Brigham Young University

BYU ScholarsArchive

2020-06-01

Creating a Long-Term Relationship Between a Museum and its Patrons: Examining Social Media as OPR Tool

Kylie M. Brooks
Brigham Young University

Creating a Long-Term Relationship Between a

Museum and Its Patrons: Examining

Social Media as OPR Tool

Kylie M. Brooks

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Christopher Wilson, Chair
Jessica Zurcher
Mark Callister

School of Communications

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Creating a Long-Term Relationship Between a
Museum and Its Patrons: Examining
Social Media as OPR Tool

Kylie M. Brooks
School of Communications, BYU
Master of Arts

This qualitative research study comprised of six case studies explores museums' practical usage of social media as an organization public relations tool. Analyzing six different museums using both surveys and interviews, this research provides a strategic, theory-based framework for any organization to utilize social media effectively by increasing public trust and engagement.

Understanding the role that social media plays within organizational public relations is crucial for both for-profit and non-profit organizations. Because nonprofit organizations are often operating under time, personnel, and financial constraints, the accessibility and zero-cost of social media are hugely advantageous tools for non-profits organizations. However, without a strategy, their efforts to build meaningful relationships with their publics using these tools is futile. Museums are an under-studied but important field under this non-profit umbrella.

The general ineffectiveness of museum usage of social media also target a key problem with social media usage by museums—the focus is on marketing, rather than on public relations, which leaves the communications from these institutions feeling robotic, inauthentic, and difficult with which to engage.

Using Hon and Grunig's (1999) four elements of OPR (Organizational Public Relations)—satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment—and the coorientaton model, this study provides insights into how museums and their patrons perceive the museum's attempts at building OPR through social media. Findings indicate that while most museums and their patrons are in alignment of their perceptions of the museums' efforts, many museums are ranking low on all four elements of OPR.

In order for any organization to fully utilize social media, it must be used not simply as an arm of marketing or sales, but as an indispensable tool of building satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment, which in turn, lead to higher levels of engagement and future behavior intentions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my professors and thesis committee members for your guidance and your assurances that I would be successful in this program and in completing this thesis, even when I did not feel confident in myself. Thank you, Mom and Dad, for your love, guidance, patience, and support throughout my entire life. To Justin, you are my everything. I love you.

And lastly, all thanks in the world to my Heavenly Father, for blessing me with these people and this wild and precious life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

A Rodin sculpture featuring a man with his head bent, one arm tucked toward his body while his other arm extends slightly in front of him, with the caption, "All the single ladies…". A 19th-century oil portrait featuring two affluent young women with quizzical expressions, this with the caption of "Stop trying to make 'fetch' happen." This isn't a Banksy prank, nor is it a fever dream of an art history major. These are 2016 Snapchats from the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA).

This Snapchat activity is just two of dozens of examples of pop-culture-meets-art-history moments posted by LACMA on Snapchat over the course of 2016 and 2017. Not only was LACMA an early adopter of this social media platform, but they knew the needs and wants of their audiences on this particular platform, and delivered with aplomb.

LACMA's Snapchat shenanigans were featured in publications including The New York Times, Vanity Fair, Business Insider, The Independent, Huffington Post, and Buzzfeed. LACMA's Snapchat strategy and usage even earned them the 2016 Webby Award in the Social: Culture and Lifestyle category. This press and attention were a direct result of the museum's unique social media activity and how they were using it not to push new exhibitions or hawk tickets to an exhibition, but instead to simply provide engaging content that resonated with a key public. As stated in a LACMA UnFramed web story about the museum's Snapchat fame, "Besides breathing new life into the artwork, the Snapchat account also helps LACMA with its mission of accessibility. Like all of the museum's social media, it's meant to engage audiences on different levels" (Antonsson, 2015).

Now Snapchat is no longer the hot new thing and its usage is dropping (Levin, 2018). However, organizations—particularly museums—can learn from LACMA's runaway success of

identifying how to target key audiences and build relations with them using their brand social media platforms.

Museums are now starting to catch up with the LACMA's vision that museums can and need to use social media to build relationships with their publics, rather than use them simply as a place to post a photo of a flier. Without an understanding of how social media usage impacts relationships with publics, a museum's social media usage is a waste of time, energy, and resources, all of which are usually very limited in the museum communication space.

But what if museums think they already are providing everything necessary on social media in order to build strong relationships with their public? What if museum publics don't realize that museums are on social media at all? Often in public relations, there is a dichotomy between the perceptions of the organization and the publics they aim to serve. This study examines both perceptions of museum social media managers as well as museum publics to form a more complete picture of how museums are utilizing their social media as PR tools and how to improve upon their social media strategies in order to have stronger relationships with their publics, using the core principles of organizational public relations as a guide.

<div align="center">Literature Review</div>

Organizational Public Relations as Facet of Relationship Theory

Organizational public relations (OPR) is an offshoot of public relations, rooted in the same theories and strategies, but focused entirely on relationships between institutions or businesses and their various stakeholders. Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (2000) define OPR as "represented by the patterns of interaction, transaction, exchange, and linkage between an organization and its publics" (p. 18). Ki and Hon (2008) explained that, just as public relations contains many principles of interpersonal relations, so too does OPR. Ledingham and Bruning

(2000) explicate on this notion, describing that maintaining and improving the relationship between an organization and its stakeholders is the entire purpose of OPR. OPR is a critical component for businesses and nonprofit organizations and without good OPR, they are unlikely to find sustained success.

Museums and the Critical Need for OPR

Museums are unique within the arts organization and non-profit spheres in that they exist permanently in a fairly static state, unlike a ballet, opera, or theatre, which are driven by limited-time events. Museums are open nearly every day for the full day, with basically the same objects on display each of those days. Even limited-time museum exhibitions are usually on display all day, every day, for several months. Museums operate in an entirely different model than the rest of the cultural institution sphere, and as such must be examined independently from the "butts-in-seats" model that drives much of the communication of other non-museum arts organizations.

Museums are a very niche slice of arts organizations, and non-profit museums are even more specific in their mission, goals, and markets. While some research has been done on non-profit OPR, as well as the role of social media in non-profit OPR, examination of these theories as they apply to non-profit museums is relatively thin. There is, however, some research on why museums must understand their need for public relations and generating engagement with key publics. Goor-Balk, Warmerdam and Ghameshlon (2003) explain that ever-evolving social trends will require museums to change how they interact with patrons—acknowledging them as part of the creation process, rather than as faceless masses, which will help what Capriotti (2013) calls "the public negative attitude towards the museums based on the image of the museums as closed and elitist organisations" (Capriotti, 2013, p. 101). Museums must be aware of this unique

challenge as they craft their OPR strategies. Part of that strategy must include social media as a key communication platform for many demographic groups.

It is crucial for museum communications personnel to understand the publics that are attending and might attend the museum. Banning and Schoen (2007) state, "The organization–public relationship scale was found to have reliability in the museum context, essential information to museum curators and administrators looking for means to quantitatively understand their membership [publics]" (p. 439). Capriotti (2013) expanded on the reasons why a museum should take their OPR seriously: "[…] strategic communication becomes a key resource for cultural institutions since it is needed to attract visitors, to obtain private funding, to maintain employees, and to engage with local communities and society at large" (p. 99). Additionally, Capriotti (2013) emphasized that social media is a key way that museums can be strategic about engaging with their publics. The problem, however, is that usually organizations' communications to their publics are simply promotional, not serving the community in any way, nor providing any reason for any stakeholder to engage in a long-term relationship with the organization (Capriotti, 2013).

The lack of museums' strategic communication is evident in their use of digital tools as well: "[…] most museums analyzed have very low level of interactivity, with only a handful of museums that are leveraging the full potential of Web 2.0 to establish dialogue and interaction with virtual visitors" (Capriotti, Carretón, & Castillo, 2016, p. 104). Capriotti's lamentation of the ineffectiveness of museum usage of social media also targets a key problem with social media usage by museums—the focus is on marketing, rather than on public relations, which leaves the communications from these institutions feeling robotic and inauthentic. "The relationships between the museums and their publics are as important as their collections"

(Capriotti, 2013, p. 101). Just as a museum is nothing without its collection, it is also nothing without its public. Labar (2010) said that in order for any organization—including a museum—to succeed, they must stay relevant by re-examining how they interact with stakeholders and publics, and embrace the technology that will reach those publics.

Museums must be studied from the OPR perspective, as it is a field that suffers from a dearth of knowledge. Ki and Hon (2008) state, in relation to their study of relationship management theory, that "[…] future studies should apply the developed measures to other types of organizations such as profit, nonprofit, governmental organizations, etc., as well as various industries," which would include nonprofit arts organizations including museums, to further test the established theories of OPR (p. 21). To this point, no study has explicitly explored the connection between museum social media efforts and levels of OPR.

Previous studies testing engagement on social media sites have usually focused on international social networking, such as the study by Men and Tsai (2012), in which they state that "future researchers can replicate and update this study by expanding the research setting to other cultural contexts and by including many other SNSs [social networking sites]" (p. 730). Similarly, Lovejoy, Waters, and Saxton (2012) mention how future researchers can find more connections: "Smaller, community-based nonprofits were excluded from the research in favor of large, national nonprofits. It can be argued that smaller, grassroots nonprofits may be more interactive and use conversational tweets with their followers rather than using one-way information dissemination practices" (p. 8). Indeed, this could be scaled to museums, as some have millions of annual visitors per year and a social media following to match while others are rural historical societies with scarce attendance and no social media presence at all.

In order to better understand museum OPR, this study will use the OPR framework as outlined by Hon and Grunig (1999), as well as the coorientation model as outlined by Waters (2007). These frameworks will provide a model by which OPR can be measured and can be examined from the perceptions of both the museum and its patrons.

Organization Public Relationships (OPR) and The Coorientation Model

In order for museums and other organizations to undertake the critical need for examining their social media efforts through OPR, there must be a framework by which the OPR can be quantified. Much of the literature surrounding OPR is based on the research of Hon and Grunig (1999). They found that four measures of the relationship outcomes between a public and an organization are satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment. When these measures are met, the relationship is working and both parties are able to benefit.

The goal in OPR is exactly that—to identify key publics with which an organization can develop a relationship in order to meet organizational goals. When an organization takes this seriously and actively includes positively and actively building relationships with stakeholders, they are much more likely to have organizational success (Kang, 2014). This area of public relations has been studied for decades, but, as Sweetser and Kelleher (2016) found, measuring these seemingly abstract OPR principles is a deterrent for many organizations from even attempting to try to improve their OPR. As mentioned above, museums definitely fall into this reticent category. However, using Hon and Grunig's (1999) four-part framework to assess OPR will provide a much-needed first step in understanding the relationship between museums and their publics. The four tenets of Hon and Grunig's (1999) framework are explained here.

Satisfaction. A public's expectation of their experience with an organization and how closely their expectation aligns with their actual experience is the main way that one can measure

satisfaction levels. Indeed, even the strategy in which an organization attempts to build relationships with the public can be an influence in a public's satisfaction. Bruning and Ledingham (1998) state,

> Just as consumers develop expectations with regard to the product, company service, company image, and product price, they also develop expectations of an organization with regard to relationship building behaviors. Similarly, consumers then evaluate whether the company is falling short, meeting, or exceeding their expectations with regard to those behaviors. This evaluation, coupled with the consumer's evaluation of the company's product, service, image, and price seemingly would combine to determine overall consumer satisfaction. (p. 205).

A key difference between satisfaction and the other elements of OPR as modeled by Hon and Grunig (1999), is that a public can be satisfied without necessarily feeling trusting, committed, or that they are in a mutually-beneficial relationship with an organization.

Trust. Ki and Hon (2007a) define trust as "a belief by publics that an organization is reliable, honest, and stands by its words as well as accomplishes its promised obligations" (p. 422). Their follow-up study in 2012 found that trust leads to behavior intentions, which is usually a major goal for any organization—to have people act in a supportive, positive way towards the organization. Ki and Hon's studies reveal that members of a public subconsciously (or consciously) weigh the effort required for any relationship to be maintained and will do what is necessary to maintain that relationship, but only if they feel that subsequent trust in the relationship. Trust is also an antecedent to the variable of engagement, which is a logical next step to behavior intentions (Kang, 2014; Smith & Gallicano, 2015). The more concrete concepts

of behavior intentions and public engagement are crucial connections for measuring the abstract concept of trust as it relates to OPR.

The annual report by the Edelman Trust Barometer is an important tool for public relations professionals to get a sense of where publics put their trust from year to year. The 2019 report, which focused on trust data gathered in 2018, indicated that within North American countries, the trust in social media is very low, even lower than the trust for traditional media outlets. The reason for this could be that 73% of respondents "worry about false information or fake news being used as a weapon," which fake news easily spreads on social media (Edelman Trust Barometer, 2019). With this information, it is important for PR professionals to understand that using social media to generate OPR may be more difficult than ever before.

Control mutuality. Hon and Grunig (1999) define control mutuality as the balance of asserting control between organization and stakeholders. This does not necessarily mean a 50-50 balance of control, but instead a unique balance specific to the organization and to the population. This balance must be reassessed and readjusted often. In particular, social media interactions between organizations should be very much a two-way dialogue platform, letting their publics assert their voices and also see that their voices are being heard in a real, meaningful way. As stated by Men and Tsai (2015), "By fostering publics' intimate interpersonal interactions with the corporate SNS representative and promoting a sense of belonging and identification with the corporate community, public-organization engagement eventually leads to positive relational outcomes" (p. 401). In addition, the benefit of control mutuality has implications throughout an entire organization, even beyond the sales and communications departments (Ledingham & Bruning, 2000. Most publics are savvy enough to recognize (and be turned off by) blatant attempts by organizations to build relationships and facilitate

communication. Instead, the focus must be on letting the audiences dictate the relationship.

Drotner and Schrøder (2013) state, "Social media are hyped as a victory of individual users over corporate power, and as the privileging of user-led, two-way, many-to-many communication rather than mass mediated [...] communication. Conversely, social media are deplored as catalysts of performative egotism and as instigators of an everflowing deluge of banal communication" (p. 2). Clearly, control mutuality is a tricky element for organizations to master, because it heavily relies on the stakeholders feeling like equal partners with the organization. Additionally, control mutuality requires constant monitoring and upkeep, as the balance may shift at any moment, due to any number of factors.

Commitment. Commitment is another key indicator of a strong organization-public relationship, as outlined by Hon and Grunig (1999). In an earlier study, Steer & Porter (1991) define OPR commitment as "1) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, 2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and 3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization" (p. 226). Thus, in the context of social media as a tool to build OPR, organizational social media must demonstrate their goals and values in such a way that their publics will feel a desire to stand up for that organization, use their product or service, and have a desire to continue to do so. In fact, commitment is the only element of OPR that leads to future behaviors and interactions between public and organization (Waters, 2007). Because of this, commitment is trickier to measure, but can be done in asking about behavioral intentions based on social media engagement with an organization.

The Coorientation Model

Organizations, including museums, must utilize and measure their publics' strength of these four elements of OPR, but must analyze the data in a way that actually provides practical,

actionable insight. The coorientation model, first introduced by Newcomb in 1953, was adapted

for public relations use by Broom and Dozier in 1990. The coorientation model is a method by

which both the organization's perceptions of their OPR activity is measured and compared

against their public's perceptions of the organization's efforts. In comparing these perceptions, it

is easier to assess where the discrepancies are and what must be done to rectify them. As stated

by Waters (2007), "organizations' actions and communication may be completely inappropriate

and ineffective if inaccurate perceptions exist on either side" (p. 27). Additionally, by

investigating OPR through the lens of the coorientation model, researchers are better able to

sense whether the relationship is truly strong.

Waters (2007) expounds on the framework of the coorientation model: "The

coorientation model consists of four elements: (a) the organization's views on an issue,

represented by the beliefs of individuals who participate in decision making; (b) the public's

views on the issue; (c) the organization's estimate of the public's views (i.e., perception); and (d)

the public's estimate of the organization's views" (p. 82). By analyzing OPR with the

coorientation model, researchers will more accurately be able to assess an organization's

relationship with its publics. Without this model, the analysis is only really assessing one side of

the OPR. Without a clear understanding of perceptions of both organization and its intended

public, communication is usually rife with misunderstandings and missed opportunities, leading

to disappointment on both sides Avery, Lariscy, and Sweetser (2010). Brønn and Brønn (2003)

clarified that evaluating OPR with the coorientation model will not only solve

miscommunications, but will lead to richer, longer-lasting relationships.

Other factors within the model give researchers the ability to assess accurately how

positive the OPR is by assessing the accuracy, as explained by Grunig and Huang (2000): "To

measure accuracy, members of organizations and members of publics are asked to predict the cognitions, attitudes, and behaviors of each other. The discrepancies between what one party thinks, feels, and how they behave and what the other thinks it thinks and feels and how it thinks it behaves can identify significant gaps in, at least, short-term relationships" (p. 28). Examining OPR with the coorientation model allows for richer, more complete public relations research to take place, due the consideration of both the perception of the organization and the perception of the stakeholders.

In practical application for social media and public relationships managers, it is imperative for an accurate sense of the perceptions of both sides. As stated by Verčič, Verčič, and Laco (2006), organizations must implement evaluations and strategies to improve the understanding of stakeholders' perception and use that data to make internal and external decisions. Indeed, if organizations operate on mere assumptions about their stakeholders' perceptions of the organization, misunderstandings can turn easily into crises (Brønn & Brønn, 2003). They state, "Without knowing [...], the researcher [or PR professional] is blindly drawing conclusions without a clear picture of what happened with the message in between the release and desired outcome" (Brønn & Brønn, 2003, p. 203).

