for nice pictures with atmosphere. There is a specific audience, it’s younger and more people are from Moscow ” (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery). According to Berthon et al. (2012), adopting the right

tone and language is crucial for social media engagement, though suitable strategy may depend on the chosen platform.

The Garage PR manager has similar point of view about usage of different platforms: “For modern museums, what they should do, in my opinion, is to engage in social media and to divide them, that is to say to select carefully the content to the channels you use” depending on the aims or project. She distinguished Instagram, for its “visuality”, and Facebook as most useful at this point (SMR, Garage). Her colleague from the Russian Impressionism supports that sentiment: “Today we can see the strongest response on Facebook and Instagram. I’ll explain why, now our audience is adult, they are 23-34+ and these visitors are mostly using social platforms for older people, such as Facebook”(SMR, RIM). She highlighted the same advantage of Instagram – it is visual and easy to consume.

The PR manager of the Pushkin State Museum did not differ much from her colleagues and told that Facebook is the most important media platform for them, because there audience is “most eligible – people from Moscow, highly educated” (SMR, Pushkin museum). Instagram was put on the second place and appreciated for the liveliness of the followers. On their social media platforms the content differs, but the topic is approximately the same “maybe the format is different”.

According to Geiser (2017), the distinctive feature of Instagram indeed is the high importance of photo and emotional contribution. Comparing to Facebook, which is characterised as more informative, the platform lacks direct reposting and sharing, which can be important for marketing of the brand (Geiser, 2017).

Therefore, managers of both upcoming and established museums shared the opinion that posting same information and content on all their social media platforms is not a good way of managing them, because each audience has its own preferences and tastes. However, for the Tretyakov Gallery such diversification related not only to format and ways of presenting, the manager distinguished specific directions of development for each platform.

### *Target audiences*

According to Ross (2004), museums are perceived by the society as a contested space between different social and age groups demanding equal access. In order to choose successful social media strategy, managers need to define not only relevant channel, but also their target audiences that their content would be suitable for (Effing & Spil, 2016). The difficulty for the museums is that often they need to address the current public, yet also to strive for a more diverse one (Blattberg and Broderick, 1991). According to manager of the

Tretyakov Gallery: “We have many targeting audiences, and we are trying to do something for each of them”. For this Gallery interesting point brought up by the interviewee is that social media platforms are valuable because they are full of people from other regions of the country: “those are not the people we sell our services to, rather those who are interested in Russian art and museum life” (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery).

The colleague from Pushkin Museum talked about the inconsistencies between followers and actual visitors – that often those are not the same people and assumes that it could also be the result of museums faults: “people are visiting our museum, but they do not want to follow us in social media” (SMR, Pushkin museum). Besides, she says that the biggest age group of the followers are 25-35, but that the museum still needs to work for the wide audience and “everyone should understand” the content they post. Similarly, the interviewee from the RIM says that they are trying to engage more adult generation because they have more deliberate approach to museum visit, however they still focus on the strategy that would please all groups: “We rather choose a golden mean, because it is probably strange to hit for younger audience and then after two posts to write for adults. It would spoil the overall impression” (SMR, RIM). She concludes that when the modern language without strong formalities is used it is positively perceived by different age groups of people.

As for the other new museums, the PR manager of the Garage says that its “ average audience is 18-35 years old”. Interestingly, 70% of its public is female. Besides, usually for the museums young people are the hardest reaching group (Andrews and Asia, 1979), but for the Garage it is not the case because they “are more open to learning new things” (SMR, Garage).

Therefore, although museums have an understanding about their specific target group and even the differences for various platforms, both traditional and upcoming are trying to be oriented toward all groups of people and attract different individuals. In the past their aim was to reach narrow and self-selected audience (Kotler and Kotler, 2000). Today they are trying to address different social and age groups, though the only characteristic they take into account is difference in the audience of specific social media platform, that was previously discussed.

### *Content*

One of the questions that the research was aimed to answer is: What type of social media content is perceived as more important for different museums? According to Valtysson (2010), online media content influences the relationship between audience and cultural

organizations. Using Kidd's (2011) frames of museum's social media posts together with Lovejoy and Saxton (2012) content typology developed for NGO's, four main types of posts were distinguished: educating posts, posts promoting dialogue and user-generated content, marketing posts. Those are different types of content museums are expected to publish on their social media platforms depending on the goals they want to achieve. During the interviews open questions were asked about the information they found important and prefer to share with their public.

To begin with, some of the managers mentioned the importance of covering inner life of the museum, details that are usually behind the scenes. The PR manager of the Tretyakov Gallery says it is important to cover all the aspects of the museum life, both inner and external, and its activities, emphasizing once again that content specificity depends on the particular platform and its audience: "We are working hard to describe what is going on inside – about scientific conferences, publications, restorations, research – it is all very interesting and helps to better understand" – referring to the museum life (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery). At the same time her colleague from the Pushkin museum also distinguished posts about inner life of the museum, for example, about workers of the museum, as something that always attracts public and they see that "it is not some cold brand...everything is really humane". In general, consumers are more likely to talk about products and services if they possess more information about the details; they like to feel personalized approach (Mangold & Fauld, 2009). From the interviews it became clear that this 'behind-the-scenes' information was important for traditional museums. Therefore, it was decided to use it as a separate code in QCA, which included posts with stories of industry insiders' and museums' internal life.

Furthermore, both state museums distinguished the significance of educational posts and sharing their knowledge. The Pushkin Museum's manager stated that would help followers to become more interested in new topics: "I also like when the director of the museum records video, for example, those answers to the questions ...it seems you came to her place" (SMR, Pushkin museum). Also she mentioned that the dates of the future exhibitions are posted, as well as some extraordinary things – "the guy proposed to his girlfriend" that would attract the public attention (SMR, Pushkin museum). Thus, she concludes there is no perfect formula for each week, that museum just needs to be open to dialogue with the public. That goes in line with Macnamara and Zerfass (2012) remark that despite the fact that social media became part of organizations' strategic communication it is

important for them to stay open and democratic, it is not always possible to plan everything, especially the reaction of the followers.

The Garage manager, when talking about the content on the social media, highlighted the importance of following new trends, such as Instagram stories or events on Facebook: “If your content is in high-quality and you understand what your audience wants and you speak the same language, then your results grow and you have more followers, people watch your content and are interested in it” (SMR, Garage). Some research support the opinion that the success of social media strategy depends on the ability to implement new technologies (Berthon et al, 2012).

Once again, as the Tretyakov Gallery manager stated that “ridiculously small” amount of people are directly influenced to go to the museum by the marketing posts, for her they were less important. At the same time, according to PR manager of the Russian Impressionism Museum, it is hard to characterize the posts with announcements because often same post can be very interesting for the public but it’s aim is to make them buy tickets: “It could be called social media marketing, but you know, as we can see in practice, that on one hand, you write about what is going on in the museum and it is so exciting, that people are ready to buy tickets and come” (SMR, RIM).

She also says there are some “common truths” for social media – they should contain entertainment and education and marketing content. Besides, she says that according to statistics, posts that simply include paintings from permanent exhibition are usually the most popular ones. It supports the standpoint that many people use online digital collections to find out new things as a form of entertainment or for planning museum visit (Cameron, 2003). What is more, according to Belfiore and Bennett (2007), the art is amusing, entertaining and bringing happiness to individuals, so the enjoyment of the arts is promoting positive emotional and physical conditions. Thus, posting the pieces from the collection on the social media could be one of the ways to let people appreciate art and has a positive feedback among the followers.

Thus, from the discussion about content once again it could be seen that the distinction between traditional museums and upcoming once is not evident, because they all say they are trying to be interesting and educational at the same time, though in the second part of the research it is going to be seen in practice. Therefore, some of the characteristics are widely common for all those cultural institutions – publishing educational facts, invitations to visit museum events. However, emerging institutions were more positive about the influence of marketing posts, about the “direct attraction of a person to the museum”

(SMR, Garage). Managers of the established organizations emphasized the importance of showing museums ‘face’, being more open about museum internal life.

### *User-generated content*

Today social media, of course, are used not only by brands, but also by consumers and include their discussions – both negative and positive – of the experiences they had. Thus, brands do not have the possibility and power to control the marketing of their image that is shared on others’ profiles (Kietzmann, Hermkens, McCarthy, & Silvestre, 2011). One of the ways to force the discussion and attract the public attention was mentioned by the Garage manager – she talked about Instagram influencers – popular bloggers that are invited to the events in order to cover museum activities. According to Booth and Matic (2011, p. 184), the influencer community is quickly developing “wielding significant power over the perceptions of brands and companies” and many organizations are starting to use them as a successful promoting tool. However, it was impossible within the scope of the research to analyse this part of the online promoting tools. This QCA would be focused on the content created by the consumers that museums post on their pages.