Using social media to build viable, strong relationships has not been well-studied in the coorientation model literature. One study by Avery, Lariscy, and Sweetser (2010) explores this facet of PR and the coorientation model. They found that "social media may in fact serve as a bridge of convergence between the two groups; they may coorient in even more similar ways in part due to shared social media information, vehicles, and meanings" (p. 200). Additionally, they found that usage of social media in and of itself is likely to enhance the relationship and perceptions between organization and stakeholder groups (Avery, Lariscy, & Sweetser, 2010). In

the context of museums, academics have identified a major gap in the literature that can be filled by examining museums' social media efforts through this coorientation model. As stated by Timpson (2010), "If established properly, both in methodology and structure, the Museum's continued opportunity for dialogue and interaction will result in an ongoing reciprocal relationship where the museum informs its visitors, who, in turn, inform the museum. Social and mobile media can be great facilitators of this interactivity" (p. 305). In addition, it is actually impossible for museums to ignore the potential social media has to deepen relationships with their visitors and potential visitors without devastating results, particularly as compared to those museums which readily embrace new technologies (Labar, 2010).

Engagement on Social Media

Though not part of Hon and Grunig's 1999 research, nor a part of the coorientation model, engagement is another key indicator of healthy OPR (Kang, 2014). The term "engagement" has new meaning now with the advent and usage of social media over the past decade. Now in-platform analytics record statistics for "engagement," which includes nearly every interaction that an organization has on their social media channels. However, Tsai and Men (2015) state that "the conceptual model of public engagement on SNSs [social networking sites] also provides guidelines for public relations professionals and social media strategists to measure the effectiveness of social media engagement efforts, which goes beyond evaluating descriptive and superficial outputs (e.g., number of followers, likes, posts=comments)" (p. 431). As Kang (2014) states, most marketers measure social media engagement with the vanity metrics of likes, number of clicks, number of retweets, and other trite measures, without really understanding the psychology of why those engagements are happening. Instead, true engagement comes when publics are creating content with the organization, in the form of

conversations, direct messages, shares, and bringing others into the conversations (Cho, Schweickurt, & Haase, 2014; Smith & Gallicano, 2015).

Some of the literature surrounding engagement on social media is rooted in the uses and gratification theory of communications, which posits that users seek specific media in order to fulfill a particular need or gratification. Once sought, those users learn that particular use of that particular media fulfills that particular gratification. Tsai and Men (2013) examined this theory in relation to social media usage for OPR and found that "brand communicators should focus on content, applications, and SNS promotions which are educational, informative, and entertaining and which provide economic incentives to keep users engaged" (p. 85). In that study, Tsai and Men (2013) discovered that an accurate model for assessing engagement follows this pattern: consuming media leads to contributing to the media, which leads to creating the media. Smith and Gallicano (2015) found a similar pattern, in which the first level of engagement is information consumption, followed by the person having a sense of presence, then interest and immersion within the organization's page, and then social interaction with the page and with others.

Engagement will be an indicator of all four facets of Hon and Grunig's (1999) OPR model. Looking for different levels of engagement will provide institutions the information they need about how they are perceived by their audience.

Social Media and Non-Profit Organization Public Relations/Museums

Organizational public relations in the non-profit sector is slightly less studied than for-profit organizations, but research has shown that the principles and theories are similar to that of for-profit OPR. OPR provides non-profit entities the chance to build deeper relationships with their publics that yield better engagement, which lead to meeting the entity's goals (Tsai and

Men, 2013). Briones, Kuch, Liu, and Jin (2011) state that while non-profit organizations have the exact same opportunity to utilize social media to reach their publics, non-profit organizations tend to lag behind in the adoption of new technologies for communication, and use it mostly to disseminate trite information that does nothing to build nor maintain relationships with publics.

Within the past decade alone, the technological landscape has changed drastically. As stated by Kelleher (2015), "Digital and social media afforded organizations many more opportunities to establish, maintain, and cultivate relationships with publics on a more interpersonal level than did traditional media" (p. 218). Adding on to that, Cho and Schweikert (2015) state, "With social media, nonprofit organizations can expand their reach to constituents, share organizational news, recruit supporters, and stay connected with key constituents" (p. 283). Utilizing social media as a relationship-building tool offers so many more opportunities for organizations than were available to them even a decade ago.

Understanding the role that social media plays within OPR is crucial for non-profit organizations, including most museums. Because nonprofit organizations are often operating under time, personnel, and financial constraints, the accessibility and zero cost of social media are hugely advantageous tools for non-profit organizations. However, without a strategy, their efforts to build meaningful relationships with their publics using these tools is futile. As stated by Cho, Schweickart, and Haase (2014), "While many nonprofit organizations use Facebook heavily for information dissemination, this limited use does not encourage publics' engagement and build relationships, even though information dissemination can be the first step to stimulate publics to pay attention to an organization" (p. 567). Similarly, Lovejoy, Waters and Saxton (2012) found that most organizations—particularly nonprofits—are squandering the potential of these tools to build meaningful relationships by simply posting the same information-based

content that can already be found in press kits and reports. While this is not always the case, Murero (2010) found that perhaps the reason for this is lackluster social media presence could be the lack of bandwidth, training, and evaluation tools available to these institutions.

At the core of all OPR is the basic need to build lasting relationships that are mutually beneficial. Men and Tsai (2014) explored this idea in their research when they found that "the way social media revolutionize public relations is not through technologies, but through the manner in which authentic organizations can act as authentic people to instill spirit and emotions in the communication messages to generate public resonance, understanding, and identification" (p. 430). Social media itself is not the most important piece of the OPR; the most important piece is an organization's ability to use the social media platform to provide messages with which key audiences can feel seen, appreciated, and encouraged to participate in an authentic way.

Cho, Schweickart and Hasse (2014) examined the possibility of OPR within Facebook, finding that most nonprofits just use social media to blast out information instead of cultivating relationships with key stakeholders. The potential for building good relationships is there, but many institutions, including museums, are not taking advantage. Capriotti, Losada-Díaz, and José-Carlos (2018) lament,

> In short, despite having a massive presence on Facebook, most museums analyzed are mainly using Facebook as a tool for disseminating information, so they are not taking advantage of their ability to generate a genuine place for dialogue, exchange and conversation, [...] that allows interactive expansion of the user experience beyond the physical space, and the creation of a true platform for the creation, discussion and negotiation between the institution, artists and visitors beyond the walls of the institution. (p. 648)

Instagram, a visual social media platform where people post pictures and other users can like and comment on the pictures, has been around since 2010. Thirty-five percent of American adults are Instagram users, a huge growth from twenty-eight percent in 2016 (Pew Research Center, 2018). The usage of the platform to build OPR has only been studied briefly, and not in relation to museums. The studies surrounding this platform are focused on the uses and gratifications of the platform, as well as the media effects that this visual platform has on its users. Lee, Lee, Moon, and Sung (2015) found that, "[…] the present findings reveal that social interaction is a strong factor in that Instagram users are motivated to establish and maintain social relationships with other people using this platform" (p. 555).

Within the museum context, there is anecdotal evidence that lone visitors are using social media in myriad ways during their visit to museums, including posting pictures, comments, tagging the museum, and inviting others to join them at the museum (Falk & Dierking, 2013). Regardless of museums' familiarity and comfort in using social media as an institution, their visitors and potential visitors are social media savvy. Museums can take advantage of this opportunity by "facilitating the coming together of individuals in virtual and physical spaces, perhaps even more effective because of [social media's] peer-based influence" (Bautista, 2014, p. 227).

Of course, as mentioned previously, one of the top issues for museums in creating and maintaining their social media strategy and sustaining it as a relationship-building tool is staff and resource bandwidth. Additionally, many museum personnel and managers are unable to separate "success" on social media with short-term vanity metrics that provide no real insight into the publics' perceptions of the museum nor their level of the long-term OPR indicators satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment. Sometimes institutional or financial

pressure may cause museums to focus solely on attendance statistics and model their social media strategy around this same in-person attendance goal, while completely ignoring the audience growth that can begin online (Laws, 2015). As stated by Labar (2010), "Many museums measure success by attendance figures. The possibility that museums could have impact and achieve their mission while never seeing or personally touching an individual will question this widely accepted metric" (p. 394).

By examining how museums perceive their own social media efforts through the lens of OPR and comparing those insights to the insights of their patrons, they will gain insights of how to use social media as a strategic tool to increase OPR. By doing so, these museums will be able to further their missions and increase their stakeholder engagement, which will lead to increased attendance and support of the organization. To understand the perceptions of both museum and patrons, the coorientation model is the lens through which this study will examine the social media efforts of six museums to assess how strong their OPR is and what the next steps for each museum should be.

To study museum OPR through social media through the lens of the coorientation model, this study is put forth with the following research questions:

RQ1: Why do museum communications managers attempt to build relationships with publics through social media?

RQ2: How do museum social media managers perceive their attempts to build relationships with their local publics on social media?

RQ3: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment?

RQ4: What coorientation state exists between the museums and their local publics in evaluation of their shared relationship?

<div align="center">Method</div>

This study explores how museums' use of social media influences their OPR with their local public. To understand both specific details of museum efforts and perceptions as well as a comparison of different types of museums in their OPR social media efforts, this study utilizes a case study methodology.

Case studies are a common methodology in many areas of academic research, including public relations. Case study methodology allows for a deep analysis of many units—in this case, museums—while also providing insights that can be broadly applied to the field. As stated by Yin (2009), "[...] the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events—such as individual life cycles, small group behavior, organization and managerial processes" (p. 4).

Case study methodology is commonly used to explore research questions that ask "how" and "why" rather than "what" (Yin, 2009). This methodology is used to understand how a real-world situation works, while considering its specific context and situation. Often, case studies are considered solely a qualitative methodology, but in reality, both qualitative and quantitative measures can be utilized (Yin, 2009).

This study employs an embedded-design case study methodology. In this research design, each site is given a set of data (in this case, a survey) to be analyzed in relation to that site only, not to be used to provide meaning to the other sites in the case. Additionally, each site participated in a semi-structured interview to provide more data points to form a complete picture of what is happening at each site. As stated by Yin (2009), "The use of multiple sources

<div align="center">18</div>

of evidence in case studies allows an investigator to address a broader range of historical and behavioral issues" (p. 7). In performing a study rooted in the coorientation model, data to assess the museums' individual perceptions and the perceptions of their respective publics is required, ergo multiple data types are required for this study. In order to form a complete image of each unit's case study as well as a holistic examination across all units, I also triangulated the data. Yin (2009) stated, "When you have really triangulated the data, the events or facts of the case study have been supported by more than a single source of evidence" (p. 116). The results of this triangulation will be reported in the Results and Discussion sections.

Sample Selection

The eligibility requirements for participation in this study were to be a non-profit museum in the United States with active Facebook and Instagram presences. There were no stipulations around annual attendance, number of followers, or other metrics. In order to get a good, random mix of museums to analyze to spot similarities and differences between them, I elected to randomly select museums to solicit for participation.

All museums chosen for participation in this study were selected from Guidestar's list of non-profit, non-university museums in the United States. The Guidestar list is a comprehensive listing of all non-profit organizations in the United States. I entered search terms that narrowed the list to include only non-profit museums. The list is not sorted by any other method besides alphabetically by museum name and does not include information that is easily accessible about the museums' visitation or other statistics. In order to select museums to solicit for participation in my study, I organized the list of museums alphabetically and then ran a random number generator to determine which museums to ask to participate. It is also important that in using this list of museums from Guidestar, I was only able to select museums which had both active

Facebook and Instagram channels (active meaning that there had been posts from the organization on the account as recently as March 2019). If my random number generator led to a museum without these criteria, the random number generator test ran again to find another qualified candidate for research. I had to undergo this process dozens of times in order to find museums that had active Facebook and Instagram accounts dedicated to the museum. Indeed, many of the museums did not have actual websites, let alone Facebook and Instagram pages, indicating the need for more literature about the crucial necessity for museums to have an online presence.

Once finding a qualified museum, I then began the process of asking the museum to participate in my study in a structured, organized method. I first found the email of the staff member at the museum most closely connected with social media and sent an introductory email. In the email, I provided an explanation of this research and study, requesting their participation in the study by way of a 30-minute semi-structured interview to be conducted by video call. If I did not hear back within four days, I would send a follow-up email to the same person. If I still did not receive any word, I found a different staff member to contact by the same process. I would also call the museum asking to be directed to the staff member who managed social media for the museum (this only led to speaking to a human one time). As an incentive for participation, I explained that each museum would receive the raw data gathered about their institution as well as the entire study following its completion.

Again, finding museums willing to participate in this study proved much more difficult that I originally anticipated. In all, I contacted 25 museums in this manner. Of those 25, six agreed and followed through in participating in this study. I never heard back from eleven of the museums. In some cases, the museums were unable to participate due to undisclosed reasons. In

other cases, museums were unwilling to participate because they did not feel that they had a

"good enough" social media presence and instead wanted the results of this study to be sent to

them, as a teaching tool for how they can best improve their own social media strategy.

This study involves six different museums from across the United States, hereby referred

to as "Museum A," Museum B," and so on.

Qualitative Interviews

Conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews with museum social media managers

provided the best method by which I could answer research questions regarding motivation

behind having the social media platform at all. The interview guide was centered around Hon

and Grunig's (1999) OPR indicators of satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment.

Additional resources used to adapt for interview use come from Ki and Hon, 2007; Capriotti,

2010; and Tsai and Men, 2013. The interview guide is available in Appendix A.

I conducted these interviews with whichever staff member at the museum in question was

responsible for creating and managing the social media channels and content for the museum. I

conducted these interviews via video call using Zoom.com, which is a free service. All

interviews were video recorded and then transcribed. Following the semi-structured personal

interview Zoom video call, the survey portion of the study could commence, as will be explained

below.

Surveys

Following conducting each of the six semi-structured interviews, and to accurately

employ the coorientation model in which there is comparison between the perceptions of

organization and their publics, I created and administered a survey to local patrons of the

museums who engage at any level with the museum on either Facebook or Instagram. The

survey was created online using Qualtrics. I then distributed the individualized surveys on

Facebook to a 40-mile radius surrounding each museum using Facebook Ads from a new

Facebook page I created for the express purpose of this study. The Facebook page was entitled

"Study for Museum Social Media and Public Relations" and had no posts nor content, but ran

these six ads for the space of six weeks in the six different geographic locations. Each ad had a

budget of $83.00 to run during the same six weeks, from January to mid-February 2020.

Data Analysis Methodology

In order to perform the data analysis of the raw data of both the surveys and the

interviews, I used Hon and Grunig's (1999) four elements of OPR as themes by which to look for

themes. In analyzing the interviews, I created physical transcripts of the interviews and read

through each one four separate times, marking each time for a different OPR element

(satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment). After identifying these themes and

examples, I read through each interview a fifth time in order to mark for themes that were not

part of those OPR elements of OPR, but that was relevant to the topic of OPR and social media.

Using these transcripts with the five main themes outlined, I was able to them begin to find

connections within and between museums.

I analyzed the raw data of the survey qualitatively as well. Though surveys are

traditionally analyzed statistically, due to the low number of responses, I was unable to do that.

Instead, I analyzed the raw data of the surveys for each museum qualitatively, again using Hon

and Grunig's (1999) four elements of OPR. The survey, which was adapted from Ki and Hon,

2007; Capriotti, 2010; and Tsai and Men, 2013, specifically measures indicators of satisfaction,

trust, control mutuality, and commitment. Particular survey questions corresponded to those four

elements, and I was able to analyze the percentages and responses of the level to which

respondents indicated their experience with the museum's OPR in those areas. Additionally, the survey included questions about current engagement and future behaviors, which provides a pre-test-type analysis should a museum wish to make changes and compare results to the previous surveys questions. In particular, the questions about future behaviors provide a sense of the quantifying the somewhat abstract ideas of OPR.

I analyzed each survey by looking at the responses that corresponded to each OPR section, and then analyzed them against the other sections of the survey responses for each museum. I then looked at how each element performed across all six museums, to get a sense of how different museums' surveys provided different results comparatively. The final question of the survey was an optional short-answer question to which respondents could provide their answer for "How do you perceive [Museum's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" This question provided insights to all four RQs, but particularly RQ4. I categorized the answers for each response to this question as one of the following: positive, negative, unrelated, didn't know. This allowed an insight into the coorientation state between patrons and museum, but also provided additional qualitative data that hinted at which OPR elements each museum could improve.

Results

This results section addresses RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3, analyzing interviews and surveys for each museum case study. Each semi-structured interview provides insights to RQ1 and RQ2: RQ1: Why do museum communications managers attempt to build relationships with publics through social media?; RQ2: How do museum social media managers perceive their attempts to build relationships with their local publics on social media?

The survey results provide insights into RQ3: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment?

This section is organized by case study, but all case studies will provide insights into all three of the above research questions.

Museum A

Museum A is located in the New England region of the United States and is classified as a mid-size museum with approximately 50,000 annual visitors. Museum A has 4,215 Facebook followers and 827 Instagram followers. This museum is located in a city of about 40,000 (based on a 2018 estimate) (census.gov/popclock), and is about an hour away from two major metropolitan areas. This museum has been in operation since 1931. Museum A is primarily an art museum.

I conducted my video-recorded, semi-structured interview with the Education and Marketing Associate at Museum A, who I will refer to as "JM." After the semi-structured interview with JM, I distributed the survey on Facebook to the 40-mile radius surrounding Museum A. After the six weeks of running the survey, there were 25 total responses. Of the respondents that answered the demographic question of age, only one was younger than the 45-54 bracket, and of all who indicated an ethnicity, all indicated that they were White. Full responses to this survey can be found in Appendix C. The survey covered three main question types: engagement on Museum A's current social media posts, perceptions of patron relationship to Museum A, and indications of future behaviors.

JM has been in this position at the museum for over two years and worked there first as an intern. The social media platforms they use—Facebook and Instagram—were already in place when JM entered their current role, which includes managing the social media for Museum A.