At the same time the manager of the Tretyakov Gallery gave some examples of the hashtags they used and asked people to post pictures related to the exhibition. However, she states that it is not always that successful as the quality of the posts is not always high and museums cannot ask something too complicated, for example, writing texts. Therefore, user-generated content (UGC) here mostly means photos from the exhibition posted by the visitors and is used both by traditional and upcoming museums.

### *Monitoring*

For developing successful social media strategy that would help promote the organization and engage its public both online and offline, it is important to monitor their feedback and reactions (Effing & Spil, 2016). There are certain metrics – such as engagement rate – that could be used in order to assess the public opinion online (Gummerus et al., 2012). The audience’s reaction: likes, comments, shares, can help the managers to get acquainted with the peculiarities of the museum’s public and its tastes.

All of the interviewees highlighted the importance of statistics for the development of a future strategy. According to the manager of the Tretyakov Gallery, there are many professional agencies whose job is to provide social media statistics, for example every month: “Engagement rate is important, because it helps me judge what is interesting and if it

is necessary, but also if it is a video clip then I look at number of views” (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery). Similarly, the Pushkin Museum’s manager said that usually positive feedback and huge amount of likes helps her to understand that they need to proceed with that content. What is more, she says that there are some things she already understands would not attract the public: “There are such things that I initially assume are causing the negative reaction, so for example, I would not post the photo of museum with a huge [waiting] line” (SMR, Pushkin museum). The Garage representative highlighted the monitoring of groups characteristics in order to choose suitable content for the targeting audiences that were already discussed: cultural organizations financial and social goals can be achieved through “understanding the needs and wishes of the visitor and aiming to satisfy them” (Carmen & María José, 2008). Lastly, the RIM manager says that they have for sure everyday monitoring of the social media, but also monthly statistics for each platform: “It helps us to adjust our strategy” (SMR, RIM).

Therefore, the research supports the previous research that discussed the “need for museums to listen to their public and take into account their needs and engagement” (Dupuy et al., 2015), but most importantly it referred to both traditional and upcoming museums.

#### *Many-to-many communication*

Additionally, in order to implement successful social media strategy, it is important not only to keep track of numeric statistic, but also to be actively engaged in discussion with public, answer to both positive and negative responses (Booth & Matic, 2011). As it was previously discussed, today, in the era of ‘new museology’, we can witness the blurring of barriers between cultural institutions and their public (Ross, 2004). The relations in society become visitors-centred and are characterised by many-to-many communication (Stam, 1993). Thus, people are engaged more in the cultural participation and their opinion is not neglected – Valtysson (2010) described it as ‘access culture’.

During the interviews all managers covered the importance for the museum of the feedback and reviews they get in social media nowadays. According to the PR manager of the Tretyakov Gallery: “Social media platforms are the shortest way, here people let you know if something is not working correctly, if they did not like something and I collect here all that information and send it to all other departments and it works well”. She emphasizes that now that process is much faster and museums can improve their services in a short time. The representative of the RIM highlights that this reversed communication can be linked to any aspect of museum life starting from the exhibition to work of the security: “That is why

we use social media, people leave their comments, their reviews and we try to answer all of them” (SMR, RIM). Same point was brought up by Pushkin museum’s manager: “We have many followers, they leave their comments on our pages, we take into account their desires, in that way we always work with our audience, it is of course very important for us”. PR manager of the Garage states that “it is important to answer any question, from potential or current visitor, to always be in touch with your guests, not to be silent, when you are leading a live dialogue it’s great and it works” (SMR, Garage). Thus, the Kidd’s (2011) point of view about the importance of making faceless institution more personal was one way or another pointed out by all the interviewees. However, as within the scope of the research it was not possible to analyse the comments, the details of such communication were not studied.

## ***4.2 Social media posts***

### *Coding*

The coding for content analysis was conducted only after the results of interviews’ analysis were finished since this multi-method was done using sequential design. Initially, it was decided to code 400 social media posts: half of them were from Facebook and half from Instagram. However, as the data collection was finished on the 4<sup>th</sup> of May, already some interesting observations could have been made: the museums on average posted different amount of posts per week, thus, while some of them had 50 posts in 2 weeks, for others these two months were not enough to collect necessary volume. On Instagram: the Garage posted 1 post per day, the RIM posted 3,3 posts, while average numbers for the Tretyakov Gallery and the Pushkin Museum are 0,7 and 0,6 respectively. As for Facebook, numbers are higher, which means that this platform proved to be more popular for spreading information: the Garage had 2,6 posts per day, the RIM 3,5 posts, the Tretyakov Gallery 1,4 and the Pushkin Museum 2,3 posts. This shows that the upcoming museums are more interested in managing social media accounts and post in general more information: on Instagram they are much more active, while on Facebook the numbers are closer.

Coding for posts included two major components: the numeral characteristics (number of likes, shares, comments, views – depending on the platform and content) and typology of the content. Initially, there were 4 main codes described in detail in theoretical framework: educational information, engaging phrases, marketing information and user-generated content.

However, during the process of coding the researcher distinguished more codes that can be useful for the analysis of the posts. Firstly, posts with practical information about museums, such as working hours, changes in schedule, ticket prices, were coded separately from marketing posts that simply contained invitations and promoted the museum brand without giving practical details. Besides, posts that have description in English were coded in order to compare levels of touristic orientation. Some of the posts were distinguished for their links to other sources, for example, magazines that wrote about museum. Many museum managers emphasized the interest of the audience in details about the internal life of the museum that is usually out of the sight of the public, thus, separate variables included posts with information about internal life of the museum (both contemporary details and historical facts) and posts dedicated only to photo and video materials from previous events. Lastly, manager of the Russian Impressionism Museum stated that posts that just contain exhibits and their denotation gain most likes and are perceived positively by the public, while some other managers declared similar opinions. Therefore, such characteristic was also distinguished as a separate variable. All in all, the 14 variables were distinguished (Appendix 2) and after trial coding and making new variables, the researcher conducted the main analysis.

### *Numerical characteristics*

As it was already stated, numerical characteristics are used in order to see the reaction of the audience on the published content. It may help managers to some extent to adjust their strategy with their followers' preferences. What is more, those numbers, such as likes, comments or shares are the most tangible evidence of the public interest in museum activities online that provide an opportunity to compare museums in their success. However, simply comparing the numbers of engagement rate in different museums would be useless, as they all have different amount of followers. Taking into account that their profiles were established at different time such comparison would seem unfair for younger organizations. Thus, for the purpose of the research it was decided to compare the average numbers of those indicators divided by the number of followers for each museum. Firstly, the research checked the proportion of likes (shares, views, comments) for each corresponding post per 100 followers and then compared the averages for each museum (Table 2 and 3).

**Table 2: average proportion per post per museum on Facebook (N=200)**

	Likes	Comments	Total	Shares	Total	Views	Total
<b>Garage</b>	0,04%	0,005%	50	0,0037%	46	1%	7
<b>RIM</b>	0,01%	0,0014%	50	0,0085%	50	3,4%	2
<b>Pushkin Museum</b>	0,2%	0,0028%	50	0,06%	41	11,4%	5
<b>Tretyakov Gallery (Ref)</b>	0,07%	0,0027%	50	0,015%	43	6,9%	5
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$						

**Table 3: average proportion per post per museum on Instagram (N=195)**

	Likes	Comments	Total	Views	Total
<b>Garage</b>	1,3%	0,008%	50	7,9%	9
<b>RIM</b>	2%	0,0021%	50	-	0
<b>Pushkin Museum</b>	1,7%	0,0021%	45	7,2%	2
<b>Tretyakov Gallery (Ref)</b>	1%	0,0063%	50	3,7%	1
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

However, all the comparisons and necessary z-test on both Facebook and Instagram revealed that differences are not significant. Thus, the amount of the feedback museums get on their social media pages, if taking into account the number of followers, is approximately the same. This also means that their followers show similar patterns of activity, if comparing same sections in each museum.

However, it is evident that number of comments and shares is much lower than likes. Despite the fact that information technology gives consumers much more opportunities and power in relationship with brands, they are still rarely generating their own content (Heinonen, 2011). According to Heinonen (2011), in previous research people are often illustrated as active and creative users of online platforms, though in fact only a small number of them can be described so. Therefore, museums, as well as other brands, need to work on encouraging users from being passive recipients of content to becoming active generators.

From these tables we can also see that videos are still not that popular type of content and are not published often by the museums. The proportions of views were not significantly different. Though, the Russian Impressionism Museum was the only museum that did not

publish any videos on their Instagram, while the Garage had significantly higher proportions of video material in general. It is hard to make conclusions without the numbers of video material that museums were publishing in previous years, however the manager of Pushkin museum stated that there is a general trend of people watching more video on social media, which means that posting such material could mean taking into consideration audience's tastes.

Besides, the researcher even compared the proportions of engagement characteristics of each museum on Instagram with Facebook. Despite that it can be clearly seen that the amount of likes on Instagram is higher, there was no significant difference and it applies to all characteristics. Finally, the total number of posts with shares is smaller due to the fact that posts with the event-function on the Facebook could not be shared. Interestingly, the proportion of such posts, that included links to event page, was significantly higher in traditional museums. Unfortunately, it is impossible to say with confidence what is the reason for this difference, however, as it was already discussed, the Garage manager mentioned that it is necessary to use those new tools available on the social media platforms, to keep up with innovations in order to communicate more easily and arouse interest in the public.

### ***Type of content***

Firstly, when analysing the content of the posts the initial focus was on the 4 variables that were based on theory. Besides, in order to compare traditional museums with upcoming ones a new variable was created that combined 1 = the Garage with the Russian Impressionism Museum and 2 = the Pushkin Museum with the Tretyakov Gallery. For each variable primarily types of museums are compared, then the researcher also checks if the differences in proportions are significant if comparing four museums among each other. What is more, within the scope of the research audiovisual materials were not analysed in details, only their manifest details would be discussed, such as that the post included user-generated content (UGC) or video from restoration, however such information is included in description, not based simply on the illustration.

**Table 4: differences in content for traditional and upcoming museums on Facebook (N=200)**

	Education	Dialogue	Marketing	UGC	Total
<b>Upcoming(Ref)</b>	29%	10%	86%	11%	100
<b>Traditional</b>	54%***	12%	82%	0%***	100
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

**Table 5: differences in content for both upcoming museums on Facebook (N=100)**

	Education	Dialogue	Marketing	UGC	Total
<b>Garage</b>	36%	8%	88%	0%***	50
<b>RIM(Ref)</b>	22%	12%	84%	22%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

**Table 6: differences in content for both traditional museums on Facebook (N=100)**

<b>Pushkin Museum</b>	48%	8%	82%	0%	50
<b>Tretyakov Gallery (Ref)</b>	60%	16%	82%	0%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

### *Educational information*

The first variable included posts that contained some educational facts or informative descriptions about exhibits, artists, museum itself. As Kuflik et al. (2011) showed that many museum guests are intimidated by the lack of knowledge when visiting museum, publishing content on social media that helps to get acquainted with exhibitions' details may be a way to overcome that. What is more, it can be a proof of museums' commitment to the ideal of Bildung and cultivation of the society, discussed by Sheehan (2000), but in online world. The interviews' results illustrated that all the museums' managers talked about the importance of educational information - to different extents.

A z-test revealed that the difference in amount of educational posts that two types of museum – traditional and upcoming – have on Facebook is significant at 99% confidence level ( $N = 200$ ),  $p < 0.01$  (Table 4). Thus, traditional museums are engaged more in cultivation of their followers and are willing to share the academic information. Besides, further analysis (Table 5 and 6) shows that both upcoming museums and traditional museums posted similar amount of information, which included facts about exhibits or artist, or any other details that could be seen as edification of their followers if compared in pairs to each other. Thus, both traditional museums are more oriented to the classical role of cultural institutions on Facebook.

As it was discussed, for every museum during the data collection 100 posts were sampled, 50 from Facebook and 50 from Instagram (for the Pushkin museum 45, as the data collection ended before the necessary number was published, only on Instagram). However, it was impossible to compare two platforms together because the interviews results illustrated that majority of the managers posit that each platform has its own targeting audience and style of content. Besides, during the trial coding the heterogeneity of the posts on those platforms was also observed.

**Table 7: differences in content for traditional and upcoming museums on Instagram (N=195)**

	Education	Dialogue	Marketing	UGC	Total
<b>Upcoming(Ref)</b>	33%	10%	88%	17%	100
<b>Traditional</b>	27,4%	13.7%	51%***	12,6%	95
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

**Table 8: differences in content for both upcoming museums on Instagram (N=100)**

	Education	Dialogue	Marketing	UGC	Total
<b>Garage</b>	42%*	8%	92%	10%*	50
<b>RIM(Ref)</b>	24%	12%	84%	24%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

**Table 9: differences in content for both traditional museums on Instagram**  
(N=95)

<b>Pushkin Museum</b>	40%***	26,7%***	37,8%**	15.6%	45
<b>Tretyakov Gallery(Ref)</b>	16%	2%	64%	10%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$				

As it can be seen in Table 7, Instagram showed state of affairs that diverged from the results of Facebook related to educational information. According to the z-test, on this social media platform museums with different positions did not have significantly different proportions of educating posts (N = 195). Interestingly, the Tretyakov Gallery introduces on Instagram even the smallest amount of informative posts though on Facebook the same museum had the highest proportion. This can be explained by the managers' tips, as many of them stated that different platforms have unmatched purposes and Instagram is more visual social media with smaller textual parts. As for the comparison between other museums, the proportions of upcoming museums were significantly different at 90% confidence level. Therefore, no conclusion can be found for the differences between platforms, because the Garage on Instagram used more educational content, while the Tretyakov Gallery used much less if comparing with their own pages on Facebook.

### *Engaging phrases*

Building community and promoting dialogue is one of the common intentions of organizations' social media pages (Fletcher and Lee, 2012). Using questions and any other phrases, steering individuals' responses, can be one of the ways of developing relationships with museum and its past and potential visitors. However, both on Instagram and Facebook, all 4 museums did not have that many direct appeals to their public, which can be a sign that museums still are not totally used to many-to-many communication principles. On Facebook only 8-16% of their posts included questions to the audience or phrases that directly implies any feedback. Thus, in other cases social media posts were more addressing to the followers and not encouraging any textual feedback.

Besides, z-tests report that the position of the museum does not play any role on the difference between 4 museums and appeals to dialogue on Facebook or Instagram, as the proportions are not significantly different in both cases. When comparing museums with one another, on Facebook they all had similar amount of posts. At the same time, on Instagram

only Pushkin State museum had proportions of posts promoting dialogue significantly different from all other museums. In other cases there  $p > 0.1$ , which means there was no significant difference.

What is interesting here – Pushkin State museum more often than others turned to its followers, though as it was seen the engagements rate – namely, proportions of the comments – was not significantly different from other museums (Table 3). Thus, it can be assumed that people are sharing their opinion not only in the cases they are asked to do it directly. According to Mostafa (2013, p.4241), opinion generated online in blogs or social media indeed are really widespread nowadays and became valuable for analysing the audience “for the purpose of customer relationship management, public opinion tracking” in all kind of fields.

### *Marketing information*

This variable again displayed inconsistencies comparing Instagram and Facebook. All 4 museums in majority of their posts on Facebook (82-88%) use references to their on-going exhibits and invite people to visit them or take part in any other events that are organized by that institution. Thus, the difference between them was not significant.

Nevertheless, on Instagram the z-test revealed that proportions for upcoming and traditional significantly differed at 99% confidence level (Table 7). Besides, further analysis illustrated that Pushkin museum has the lowest figure, but both traditional museums and their proportion of engaging post are significantly different from all other museums, including each other. As for upcoming museums, they had similar results – 92% of marketing posts for the Garage and 84% for the RIM. Thus, upcoming museums are more often engaged in promoting their activities and trying to enhance visitors rate with the help of Instagram than traditional museums.

What is interesting to note here is that most all of the museums promoted not only visits to the museum and exhibitions, but also to the shops, cafes and restaurants situated at their territory. The Tretyakov Gallery was the only one that did not promote anything but the museum activities. The Garage manager mentioned that the diversity of the spheres related to museum can help PR department to publish interesting content: for example, they have a lot of information about books that are sold in the museum shop. It can be explained by the fact that some museums have a stronger need to promote purchase of those products, while in others the management of the private enterprises, such as cafes, is independent from the museum itself. Hence, art museums in the era of visitor-oriented society are orienting more

on the full audience experience: they are working not only on the traditional learning process and the individuals' perception of exhibitions, but the whole experience that can be offered (Packer & Ballantyne, 2002). People have different reasons and motivations for the visit, so the museums that are working on the attraction of diverse public need to make sure that all the factors of the experience are covered – people can learn, have fun, spend time with family and friends, and many other things, all in the same place.

### *User-generated content*

In consumer-oriented economy, when ordinary visitors can act also as “brand ambassadors”, museums are encouraging them to publish content, related to certain exhibitions and events (Booth and Matic, 2011, p.185). Some of the museum pages had posts created by their followers with corresponding caption or tag. Firstly, z-test comparing upcoming with traditional museums revealed that the difference in proportions related to the amount of user-generated information on Facebook is significant (Table 4). However, as it can be seen on Table 5 and 6, only the Russian Impressionism Museum actually had such posts.

On Instagram, the proportions of traditional museums and upcoming ones led to not-significant result. The RIM again had the highest proportion, that was significantly different both from the Garage and the Tretyakov Gallery. Thus, on both platforms this museum most actively used photos made by the visitors, indicating the authors. Besides, on Instagram all museums had more such posts, if comparing it with their pages on Facebook, which again leads to same assumption that for Instagram visual information plays important role.