JM explained that it is difficult to engage audiences on social media when the interests and demographics are so different. JM explained, "The arts in this area are trying to catch up with more contemporary arts. But our museum is not so much a contemporary art museum. We have a lot of old European Masters paintings, we have early American art. Our audience right now is mostly an older audience. There's a lot of older people in [city] and we're trying to bring younger people in because a lot of younger people have started moving in" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). JM is solely responsible for the social media management at Museum A and is constantly striving to bring value and awareness of the museum's offerings to the varied demographics the museum serves through engaging, uplifting, and shareable social media strategy. The analytics JM gathers inform future decisions about social media strategy.

Based on this interview, it is clear that JM feels that Museum A has a positive perception of their own efforts to build relationships through social media, though there seems to be a bit of unknown about how their followers perceive the museum's relationship-building efforts (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). The data gathered through the interview and survey yielded many insights and themes about how the museum perceives their usage of social media to build relationships with audiences. These results from both the semi-structured interview and survey for Museum A are presented in the OPR framework as outlined by Hon and Grunig (1999).

Satisfaction. Satisfaction did not come up during the semi-structured interview with JM. The only clues they receive about if their publics are satisfied is based on the engagement those posts receive. They do not have a real sense of what their public actually wants or needs, nor how to satisfy those.

Six of the survey questions were administered with the express purpose of assessing satisfaction from the respondents. Three of the responses were answered in the majority neutral, which is unsurprising considering that the museum is likely not putting forth much intentional effort in this area. In some cases, such as "Patrons feel important to [Museum A]," it is not a terribly huge issue. However, when a statement such as "[Museum A] listens to and responds to patrons," is majority neutral responses, this lack of satisfaction becomes direr.

However, the majority of survey responses in this area were answered in the neutral or as "somewhat agree," or "strongly agree." Again, this is unsurprising as there have not been museum efforts or initiatives to learn how to best satisfy patrons.

Trust. While the community that Museum A serves is varied, JM feels that they can offer something to everyone at the museum, and that the social media efforts just need to reflect that there truly is value for everyone. They said, "We offer a lot to our community in ways of not just an art museum and cultural center, but it's also a safe place for the underserved as well. It's just a really great hub for families and communities to come together and to host events and to learn" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019).

As mentioned by Kang (2014), trust is an antecedent to engagement. Patrons will not engage on social media if they do not feel a certain level of trust with the organization. For Museum A, JM explained that while they do offer a lot of value to their community as a cultural center and "safe space," there was no real indication of showcasing those aspects of the museum on social media, which would likely increase patrons' trust.

Four of the survey questions specifically measured trust. For three of those four, 68% of the respondents answered the neutral "neither agree nor disagree." The rest of the respondents answered in the positive "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree," except for one who responded

"somewhat disagree" to all questions in this section. Generally, the patrons do not feel strongly about the level of trust they have in the museum, as the museum has not blatantly made any effort to build this component through their social media strategy. That said, the question in this section that said, "[Museum A] treats patrons fairly and justly," yielded 48% answering "strongly agree" and only 44% answering neutrally. This indicates that in that particular area of trust—usually happening within an in-person experience at the museum—is stronger than the social media efforts to encourage trust.

   Control mutuality. Control mutuality is a balance of control between the stakeholders and the organization (Hon & Grunig, 1999). This balance is constantly in flux, which means the organization must be constantly monitoring it. For JM, this looks like seeing what people best respond to on their social media and what is not getting the response they anticipate. JM states, "I notice with children's events, it'll be a lot of parents tagging other parents on Facebook" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). And, another observation about what wasn't working: "We did find that most of our older members prefer paper marketing materials over internet marketing materials [social media]" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019).

   However, the interview did not yield very much information about the museum listening and responding to patrons' requests. Again, Drotner and Schoder (2013) make it clear that organizations' blatant attempts to build relationships usually backfire and that organizations should opt for natural listening and responding techniques in their social media strategies.

   The museum's efforts in relationship-building are best done in-person, according to JM. However, they realize that for most people, that in-person relationship might never come to fruition if the social media efforts are unable to stir feelings of control mutuality in their

followers. That is one of the reasons JM is most interested in creating shareable content—getting buy-in from existing followers proves more effective.

"For us, we count 'engagement' as everything we can reach," JM said. "I know that our directors are really interested in a total reach. But for me personally, I think we get best results with sharing and having people tag other people. So, sharing, tagging, and likes are great. Comments are better" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). Again, this is exactly in line with academic research, which indicates that OPR is stronger when the level of engagement moves into a two-way dialogue on social media, as outlined by the element of control mutuality.

Two of the survey questions measured respondents' sense of control mutuality with Museum A. Both yielded highly neutral responses, though nothing more negative than that. The first of these questions stated, "When interacting with [Museum A], patrons feel a sense of control." Twenty respondents (80%) answered neutrally. The other question, "[Museum A] cooperates with patrons," yielded 16 (64%) neutral responses.

Museum A has not really put forth any sort of effort in this area, and the patrons answering the survey likely have not consciously thought about that aspect of their relationship with the museum as nothing has ever been done either way about it. The next step for the museum would be to start incorporating feedback from patrons into their in-museum and social media experiences and showcasing any adjustment or changes they make accordingly.

Commitment. Commitment is the element of OPR that is an indicator for future behavior. Understanding and measuring for patron commitment is crucial for museums, as usually the ultimate goal is to get people through the doors. Understanding how committed an audience is can help in creating campaigns, programming, and other efforts to bring them to the museum.

JM's interview did not yield any particular insight into how Museum A perceives the commitment of their patrons, nor did it yield insight into any of the museum's efforts to build commitment other than creating sharable content on social media.

The three survey questions that measured commitment also yielded very neutral results. For all three of the questions, between 44-48% of responses were neutral. However, these questions also yielded the most "strongly agree" answers of any questions throughout the whole survey, between 24-28% choosing that answer. This indicates that while there is not any particular reason to be committed, many patrons do feel committed to Museum A. This, in turn, indicates that their commitment leads to engagement, which can ultimately lead to future behaviors.

Engagement. While JM says that the museum's efforts on social media are working, they also admit that there is definitely room for improvement. "We're on Instagram, where engagement is more like blind likes. But on Facebook, I've noticed that people seem to absorb the information better and I'll see people that I recognize from liking all their things on Facebook at our events" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). It is also clear that Museum A's Facebook is finding more success than the Instagram: "I prefer Facebook because we do get more engagement on Facebook than on Instagram," JM said. "Maybe it's because we have more people on our Facebook page than we do on our Instagram" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019).

JM is constantly refining the social media strategy to increase engagement online, which they believe also increases attendance at the museum. "I would like to achieve having more interactive things on Instagram, just more bright and engaging and fun and eye-catching posts.

And with our Facebook, I'm interested in getting more shares. That's one of my goals. I think shares are what really draws attention" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019).

It was surprising to note, however, how few respondents were actually following the museum on either Facebook or Instagram. Sixteen respondents did not actually follow Museum A on Facebook nor on Instagram, seven followed on Facebook only, one followed on Instagram only, and one followed on both.

In regard to engaging with Museum A's current social media posts, it was unsurprising to see that the higher the engagement level, the less likely respondents were to have participated in it. For example, eighteen respondents indicated that they have never commented on any posts by Museum A on Facebook. Five indicated that they rarely comment, one indicated commenting less than once per year, and one indicated 1-5 times a year. Respondents indicated that they never have (21) or rarely (4) tag others in Facebook posts by Museum A.

The engagement levels rarely get to the "share" level that Museum A is so desperately working to achieve on their Facebook posts. In regard to the engagement on Museum A's Instagram, the engagement numbers are even lower. This is to be expected, as fewer respondents follow Museum A on Instagram than on Facebook.

Future behaviors. The final set of questions in the survey assessed future behaviors, which can be predicted through engagement and commitment. The survey responses strongly skewed positive, with fewer neutral responses. This indicates that people's perceptions of their own future behavior are more likely to include action, regardless of their current state of action or relationship to the organization. The first question of this section stated, "I would recommend visiting [Museum A] to others." Nineteen respondents indicated "strongly agree," the highest for any of the questions thus far on the survey. Only three respondents answered "neither agree nor

disagree," two responded "somewhat agree," and one answered "strongly disagree." The other three questions in this section yielded similar responses.

Again, these responses were less neutral than the OPR perception questions, leading to a conclusion that while these patrons do not necessarily feel a particularly close relationship with the museum, there is an element of commitment that ties them back to Museum A, and thus to very positive prediction of their own future behavior of supporting and attending the museum.

The final aspect of the survey was an optional short-response question: "How do you perceive [Museum A's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" There were eight responses. I've categorized the responses into four categories: positive, neutral, negative, and unrelated.

For the most part, the responses were enlightening as they indicated that they did not realize Museum A was providing content on social media. For example, "What media efforts?"; "Not familiar with all media efforts. It is a wonderful little gem of a museum. Great art and amenities."; "Since I was not aware of it, I cannot answer"; "I have never seen it on social media"; and "Can't answer that at the moment as this survey is my first interaction. Will be changing that though when I'm done here." Based on this free-response, there seems to be a positive feeling toward the museum but that patrons do not particularly feel that the museum has any social media efforts to speak of, let alone any that would foster a relationship between patrons and the museum by way of social media.

Conclusion of Museum A results. The results of Museum A's survey reflect that, generally, the audience is mostly neutral about their feelings toward the museum. They do not feel particularly satisfied, trusting, committed, or in a relationship with the museum, nor are they the opposite. This seems like a fairly neutral group who has no real long-term investment with

the museum. However, the strongest indicator of a relationship between patrons and Museum A is within commitment, as evidenced both by the survey scores of commitment and future behavior, as well as JM's emphasis on engagement in describing Museum A's social media strategy.

In examining these results through the lens of the coorientation model and comparing the survey data with the data of the qualitative interview, there is some discord between Museum A's perception of their social media efforts to build relationships and their local audience's perception of their efforts. The most striking examples of this come from the general ambivalence of responses as well as the responses for the open-ended question at the end of the survey, in which people mentioned that they did not realize that the museum was operating social media nor that it was meant to be a tool to build a relationship between the public and the museum.

Museum B

Museum B is a small museum and historical society which operates in a rural community in the New England region of the United States. There is no data available for their annual attendance, but it is quite low. Museum B has 1,335 Facebook followers and had less than 200 Instagram followers at the start of the study. Museum B has since deleted its Instagram account. Museum B is located in a town of 10,352 (census.gov/popclock).

I conducted a semi-structured interview with the Director of Museum B, who I will refer to as BK. According to BK, this small museum runs on a staff of just three people. BK, as Director, is also manager of all the social media accounts, running them entirely alone. It is a small operation with only three staff members, so it is not as robust as it could be, but they do what they can to make their social media content applicable to the existing and emerging

audiences in the town. BK describes the town as "not your typical postcard New England town. It's a sleeper town for [larger city], and most people commute there for work. There are a lot of retirees as well as a new influx of younger families" (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019).

None of the staff are trained in social media nor communication, but they perceive that their efforts to yield results increase awareness of the museum and in attendance at museum events.

Following the semi-structured interview with BK, I released the survey to the 40-mile radius around the Museum B using Facebook ads. The survey for Museum B garnered thirteen respondents, which is a smaller response rate than the other museums in this study. However, due to the rural nature of this museum, the geographic targeting was unable to reach as many people within its 40-mile radius as the other museum ads for this study. Regardless, the thirteen responses to this survey provide valuable information about how Museum B's relationship building via social media is perceived by the local population.

Most of the thirteen respondents were of an older age demographic. One was 18-24, one was 25-34, one was 35-44, four were 45-54, two were 55-64, and four were 65 or older. Nine respondents were female, four were male. Twelve respondents indicated White ethnicity and one indicated another ethnicity, which they wrote in as "Scottish."

As with the other identical surveys, the first set of questions dealt with current engagement, followed by perception of the museum, ending with future behaviors. One of the first questions asks on which platforms respondents follow Museum B: Facebook, Instagram, both, or neither. Nine indicated that they follow Museum B on Facebook, four indicated that they do not follow Museum B on Facebook nor Instagram, zero respondents indicated that they

follow on both Facebook and Instagram, and zero indicated following Museum B only on Instagram.

Satisfaction. Due to the small nature of the museum and community, which is quite close-knit, BK sees that most people who come to the museum or who follow and interact with the museum on social media are very supportive of the museum's efforts. This is good because it shows that people are receiving what the museum is posting, but it can be difficult to gauge what content would actually incline a public to truly feel like the museum was exceeding expectations (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019).

BK indicated that he believes that patrons follow the museum on social media because it is the best way to find out what is going on in the town, especially for more rural, out-of-town people living outside the main town (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019). However, outside of that, it is unclear what content keeps followers following.

That said, for the survey questions asking about patrons' level of satisfaction from Museum B, five out of the six questions yielded very positive results. At least six (54.55%) respondents indicated "strongly agree" in the survey's five questions designed to measure patrons' satisfaction of Museum B. The only question that did not yield over 50% of respondents answering "strongly agree" was this question: "[Museum B] listens and responds to patrons." In this case, only four (36.36%) answered "strongly agree." Three (27.27%) answered "somewhat agree" and four answered in the neutral "neither agree nor disagree." The change in answer spread on this question indicates that patrons are generally satisfied with Museum B but have not encountered any personal or overheard evidence that Museum B listens to or responds to patrons, especially on social media.

For Museum B, this is a good starting point, as there is already a high level of satisfaction for Museum B patrons. To improve this aspect of OPR, Museum B must make a concerted effort to ask for patrons' opinions and questions, and then make a point to respond and then showcase change that happens as a result of the information gleaned from patrons. This will increase the satisfaction by showcasing that they do listen and respond to patrons. Additionally, Museum B can increase other aspects of satisfaction by asking patrons what type of content would be interesting or helpful to them on social media, and then provide those things.

Trust. In the interview, BK mentioned that they believe social media is important to the organization because it increases people's appreciation for the town, which is the primary mission of the museum and organization (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019). They assess this by looking at the engagement rates. Additionally, because Museum B is such a small organization within a small town, it may be that any organization that is promoting the town may be seen as trustworthy and engagement-worthy. The museum is not making any specific effort to increase its patrons trust, as BK feels that they already have it from the locals.

In the four survey questions measuring trust, the responses are in alignment with BK's assessment. For nearly all of these trust questions, at least 6 (54.54%) answer "strongly agree," with all responses except one (across all questions) indicated at least a neutral or above sentiment in their response. The one question in this section that was an exception—and can provide a bit of direction for Museum B—was this statement: "Whenever [Museum B] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Only four (36.36%) indicated "strongly agree," while three (27.27%) answered "somewhat agree" and four answered neutrally. Though these numbers are not much different than the shared responses of other questions in this section, even the slight difference tells an important story. This indicates

that patrons likely have not had an opportunity to participate in any decision made by Museum B, but that the museum's decisions to this point have not negatively affected the patrons. Moving forward, the museum can increase trust by being more vocal about their decision-making and emphasizing the patron benefits of museum decisions.

  Control mutuality. This element of OPR did not really surface during my interview with BK. Perhaps because of the low number of followers and annual attendees, it may seem unnecessary or not worth the time to see if patrons feel like they have a balance of control with the museum. The only indication that BK has considered this is the museum's choice to stop their Instagram. BK said that, "It feels like creating Instagram content would just be a repeat of Facebook, and I can't schedule Instagram ahead of time. I don't have the bandwidth to do it. If we got more volunteers, maybe they could help with that" (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019). BK did not indicate what the engagement levels or content was like on Instagram, and clearly the museum's bandwidth makes their choice totally understandable. However, if their patrons or potential patrons are on Instagram, there will have to be shift in emphasis to provide for the patrons on their preferred platform.

  Sentiment is guardedly positive about control mutuality from the patrons' point of view, as measured in the survey. Two questions measure specifically for control mutuality in the survey. For one, the majority (54.55%) indicated that they feel neutral in response to "When interacting with [Museum B], patrons feel a sense of control." The other responses were positive, but this high level of neutrality in response to this question indicates that either many respondents do not interact with the museum or that the museum has not presented many opportunities for interaction, particularly on social media. However, the same majority (54.55%) answered strongly agree for the other control mutuality question: "[Museum B] cooperates with

patrons." This indicates that while patrons feel like the museum is pleasant enough, there have not been any real opportunities to formulate a balance of control between museum and patrons.

Commitment. Commitment did not come up in the interview with BK, from either a museum or patron perspective. Commitment is the antecedent to engagement, but measuring engagement for Museum B is more observation rather than a heavily analytics process. However, there is not really a growth in followers, nor are there many followers leaving the museum social media accounts—followers tend to follow and then stay.

Despite this, the survey questions about commitment yielded very positive results from the patron perspective. In asking "[Museum B] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship with patrons," eight (66.67%) indicated that they strongly agree, two (16.17%) that they somewhat agree, and two neither agree nor disagree. The other questions in this section were answered positively as well, though with slightly more toward the neutral than to the strongly agree. This is indicative of the answer pattern of most sections for patrons of Museum B, in that they feel perhaps that the museum is doing the best with the resources it has, though nothing is really being done intentionally to build relationships or encourage commitment from patrons.

Engagement. Within the survey questions asking about level of engagement with Museum B on social media, more respondents tend to like a post than comment, more tend to comment than tag others, and more tag others than sending the museum direct messages. The numbers of engagement were much higher for Facebook than for Instagram. The reaction to the social media posts is low right now. According to BK, the museum would measure engagement success by having an increase in paid memberships, attendance at the programs and events, as well as the digital reactions such as likes, shares, and comments. Those likes, shares, and comments are what BK primarily "counts" as engagement, though Museum B is not currently

37

capturing social media analytics besides those (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019). But, even those numbers lead BK to have a positive perception of the museum's social media efforts to build relationships. BK said, "Relationship-building for us is best done on social media, especially for the out-of-area folks. We have seen an increase in attendance due to our posting about events on Facebook" (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019).

BK finds that engagement on the social media platforms does actually lead people to attend the events and finds that they get the most engagement on social media when posting stories and the voices of the patrons, volunteers, and stories of town citizens from decades' past. BK perceives that Museum B's social media efforts, though small and not particularly robust, are having a positive effect on the community and on the museum" (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019).

Future behaviors. The last portion of the survey asked questions regarding future behaviors. These questions asked if respondents planned on following Museum B on social media for another year, visiting the museum itself sometime within the next three years, and following Museum B on social media even if another museum were to come to the area. No respondents answered more negatively than the neutral. This could be because this museum serves the small community and it is unlikely that another museum would come to the area, or perhaps because of a small-town attachment to an organization that preserves and celebrates the area.

The final question of the survey was an optional short-response to this question: "How do you perceive [Museum B's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public? Five people responded to this question. I categorized these responses into four categories: positive, unrelated, negative, neutral. The first respondent does not actually address the question

and talks instead about the location of the museum in relation to somewhere they had lived previously (unrelated).

The next response does answer the question by saying, "I see it [Museum B's efforts on social media to build relationships] as a way to invite established patrons as well as new patrons to learn about and interact with the community" (positive). The next response says, "I believe that [Museum B] is doing its best using social media to keep in touch with more people. The only thing I would suggest is try to get more exhibits. And including some more recent things in [location's] history to try and connect with the younger people so it doesn't seem so far away and that it doesn't affect them" (positive). The next response simply read, "Ok" (neutral). The final response said, "Uhmm; this is a bit weird. I don't imagine that [Museum B] is out to grind axes; of course they cherish their patrons!" which is likely in response to the survey itself rather than as a response to the question posed. I categorized this response as (unrelated). In total, there were two positive responses, two unrelated, and one neutral, which is reflective of most of the answers across all sections of the survey.

Conclusion of Museum B results. Based on the semi-structured interview of BK and the survey responses, it seems that patrons are generally perceiving the museum to be doing a good job in building OPR with the patrons and that the museum is also happy about their efforts. Due to the small nature of the museum and community it serves, it is unsurprising that the responses to the survey indicate that they believe the museum is doing the best it can with the resources it has.

The coorientation between the museum and the local audience was a little more in harmony for Museum B. This could be due to several unrelated factors, including the nature of a small, tight-knit rural community. However, it is clear from the survey responses that, while

there is some neutrality about some elements of OPR, in general, there is a high level of

satisfaction, trust, control mutuality, and commitment for the patrons of Museum B. In addition,

though the museum's social media efforts are not particularly robust, the public's perception is

that they are doing their best to include the community and build a good relationship with

members of the community, which is what the director of the museum expressed as his

perception as well.

Museum C

Museum C is a large museum in a major metropolitan city in the southern region of the

United States. Museum C has 309,741 followers on Facebook and over 32,000 on Instagram.

This museum primarily exhibits artifacts from World War II and is located in a city with a

population of approximately 391,000 (census.gov/popclock). This museum has been in operation

for 20 years. This museum is a large, national-scale museum with thousands of annual visitors

and a very robust social media strategy.

I conducted my video-recorded semi-structured interview with the Communications

Specialist of Museum C, in which interview I discovered many themes in regard to this

museum's social media strategies to build relationships with their patrons. I will refer to the

Communications Specialist at Museum C as "DW." Because of the amount of engagement and

interest that the social media content has, DW feels that the public has a good perception of the

museum and its efforts to use social media to build relationships with their publics.

After the semi-structured interview, I distributed the survey to the 40-mile radius around

this museum via Facebook ads for six weeks. There were 35 respondents. Of the 35 respondents,

18 were 65+ years old (51.43%), seven were 55-64 years old (20%), six were between 18-24

(17.14%), and there was one respondent for both the 25-34 range and the 35-44 range (2.86% for

each). Half of the respondents identified as female, and 44% identified as male, and 5% chose not to answer. Thirty-one respondents were White, while one was Asian, one was Caribbean, and three preferred to not answer their ethnicity. Full responses to this survey can be found in Appendix C.

Satisfaction. DW explained to me that they have a unique audience base because of the focus this museum has on World War II. Due to this focus, social media is a crucial tool for Museum C. They use social media to both reach current patrons as well as those who will never visit the museum but have an interest in the topic matter presented by the museum. DW said, "A substantial percentage of our followers will never come to the museum. We have the largest membership of any museum in the country. [...] And most of them, even though they support the museum, they'll never visit" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019).

On their social media platforms, Museum C honors veterans, commemorates important dates, recognizes historical events, and highlights important artifacts as a major part of their strategy to satisfy their follower base. Because they have been doing social media for a while and have some social media training, and also because they work with an outside agency to assess and strategize their social media, Museum C has been able to assess what types of social media posts and content receive the most positive engagement. They can then provide that type of their audiences more regularly with the hope of creating more loyal followers. This provides them the blueprint for creating that satisfaction factor. DW said, "We have a content strategy in place that works. We also repeat our historical content posts every month. That's considered evergreen content. And the algorithms almost guarantee that the few thousand people who saw it last time won't see it this time. So that's been driving people to the website and to that content" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). However, DW feels that there is still more to do in

order to increase satisfaction: "I'd love to do way more behind-the-scenes posts, either video interviews or picture posts with curators and exhibit designers. I'd love to be able to do more video interviews with World War II veterans who visit the museum" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019).

The survey responses about satisfaction yielded mixed results. In response to "Both [Museum C] and its patrons benefit from their relationship," respondents indicated again, in the positive. Sixteen respondents (44%) indicated "strongly agree" and sixteen (44.44%) indicated "somewhat agree," and four (11.11%) responded "neither agree nor disagree," presenting a set of responses with nothing negative beyond the neutral response. This was the case for a few of the survey responses dealing with follower satisfaction.

However, there was a greater variety in response to the questions "Patrons are happy with [Museum C]" and "Patrons feel important to [Museum C]." These satisfaction questions are focused on the patrons' emotions as they remember their interactions with Museum C and are not as favorably answered as questions relating to the organization-patron relationship in general. These more emotionally-based questions followed this pattern of response: 11 (30.56%) "strongly agree," 14 (38.89%) "somewhat agree," 9 (25%) are neutral, 1 (2.78%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and 1 (2.78%) indicated "strongly agree." This wider spread of responses—including a dip into the negative—are an indication of a potential pain point for patrons. Museum C can look at these and incorporate strategies into their social media for increasing the level of satisfaction in this area.

Another survey statement that yielded more negative responses was, "[Museum C] neglects patrons." Fifteen (41%) strongly disagree, eight (22%) somewhat disagree, nine were neutral, and four (11%) indicated "somewhat agree." This indicates that perhaps the museum can

focus on this aspect of their relationship-building, as this is the highest number of respondents answering in the negative. Even though the majority are still indicating "somewhat agree," any negative responses can lead the museum to action that will increase satisfaction overall.

Trust. Because of Museum C's unique followership online, social media is the first point of contact, the virtual front door, welcoming patrons to experience the museum. DW said, "Everything we do on those [Facebook and Instagram] is to capture today at the museum. The intention is to create a virtual day at the museum" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). The social media is meant to promote the mission while showcasing an honorific, patriotic, and respectful institution. DW said, "I think the agency and some of my bosses would rather I do more 'No-Shave November' posts and those kinds of things. But the things that really resonate most with our followers are the posts and the messaging that recognizes and honors the World War II generation for their service and sacrifice. [...] We're not going to be as irreverent as Doritos, say, just because of our brand and our topic that we honor and represent" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). Sticking to the tone of the brand in the social media is imperative for how Museum C maintains and increases the patrons' trust in the museum.

The survey responses yielded very positive sentiment regarding trust in Museum C. All of the responses did have one or two negative-leaning responses, but overall, the sentiment for trust was very positive. An example of the response breakdown for the trust questions would be this statement featured in the survey: "[Museum C] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons." In response, 15 (41%) "strongly agree," eight (22%) "somewhat agree," 12 (33%) "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "somewhat disagree." Again, sentiment is mostly positive in that the respondents believe that Museum C is generally trustworthy and that the patrons feel confident in the museum to do what it claims to do. Some of the dissatisfaction can

be addressed by qualitative means to determine what, exactly, the source of the distrust is and how it could be addressed.

Control mutuality. Control mutuality, or the balance of control between organization and stakeholders, did not come up during my interview with DW. Hints at increasing particular types of content based on engagement came up, as mentioned in the above section about satisfaction. However, a real discussion about finding and maintaining and even desiring any sort of control balance did not come up.

This is reflected in the survey responses for the survey questions measuring patrons' perception of control mutuality with Museum C. For example, "[Museum C] cooperates with patrons" yielded only ten (28.5%) "strongly agree," seven (20%) "somewhat agree," and sixteen (45%) neutral, and two "somewhat disagree." While still skewing positive, the vast majority of responses were neutral here, with "somewhat negative" responses as well. The other question in this area was "[Museum C] cooperates with patrons.," and this question yielded a similar response. Statements in which the responses are majority neutral indicate that the museum likely has put forth no effort in maintaining or introducing this aspect of relationship-building into their strategy. This is very easily done on social media by asking for feedback or opinions, acting on those, and then showcasing the changes that have results from that patron and follower feedback.

Commitment. DW feels that building relationships with both local and national audiences is very well done via social media, as it allows topical content to have unlimited geographic reach (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). Additionally, social media can build relationships by presenting the museum to all, hopefully gaining memberships and conversions to the website where visitors can further engage with the museum.

Museum C's own perception of their relationship-building via social media is positive, as evidenced by the continued success of the in-museum programming. "I think our programming is well attended and we do a lot of it and our education programs do well. You know, we have an annual conference every year that is attended by several hundred people. And I think there's gradual growth in all those things year to year. And so not all of that is attributable to organic social, but it's part of the awareness and part of the plan" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). That plan of using social media to both engage national followers because of a specific topic while turning local interest into action is a savvy strategy that allows Museum C to assess the commitment of its followers.

This is evident in the survey responses—it appears that both the organization and the follower base are in agreement about the level of commitment the museum is putting forth. Two questions asked about patrons' perceptions about the museum's desire to build positive, long-term relationships with patrons. Those questions received nearly identical responses: 17 (42.77%) indicated "strongly agree," 13 (36.11%) indicated "somewhat agree," 3 (8.33%) indicated neutrally, and 3 (8.33%) indicated "somewhat disagree." This response does show that, in general, patrons feel positively about their commitment to Museum C. The negative responses show the room for improvement and the need for a deeper understanding of what aspect of the relationship is causing that negative reaction.

The final question in this section of the survey states, "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum C]. In line with DW's goals and perception of Museum C, this question yielded no negative responses, which may be perhaps because of the mission and subject matter of the museum.

Engagement. This museum uses a complicated system of social media. "We have multiple pages for each channel," said DW. "We have six or seven Facebook pages, we have six or seven Twitters, we have multiple Instagram. I manage the main channels plus a couple of other extra ones. [...] the main channels are Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). DW went on to explain that engagement on the smaller channels was very low. "I'm mostly concerned myself with the big broadcast, big following channels. Main channels are where we message all the things going on in all those different departments. The difference is that people actually see those posts [on the main channels]. Because the following and engagement on all the other sub-channels is minimal" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019).

Along with many channels, the museum practices a very robust posting schedule. DW explains, "We post 30 times a day on Facebook and Twitter, probably hourly from 5:00 AM to 10:00 PM. We try to do one Instagram post a day and we've been doing Instagram stories" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019).

For many organizations, such an intense level of social media posting and management is overkill. DW's recognition that Museum C's smaller accounts do not receive the same amount of engagement and are repeating content from the main accounts anyway, may lead Museum C to choose to drop those smaller accounts and focus entirely on the larger accounts that are getting more engagement. If Museum C chooses to shut down the smaller accounts, they will likely see an increase in engagement in the larger accounts as well.

DW is able to find social media "success" for Museum C in a variety of ways. In addition to the observed attendance at various programs and exhibitions, Museum C also perceives their relationship-building through social media to be positive because of the analytics they gather,

particularly in regard to engagement. As DW explained, "Monitoring analytics is one thing I've really had to learn to do. I understand how important it is because everything has to be measured. It all has to do with the return on investment of my time. It's just me. We don't have a team of people doing it. So I look at everything every day, but the monthly report is the one that my supervisors are mostly interested in" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019). Even in the national museum, DW is solely responsible for monitoring these social media efforts from the museum and using the data to make decisions about future content and social media strategy.

As is the pattern, questions about current engagement with Museum C on social media yielded somewhat grim results. For example, in the survey question asking how often respondents commented on one of Museum C's Facebook posts, one respondent indicated that they comment on a post from Museum C weekly, two indicated monthly, two indicated between 6-11 times a year, one indicated between 1-5 times a year, three indicated less than once a year, twelve indicated "rarely," and 15 indicated that they have never commented on any content posted by Museum C on Facebook. This follows the typical pattern of less engagement on the "higher levels" of social media engagement.

Of course, commenting is a much more "difficult" step to take than just reading or even "liking" a post and indicates a progression of relationship between institution and patron. Progression through levels of engagement solidifies the relationship between a patron and the museum. The majority indicated "rarely" or "never" on this question, and in questions asking about how often they tag others or direct message Museum C on either Facebook or Instagram, all of which actions would indicate a stronger relationship. It seems like a higher percentage of people err toward "rarely" or "never" when interacting with a larger museum as opposed to a smaller or mid-size museum in a smaller town or city. Perhaps this has to do with feeling

anonymous to a larger institution, whereas museums in smaller locales receive more feedback because those giving the feedback feel that their words might make a real difference and actually be considered.

Future behaviors. The last set of questions on the survey asked about respondents' likelihood of behavior or taking action. As discussed in the literature, the final step of building a relationship with an institution is when a person takes an action in line with the institution's goals for that person. As mentioned earlier, DW has seen an increase in program attendance correlated to museum social media efforts. The survey reflects this optimism and positive response. For museums, many hope that the action will be to attend and patronize the museum. The first question in this section reads, "I would recommend visiting [Museum C] to others." Most respondents indicated "strongly agree"—30 respondents (83%). Five respondents indicated "somewhat agree," and one indicated "strongly disagree." It is important to note that there are no neutral responses to this statement, meaning that taking future action in this way is a clear choice for respondents. Their relationship to Museum C is such that they can have a clear decision on whether or not they recommend that others form a relationship with Museum C. Other survey results in this section were similar.

The last question of the survey is an open-ended short answer response, in which respondents could answer the optional question: "How do you perceive [Museum C's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?"

Responses to this optional, short-response question are categorized into four categories: positive, neutral, negative, unrelated. All the responses are available in Appendix C. Answers were generally positive, including feedback both about social media efforts and about the museum in general. Positive answers included "I would like to see more. I am amazed at how

many of my friends and acquaintances know little [or] nothing about it [or] its origin, especially the younger ones. I tell everyone who plans to visit [city] it is a must see!"; "The Facebook posts are very informative and very inviting. We have loved [Museum C] from the beginning"; and "I think they are doing a fabulous job. We recommend it strongly to any of our friends who are in town and they (without exception) have come away most satisfied and impressed. [...] I feel there is still a great deal to be added to it and look forward to seeing that done."

Some responses were constructive criticism, but did not specify social media critique, such as this response: "Making the public aware of special exhibits, lectures and a variety of opportunities for learning more about World War II needs to be a priority."

Most of the negative responses to the question about how the museum is doing in using social media to build relationships were unrelated to social media and instead directed toward the in-person experience at the museum. These negative responses could also provide insights into the negative responses in previous sections of the survey. Negative responses of that nature included, "You neglect to have enough seating for those not in wheelchairs but are old or unable to stand long periods to watch videos. A pamphlet better describing each display and more directional signs would help" and "Not deaf friendly the last time I went. No captions nor a guide to read when sounds or voices are involved."

Conclusion of Museum C results. For this survey, I asked the same questions as the previous and following museums. Because this museum is larger, it has more visitors as well as more followers, and as such, more diversity in the answers that the respondents gave in the survey. In addition, many of the questions yielded "somewhat disagree" or "strongly disagree" responses." Despite this, the overall sentiment toward the museum and the museum's social media efforts is positive. Because this is a larger museum with a specific niche interest group,

their social media strategy is very much about building relationships. They are excelling in the OPR elements of commitment and satisfaction, while the areas of control mutuality and trust need some improvement, both of which are very easy to do on social media. These results are reflected in both the interview with DW about the museum's efforts as well as the survey results. The social media efforts of Museum C, while sometimes unnecessarily extensive, are positively building relationships through quality content in a topic area that is extremely personal and important for thousands of people around the country.

Museum D

Museum D is a small, brand-new museum based in a medium-sized city in the northwestern region of the United States. Museum D has 754 followers on Facebook and 195 on Instagram. This museum primarily exhibits art and is located in a city of 48,532 (census.gov/popclock). This museum opened in 2018.

As with all the museums, I conducted a video-recorded semi-structured interview with the staff member of the museum primarily responsible for social media, after which I distributed the survey to the 40-mile radius around this museum via Facebook ads. I interviewed the Founder and Director of the museum, who I will call LW. Museum D is a new museum in the area, previously operating only as a pop-up museum at community events and in temporary spaces. Now it has a brick-and-mortar location and is still trying to build a reputation in the community and bring awareness to its permanent location.

LW describes their audience as primarily the locals in the area, which is a wide demographic pool. LW said, "We have a young demographic in the city because of the university, but also a lot of older people as well coming here because it is sort of a touristy ski

town. There is a lot of interest in the arts here" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019).