What is important to note here is that the differences in proportions are also explained by the numbers of posts per week, which was already discussed. For example, on Instagram for both traditional museums the rubric of posting the visitors pictures is announced on the profile and is repeated once a week. Their profiles on Facebook are used for more official purposes, thus, such content is not used there.

**Table 10: differences in content for traditional and upcoming museums on Facebook (N=200)**

	<b>Practical informati on</b>	<b>Links</b>	<b>Photo and video</b>	<b>Internal details</b>	<b>Exhibits</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Upcoming(Ref)</b>	22%	13%	6%	0%	14%	10%	100
<b>Traditional</b>	62%***	23%*	20%***	20%***	18%	0%***	100
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p<0.01$ , ** $p<0.05$ , * $p<0.1$						

**Table 11: differences in content for both upcoming museums on Facebook (N=100)**

	<b>Practical information</b>	<b>Links</b>	<b>Photo and video</b>	<b>Internal details</b>	<b>Exhibits</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Garage</b>	22%	14%	8%	0%	18%	18%***	50
<b>RIM(Ref)</b>	22%	12%	4%	0%	10%	2%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p<0.01$ , ** $p<0.05$ , * $p<0.1$						

**Table 12: differences in content for both traditional museums on Facebook (N=100)**

<b>Pushkin Museum(Ref)</b>	66%	10%	12%	14%	28%	0%	50
<b>Tretyakov Gallery</b>	58%	36%***	28%**	26%	8%***	0%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p<0.01$ , ** $p<0.05$ , * $p<0.1$						

#### *Posts with practical information about museums*

Social media platforms can be quite useful for the public as it is a fast way for museums to deliver information related to working details or urgent changes in order to make the visit more convenient. For example, some of the museums notified their followers about the rush hours and how to avoid standing in long lines, or suggested days when exhibitions can be visited for free. Thus, this is quite an important advantage of social media that makes the relationship with customers easier.

On Facebook, z-test proved that the traditional museums have significantly more posts with pragmatic facts about visits (Table 10). Thus, long-established institutions were much more often willing to publish posts not only encouraging people to come to the museum, but also that contained more specific information necessary for the visit. The emerging cultural institutions have same proportion of such posts, while their colleagues had slight difference between each other, though it was not significant (Table 11 and 12).

**Table 13: differences in content for traditional and upcoming museums on Instagram (N=195)**

	<b>Practical information</b>	<b>Links</b>	<b>Photo and video</b>	<b>Internal details</b>	<b>Exhibits</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Upcoming</b>	34%***	5%	5%***	6%***	27%**	48%	100
<b>Traditional(Ref)</b>	52,6%	3,2%	31,6%	21%	12.6%	0%	95
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$						

**Table 14: differences in content for both upcoming museums on Instagram (N=100)**

	<b>Practical information</b>	<b>Links</b>	<b>Photo and video</b>	<b>Internal details</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Garage</b>	44%**	6%	8%	12%	40%***	94%	50
<b>RIM(Ref)</b>	24%	4%	2%	0%	14%	2%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$						

**Table 15: differences in content for both traditional museums on Instagram (N=95)**

<b>Pushkin Museum</b>	35,6%***	6.7%	15,6%***	33%***	20%**	0%	45
<b>Tretyakov Gal.(Ref)</b>	68%	0%	46%	10%	6%	0%	50
<i>p-value:</i>	*** $p < 0.01$ , ** $p < 0.05$ , * $p < 0.1$						

As for Instagram, the first step of comparison between types of museums revealed same situation: traditional museums' proportion of posts with detailed information about

activities is significantly different from young museums at 99% confidence level (Table 13). However, the more specified analysis illustrates that Pushkin museums results are significantly different from the Tretyakov Gallery (Table 15). Finally, the Garage and the RIM also portrayed contrasted numbers. Therefore, it is again hard to make conclusions due to differences between museums that have similar position and in interviews had similar opinion about the social media strategy. The differences between platforms for the same organizations again signifies that the managers are not simply duplicating the information, rather seek specific approach – though the Pushkin Museum on Instagram publishes less practical details, while the Garage does more.

#### *Links to other sources*

Museums are often interested not only in promoting their image themselves, but illustrating the opinion of other known sources, for example, magazines or famous people about their exhibitions. It was discussed in one of the interviews' how the reference to the museum in already known sources can positively influence people who already follow social media platforms and make them finally visit the institution. Besides, it can be seen as one of the evidences of integrated media campaign, as a mix between social media promotion with the help of more traditional sources (Mangold & Faulds, 2009).

Firstly, there is a significant difference between proportions of posts that included links to other sources that upcoming and traditional museums published on Facebook (Table 10). However, when traditional museums are compared with each other, it can be seen that significantly higher proportion of such posts was found on the Tretyakov galleries' page (Table 12). As for upcoming museums, they had approximately same numbers.

Furthermore, on Instagram it must be noted that numbers in general were much lower and proportions of traditional and upcoming museums not significantly different (Table 13). According to Geiser (2017), often this platform is less convenient for marketing because the direct links and shares could not be used in posts. Nevertheless, while the Tretyakov Gallery did not include any of links at all, z-tests comparing all other museums revealed no difference between them – from 4 to 6.7% of posts had associations with other sources.

#### *Photo and video materials from previous events*

Publishing photo and video reports from museums' events, for example, openings of the exhibition, is interesting type of social media activity that was not mentioned by any of the interviewees. However, during trail coding the researcher noticed that posts dedicated to

series of media files were repeating, so it was decided to include such category in the analysis. Such posts usually covered some special event taking place in the museum, for example, opening of the exhibition. The Tretyakov Gallery is an interesting example, because on Facebook and Instagram they post almost only the high-quality professional pictures from photographers and even indicate their names. This once again proves that this particular traditional museum has quite official strategy for social media and strict rules for their content.

On Facebook, according to the results of z-test, museums with different positions had significantly different proportions of posts with special illustrational reports from the events or any other museum activities at 99% confidence level (Table 10). However, as it was possible to assume by the serious attitude toward photo and video materials The Tretyakov Gallery had significantly more pictures than all 3 other museums, which showed similar results (8-12%). For this variable the results on Instagram were almost the same (Tables 13, 14, 15).

#### *Internal details*

Museum managers emphasized the fact that social media platforms are a good way to show the audience that it is not faceless institution, but a complex organism with interesting workers and activities that are usually not seen by visitors.

Z-tests comparing upcoming and traditional museums revealed that proportions significantly differ both on Instagram and Facebook, though on the later platform both upcoming museums even did not have such posts at all (Table 10 and 13). On Instagram, the further analysis illustrates that here only the RIM did not have any ‘behind-the-scene’ facts, while the Garage had 12% of them. As for traditional museums, the proportions of such posts on Facebook did not differ, however, on Instagram they were contrasting at 99% confidence level: here the Pushkin had the highest amount of such posts (Table 15). Therefore, in general traditional museums illustrated more interest in sharing details of their internal life on social media, the only important exception being the Garage that included such posts on Instagram.

#### *Exhibits*

This variable is closely intertwined with educational one. According to Nielsen (1999, p.194), for modern education it is important to engage individuals in dialogue about and with art objects, which can develop their “reflective capacity for adaptation and situational

judgment”. At the same time, manager of the RIM admitted that such posts are the most popular among the followers and gain more feedback. Thus, the aims of such post are not always purely related to Bildung.

Firstly, on Facebook proportions of long-established and upcoming museums did not differ significantly (Table 10). At the same time, upcoming institutions among themselves showed similar results, while the comparison of traditional museums led to significant results at 99% confidence level (Table 11). Thus, the Pushkin State Museum had the highest amount of posts that portrayed the exhibits with referral to the authors, followed by the Garage.

On the Instagram situation was different: established and developing museums had significant difference (Table 13). The further analysis revealed similar situation: the Tretyakov Gallery and the RIM had the lowest amount of such posts, while Garage had the biggest proportion and still twice as much as the Pushkin Museum (Table 14 and 15).

### *Posts in English*

As it can be seen, the lion’s share of all the posts written in both Russian and English was found on Garage’s pages on both platforms (Table 10 and 13). The proportions were significantly different at 99%: traditional museums did not have any English descriptions. However, the Tretyakov Gallery in their ‘Concept of development’ stated the necessity to “translate all the main information materials to English, Chinese and other foreign languages” (The Tretyakov Gallery, 2016). Thus, in the future it can be assumed that other museums would work more on their attraction of foreign audiences.

As for the Garage - on Instagram as much as 98% of their posts were in English, while on Facebook the number was 18%. It could be assumed that on Instagram their targeting audience included more foreigners, though manager did not mention that point.

### ***4.3 The parallels between interviews and QCA***

Despite the fact that in the beginning comparison between Instagram and Facebook was not intended, after the analysis of the interviews it became evident to separate them as the majority of the managers stated that the audience’s preferences and tastes differ on each platform. The majority of the variables revealed inconsistencies in content between Instagram and Facebook, which proves that making generalizations about the social media strategy based on one of them would affect the validity of the research. The most surprising results were related to the Tretyakov Gallery – it had the highest amount of educational posts and links to other sources on Facebook, but the lowest indicators for both variables on Instagram.

That could be the result of the diversified policy for different platforms. During the interviews it was likewise seen, that for them it was very important point. Unfortunately, it was impossible within the scope of the research to compare all social media, but the manager stated that they had pages totally dedicated to art on Vkontakte, which is Russian social media platform, as well as special blog about the past exhibits. Other museums had similar numbers for both platforms, which revealed that the RIM – which also happens to be the youngest organization, publishes the smallest proportion of the information which aim is to cultivate the audience, but often uses user-generated content. Therefore, that museum is the good example of contemporary institutions that place customer in the centre of their policies.

Most of the managers emphasized that in order to make interesting content it should be diversified. The SMR of the Russian Impressionism Museum called it “common truths” – the posts need to educate, entertain and also promote visits to museum. As it was stated in methodology section, one unit could have been assigned to different variables, therefore, the posts are not simply dedicated to marketing, or to cultivation, rather consist of various information types. Besides, the high numbers of marketing posts, those ones that included information about on-going exhibitions and events and invitations to them, illustrates that social media are often mainly used as a tool for increasing number of visitors. However, traditional museums on Instagram showed significantly lower numbers than upcoming ones, which can be reinforced by their opinion that the traditional position of museum makes it less important to work on spreading the information about the existence of museum and more on cultivation of the followers and sharing knowledge. The social media of traditional museums is often the continuation of their museum activities, rather than simply a tool for inviting new customers.

According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), “brands are successful when they act like people. Everything else is perceived as disturbing”. However, the Tretyakov Gallery policy is rather formal – the social media visual material is made by professional photographers, that are indicated on each post, that looks rather official for social media. Besides, the manager herself emphasized, that unlike other museums, for them it is not allowed to make jokes or use less official style of communication. According to her, it is dictated by the audiences preferences and tastes. At the same time, the Pushkin Museum manager also called their museum traditional and stated their inability to experiment and make something too extraordinary as the result of their traditional policy. However, on the 1st of April on Instagram they posted pictures of their sculptures and paintings wearing funny masks – something that can be seen as rather innovative and untraditional for museums’ content.

Therefore, it can be observed that the answers during the interviews indeed were relative and depended on the point of view of certain person. Besides, both traditional museums indicated a need to show the audience the face of the brand, be more close to them, which was revealed to be true by QCA – they had more posts with ‘behind-the-scenes’ details, especially the Tretyakov Gallery.

What is interesting in this research is that both representatives of traditional museums talked about those people who are interested in their activities, but are not able to physically visit the place because of different reasons, including far distances from the city. At the same time neither of them is providing information in English. That could be explained by the fact that they have wide audience of people living in remote regions of Russia. This also leads to the conclusion that Bildung and the ambition for working on the cultivation of the society is linked to the nationality and national interests. Thus, the museums are mostly oriented towards sharing the knowledge with the people from the country where they are situated. However, according to the interviews in the future the development of English social media pages could be expected, as the number of the tourists in Moscow grows.

Besides, all museum managers talked about the importance of the feedback they get online concerning not only exhibitions, but anything related to the functioning of the organization. Nevertheless, the QCA illustrates that the proportions of posts that contain engaging phrases, such as questions or direct appeals to public, were quite low for all of them, except the Pushkin Museum on Instagram. While the findings of Heinonen (2011) highlights that the users are often passive consumers of information, this research reveals that brands could work more on their engagement. In some cases the managers, for example, used the educational and engaging information together: they described historical facts about artists and then asked for opinion about their work. In the future research it could be interesting to analyse how such encouragement of feedback actually influences the audience.

The Russian Impressionism Museum was the only one that had almost same posts without any changes on both platforms. It was the manager of RIM that emphasized that the audience always enjoys pictures of exhibits, but this museum turned out to have the lowest amount with such posts. Therefore, it can be seen that this museum being the newest one is still focused the most on brand awareness and on spreading the information about their activities.

The researcher tried to take into account the differences of museums in order to avoid bias in comparison. For example, the Garage is the only museum of contemporary art in the sample, however it seemed that it did not affect their content significantly. The representative

of the Garage posit that it is not that important what is the actual product you are promoting, “you can talk about the contemporary art as boring, as about any other classical traditional thing, if you are not doing your best”.

## **5. Conclusion**

New museology is characterised by the modernization of cultural institutions and the ways of communication with the audience. It has affected the museums' activities in general and many of them are encouraged to become more visitor-oriented and open (Ross, 2004). Museums are faced with struggle – they need to cultivate the society, entertain it and, at the same time, work on attracting wider audiences (Kotler & Kotler, 2000). However, their attitude toward social media presence and the importance of such is not completely researched yet, mostly because the situation is rapidly changing. The main aim of this paper is to compare incumbents among the museums – those traditional institutions that were established in the late 18<sup>th</sup> or early 19<sup>th</sup> century with the new institutions. Namely, the way those organizations use social media and attitudes toward such platforms. Firstly, the interviews with social media representatives of 4 museums, situated in Moscow, were conducted followed by the quantitative content analysis of the posts on their social media pages. The research was done using inductive-deductive approach. In the beginning the analysis was based on the previous theory and the interview transcriptions and posts were examined orienting at general trends discussed in theoretical framework – the only difference being that for the QCA the ideas and codes from conversations' analysis were already taken into account. Thus, the research ended up suggesting new ideas based on the careful observations of the information from the texts.

The exploratory conversations with the experts in the field, who are responsible for the development of social media strategies, made it possible to get the inside knowledge about the topic and draw parallels between their positions. The main questions were: How do museums' PR managers perceive the goals of social media pages? Is there a difference in the objectives of managers working in the established museums comparing to those from upcoming institutions? Interviews were followed by the quantitative content analysis of 395 posts collected from Facebook and Instagram, as the media platforms with the biggest audiences, as well as those ones that the managers preferred.

PR managers' perception of the social media goals is not single-sided or univocal. The difference certainly exists, but still both traditional and upcoming museums are influenced by the era of edutainment and strive for promotion of their image among different audiences. Actually, when discussing the fact that their museums exist for more than a century and has a certain public loyal to their brand the Pushkin State museum and the State Tretyakov Gallery's managers saw that point both as the advantage and the disadvantage for the progress of their social media platforms. On the one hand, they indeed already are known

among wide public, have the past experience and knowledge from previous exhibits and events that can be used and shared online. On the other, people have high expectations and it is harder for them to experiment and post something extraordinary. Similarly, the newcomers – the Garage and the Russian Impressionism Museum also see their position from both sides – they need to work more on the brand awareness and make people find out about them, while they have higher level of freedom in choosing content. Besides, the QCA revealed that recently established organizations post on average much more posts per week, while the traditional ones are less often sharing some new information. This can be a proof of the points, brought up by the managers, that for the new cultural institutions it is crucial to reach new audiences and they feel the need to address social media users more often.

Therefore, managers do see the differences between their media tactics, however their goals are similar – at the same time to raise attendance rates to actual museum, but also to spread the museum life to online world and communicate with those users, who are not coming, or even are not able to come, to visit it. Besides, all of them were dedicated to work with diverse public, preferring not to distinguish specific target audience.

What is more, the questions that were answered by QCA are: What type of content do art museums generate on their social media pages? Does the content published on the established museums' social media pages differ from the posts of the emerging museums? For the research it happened to be impossible comparing together both Instagram and Facebook - the managers emphasized that their audiences on different platforms have their own tastes and preferences, thus, simply copying posts to all media would not be successful. This idea was confirmed by QCA. The majority out of 14 coded variables exposed discrepancies in the results. Therefore, the comparison is made more complex due to the fact that two channels had sometimes contrasted patterns of layout.

However, the comparison of the engagement rates – likes, comments, shares and views - illustrates that the followers of all the museums on both platforms were equally active. The amount of posts did not lead to differences in response patterns. Importantly, the researcher took into account the number of the followers that has a great influence because, for example, Russian Impressionism Museum was established only 2 years ago and still has much less subscribers. Within the scope of the research it was not possible to compare the growth of followers' numbers in a long time period, that can be an interesting sign of the media strategy success. Besides, the results of such observations could be more precise if the information about the audience reach for each post was in open access - the reach can include those users that are not following the museum.