Their social media work is growing and LW feels that it is "an indispensable tool to foster those relationships" particularly as they have made the move from pop-up to permanent location. LW says, "There's a difference now in what we're doing on social because before now, we haven't been that visible. We've been going into schools, we've been doing lectures. The workshops we do are usually on ranches or in a rented space. So we've never had a home until now" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019). LW emphasized that social media is crucial for letting the local population know that they do exist.

Museum D, along with many other museums, are on a mission to transform the perception of museums in general as dusty and archaic, to living and interesting organizations that can provide inspiration, value, and education to their communities and audiences. Museum D is hoping that their social media work will help this perception among their community.

LW is the sole manager of the social media content and strategy. The staff of the museum is very small and they indicate that they do not trust anyone else to run their social media. LW does have a nonprofit consultant to help with various aspects of running the museum, though they are loath to take the advice from the consultant about how to run the social media channels. "My nonprofit consultant says that I can't do all of this, that I need to let somebody else do the social media," said LW. They continued, "Well, until I'm comfortable that I know they're not going to do something ridiculous...I just don't trust it at this point. I mean, I wouldn't have someone else write an appeal letter, I wouldn't have someone else write an information packet. [...] Because once it's out there, you're not getting it back once it's posted. It's permanent forever" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019).

Following the interview with LW, the survey was distributed in the 40-mile radius around the museum. There were 29 respondents to this survey. The age of the respondents varied differently than the other museums surveyed. Of the 37 respondents, none were between the ages of 18-24, one (3.7%) was between 25-34, eight (29%) were between 35-44, five (18%) were between 45-54, six (22%) were between 55-64, and seven (29.5%) were 65+. Just over 67% of respondents were female and 32% were male. Twenty-five (92%) respondents were White, one was an ethnicity not listed, and one preferred to not answer their ethnicity.

Satisfaction. Interestingly, my interview with LW did not feature extensively on patron satisfaction. The focus for Museum D is more about getting attention at all. Satisfaction requires some baseline level of engagement and sentiment, which Museum D is currently struggling to get. Not having enough engagement makes it very difficult to gauge satisfaction. Unfortunately, but unsurprisingly, the survey results of this section reflect the lukewarm satisfaction that LW is experiencing. All responses to the questions of this section were overwhelmingly neutral. An example of this pattern would be in the response to "Patrons are happy with [Museum D]." Three (13.04%) respondents indicated they "strongly agree," three (13.04%) indicated that they "somewhat agree," sixteen (69.57%) indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," and one (4.35%) indicated that they "strongly disagree." The pattern was nearly identical for all six questions in the section of this survey.

Because Museum D is so new and trying still to create a following on social media, LW has the freedom here to try a lot of different things on social media to see what creates the most engagement. Additionally, Museum D needs to focus on gaining a followership in order to start measuring for satisfaction and the other elements. Campaigns to simply follow the museum on Facebook and Instagram are imperative at this stage of organizational social media development.

Trust. LW explains that already utilizing social media to promote events has made a difference to attendance, which is helping get the word out about the museum's existence. "Posting on social media makes a huge difference," LW said. "I wouldn't dare not post if we are having an event" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019). At the same time, LW feels like there is a long way to go to make the museum's social media a good relationship-building tool, especially as people tend to look up the museum's social media accounts to learn more about the organization. LW said, "I think for us, because we're so new, people are kind of shocked that we exist. 'Oh, there's an art museum in [city]?' So they'll probably go first to Facebook and look at museums in the city" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019). The social media from Museum D must showcase exactly what the museum is about, so when patrons attend (as LW says they do) as a result of seeing a post, their trust in the organization and its social media increases.

Again, due to the beginning stage in which Museum D finds itself, much of the survey response to the questions measuring trust is overwhelmingly neutral—more so even than the responses in the satisfaction section.

For example, in response to "[Museum D] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons," there were 19 (82.61%) neutral responses, and 4 (17.39%) responses. The other questions of this section yielded similar response. These do reflect the museum's perception as well, as noted by LW. While social media is bringing attention to the museum and sometimes leads to an in-person experience, in general, there is no concept of trust here simply because there is such little interaction between the public and the museum at this point in the museum's development.

Control mutuality. LW is working hard to stay on top of social media information and trends in order to create content that does increase engagement and leads to an increase in museum attendance. LW also recognizes the importance of meeting potential followers where they are. For example, LW is trying to make more of an effort on the museum's Instagram. LW said, "I'm not as comfortable with it [Instagram] so I don't put the effort in with Instagram that I should. But I'm aware of that and we'll work to fix it. Because I know there are people that don't mess with Facebook anymore" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019). LW's awareness of needing to work with the patrons instead of forcing them into participating with the museum on the museum's terms is commendable. In the future, Museum D would do well to continue this attitude in order to have a strong element of control mutuality in their OPR.

Again, the responses to these questions were overwhelmingly neutral (both questions in this section receiving 77.27% neutral response). However, a slight difference in the level of positive response is interesting to note. In the statement "When interacting with [Museum D], patrons feel a sense of control," there were only 2 (9.09%) "strongly agree" responses. However, the statement, "[Museum D] cooperates with patrons," there were 4 (18.18%) "strongly agree" responses. While the difference is minimal, in this particular case, it is significant because it shows that while patrons do not feel particularly involved in the balance of control, they do feel like the museum is an entity that is cooperative and will listen to patrons.

Commitment. While not discussed in the interview directly, commitment is the overarching goal and desire for Museum D. As such a new museum in an art-minded town, it should not be terribly difficult to convince locals to engage with the organization. However, the more difficult aspect will be showing that Museum D values their followers and patrons in a way that encourages long-term commitment and support.

Again, the results of this section were very neutral, though none negative. This is promising. The questions of this section read, "[Museum D] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship with patrons," "[Museum D] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons," and "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum D]." Though still new in town, it is encouraging for Museum D to note that while over 60% of the responses to these questions were neutral, over 30% of them "strongly agree." This is an excellent trajectory for this museum. It can be a very attainable goal to move some of those neutral votes over into the more committed "somewhat agree" and "strongly agree" categories.

Engagement. Within the first section of the survey, which deals with current engagement with Museum D on social media, most question responses followed an inverted bell curve pattern. For example, in response to the question, "How often do you read posts/watch videos by [Museum D]?", five (19%) said weekly, three (11.54%) said monthly, one (3.85%) said between 1-5 times a year, two (7.69%) said rarely, and 15 (57.69%) said that they have never read posts/watched videos from Museum D on Facebook. Similar patterns were present in asking about frequency of commenting, tagging others, or sending direct messages, though each had progressively fewer that indicated that they were doing the action more than monthly. In the set of questions dealing with Instagram, the pattern tended toward "never" on all questions of engagement. This is reflective of LW's efforts on Facebook as compared to Instagram.

LW describes the ideal engagement for Museum D to include "being conscientious of and building a community" (LW, personal communication, November 11, 2019). While engagement—likes, comments, shares, DMs, tagging others—is currently minimal, the museum can learn to create content that encourages the more "committed" engagement, the higher level of commitments, such as commenting or sharing or creating content about the museum.

Future behaviors. The final section of the survey asked about future behaviors. These, surprisingly, elicited similar patterns of response (mostly neutral). The first question of this section reads "I would recommend visiting [Museum D] to others." Eight (34.78%) answered "strongly agree," one (4.35%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (56.52%) responded neutrally, and one (4.35%) responded "strongly disagree." The other responses in this section, which involved actually attending the museum and continuing to follow the museum on social media, received similar responses.

The overwhelmingly neutral responses to the perception and future behavior sections could be because there is little OPR between patrons and Museum D due to its newness in the community. This is a great opportunity for Museum D to turn neutral perceptions into positive ones and start solidifying relationships through their social media efforts. However, the lack of commitment as it pertains to future behaviors is concerning and Museum D should immediately implement social media campaigns to increase awareness of and interest in the museum and how it serves the community.

The final question of the survey was an optional short-answer response. The question presented was "How do you perceive [Museum D's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" This question received 13 responses, which I categorized into four groups: positive, neutral, negative, and unrelated. Overwhelmingly, the responses were unrelated to the museum's social media efforts and instead focused on the fact that they did not know about the museum at all (which also accounts for the many neutral responses in the survey). Some of these responses included "The last I had heard, [Museum D] was doing pop-up events and had no permanent location. This survey is the first time I found out it really exists. I hope to visit as soon as the weather improves. June, perhaps."; "This is the first time I've heard

of it."; "Have never visited the place. In fact I didn't even know it existed. What's the location?";

"Didn't know the museum existed. Start there."

Other responses to this open-ended question were either neutral or negative about

Museum D's relationship-building via social media. These responses included: "I feel they have

room for improvement. I think they are still trying to figure out how to best use social media

with the museum."; "I have seen very few social media posts about the museum and until I

recently read a short article about the museum I didn't know that [location] had an art museum.";

and "I think it needs to be more active and interactive!"

Conclusion of results of Museum D. Based on my semi-structured interview with LW,

Museum D museum understands the impact and how the relationships between themselves and

the audiences can increase in engagement on social media. Because the museum is new, they

have not had a lot of traffic or awareness campaigning to bring awareness to their new location,

so social media has previously been their only real tool in building relationships with patrons.

They believe it has worked to this point but now need to level up, so to speak, in order to

increase the number of people with whom they are building relationships through social media.

Overall, they perceive their efforts positively, though knowing that there is likely more they

could be doing to build strong relationships via social media.

While the mostly-neutral survey responses could be somewhat discouraging, it also

presents a wonderful opportunity for Museum D to take advantage of their social media tabula

rasa and build more engaged, connected relationships with local patrons. Clearly LW

understands the impact that social media can have, but I see that the survey responses mostly

indicate that few people have any relationship with the museum at all. All four elements of

OPR—trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction—are lacking for this brand-new

museum. The museum is currently in a good position to have immediate impact by taking any sort of strategic social media action.

Museum E

Museum E is a medium-sized museum based in a large city in the western United States. Museum E has 4,986 followers on Facebook and 2,094 followers on Instagram. This museum primarily exhibits art and is located in a city of 716,492 (census.gov/popclock). The original museum opened in 2003 but relocated to a new building elsewhere in the city in March 2018. As with all the museums, I had a video-recorded semi-structured interview, after which I distributed the survey to the 40-mile radius around this museum via Facebook ads. There were 53 total respondents to this survey geographically targeting a 40-mile radius around this museum.

I conducted an interview with the Chief Operating Officer at Museum E, to whom I will refer as CS. As COO, CS is responsible for myriad departments, projects, and initiatives at Museum E, including social media content and strategy management. The museum has a full-time staff of eleven, with some part-time employees to bring the total to 20 staff.

Their social media efforts have waxed and waned in different seasons, as they have tried to hire a new staff member to run the social media who has marketing, PR, and digital expertise. They have just hired someone to fill that role, but at the time of this interview they were still determining how to best utilize social media to build relationships with patrons. CS described the situation: "We had social media accounts in the past but weren't really spending a lot of time or energy promoting it, making it a viable channel to really engage people. So as we move into 2020 and 2021, we are really paying a lot of resources into making sure that we spend a lot more time and energy into our marketing and PR" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019).

CS describes the community they serve as quite diverse, as they are located in a major metropolis. That said, the museum patron demographic tends to be more homogeneous. CS said, "Our audience tends to skew older. Our core audience tends to be the 50 to 65 and older. Knowing that, traditional media seems to be the thing, that tends to be a little more costly than digital media" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019). Even with this older demographic, CS feels confident that with the right expertise, the museum can reach that group on social media. "We're just hoping to use all the media available to use in the best ways we possibly can, including developing these campaigns, scheduling them out, and coordinating all of that. It's a lot for one person" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019).

The age of the respondents followed a similar pattern of other museums' respondents, with more respondents being older. Of the 53 respondents, none were between the ages of 18-24, seven (13.21%) were between 25-34, six (11.32%) were between 35-44, eight (15.09%) were between 45-54, 14 (26.42%) were between 55-64, and 18 (33.96%) were 65+. Just over 58% of respondents were female and 37% were male, 1.89% identified as another gender, and 1.89% preferred not to answer. Forty-seven (83.93%) respondents were White, one was Asian, two were of an ethnicity not listed, and two preferred to not answer their ethnicity.

Satisfaction. Overall, this museum is earnestly trying to shift away from more marketing strategy on social media and instead assess the needs of their community in order to use their social media to build relationships. Overall, Museum E perceives that their patrons view their efforts positively, as evidenced through their observations of the type of engagement they do get. "I would say comments, likes, messages, you know, any sort of that promotes a conversation or that shows that they had some sort of reaction to the content. Both positive and negative. Although I would say most of ours is positive reviews," said CS (CS, personal communication,

December 2, 2019). These "positive reviews" are what constitute the museum's perception of providing satisfaction to their patrons and followers.

In reality, as shown by responses to the survey questions, there are many areas of satisfaction in which the museum is doing well and others that are more concerning. While the responses skew positively, rather than neutrally or negatively, there is a varied response for each question of this section. That said, each statement received at least one "strongly disagree" response. For Museum E, it would be worth delving deeper into this element of satisfaction to determine what exactly is working for patrons and what is not working. From there, the museum can build a social media strategy to address the issues and increase the awareness of the areas that are the most satisfying.

Trust. In our interview, CS expressed that when Museum E is making a concerted effort on social media, they see an increase of in-person visits, which they feel is truly what builds strong OPR. When people visit in-person, that is when the relationship between Museum E and a patron really solidifies. CS said, "Something we hear a lot from people who visit the museum is that it feels like someone's home, and that everyone is so nice here. We really take the time to talk to visitors. [...]It's very homey, so everyone kind of feels that warmth. And I think that's the best way we kind of connect with people" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019). In order to increase trust via social media, Museum E must translate that "homey" in-person experience to the social media experience. This can be done through types of content, tone, frequency of posts, and consistent effort.

Museum E has a strong start in their social media efforts, but have not been consistent, which can negatively affect trust. However, the museum is aware of their deficiencies and is working to improve and increase trust using their social media channels. For Museum E, they

believe that the best relationships with patrons still happen in-person at the museum but concede that many people—both patrons and non-patrons—will learn about and first discover the museum on social media.

The survey responses measuring trust yielded varying results. The statement, "[Museum E] treats patrons fairly and justly," was met with quite positive results, with 58.49% answering "strongly agree," 7.55% answering "somewhat agree, 26.42% answering neutrally, 1.89% answering "somewhat disagree," and 5.66% answering "strongly disagree." This statement received varied response, skewing positive, but still worth making an effort to increase trust at the museum and online.

Other responses in this section yielded more neutral responses, including questions about patrons feeling like they are considered in museum decision-making and the museum keeping promises. These elements of trust can be improved easily on social media and Museum E would be wise to do so very soon.

Control mutuality. Their social media efforts thus far have been generally positive, but CS feels that there is definitely more to be done to really build strong relationships using social media, particularly in reaching new followers or those who are not yet patronizing the museum. CS said, "I think maybe we've fallen into the trap of, 'Oh well I'll just post on Facebook and post this and that and we'll automatically get all these new followers and audiences to the museum.' I think we ended up just shouting to our own people that already have been here and already like us, and not attracting new people" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019). Instead of using social media as a relationship-building tool, they have been using it as a marketing tool to "sell" exhibitions and events. The museum currently does not have any information about any attendance in exhibitions or events due to these social media efforts.

CS has ideas of how to make Museum E's social media more of that relationship-building tool and is hoping that an expert staff member in this area will help. CS said, "We hear from visitors all the time, like, once you're here you're like, 'Oh my gosh, this is so cool.' So using a visual medium [Instagram] to show our space, I think is kind of a no-brainer and we should have been doing it a long time ago. [...] I think the hesitation to doing it earlier was just manpower. [...] It's something we're still not great at is we tend to post the same thing across all platforms, which you're not supposed to do, which is not a best practice" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019).

Museum E is aware of the deficiency in this area and again, needs to align the in-person experience with the social media experience, in order to bring more people to the in-person experience. The survey results for control mutuality were mostly neutral, but none negative, which reflect the effort that the museum has put into this area. For both questions in this area, 77.27% answered neutrally, and the remaining answered either "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree."

Commitment. My interview with CS did not yield specific information about the museum's perception of their effort to increase commitment among their patrons. This is likely an area that Museum E is managing to accomplish at an acceptable level for most of their patrons by the way they have already been operating. That said, there is always room for improvement. Patrons can be lukewarm committed or they can truly be an advocate for the organization, as discussed by Steers and Porter (1991).

All of the survey responses in this area were either neutral or positive, which is encouraging. For all three questions in this area, the majority answered neutrally. These questions asked about patrons' perceptions of the museum's desire to forge long-term and

positive relationships with patrons, as well as a patron's feelings of loyalty to the museum. Again, the fact that there were no negative responses in this area is encouraging, but a neutral response is not an indicator of strong OPR.

Engagement. CS mentioned in the interview that Museum E does not currently gather analytics about social media engagement but understands the importance of understanding the engagement to see what type of audience response and relationship they are building with their social media efforts. The engagement CS is referring to includes likes, shares, and comments. CS understands that measuring engagement is really the only way to assess their metrics of "success" and that some sort of analytics workflow should be implemented immediately.

Within the first section of the survey dealing with current engagement behaviors, most respondents answered "never" in having read a post by, commented on, tagged someone, or messaged Museum E directly on Facebook. The breakdown can be seen here: in response to "How often do you comment on posts by Museum E on Facebook?," 40 respondents (75.47%) have never commented. Eight (15.09%) indicated "rarely," two (3.77%) indicated "less than once a year," one (1.89%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," and two indicated "monthly." A similar pattern, though many more answering "never," could be seen on the responses to current engagement behaviors with Museum E on Instagram. This is typically the pattern for any social media engagement with any organization.