Different museums do not have totally contrasted content of their social museum pages, though the differences in proportions were often significant. However, that means that there are certain unwritten rules about the social pages content. Historically, the classical role of the museums was preserving the culture and edification of the visitors (Sheehan, 2000). The museums strive for educational ideal of *Bildung* can be seen today even on social media and in both types of the museums - their difference is not that evident as all the managers mentioned the role of educational posts. Art museums are often seen as 'difficult brands' because it is not always clear what to expect from the exhibit and they also sometimes have constrained time limits (Preece & Johnson, 2011). Therefore, the research proves that social media content, related to information about art, masterpieces or even interesting details about museum itself, can help to smooth out these restrictions. People have more possibilities to interact with art objects and get information about them, making the expectations for visit more predictable. Thus, despite the fact that many authors predict the waning of the notion of *Bildung*, it can still be seen that museums did not turn away from it, but rather became more focused on edutainment (Roose, 2008)

Taking into account that satisfaction is related to comparison between expectations and actual performance (Bloemer & Kasper, 1995), social media help museums to familiarize the users with the internal life, exhibits and other details related to their activities. The long-established museums were much more focused on such facts from 'behind-the-scenes'. Such tactics reveal that traditional organizations are still much more oriented toward themselves, rather than the audiences and their experiences. The constant communication with the potential visitors can help not only to increase attendance rates, but also to build closer ties with them – influence brand loyalty. Therefore, for traditional museums, that already have high levels of trust, it would be easier, than for new ones, that are working more on the awareness about them in the first place.

At the same time, the Tretyakov Gallery had the most conservative attitude toward their activities: according to the manager simply making announcements in news feeds would be useless, as the posts are not directly influencing people and the number of sold tickets. The audiences of Moscow museums include numerous people who are interested in museum life, but do not live in the city and, thus, are not able to visit it.

All the managers see the importance of publishing informational posts, but also more diversified content that would engage their audience. As the majority of the interviewees posit that museums nowadays need to address wider public, they tried to select the content that would attract different people. Therefore, the elitist image of museum receded into the

background, it is not anymore a contested space associated only with people of high socioeconomic status and educational achievement (DiMaggio & Mukhtar, 2004).

Nevertheless, the amount of marketing information that included posts describing exhibits, events or even museum shops or cafes, in a way explain contemporary museums' openness towards the general public as a necessity to attract more customers. On Facebook all museums have similar proportions of such posts, however on Instagram for younger organizations that type of content was more used. Both upcoming museums were also private ones, and this characteristic should also be taken into account. The fact that social media are still used more as a tool for attracting visitors, than working with separate group of people interested in museum life, is also confirmed by the high amount of practical information – such as dates of exhibits, working hours, prices. Traditional museums in general had more practical information and such attitude can be regarded as similar to website pages – museums are managing quite official pages in informative style. Besides, the posts with art objects and with indication of the author gained the popularity, the Garage and the Pushkin Museum having significantly more than others on both platforms. Though, the RIM manager stated that this type of content also usually gets the most attraction and feedback.

As it was discussed in the theoretical framework, one-to-many communication has always been habitual way of building relationship with the audiences – through exhibitions and publications. Today the proportions of posts that included direct appeals to the followers is quite low for all museums that took part in the research. That could be seen as the remnants of the old style of communication. It was discussed in the theory that museums still demonstrate their authoritativeness and neglecting the significance of participatory communication (Russo et al., 2008). However, museum managers stated that feedback they got in social media – both in comments and as direct messages was extremely important for them. Those messages are related to all spheres of museum work – starting from exhibition content to work of security and administration members. It can be concluded that museums get lively feedback even without the encouragement of people to give such. That is an example of the changes of habitual patterns in communication, the increase in its importance, which is influenced by the customers themselves. Thus, there is a rise in collaborative frame engagement, described by Kidd (2011): both new and traditional museums are starting to use social media and such opportunities to interact with their audience, answer their questions and develop wider museum rhetoric, though in the future the appeals to the audience can be promoted more.

Another important conclusion of the research is that the effect of social media needs to be analysed as the part of integrated campaign led by PR and marketing departments. The managers posit that the influence of different sources has cumulative effect. TV, magazines, outdoors advertising still play important role on promoting museums' brand. However, absolute advantage of social media is that the museum activities can be promoted for free.

Therefore, the research illustrates that museums have more and more tendency to act like a brand rather than cultural institution. The difference between traditional and upcoming museums exists, however it was less significant than the managers themselves expressed the opinion. The managerial and administrative decisions play important role, as the same content activities can be regarded by some museums as too unconventional, while traditional and habitual by others.

### ***5.1 Discussions and limitations***

Firstly, main limitation of the thesis that it does not focus much on the audience's reaction and perception on the information posted on the museum's social media accounts. For the given time scope of the work it was decided to research the issue only from the point of view in museums. Nevertheless, the differences of individuals' interpretation of social media content and the importance of the frame alignment were discussed in the theoretical framework and taken into account during the data analysis. Besides, the study of the engagement rate was included – likes, comments, share – and it is one of the ways to get information about the public. However, in the future it would be also useful to study both museums' opinion about their strategy and more particularities about user's feedback – to focus on their comments or make interviews with them. Companies are no longer in control of this relationship (Heller Baird & Parasnis, 2011).

Moreover, the research is focused on the Facebook and Instagram, while the museums are also present on other social media platforms. However, most of the managers indeed highlighted these ones as the most popular among their audience and the most useful for the engagement. Qualitative content analysis, probably even visual analysis of the posts can be useful for more detailed comparison between museums.

The research was conducted in Moscow, however no additional cultural adaptation is necessary, as the museums under study and their ways of communication correspond with international standards, take part in different universal events and in general are aimed also at working with foreign tourists. The translation of the necessary data was done meticulously.

Most importantly, the research has a comparative component in many aspects that

actually helped to overcome some of the limitations: the strong point of the research was the additional value of QCA as a certain verification of their positions. Therefore, it was not enough to take into account the managers' opinion of their media strategy, the analysis of the posts helped to draw parallels between theoretical position and actual content. Interestingly, it turned out that the managers in certain points expressed opinion that partly contradicted the actual outcome of QCA.

The comparison between traditional and upcoming museums was chosen as a result of the assumptions that arouse from the theory of struggle for organizational legitimacy. The changes in museology and in consumers' behaviour in generally affected everyone, however as we saw in the results, their response actions are not always the same. Finally, the differences between Instagram and Facebook were also taken into account, which became necessary after the analysis of the interviewees' opinion that their content should be diversified. Thus, multimethod design positively affects the validation of the research.

Furthermore, trustworthiness and validation of the methods are also supported by the clear and rigorous descriptions of the data collection: interview guides and transparent codebooks. Besides, those procedures were initially based on thoroughly discussed theoretical framework. The research questions are put in a way to analyse new phenomena and bring in conclusions that are both academically and socially relevant. Finally, samples were quite heterogeneous – museums were classical and contemporary, state and private, while social media posts were taken from different platforms. Therefore, the researcher tried to ensure that the conclusions from the paper could be generalizable and used for the future analysis of the same conceptual structures in other contexts.

The academic relevance of this research is that it confirms the assumption that the difference between traditional and upcoming museums still exist, despite the fact that rules are changing and established organizations are working on adaption to more customer and entertainment oriented society. However, the role of the museums related to Bildung and cultivation of society is not to be abolished yet and newcomers are complying with the necessity of sharing educational information. Besides, the coding scheme used for QCA is a developed typology on the basis of Kidd (2011) and Lovejoy and Saxton (2012), but which includes characteristics relevant specifically for museums and their social media pages, that could be used for future researches in this sphere. As for social relevance, even though much of the new challenges are widely discussed, one of the interviewees admitted “museums could work better” for making their online presence useful for them and for the society (SMR, Tretyakov Gallery). Therefore, other than academic and social significance, this

research could be used by cultural institutions for understanding the problems that they need to work on – has managerial implications.

Therefore, taking into account the results of both QCA and interviews, the research adds to theoretical framework because it reveals that the difference between museums with long history and new organizations still exist with regard to their goals and the information they are disseminating on the social media platforms. The paper shows the interesting case of the multimethod design usage, revealing that the analysing information from different angles can help to get a bigger picture about the phenomena under study and even find inconsistencies, especially when it comes to interviews, because personal factor and opinion may affect the outcome of the conversation, while QCA helps to illustrate the real examples.

## Reference List

- Absalyamova, A., Absalyamov, T., & Absalyamova, S. (2015). Private Museums as a form of Preservation of Cultural Heritage. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 218-221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.03.376>
- Addis, M. (2005). New technologies and cultural consumption—edutainment is born!. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(7/8), 729-736. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560510601734>
- Adler-Nissen, R. (2014). Symbolic power in European diplomacy: the struggle between national foreign services and the EU's External Action Service. *Review of International Studies*, 40(4), 657-681. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210513000326>
- Alhabash, S., McAlister, A. R., Hagerstrom, A., Quilliam, E. T., Rifon, N. J., & Richards, J. I. (2013). Between likes and shares: Effects of emotional appeal and virality on the persuasiveness of anticyberbullying messages on Facebook. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16(3), 175-182. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2012.0265>
- Andrews, K., & Asia, C. (1979). Teenagers' attitudes about art museums. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 22(3), 224-232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.1979.tb00949.x>
- Babbie, E. R. (2013). The basics of social research. The 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Cengage Learning.
- Balloffet, P., Courvoisier, F. H., & Lagier, J. (2014). From museum to amusement park: The opportunities and risks of edutainment. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 16(2), 4.
- Barczak, G., Kahn, K. B., & Moss, R. (2006). An exploratory investigation of NPD practices in nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 23(6), 512-527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5885.2006.00221.x>
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2007). Rethinking the social impacts of the arts. *International journal of cultural policy*, 13(2), 135-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630701342741>
- Berthon, P. R., Pitt, L. F., Plangger, K., & Shapiro, D. (2012). Marketing meets Web 2.0, social media, and creative consumers: Implications for international marketing strategy. *Business horizons*, 55(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2012.01.007>
- Bloemer, J. M., & Kasper, H. D. (1995). The complex relationship between consumer satisfaction and brand loyalty. *Journal of economic psychology*, 16(2), 311-329.
- Boeije, H. (2010). Analysis in qualitative research. London: Sage (pp.93 – 121)

- Biesta, G. (2002). How general can Bildung be? Reflections on the future of a modern educational ideal. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(3), 377-390.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00282>
- Blattberg, R. C., & Broderick, C. J. (1991). Marketing of art museums. In *The economics of art museums* (pp. 327-346). University of Chicago Press.
- Booth, N., & Matic, J. A. (2011). Mapping and leveraging influencers in social media to shape corporate brand perceptions. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 16(3), 184-191. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563281111156853>
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: how is it done?. *Qualitative research*, 6(1), 97-113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794106058877>
- Butler, P. (2000). By popular demand: marketing the arts. *Journal of marketing management*, 16(4), 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1362/026725700784772871>
- Cameron, F. (2003). Digital Futures I: Museum collections, digital technologies, and the cultural construction of knowledge. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 46(3), 325-340.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2003.tb00098.x>
- Carmen, C., & María José, G. (2008). The role of technological and organizational innovation in the relation between market orientation and performance in cultural organizations. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11(3), 413-434.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060810889035>
- Chekova, E. (2004). Organizational structure of Russian state museums: Recent innovations. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 44-53. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41064819>
- Daenekindt, S., & Roose, H. (2017). Ways of preferring: Distinction through the ‘what’ and the ‘how’ of cultural consumption. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 17(1), 25-45.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1469540514553715>
- Davies, J. (2006). Escaping to the borderlands: An exploration of the Internet as a cultural space for teenaged Wiccan girls. *Travel notes from the new literacy studies: Instances of practice*, 57-71.
- DeMers, J. (28/03/2017). *Why Instagram Is The Top Social Platform For Engagement (And How To Use It)*. Retrived 18/02/2018 from Forbes:  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/jaysondemers/2017/03/28/why-instagram-is-the-top-social-platform-for-engagement-and-how-to-use-it/#397e5f6b36bd>

- De Clercq, D., & Voronov, M. (2009). The role of domination in newcomers' legitimation as entrepreneurs. *Organization*, 16(6), 799-827.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508409337580>
- Dupuy, A., Juanals, B., & Minel, J. L. (2015). Towards open museums: The interconnection of digital and physical spaces in open environments. In *MW2015: Museums and the Web 2105*. Retrieved from <http://mw2015.museumsandtheweb.com/program/>
- DiMaggio, P., & Mukhtar, T. (2004). Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982–2002: Signs of decline?. *Poetics*, 32(2), 169-194. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2779635><sup>[1]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>
- Duncan, C. (2005). The art museum as ritual. *Heritage, museums and galleries: an introductory reader*, 473-562.
- Drury, G. (2008). Opinion piece: Social media: Should marketers engage and how can it be done effectively?. *Journal of Direct, Data and Digital Marketing Practice*, 9(3), 274-277. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.dddmp.4350096>
- Effing, R., & Spil, T. A. (2016). The social strategy cone: Towards a framework for evaluating social media strategies. *International journal of information management*, 36(1), 1-8.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 5(1), 80-92.
- Färber, A., & Gdaniec, C. (2006). Shopping Malls and Shishas. Urban Space and Material Culture as Approaches to Transformation in Berlin and Moscow. *Multicultures and Cities. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, University of Copenhagen*. S, 113-128.
- Fletcher, A., & Lee, M. J. (2012). Current social media uses and evaluations in American museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 27(5), 505-521.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2012.738136>
- Frith, H., & Gleeson, K. (2004). Clothing and Embodiment: Men Managing Body Image and Appearance. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5(1), 40.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.5.1.40>
- Geiser, F. (2017). Social media as a communication channel: Is it possible to build a digital brand and generate revenue streams simultaneously by applying influencer marketing?.

- Gerlitz, C., & Lury, C. (2014). Social media and self-evaluating assemblages: On numbers, orderings and values. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 15(2), 174-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1600910X.2014.920267>
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01574.x>
- Gummerus, J., Liljander, V., Weman, E., & Pihlström, M. (2012), "Consumer engagement in a Facebook brand community", *Management Research Review*, Vol. 35 No. 9, pp. 857-877. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171211256578>
- Han, J. K., Kim, N., & Srivastava, R. K. (1998). Market orientation and organizational performance: is innovation a missing link?. *The Journal of marketing*, 30-45. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1252285>
- Hanquinet, L., & Savage, M. (2012). 'Educative leisure and the art museum. *Museum and society*, 10(1), 42-59.
- Hargittai, E., & Walejko, G. (2008). The participation divide: Content creation and sharing in the digital age. *Information, Community and Society*, 11(2), 239-256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180801946150>
- Hartley, N., & Harrison, P. (2007, July). Bonding With Cultural Brands: Exploring the Binds That Tie Us. In *Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management* (pp. 8-11). Valencia, Spain.
- Heinonen, K. (2011). Consumer activity in social media: Managerial approaches to consumers' social media behavior. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 10(6), 356-364. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cb.376>
- Heller Baird, C., & Parasnis, G. (2011). From social media to social customer relationship management. *Strategy & leadership*, 39(5), 30-37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10878571111161507>
- Hoffman, R. R., Shadbolt, N. R., Burton, A. M., & Klein, G. (1995). Eliciting knowledge from experts: A methodological analysis. *Organizational 72on-profit and human decision processes*, 62(2), 129-158. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1995.1039>
- Hurd, I. (2002). Legitimacy, power, and the symbolic life of the UN Security Council. *Global Governance*, 8(1), 35-51. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27800326>

- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business horizons*, 53(1), 59-68.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
- Kidd, J. (2011). Enacting engagement online: framing social media use for the museum. *Information Technology & People*, 24(1), 64-77.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/095938411111109422>
- Kietzmann, J. H., Hermkens, K., McCarthy, I. P., & Silvestre, B. S. (2011). Social media? Get serious! Understanding the functional building blocks of social media. *Business horizons*, 54(3), 241-251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.005>
- Kotler, N., & Kotler, P. (2000). Can museums be all things to all people?: Missions, goals, and marketing's role. *Museum management and curatorship*, 18(3), 271-287.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770000301803>
- Kravchyna, V., & Hastings, S. (2002). Informational value of museum web sites. *First Monday*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v7i2.929>
- Kuflik, T., Stock, O., Zancanaro, M., Gorfinkel, A., Jbara, S., Kats, S., Sheidin, J., & Kashtan, N. (2011). A visitor's guide in an active museum: Presentations, communications, and reflection. *Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage (JOCCH)*, 3(3), 11.
- Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., Richard, M. O., & Sankaranarayanan, R. (2012). The effects of social media based brand communities on brand community markers, value creation practices, brand trust and brand loyalty. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(5), 1755-1767. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.04.016>
- Laroche, M., Habibi, M. R., & Richard, M. O. (2013). To be or not to be in social media: How brand loyalty is affected by social media?. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(1), 76-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.07.003>
- Laermans, R. (1992). The relative rightness of Pierre Bourdieu: Some sociological comments on the legitimacy of postmodern art, literature and culture. *Cultural studies*, 6(2), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502389200490131>
- Lennon, J. J., & Graham, M. (2001). Commercial development and competitive environments: The museum sector in Scotland. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 3(4), 265-281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.314>
- Legard, R., Keegan, J., & Ward, K. (2003). In-depth interviews. *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*, 138-169.