Future behavior. The last set of questions on the survey asked about patrons' future behaviors. The first statement read, "I would recommend visiting [Museum E] to others." The responses to this skewed very positive. Forty-two (79.25%) indicated "strongly agree," four (7.55%) indicated "somewhat agree," two (3.77%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree." A

nearly identical answer pattern occurred in response to "I plan on visiting [Museum E] sometime within the next three years."

The two other questions in this section followed a different response pattern but were nearly identical to one another. The next statement reads, "I would continue following [Museum E] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Twenty-six (49.06%) indicated "strongly agree," ten (18.87%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (24.53%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree." The next statement read, "I plan on continuing to follow [Museum E] on social media for at least another year" and was met with very similar responses.

The last question was an optional short-answer response that allowed patrons to write their response to the prompt, "How do you perceive the [Museum E's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" There were 27 responses, which I sorted into four categories: positive, neutral, negative, and unrelated.

A lot of respondents did not realize Museum E was on social media at all. Some did not provide responses to the prompt but instead provided critiques of the museum's policy of not allowing young children, such as "I will not return because you have banned children from your museum. Figure out how to make more items childproof so our grandkids can enjoy our history!"; "I'm not sure. Most of my answers in this survey related to them not allowing children in their space, which is really inconvenient. I also think it sends the wrong message about who art is for" (off-topic); These responses could inform some of the negative responses in the previous survey questions.

Other responses provided valuable critiques of how the museum could improve their social media efforts: "[Museum E] could be more active on social media and utilize the different

features each platform has in order to engage with the public. For example, Instagram polls, Q&A, etc." Still others were not impressed with the efforts and could not see themselves interacting with Museum E on social media: "I don't think about it at all"; "It could also have patrons taking selfies constantly and not paying attention to the art"; "inadequate"; "I live on the cutting edge of obsolescence so am not social media savvy"; "I don't see a lot on FB, and use no other social media."

Conclusion of Museum E results. Both Museum E's perceptions (through the lens of CS) and the survey indicate that patrons of Museum E may feel that the museum is doing an adequate job to build relationships with patrons, but that the efforts seem insincere or there are aspects of the relationship that need strengthening. In particular, elements of satisfaction and trust need the most work, while control mutuality and commitment are the strongest (though both of those could also use some immediate attention).

The general sentiment is that patrons do not feel a particularly strong relationship with Museum E. Museum E can take advantage of the fact that not many respondents knew the museum was on social media to roll out brand-new campaigns and try new things to turn the museum's social media into a relationship-building tool. These survey results do correspond to the information from the semi-structured interview in that CS knew that they had some engagement that tended to skew positively, though they felt that there was a lot more they should be doing to use social media as a way to build OPR.

Museum F

Museum F is a medium-sized museum based in a large city in the midwestern United States. Museum F has 18,665 followers on Facebook and 5,014 followers on Instagram. This museum primarily exhibits art and is located in a city of 302,605 (census.gov/popclock). This

museum has been in operation since 1932. As with all the museums, I had a video-recorded semi-structured interview with the staff member at Museum F, after which I distributed the survey to the 40-mile radius around this museum via Facebook ads.

I conducted my semi-structured interview with the newly-hired senior manager of marketing and engagement of Museum F, hereby called "SD."

SD described the effectiveness of their social media as "I think it depends on what audience you're trying to reach. A big core demographic for us is going to be the 65 plus, but we're also trying to reach people who are younger and more diverse, as are probably most museums" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019). SD explains the demographics of their followers as "We are on Facebook and Instagram. As it stands, our Facebook primary demographic of the most populous is females aged 35 to 44. And then for Instagram, it is females 25 to 34, so younger. A different generation" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

Museum F is utilizing Facebook and Instagram and have primarily been using those to promote exhibitions, events, and programming, with not as much focus on the relationship-building potential of those platforms. SD manages all the social media and was in their first month on the job when I conducted my interview. They are still working through how to improve the social media strategy but are clear that there does need to be a drastic change. SD said, "The ways that we attract people are through the programming and through the exhibit itself. So, I'm in the process of developing those digital campaign strategies and we are figuring out what will work. There's never been a strategy before. So to be honest, we're just going to throw some money at the cause with educated guessing and then go from there" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

Because of bandwidth restraints, SD says it is difficult to broaden the scope of social media efforts. "We have to be realistic of the resources we have in-house. Meaning that if we had a larger team, it would be great to have extremely different content on both [Facebook and Instagram]," (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

For the survey, the demographics were similar to those of other museums' respondents. The age breakdown of the 53 respondents were predominantly older. Twenty-five respondents (48.08%) were 65 years old or older, 16 (30.77%) were between 55-64, five (9.62%) were between 45-54, three (5.77%) were between 35-44, none were between 25-34, and three (5.77%) were between 18-24. The respondents to this survey were predominantly female (88.46%), while 9.62% respondents were male, and 1.92% preferred to not indicate their gender. In keeping with the ethnicity demographics from the other surveys, the respondents to this survey were predominantly White. Forty-six (85.19%) were White, one was Black, one was Hispanic/Latinx, four were of an ethnicity not listed, and two preferred not to answer.

As always, the survey consists of questions to assess current engagement, perceptions of the museum's social media efforts to build relationships, and finally, future behaviors.

Satisfaction. SD's plan as they embark on their journey with Museum F is to turn the museum's social media into a viable tool for building strong relationships with patrons, which is lacking in their current strategy. SD said, "I am a firm believer in quality over quantity. Except for when it comes to admissions. We want people in the doors. But I do think that quality drives quantity. So if we're giving good quality messaging experiences, whether it's in person or on social media, then that will lead to them speaking highly of us. [...] So, if we have a good relationship with people, they're going to tell 25 more people, but if they have a bad relationship with us, they'll tell 50. That's just how it works. So it's important that we keep positive contact

with people who like us. [...] So it might be a slower and steadier burn, but it's a more sustainable one" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019). SD's efforts are to understand the baseline of what people do like and do not like and then provide more of that, as well as to understand the needs and desires of the patrons.

The survey responses to the questions measuring satisfaction yielded mostly positive results with the majority of responses in the "strongly agree category." In every question response, however, there were at least 17% neutral and at least 5.77% negative responses. The most concerning set of responses from this set of questions was in response to "Patrons feel important to [Museum F.] Only 19 (36.54%) answered "strongly agree," while 15 (28.85%) answered "somewhat agree," 13 (25%) answered neutrally, and five (9.62%) answered "somewhat disagree." This is a worrisome breakdown of responses and worth immediate action on the part of the museum. Making patrons feel important is a crucial component of OPR satisfaction and can easily be done on social media.

Trust. My interview with SD did not yield any specifics about the museum's efforts to increase their patrons' trust in the museum. Trust can easily be built through a coordinated effort between positively presenting the museum on social media and providing an experience to match, whether interacting with the museum on those social media platforms or in-person. These questions proved slightly polarizing in the survey responses. Responses to the four questions measuring trust had the majority of responses in "strongly agree" or "neutral," with a few of the "somewhat agree," "somewhat disagree," and "strongly disagree" throughout. Generally, though, it seems that patrons have either had an experience that has solidified their trust in the museum or they have not noticed any particular trust at all. Museum F can use this information to start

providing content and experiences on social media that will foster experiences of trust between patrons and the organization. Listening to the needs of the patrons is a great way to start.

Control mutuality. SD is cautious about giving into institutional pressure that says that Museum F must be on every platform, instead focusing on what affordances the platforms can provide to benefit both the museum and its audiences. "I think a lot of people don't think bigger in terms of strategy," SD said. "I would think, 'Do I need a Facebook for this? Do I need to do that? What makes sense for my museum?' They need to decide who their audiences are and who they're trying to target" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

SD believes that the museum is a positive influence for their patrons but doesn't necessarily think that they have developed particularly strong relationships with patrons through their social media efforts. Similarly, SD's perception of what the patrons think of the museum is not very promising either. "It's definitely different than what I want it to be," SD said of their perception of how locals see the museum. "For the general audience, I don't know if they would know what we were and that's the only way I can describe it. I don't know if they would know what we offer or even what's inside" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

The survey responses reflected SD's perceptions of how they see the patrons' experience with control mutuality. The majority of responses were neutral with the most "somewhat disagree" answers of the entire survey. In answer to "When interacting with [Museum F], patrons feel a sense of control," there were 27 (51.92%) neutral responses and 9 (17.31%) "somewhat disagree" responses. There were more of these "somewhat disagree" responses than either the "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" responses. This should raise a red flag for Museum F in addressing this issue immediately, which can be done on social media. First steps would be to

ask patrons about their needs and desires, act on those steps, and then showcase on social media the changes occurring because of patrons' suggestions and opinions.

Commitment. Commitment is the antecedent to engagement, so many museums are focused on it without being intentional about it. This is certainly the case with Museum F. SD did not mention any particular efforts to increase patron commitment but did mention a desire for more engagement. The commitment, as reflected in survey responses, showcased a surprising amount of commitment as per the lack of effort the museum has put into this component of OPR. All of the questions had majority positive responses with a high number of neutral responses and few negative responses. For example, in response to "[Museum F] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons," 38.46% indicated "strongly agree," 19.23% indicated "somewhat agree," 38.46% indicated neutrally, 1.92% indicated "somewhat disagree," and 1.92% indicated "strongly disagree." Overall, it seems that the patrons of Museum F are generally committed to and supportive of the organization.

Engagement. Because SD was only within their first month of working at Museum F, there was no real discussion of the types of engagement the museum is hoping for. The general "likes, comments, and shares" was brought up as a goal for social media platform engagement, without any real specifics beyond that.

The first section of the survey explores current engagement. In asking about reading Facebook posts from Museum F, commenting, tagging others, or direct messaging Museum F, about 75% of respondents indicated either "never" or "rarely" as their answer for all. For the same questions about Instagram, nearly 90% of respondents answered "never" or "rarely" for all levels of engagement. Clearly there is very little direct engagement with Museum F and patrons do not feel close enough to want to share or interact with the museum on social media. This is

concerning for a museum of this size, which has been in operation and part of the community for decades. Museum F must immediately create social media strategies to encourage commitment and higher levels of engagement, or else they risk becoming obsolete within their community.

Future behavior. The last portion of the survey dealt with future behaviors. The two questions that asked about visiting the museum in person were slightly more positive than those that asked about continuing to follow Museum F on social media. The answers to "I would recommend visiting [Museum F] to others" were very positive. Thirty-nine (75%) answered "strongly agree." Eight (15.38%) answered "somewhat agree," four (7.69%) answered neutrally, and one (1.92%) answered "somewhat disagree." No respondents answered "strongly disagree." The next statement read, "I plan on visiting [Museum F] sometime within the next three years." An overwhelming majority of 46 respondents (88.46%) answered "strongly agree," five (9.62%) answered "somewhat agree," and one (1.92%) answered "neither agree nor disagree." The results for future behaviors regarding continuing to follow Museum F's social media were very similar and still positive, but slightly less so. These responses are very encouraging, showing a level of commitment and engagement that was not reflected in the survey responses. Museum F has the benefit of secretly-loyal local patrons who, despite the shortcomings in the relationship between the museum and the patrons, feel that they will continue to support the institution.

The last question on the survey was an optional open-response wherein respondents could provide a response to the prompt, "How do you perceive [Museum F]'s social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" There were 24 responses that ranged from positive, negative, neutral, unrelated.

Much of the feedback was positive: ""Excellent"; "They keep me well informed on Facebook"; "[Museum F] is attempting to strengthen its relationship with the public by stepping

up its social media efforts. The more the museum publicizes its events the more the public will attend those events"; and "I think they are positive in terms of increasing awareness" (positive).

Other responses were either unrelated to social media or expressed that they were unaware of Museum F on social media. These types of posts made up nine of the 24 responses to this question. There were only two negative answers in the free response.

Conclusion of Museum F results. Overall, the perceptions are quite positive, though still reflecting the feeling that SD expressed in the interview, that while positive, there likely is not a strong sense of relationship between the museum and its patrons. One of the responses to the final question on the survey said, "[...] I feel that you are providing info but I don't feel I'm in a relationship." This perfectly summarizes the perception that SD had about the museum's social media efforts and provides a roadmap for Museum F moving forward. Their patrons want a more robust relationship with Museum F but are currently having to settle for the mere ghost of a relationship.

<center>Discussion</center>

While all six museums had very different purposes and missions for their organizations, as well as different annual attendance and social media followership, all museums expressed a desire to better utilize social media to build relationships with patrons. All museums also expressed their perceptions that patrons viewed the museum in a positive light, though to varying degrees. This discussion section addresses RQ4 (What coorientation state exists between the museums and their local publics in evaluation of their shared relationship?), as well as RQ 1-3 by analyzing themes and data from across all six of the case studies to evaluate the museums' perceptions of their OPR work on social media to the perceptions that their patrons have of those

same initiatives. The data in this section is not new, but simply interprets the results in a method that allows for focus on the coorientation model, as stated in RQ4.

Museum Perspective

Conducting semi-structured interviews with museum social media managers provided valuable insights into the research questions and provided the vital component of museum perspective to the coorientation model analysis of this study. These semi-structured interviews yielded important themes that can inspire and motivate museums to use their communication tools more effectively.

All six museum social media managers recognized that while social media can build relationships with their publics, many explained that their social media strategy was instead more focused on advertising events and programming at the museum. This observation is covered extensively by Capriotti (2013). There were varying degrees of success with this model.

In asking what social media managers hoped to accomplish by using social media, answers varied from "to get more attention from younger audiences," "to start getting known in the town," to "create engaging content that makes people feel like they're here." Though no one said it directly, the underlying theme for all museums is that they utilize social media to encourage people to visit the museum in-person. While Museum C, for example, is a national museum and has followers from around the country who will never visit, their primary social media goal is still to use the tool to engage and satisfy followers, and then welcome those followers as they become in-person visitors to the museum.

 While this is the ultimate goal of every museum interviewed for this study, not many of the museums were using social media as a primary relationship-building tool. That usage was

either subconscious or secondary to the goal of showcasing events, exhibitions, and programming with the hope of "getting engagement."

Museum perception of their attempts to build relationships vary by museum. Some, like Museum D, recognized that because they are new in the community and are not comfortable on some platforms, that they are still deficient in how they are building relationships with their publics. Others, like Museum E, are in a large metropolitan area and perceive that they are not actually building strong relationships through social media, but instead rely more on previous press coverage and in-person visits to build relationships with their public. And museums like Museum B, which are small organizations in small towns feel that they are succeeding in building relationships through social media, which may be slightly faulty logic as their public might feel committed already, due to their mission and local appeal.

I find that there is a disconnect between museum goals and the means by which they hope to reach those goals. All of the museums examined for this study hope for increased attendance and engagement, which are outcomes of strong OPR. However, their usage of social media instead is primarily focused on luring people in for one-time attendance and engagement, hoping that if they can get them into the museum once they will be able to then build a strong relationship with that patron. Instead, solidifying the relationship before a patron attends will yield stronger OPR and more satisfied, trusting, participatory, and committed patrons who will naturally increase museum attendance and online engagement because of the strength of that museum-patron relationship.

Besides the issues of OPR discussed above, other common themes emerged across all of these museum case studies, which themes seemed to be pertinent to their ability to use social media to build relationships with their local audiences.

The person with whom I conducted the semi-structured interview for each museum was the person with primary responsibility over the museum's social media, including oversight of content and strategy. Often, however, this was not the sole focus of that person's job responsibilities; most people were doing social media and PR as a segment of their responsibilities, which also included education, curation, fundraising, advertising, and/or total directorship or museum management. As stated by CS of Museum E, "I'm the Chief Operating Officer at [Museum E]. [...] I'm really the day-to-day manager of the museum. So, what falls under me is the board management, the accounting, the HR, the facilities management, visitor services, volunteers fall under me as well. A lot of the interpretation actually gets filtered through my department as well. Group tours. [...] I'm on the fundraising team as well. And then I do the grants—writing the grants, administering the grants, and doing all the tracking and management of that as well. So, a little bit of everything" (CS, personal interview, December 2, 2019).

Every other interviewer expressed frustration with the bandwidth restrictions that made it impossible to do all that they wished they could do on social media. When asked what they would do if their entire job was managing the social media of their museums, answers ranged from "more videos," "more interviews because we know our followers enjoy those," "showing behind the scenes," and more. All had many ideas and were unable to fulfill the needs and wants of their publics because of their restricted bandwidth.

Another common theme that emerged across many of the museum interviews was that the person with the oversight over the social media strategy for the museum rarely had any professional or educational training in social media nor in public relations. Of course, they often were self-teaching these principles and had been doing social media for the museum for a

number of years which provides good training and practical experience. However, they were not professionals in the field of social media and PR and as such, often felt out of their comfort zone in being able to provide the most effective, engaging social media experience possible for their patrons. Some museums, such as Museum F, did have a person of expertise in the role, but that person was so new that they had not yet implemented any changes to the strategies. DW of Museum C has been at the museum for years, but social media was not always a part of their responsibilities. They have learned by doing, which can be frustrating, with slow progress. However, with the luxury of enough time, it can be done.

Patron Perceptions

All museums' patrons tended to skew positively on the perception questions, which had varying levels of positive responses, but overall it was very positive. Overall, those questions provided an insight into how satisfied the respondents are with the museum in general. Understanding when followers are reacting and engaging with your content, then providing more of that increases the level of satisfaction in the OPR.

Museum D had the lowest percentage of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" satisfaction survey scores out of the group of these six museums. This is likely because they are so new in their community and have not had a chance yet to know their audience, let alone their needs. Museum B had the highest percentage of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" satisfaction survey scores, which at first glance is surprising, due to their size and mission. However, it may indicate the "home team advantage" that small-town organizations have with their local publics, more than larger institutions.