- Li, C. (2010). Groundswell. Winning in a world transformed by social technologies. *Strategic Direction*, 26(8). <https://doi.org/10.1108/sd.2010.05626hae.002>
- Long, B. S., & Driscoll, C. (2008). Codes of ethics and the pursuit of organizational legitimacy: Theoretical and empirical contributions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(2), 173-189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9307-y>
- Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 337-353. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01576.x>
- Løvlie, L., & Standish, P. (2002). Introduction: Bildung and the idea of a liberal education. *Journal of philosophy of education*, 36(3), 317-340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00279>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-01-2015-0029>
- Macnamara, J., & Zerfass, A. (2012). Social media communication in organizations: The challenges of balancing openness, strategy, and management. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 6(4), 287-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2012.711402>
- Mangold, W. G., & Faulds, D. J. (2009). Social media: The new hybrid element of the promotion mix. *Business horizons*, 52(4), 357-365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.03.002>
- Masschelein, J., & Ricken, N. (2003). Do we (still) need the concept of Bildung?. *Educational philosophy and theory*, 35(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-5812.00015>
- McCall, V., & Gray, C. (2014). Museums and the 'new museology': theory, practice and non-profit change. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 29(1), 19-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09647775.2013.869852>
- McEwan, B., & Sobre-Denton, M. (2011). Virtual cosmopolitanism: Constructing third cultures and transmitting social and cultural capital through social media. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 4(4), 252-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2011.598044>
- McIntyre, C. (2009). Museum and art gallery experience space characteristics: an entertaining show or a contemplative bath?. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 11(2), 155-170. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.717>

- Mikecz, R. (2012). Interviewing elites: Addressing methodological issues. *Qualitative inquiry*, 18(6), 482-493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412442818>
- Mostafa, M. M. (2013). More than words: Social networks' text mining for consumer brand sentiments. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40(10), 4241-4251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2013.01.019>
- Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 611-633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00397.x>
- Nielsen, H. K. (1999). Critical public agent or hired hand?: Perspectives for research on cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy*, 5(2), 183-198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286639909358099>
- Nordenbo, S. E. (2002). Bildung and the Thinking of Bildung. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(3), 341-352. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9752.00280>
- Ohlson, J., & Villaespesa, E. (2014). *Evaluation report – The 1840s GIF party*. Retrived from Tate: <http://www.tate.org.uk/download/file/fid/40467>
- Packer, J., & Ballantyne, R. (2002). Motivational factors and the visitor experience: A comparison of three sites. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 45(3), 183-198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2002.tb00055.x>
- Peterson, R. A. (2005). Problems in comparative research: The example of omnivorousness. *Poetics*, 33(5), 257-282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2005.10.002>
- Preece, S. B., & Johnson, J. W. (2011). Web strategies and the performing arts: A solution to difficult brands. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 14(1), 19.
- Pulh, M., Marteaux, S., & Mencarelli, R. (2008). Positioning strategies of cultural institutions: A renewal of the offer in the face of shifting consumer trends. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 4-20. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41064960>
- Ross, M. (2004). Interpreting the new museology. *Museum and society*, 2(2), 84-103.
- Roose, H. (2008). Many-voiced or 75on-pr? An inquiry into motives for attendance and aesthetic dispositions of the audience attending classical concerts. *Acta Sociologica*, 51(3), 237-253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699308094168>
- Roose, H. (2015). Signs of 'emerging' cultural capital? Analysing symbolic struggles using class specific analysis. *Sociology*, 49(3), 556-573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038514544492>

- Russo, A., Watkins, J. J., Kelly, L., & Chan, S. (2006). How will social media affect museum communication?.
- Russo, A., Watkins, J., Kelly, L., & Chan, S. (2008). Participatory communication with social media. *Curator: The Museum Journal*, 51(1), 21-31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2008.tb00292.x>
- Taheri, B., Jafari, A., & O’Gorman, K. (2014). Keeping your audience: Presenting a visitor engagement scale. *Tourism Management*, 42, 321-329.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2013.12.011>
- Thomas, W.A., & Carey, S. (2005). Actual/virtual visits: What are the links? In *Museums and the Web*, edited by D. Bearman and J. Trant. Toronto, CA: Archives and Museum Informatics
- Trant, J., & with the participants in the steve. Museum project. (2006). Exploring the potential for social tagging and folksonomy in art museums: Proof of concept. *New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia*, 12(1), 83-105.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13614560600802940>
- Sashi, C. M. (2012). Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media. *Management decision*, 50(2), 253-272.  
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741211203551>
- Sheehan, J. J. (2000). *Museums in the German art world: From the end of the old regime to the rise of modernism*. Oxford University Press.
- Silverman, D. (2011). Credible qualitative research. In *Interpreting qualitative data. A guide to the principles of qualitative research* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). London:Sage (pp. 351-359).
- Stam, D. C. (1993). The informed muse: the implications of ‘The New Museology’ for museum practice. *Museum management and curatorship*, 12(3), 267-283.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09647779309515365>
- Valtysson, B. (2010). Access culture: Web 2.0 and cultural participation. *International Journal Of Cultural Policy*, 16(2), 200-214.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10286630902902954>
- Wallace, E., Buil, I., & de Chernatony, L. (2014). Consumer engagement with self-expressive brands: brand love and WOM outcomes. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 23(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-06-2013-0326>
- Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How 76on-profit organizations are using Facebook. *Public relations review*, 35(2), 102-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2009.01.006>

- Wright, D. K., & Hinson, M. D. (2008). How blogs and social media are changing public relations and the way it is practiced. *Public relations journal*, 2(2), 1-21.
- Zolberg, V. L. (1984). American art museums: sanctuary or free-for-all?. *Social Forces*, 63(2), 377-392. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/63.2.377>

## **Appendix**

### **1. Interview guide**

- **General questions about the usage of social media**

Does the museum's position and history – more established/traditional have an impact on its media strategy?

How do social media practices fit into your company's marketing plan?

Do you have separate department/working position for social media and for other ways of marketing? What does your specific job at (name of museum) consist of?

Do you think it is necessary to invest in social media? How important is the usage social media for you?

What are your specific goals for social media platforms?

Which of the social media platforms you find the most useful?

What is specific about Instagram? Facebook? V Kontakte? (any other platform used by museum)

What is the connection between them and museums' website and offline informative content?

Which are the possible advantages and disadvantages of using social media for a museum or a cultural institution?

Do you think that investing in social media will increase visitor numbers to the museum? How?

- **Target audience**

Who is your main target audience? Do you think you are managing to reach it?

Do you have one strategy for everyone or you have specific strategies for specific target audiences?

Do you take into consideration when creating content?

What do you think the audience expects when they visit/follow your social media platforms?

- **Content activities**

What are other criteria and guidelines for the creation of your content?

How do you come up with your content?

Do you have some kind of content plan and special time/dates when you publish your posts?

Do you post only practical things about your?

- **Monitoring**

Do you monitor the feedback of your audience?

What insights and metrics are important to you? (For example, not only replying to their questions, but also checking what content generates more likes, etc.

How do you define success in social media?

Do you get any complaints from the audience?

## 2. Codebook:

1. Number of likes
2. Number of comments
3. Number of shares (only for Facebook)
4. Number of views (only for videos)

Content	Description	Example
Educational information	The interesting and detailed facts about the exhibits, history of the museum, painters, or any other cultivating information.	“In 1960s, a Czech painter and sculptor Zdeněk Sýkora's work moved fully into geometric abstraction. In so-called Structures, the artist used mathematical systems to determine combinations of visual elements on the canvas. You can see Zdeněk Sýkora's works at the exhibition The Other Trans-Atlantic, opening on March 17 at Garage. Zdeněk Sýkora. Red-green structure, 1970”
Promoting engagement	Questions or any other direct appeals to the audience	“Do Wekua's works remind you of any other artists?”
Marketing information	The information related to museum activities, that contain invitation of the followers to take part, come and visit - promotion of the brand	“On the 11th of March there will be special event "I'll show you a museum" in the Pushkin Museum. On this day, students from the Club of Young Art Critics will show the museum to the visitors the way they know and love it. The main theme of this movement this year will be a journey through time”.
User-generated content	The posts containing pictures from the followers with the indication of the author	“Catch the photos taken at Garage new exhibitions. Join us this spring and don't forget to tag @garagemca #springatgarage#garagemca □: @ann_andreeva @elijah.huh @juliago

		mz@ona_stacia @alison_killjo
Description in English	The posts that are written in both Russian and English	
Practical information about the museum	The posts containing specific information such as tickets prices, working hours, dates of the exhibition, time of the event	“Installing If our soup can could speak: Mikhail Lifshitz and the Soviet Sixties. Check our stories to see more, and join the opening of the exhibition on March 7. Starting 19:00 admission is free”.
Details from internal life of the museum	The information describing history of the museum, stories about its workers, details from the exhibitions’ establishment and etc.	“In April, the Contemporary Art Foundation Winzavod donated exhibits from 10 artists-participants of the anniversary cycle "Farewell to Eternal Youth" as part of the "Patrons and Donors to the Tretyakov Gallery" donation to the Tretyakov Gallery. For the first time the Museum of Classical Arts accepts a significant body of works by contemporary artists from one of the first private art centres in Russia!”
Links to other sources	The links to other magazines, journals, websites that usually wrote something about the museum	
Exhibits	The posts containing the photo of the exhibit that is followed by the name of the author and usually the date of creation.	“Arnold Becklin. Songs of spring.1876”
Photo or video materials from previous events	The posts dedicated to overview of past exhibitions or events through photo and videos	