Museum E had the highest percentage of "strongly disagree" and "somewhat disagree" satisfaction survey scores out of the group. Any museum with answers in these more negative

response categories should further their inquiry through more qualitative measures in order to pinpoint exactly what aspects of the museum-patron relationship are breaking down. Museum E is located in a major metropolitan city and may also be held to higher standards than they believe they ought to be and are unable to meet the requirements of their public.

For the element of satisfaction, according to the coorientation model, museum and museum patrons are generally in sync. For the most part, museums feel that their patrons are satisfied with their social media to build relationships and the patrons generally do feel satisfied with the museum's efforts. This fulfills the qualifications between organization and stakeholder having a shared perception of satisfaction, though museums must constantly monitor their social media efforts and their publics to make sure that they continue to satisfy their needs and wants from the organization-public relationship.

Trust was an element that did not come up in very many of the museum interviews. Perhaps this is because it seems to be woven into the other elements. However, any discord between expectations and reality for a museum patron will result in a lower trust, which then leads to the breakdown of the relationship. It is imperative that organizations actively work to increase their patrons' trust.

Trust was measured in the surveys by questions that asked respondents about their perceptions about the museum's tendency to keep promises, provide benefits, and consider their patrons as they make decisions. Generally, as with most of the responses, the answers were very positive. Museum B once again had the highest percentage of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" responses to the trust questions on the survey. This is likely because of the very personal relationships that patrons have with the owners and staff, or with the town itself. Museum A had the lowest percentages of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" answers. Museum A is well-

established in its city and has an active social media strategy to improve relationships, but this information should alert Museum A to the immediate need for a social media strategy to increase patrons' trust in the organization. Once again, Museum E had the highest percentage of negative responses in this section of the survey.

Nearly every interviewee expressed their desire for more mutual engagement and learning what their audiences actually want from the museum. There seems to be a level of misunderstanding between the museum and their audiences in understanding what the audiences actually want to see on social media that will encourage them to continue the relationship. As stated by CS from Museum E, "I'd like a higher engagement level, a lot more commentating, a lot more legs, a lot more conversation generating that sort of engagement. I think we do have a level of people who are interested, who comment back and forth, but there's always room for more and you really do want that level of interest" (CS, personal communication, December 2, 2019). For some museums, like Museum F, it is simply observing behaviors and engaging where possible: "We have someone that tries at least to respond to almost every message or comment, whether it's positive or negative because that's how people give us feedback now" (SD, personal communication, November 18, 2019).

Museum F, which had the most negative scores for satisfaction and trust, had the highest amount of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" scores for the survey questions in the control mutuality section. This is encouraging for Museum F, as they know that their public knows that the museum is willing to cooperate and work with them to make decisions and changes, so implementing strategies to increase trust and satisfaction are likely to be successful if Museum F can keep up their control mutuality. Museum A had the lowest percentages of these positive

responses, which now gives them the opportunity to practice building a sense of control mutuality, that can be simplified by strategic use of social media.

Museum E had the highest percentage of negative responses to the control mutuality survey questions, which indicates again that there is a breakdown between the organization and the patrons' expectations for how the balance of control has been and should be dispersed.

Commitment is different than the other elements of OPR in that it leads to engagement and future behavior (Waters, 2007). The final four questions of the surveys asked respondents about their intentions to recommend and attend the museum, as well as their intentions to continue following the museum on social media. As evidenced by responses from all museums' surveys, the responses with intention to attend, recommend, and follow were all extremely high. This was surprising, considering the somewhat low trust and control mutuality observations. In general, this bodes well for all the museums as they have a built-in loyalty from their local audiences that they can take advantage of in their social media strategy to build stronger relationships moving forward.

For some museums, the museum focus is the magic bullet that encourages commitment. As DW from Museum C states, "I think it's people who've been here who want to stay connected to what's going on or learn more about what's new or what's coming up. I think a lot of our followers are people who are just interested in the topic field. [...] many of them support the museums but will never visit. But, it has something to do with the museum's mission" (DW, personal communication, October 14, 2019).

Museum B had the highest percentage of "strongly agree" and "somewhat agree" responses to the survey questions about commitment. Again, this reflects the small-town nature of the museum and its mission. Museum A had the lowest percentage of these positive responses,

indicating that they can work to improve their patrons' desire to become part of the organization through online or in-person action. Museums C and E both had about the same percentage of the negative responses. Both of these museums are in large metropolitan areas and their patrons may not feel that being committed to an impersonal institution is worth the effort. These museums can work to create social media and in-person experiences that reward those who participate with them.

Overall, the perceptions of the museums and the perceptions of their publics are quite in line. For the most part, museum social media managers are aware of the deficiencies in their current ways of building relationships on social media and publics are willing to give their local museums the benefit of the doubt and a "home team" advantage. However, if museums do want to reach goals of increased attendance, more engagement, and fulfilling their missions, they must go beyond the bare expectations their audiences have by listening intently and responding by providing the resources that can build true relationships.

Practical Implications

This research provides valuable insights into how all museum personnel—especially communication managers—can more strategically use social media to build long-term relationships with their various stakeholder groups, instead of defaulting to the usual trite information blasts, as discussed by Lovejoy, Waters & Saxton (2012). Findings from all six of these case studies can provide insights to help all museums begin to shift their attention to relationship-building.

Listen to the public. Across all six museums, satisfaction did not seem to be a top priority. However, all museums did have an element of creating more posts and content that they believed would be "popular" or engaging to their public, which would increase satisfaction. On

social media, satisfaction is one of the easier OPR elements to cultivate. By asking the public what their needs and wants are, and then fulfilling those is an easy starting point. Most organizations may feel like they should tell their public what they want their public to know, when actually satisfaction occurs when the organization takes their cues from their publics.

Organizations may have trouble learning to shift from telling to listening. Implementing social media strategies to ask for patrons' opinions and needs, making subsequent changes (whether operationally or otherwise), and then showcasing these changes are important to indicate to the public that the organization is invested in them. Slowly the level of control mutuality should become more positive. However, acting upon stakeholder input can be difficult if the entire organization is not in agreement. In order to fully shift, there must be buy-in from the highest management levels of the organization.

On social media, regardless of the level of organizational buy-in about institutional change, museums can demonstrate their willingness to listen to stakeholders. For most museums, it is a culmination of providing for the needs and wants of the population that leads to this commitment. As stated by BK of Museum B, "Being friendly and connecting people to the mission of the town and organization goes a long way" (BK, personal communication, July 23, 2019). And JM of Museum A stated, "Ask your audience questions, and then respond. Throw them a line and give them something they can easily respond to. Be interesting" (JM, personal communication, July 19, 2019). Be authentic to the vision and mission of the organization, and sincerely ask stakeholders about their needs.

Know your audience like you know your museum. For any organization needing to increase the level of trust of their patrons, they must examine where the realities of interacting with the museum are falling short of patrons' expectations. Once identified, using social media to

address these issues and showcase change can increase the level of trust. From a coorientation model standpoint, trust did not come up in any of the semi-structured interviews. However, each museum representative expressed a desire to be a center within the community where people feel safe and supported. This indicates a desire to become a trustworthy organization and maintain that reputation.

Each museum organization has a duty to decide internally what the museum's expectations of itself is and to ask their patrons what their expectations are. Listen and learn from the patrons to understand their pain points and their perspectives. From there, organizations must measure for those elements they have gleaned from their publics, which will then allow them to gain perspective on how they believe their publics are seeing those efforts.

As evidenced by every museum in this study, the number of people participating in each level of social media engagement decreases as the level of engagement increases. This was true of every single data set of each case study in this study. Higher engagement levels require a stronger relationship between organization and member. When organizations can measure the different levels of engagement, they will sense when and how they are building that stronger relationship by the changes in the level of engagement. Understand the nuances of engagement on social media for your museum and your public in order to find a more complete picture if the museum is successfully building long-lasting relationships.

Understand social media's potential. Another common theme that emerged across all of these case studies is that many museum followers do not realize that there is any sort of social media strategy happening. This was most evident in the optional short-answer responses at the end of each survey. Many followers are participating with the museum social media in an apathetic way, not particularly caring if the museum ever posted again or not. Indeed, this is

often the case for many organizations. They feel that because social media is a new frontier of advertising they should have a presence on the major social media platforms, failing to realize that their presence on these platforms is affecting the public reputation and relationships they have with various stakeholders, whether for good or for ill. It is important for any organization to find the balance between being genuine to the museum mission and purpose while being conscientious of social media trends and to the varying opinions of the many audiences on social media. While you cannot please every stakeholder group with every post on social media, you can definitely disappoint all of them with a single misjudged post.

The most effective social media strategy for a museum includes ownership of one or two really great social media platforms that are strategic, consistent, and in keeping with the organization's mission and vision, rather than regurgitating the same information across all platforms, providing unimportant content, or posting irregularly. Merely being a presence on social media is not good OPR. Good OPR through social media occurs when the target stakeholders become invested and loyal to the organization by participating through the higher levels of engagement and behavior.

Theoretical Implications

This series of case studies, cross-examined using OPR and coorientations as a guide sheds light on both of these theoretical principles. Many prior studies have urged future researchers to further study OPR in non-profit settings, including cultural institutions (Lovejoy, Waters, & Saxton, 2012; Men & Tsai, 2012). Only a few studies have delved into OPR and museums, and none to this point have considered museum OPR through the coorientation model. This study is one of the first to look at perceptions of museums' use of social media as an OPR tool while also comparing this to the perceptions of their publics. This study provides a pattern

by which to more effectively understand museum OPR—by way of the coorientation model of examining perceptions from both the organization and its public. The OPR literature indicates that modeling OPR from this coorientation perspective is really the only way to truly understand OPR (Avery, Lariscy, & Sweetser, 2010; Brønn & Brønn, 2003).

Social media is an amazing OPR tool, but this study supports the literature in that it shows museums are not running a sophisticated strategy, and thus are not utilizing social media to its fullest relationship-building potential as other types of businesses and organizations might be (Capriotti, Carréton, & Castillo, 2016; Cho, Schweickart, & Haase, 2014). In addition, this study also utilizes Hon and Grunig's 1999 OPR elements as the measures of the strength of OPR, which has been done in many types of organization, but until this study, has not seen museums analyzed by these criteria.

In addition, most museum social media managers feel that they could build stronger relationships with visitors if they could just get them in the doors of the museum. Studies and evaluation tools have been developed to measured and evaluation the patron experience within the museum, but very little has been done to understand what the processes before and after a museum visit are, and how the museum-patron relationship factors into that. This study provides the first steps into understanding the museum-patron relationship and where the museum should focus immediate attention in their social media strategy.

Limitations and Future Research

There are limitations to this study and future researchers would do well to replicate this study in a way that eliminates these limitations. A major pitfall of qualitative research lies in that it is more difficult to generalize to another situation, while quantitative methodology does not account for the nuances in human behavior within the data (Yin, 2009). However, by conducting

a study in which both methodologies are used, I was able to capture the human motivations of both museum communication professionals and their publics, as well as the actual engagement data. The case study also provides a practical application of my research to those in the museum communications field, more so than would using solely qualitative or quantitative research. A limitation of the choice to use a case study methodology is that it provides such a small sample and may not be generalizable to other museums.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted via video call, which proved a good method to communicate with these museum professionals. However, a more structured survey may have yielded more responses that specifically tied into the four OPR elements. While the interview guide was comprised of questions adapted from previous studies involving OPR, I found that because the interviews were semi-structured, I did not cover the exact same ground in every interview which may have caused some interviews to be more relevant than others.

Additionally, all interview data that I analyzed came from these interviews with just one museum staff member—whoever was primarily responsible for social media management at the museum. This was analyzed as the museum's holistic perception, while in reality, one single interview is quite biased and cannot be presumed to be the perception of the whole leadership and staff of a museum. There may be some incongruence issues as result of this bias.

I analyzed the surveys for each museum through an observational, qualitative lens in order to find data with which to compare the data from the semi-structured interviews with museum staff. None of the surveys yielded enough respondents to provide a viable sample size for running statistical analysis on any of the museum surveys, therefore I undertook a qualitative analysis approach for the surveys which is not a common methodology in analyzing survey data.

Another limitation includes the very wide spread of followers of museums. Future research studies in this topic might look only at museums with high numbers of followers or only with low numbers of followers.

Additionally, there is not an even distribution across age, gender, nor ethnicity occurred in the responses to any of the surveys for any of the six studied museums.

The limitations of this study are varied and plentiful, providing many directions for future research. Of course, there are only six museums featured in this study, which provides a miniscule slice of the museums in the United States. Additionally, all six vary dramatically in size, annual attendance, purpose, focus of permanent collection, social media strategy, and geographic location. Future research can replicate this study focusing on any of the above-mentioned parameters. For example, studying only medium-sized or national-scale art museums could be niche foci that could provide additional insight that would be more generalizable to that niche population. Other limitations include the number of responses in the surveys. Each museum collected a different number of surveys, none of which had enough to be statistically significant (n=400). Instead, these surveys were analyzed in more of a qualitative methodology, to work in tandem with the qualitative semi-structured interviews and doing comparisons that way. Future research could extend the run of the surveys in order to gain more responses and then analyze the data using quantitative statistical methodology.

Another limitation of this study is that these surveys ran only through Facebook ads. Running the surveys by using the actual museum emails of each institution, other platforms, geo-targeted Google ads, or other methods would provide different results. Future research could also study more museums. This study was originally intended to contain ten different museums but only six museums agreed to participate in the study during the recruitment phase. The more

museums, the more the results will start to become generalizable. The results of this study are not to be generalized but instead to identify common themes, problems, and issues across the social media of these organizations, which themes will be more generalizable, applicable, and useful to other museums than the actual numerical data or content of the semi-structured interviews.

Another limitation is the scope and timing of this study. Ideally, this study would take place over many years so as to gather more museums and more survey participants, but that was not possible for this study. Future research may also choose to focus on the content of various museums' social media, conducting content analyses to assess the most effective types of content for museum engagement and best OPR.

Conclusion

Research indicates that social media is a very valuable tool for businesses and organizations to employ in building strong relationships and loyalty, which, in turn, increase sales and services. Nonprofit cultural institutions, including museums, could be a part of this but they tend to lag behind the regular patterns seen in businesses and nonprofits. This is usually due to small staff not trained in social media communications. The result is social media is being thrown upon someone who already is managing several different aspects of the museum. The social media then becomes a regurgitation of uninteresting and impersonal posts and information that do nothing to spark interest within a patron or potential patron.

This study aims to see if museums' perceptions of their OPR using social media is matching what their followers' perceptions of the museums' efforts are. All museum social media managers interviewed indicated that they believed social media to be a great tool for building relationships and that their own museums' social media were perceived positively with good information. Overall, that proved to be true—respondents in the studies did have positive

perceptions about the museum in general. And within the core elements of OPR, as outlined by Hon and Grunig (1999), museums tend to have satisfaction and commitment built in with their local audiences, regardless of how much effort they put into maintaining those relationships on social media.

This study aligns with the research in showing that, in order to have the most success with OPR through social media, museums must hire social media experts to make their social media efforts worth something, rather than just a digital billboard ad. Low effort on the side of the museum tends to mean low relationship engagement on the side of the patron.

That said, all of the museums studied here are engaged in some sort of education or study, or show interest, in increasing their social media engagement and OPR. However, through no fault of the museum, the stretched bandwidth of the staff and the limited resources take a toll. This often means they are unable to form meaningful relationships that would help increase donations and loyalty from in-person visits.

Museums must adjust their social media strategies from simply an advertising tool and instead consider the widespread effect of building loyal patrons through social media. As indicated by this study, the number of followers does not matter—it is the careful consideration of reaching a specific audience with the intention to make them fall in love with the museum.

Since finishing this study, the COVID-19 pandemic has swept across the globe, forcing thousands of museums to close their doors for undetermined lengths of time while still trying to remain engaged with their patrons and audiences. Social media has become even more crucial for these organizations, as they now exist solely online, without the benefit of events and programming to provide fodder for posts. Still, there is a huge opportunity for museums to build strong relationships with the public, even without a physical venue. Museums can utilize the

principles of OPR in this study and also take the opportunity to understand their audiences'

perceptions and what their needs and wants are. And hopefully, when the museum doors reopen,

an eager crowd of patrons will be ready to support that organization with whom they have

developed a positive, long-lasting relationship.

References

American Alliance of Museums, (2008), "Museum Facts and Data." Retrieved from

    https://www.aam-us.org/programs/about-museums/museum-facts-data/

Antonsson, K. (2015). How to Snapchat, LACMA Style. Retrieved from

    https://unframed.lacma.org/2015/11/16/how-snapchat-lacma-style.

Avery, E., Lariscy, R., & Sweetser, K. D. (2010). Social media and shared—or divergent—uses?

    A coorientation analysis of public relations practitioners and journalists. International

    journal of strategic communication, 4(3), 189-205.

Banning, S. A. & Schoen, M. (2007). Maximizing public relation with the organization-public

    relationship scale: Measuring a public's perception of an art museum. Public Relations

    Review, 33 (4), 437-439.

Bautista, S. S. (2014). Museums in the digital age: Changing meanings of place, community, and

    culture. Lanham, Maryland: AltaMira Press.

Briones, R. L., Kuch, B., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2011). Keeping up with the digital age: How the

    American Red Cross uses social media to build relationships. Public relations review,

    37(1), 37-43.

Brønn, P. S., & Brønn, C. (2003). A reflective stakeholder approach: co-orientation as a basis for

    communication and learning. Journal of Communication Management.

Broom, G. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1990). Using research in public relations: Applications to

    program management. Prentice Hall.

Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (2000). Toward a concept and theory of organization

    public relationships: An update. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), Public

    relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations (pp. 3-

    22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (2000b). Public relations as relationship management: A

    relational approach to public relations. Mahwah, NJ:, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

    Capriotti, P. (2010). Museums' communication in small- and medium-sized cities.

    Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 15(3), 281-298.

Capriotti, P., (2013). Managing strategic communication in museums: The case of Catalan

    museums. Communication & Society/Comunicación y Sociedad, 26(3), 98-116.

Capriotti, P., Carretón, C., & Castillo, A. (2016). Testing the level of interactivity of institutional

    websites: From museums 1.0 to museums 2.0. International Journal of Information

    Management, 36(1), 97-104.

Capriotti, Paul; Losada-Díaz, José-Carlos (2018). Facebook as a dialogic communication tool at

    the most visited museums of the world. El profesional de la información, 27(3), 642-650.

Cho, M. & Schweickart, T. (2015). Nonprofits' Use of Facebook: An Examination of

    Organizational Message Strategies. In R. D. Waters (Ed.), Public Relations in the

    Nonprofit Sector (pp. 281-295). New York: Routledge.

Cho, M., Schweickart, T., & Haase, A. (2014). Public engagement with nonprofit organizations

    on Facebook. Public Relations Review, 40(3), 565-567.

Drotner, K. & Schrøder, K. C. (2013). Museum communication and social media: The

    connected museum. New York: Routledge.

Edelman Trust Barometer. (2019, January 20). 2019 Edelman Trust Barometer. Retrieved from

https://www.edelman.com/trust-barometer

Falk, J. H. & Dierking, L. D. (2013). The museum experience revisited. Walnut Creek,

California: Left Coast Press, Inc.

Goor-Balk, A., Warmerdam, Z., & Ghameshlon, E. (2003). Satisfaction among museum visitors:

the holistic approach confirmed empirical evidence from the Anne Frank House visitors.

Vrije Universiteit. Accessed Jan 2018.

http://degree.ubvu.vu.nl/repec/vua/wpaper/pdf/20030013.pdf

Grunig, J. E. & Huang, Y. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators:

Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J.

A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), Public relations as relationship management (pp.

23-54). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). Measuring relationships in public relations. Gainesville, FL:

Institute for Public Relations.

Laws, A. L. S. (2015). Museum websites & social media. New York: Berghahn Books.

Lee, E., Lee, J., Moon, J.H., & Sung, Y. (2015). Pictures speak louder than words: motivations

for using Instagram. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 18(9), 552-

556.

Levin, S. (2018). "We're Watching a Company Explode": is Snapchat becoming irrelevant?

Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/feb/23/snapchat-redesign-

scandal-kylie-jenner-what-went-wrong.

Kang, M. (2014). Understanding public engagement: conceptualizing and measuring its influence on supportive behavior intentions. Journal of Public Relations Research, 26(5), 399-416.

Kelleher, T. (2009). Conversational voice, communicated commitment, and public relations outcomes in interactive online communication. Journal of communication, 59(1), 172-188.

Kelleher, T. (2015). Everybody's job? Managing public relations in the age of social media. In E. J. Ki, J. N. Kim, & J. A. Ledingham (Eds.), Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations (2 ed., pp. 281-305). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. (2007a). Reliability and validity of organization-public relationship measurement and linkages among relationship indicators in a membership organization. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 84(3), 419-438.

Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. (2007b). Testing the linkages among the organization–public relationship and attitude and behavioral intentions. Journal of Public Relations Research, 19(1), 1-23.

Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. (2008). A measure of relationship cultivation strategies. Journal of Public Relations Research, 21(1), 1-24.

Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. (2012). Causal linkages among relationship quality perception, attitude, and behavior intention in a membership organization. Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 17(2), 187-208.

LaBar, W. (2010). The gyroscopic museum. In J. E. Katz, W. LaBar, & E. Lynch (eds.), Creativity and technology: Social media, mobiles, and museums (pp. 346-379). Boston: MuseumsEtc. Ltd

Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (2000). Public relations as relationship management: A

 relational approach to the study and practice of public relations. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

 Erlbaum Associates.

Lovejoy, K., Waters, R. D., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Engaging stakeholders through Twitter:

 How nonprofit organizations are getting more out of 140 characters or less. Public

 Relations Review, 38(2), 313-318.

Men, L. R., & Tsai, W. H. S. (2012). How companies cultivate relationships with publics on

 social network sites: Evidence from China and the United States. Public Relations

 Review, 38(5), 723-730.

Men, L. R., & Tsai, W. H. S. (2013). Toward an integrated model of public engagement on

 corporate social networking sites: Antecedents, the process, and relational outcomes.

 International Journal of Strategic Communication, 7(4), 257-273.

Men, L. R., & Tsai, W. H. S. (2014). Perceptual, attitudinal, and behavioral outcomes of

 organization–public engagement on corporate social networking sites. Journal of Public

 Relations Research, 26(5), 417-435.

Men, L. R., & Tsai, W. H. S. (2015). Infusing social media with humanity: Corporate character,

 public engagement, and relational outcomes. Public Relations Review, 41(3), 395-403.

Murero, M. (2010). Web empowerment for cultural heritage organizations. In J. E. Katz, W.

 LaBar, & E. Lynch (eds.), Creativity and technology: Social media, mobiles, and

 museums (pp. 128-161). Boston: MuseumsEtc. Ltd.

Newcomb, T. M. (1953). An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychological

 Review, 60, 393-404. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063098

Pew Research Center. (2018, March 1), "Social Media Use in 2018." Retrieved from

      http://www.pewinternet.org/2018/03/01/social-media-use-in-2018/.

Smith, B. G., & Gallicano, T. D. (2015). Terms of engagement: Analyzing public engagement

      with organizations through social media. Computers in Human Behavior, 53, 82-90.

Stacks, D. W. (2002). Primer of Public Relations Research. New York City: New York, The

      Guilford Press.

Steer, R. M. & Porter, L. M. (1991). Motivation and work behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sweetser, K. D., & Kelleher, T. (2016). Communicated commitment and conversational voice:

      Abbreviated measures of communicative strategies for maintaining organization-public

      relationships. Journal of Public Relations Research, 28(5-6), 217-231.

Timpson, C. (2010). Placing our bets: building a national museum's media strategy from scratch.

      In J. E. Katz, W. LaBar, & E. Lynch (eds.), Creativity and technology: Social media,

      mobiles, and museums (pp. 292-307). Boston: MuseumsEtc. Ltd.

Tsai, W. H. S., & Men, L. R. (2013). Motivations and antecedents of consumer engagement with

      brand pages on social networking sites. Journal of Interactive Advertising, 13(2), 76-87.

Trochim, W. M. K. (2005). Research methods: The concise knowledge base. Cincinnati: Ohio,

      Atomic Dog Publishing.

Verčič, D., Verčič, A. T., & Laco, K. (2006). Coorientation theory in international relations: The

      case of Slovenia and Croatia. Public Relations Review, 32(1), 1-9.

Waters, R. D. (2007). "Advancing Relationship Management Theory: Coorientation and the

      Nonprofit-Donor Relationship." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of

      Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Waters, R. D. & Jamal, J. Y. (2011). "Tweet, tweet, tweet: A content analysis of nonprofit

organizations' Twitter updates. Public Relations Review, 37(3), p. 321-324.

Yin, R. K. (2009). Case Study Resesarch: Design and Methods. Thousand Oaks: SAGE

Publications.

Appendix A

Interview Guide for Semi-Structured Personal Interviews
with Museum Social Media Managers

Introductory Question(s):
Tell me a little bit about your role at the museum. What are your duties/what do you manage, as far as marketing, PR, and social media?

What social media platforms is your museum currently using? How often are you posting on each?

RQ1: Why do museum communications managers attempt to build relationships with publics through social media?

Explain to me how you feel that a museum can benefit from having a Facebook account. An Instagram account?

Why is social media a good way to build relationships with your patrons? If you don't think it is, why not?

Facebook Questions:
What is your thought process behind having a Facebook account for the museum?
Explain to me the strategy of your Facebook content.
Who are you trying to reach with your Facebook content?
Do you feel like you are successful in reaching that audience?
If your entire job was Facebook for this museum, and that's it, what would you continue to do and what would you do differently?

Instagram Questions:
What is your thought process behind having an Instagram account for the museum?
Explain to me the strategy of your Instagram account.
With whom do you feel like you're communicating on Instagram?
Who are you trying to reach with your Instagram account?
If your entire job was Instagram for this museum, and that's it, what would you continue to do and what would you do differently?

Which do you prefer to use, Instagram or Facebook? Why is that?

RQ2: How do museum communications managers perceive their attempts to build relations with them on social media?

-        How do you feel that building relationships with your patrons is best done?
-        How do your patrons react to your social media posts?
-        Why do you think your patrons follow you on social media?

RQ3-6: Are museum communication managers successful in building relationships through their social media channels?
- Which do you think is your best platform for engagement? Why?
- How do you measure activity on your social media platforms? How regularly do you monitor your analytics?
- What kind of engagement do you get?
- How do you define engagement on each platform?
- Tell me about the engagement on each platform. Do you consider it high or low? Does it vary? Tell me what you've noticed.

RQ7: What coorientation state exists between the museums and their local publics in evaluation of their shared relationship?
- Do you find that engagement on social media platforms leads to people actually coming to the museum?
- If you could give advice to a museum professional about to launch their Facebook and Instagram platforms, what would you tell them?

Appendix B

Survey for Museum Patrons
(Adapted from Ki & Hon, 2007, 2012; Capriotti, 2010; Tsai & Men, 2013)

RQs for Survey Portion of Study
RQ3: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through satisfaction?
RQ3: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through trust?
RQ3: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through control mutuality?
RQ6: How does a public perceive their local museum's attempts to build OPR through commitment?
RQ7: What coorientation state exists between the museums and their local publics in evaluation of their shared relationship?

Survey

Have you visited [name of their local museum]?
Yes
No

Do you follow [name of museum] on the following social media platforms:
Facebook
Instagram
Both
Neither

Behavior Intentions

When was the last time you visited [name of their local museum]?
This month
In the past six months
In the past year
In the past two years
It has been more than two years since I visited [name of museum]

How do you most often find out about exhibitions, events, and programming at [name of museum]?
TV
Radio
Newspaper
Magazine
Local publications
Posters/fliers
Billboard/street signage/public transportation signage

Social media
Museum email
Museum direct mail
Friends/Family

Current Engagement

Facebook Engagment

How often do you read posts/watch videos by [name of museum] on Facebook?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never read posts by [name of museum]'s on Facebook

How often do you comment on posts by [name of museum] on Facebook?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never commented on posts by [name of museum] on Facebook.

How often do you tag others in posts by [name of museum] on Facebook?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never tagged others in posts by [name of museum] on Facebook.

How often do you send [name of museum] direct messages on Facebook?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year

Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never sent [name of museum] direct messages on Facebook.

Instagram Engagement

How often do you read posts/watch Instagram stories by [name of museum] on Instagram?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never read posts by [name of museum] on Instagram.

How often do you comment on posts by [name of museum] on Instagram?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never commented on posts by [name of museum] on Instagram.

How often do you tag others in posts by [name of museum] on Instagram?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never tagged others in posts by [name of museum] on Instagram.

How often do you send [name of museum] direct messages on Instagram?
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Between 6-11 times a year
Between 1-5 times a year
Less than once a year
Rarely
I have never sent [name of museum] direct messages on Instagram.

Trust

[Name of Museum] treats patrons fairly and justly.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Whenever [name of museum] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of Museum] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of Museum] misleads patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Commitment

[Name of Museum] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of Museum] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral

4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [name of museum].
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Satisfaction

Both [Name of Museum] at its patrons benefit from their relationship.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Patrons are happy with [name of museum]
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Interacting with [name of museum] is a pleasant experience for patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Patrons feel important to [name of museum].
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of Museum] neglects patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of Museum] listens and responds to patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Control Mutuality

When interacting with [name of museum], patrons feel a sense of control.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

[Name of museum] cooperates with patrons.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

Behavior Intentions
I would recommend visiting [name of museum] to others.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

I would continue following [name of museum] even if another comparable museum were available in my area.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

I plan on continuing to follow [name of museum] for at least another year.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

I plan on visiting [name of museum] sometime within the next three years.
1 Agree
2 Slightly Agree
3 Neutral
4 Slightly Disagree
5 Disagree

How do you perceive [name of museums]'s social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?
[Open-ended question.]

Demographic information for data collection purposes
Age
Under 20
20-30
30-40
40-50
50-60
60+

I identify my gender as:
Male
Female
Other:
Prefer not to answer

I identify my ethnicity as: [multiple option]
Asian
Black/African
Caucasian
Caribbean
Hispanic/Latinx
Middle Eastern
Native American
Pacific Islander
Other:
Prefer not to answer

Appendix C

Full Data from Museum Surveys

Museum A
Survey responses = 25

Of all the respondents, only one had not before attended Museum A, and nine of those who had visited the museum had done so within the past six months. Three respondents had visited within the past year, six within the past two years, and six respondents' last visit was over two years ago. One respondent had been to the museum within the past month. Overall this shows that most of the respondents have attended the museum within the past two years. Sixteen respondents did not actually follow Museum A on Facebook nor on Instagram. Seven followed Museum A on Facebook only, one on Instagram only, and only one respondent followed Museum A on both Facebook and Instagram. This makes sense as this ad ran on Facebook [did it run at all on Instagram??] and was targeted to people in the geographic area, not to those who already follow the museum.

The next question asked respondents how they most often find out about events, exhibitions, and other museum events. The highest response was from social media (seven respondents), while "friends/family" was the second-highest response with six responses. Newspaper, Other, Museum Email, and Local Publications all were included, all with four or fewer responses.

The next questions on the survey asked respondents about their engagement with the content posted by Museum A on Facebook. Most respondents (13) have never read posts nor watched video by Museum A on Facebook, and an additional three respondents indicated that they "rarely" do. Three indicated that they read/watch posts between 1-5 times a year, one indicated between 6-11 times a year, four indicated monthly, and one indicated weekly.

The next question in this set dealt with how often they commented on posts by Museum A on Facebook. Respondents definitely erred toward less-often in this question. Eighteen indicated that they have never commented on any posts by Museum A on Facebook. Five indicated that they rarely comment, one indicated commenting less than once per year, and one indicated 1-5 times a year. Respondents indicated that they never have (21) or rarely (4) tag others in Facebook posts by Museum A.

As far as sending Museum A direct messages through Facebook, 22 respondents indicated that they have never sent Museum A a direct message on Facebook, one indicated that they rarely do, one does between 6-11 times a year, and one does monthly.

Twenty-one respondents indicated that they have never read Instagram posts/watched Instagram stories by Museum A, one indicated that they rarely do, two indicated that they do monthly, and one weekly. All respondents except one indicated that they have never commented on posts by Museum A, nor did they tag others in posts (the one exception marked that they rarely did for both questions). All twenty-five respondents indicated that they have never sent Museum A a direct message on Instagram.

Twelve respondents indicated that they "strongly agree" that Museum A treats patrons fairly and justly, and eleven indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," while one indicated that they "somewhat agree" and one that they "somewhat disagree."

Seventeen respondents indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree" that "when [Museum A] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Four respondents "somewhat agree" to this question, and four "strongly agree."

In response to the statement that "[Museum A] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons, the first indication of a negative-leaning response is present. Seventeen respondents indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," three "somewhat agree," and four "strongly agree." One respondent indicated that they "somewhat disagree" with the statement.

The next statement presented in the survey said "[Museum A] misleads patrons." Closely following the responses from the previous question, seventeen indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three indicated "somewhat disagree," six indicated "strongly disagree," and one respondent indicated "somewhat agree."

The next statement measured how respondents perceived Museum A's attempts at long-term relationship-building with patrons. The survey question reads "[Museum A] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons. Fifteen respondents answered "neither agree nor disagree," one respondent answered "somewhat agree," and three respondents indicated that they "somewhat disagree" and six respondents "strongly disagree" with the statement.

In an interesting companion question, the following question stated, "[Museum A] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons." Eleven respondents indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," seven marked "somewhat agree," and seven marked "strongly agree."

The following statement said, "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum A.] Twelve respondents marked the neutral "neither agree nor disagree," seven marked "somewhat agree," and six marked "strongly agree."

The next statement of the survey asked respondents, "Both [Museum A] and its patrons benefit from their relationship." Fewer respondents were neutral in responding to this statement. Eight responded "neither agree nor disagree," six indicated "somewhat agree," and eleven responded that they "strongly agree" that both Museum A and its patrons benefit from the relationship.

In responding to the next statement—"Patrons are happy with [Museum A]."—eleven respondents indicated "neither agree nor disagree," eight indicated "somewhat agree," and six indicated "strongly agree."

The next question delves into a visitor experience-type question. The survey statement says, "Interacting with [Museum A] is a pleasant experience for patrons." Five respondents were neutral, seven "somewhat agree," twelve "strongly agree," and one respondent indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next survey question states, "Patrons feel important to [Museum A]." Ten respondents indicated they "neither agree nor disagree," seven "somewhat agree," seven "strongly agree," and one indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next question states, "[Museum A] neglects patrons." Ten respondents answered neutrally, four answered "somewhat disagree," and the eleven answered "strongly disagree."

In answer to "[Museum A listens to and responds to patrons," sixteen respondents indicated "neither agree nor disagree," seven indicated "somewhat agree," and two indicated "strongly agree."

The next question asked "When interacting with [Museum A], patrons feel a sense of control." Twenty answered "neither agree nor disagree," four answered "somewhat agree," and one answered "strongly agree."

In answer to "[Museum A] cooperates with patrons," sixteen responded "neither agree nor disagree," and five answered "somewhat agree," while four answered "strongly agree."

The responses to the next question varied from the normal pattern of answers from previous questions. The question stated, "I would recommend visiting [Museum A] to others." Only three respondents answered "neither agree nor disagree," two responded "somewhat agree," and nineteen responded "strongly agree." One answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "I would continue following [Museum A] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Eight responded neutrally, three "somewhat agree," and fourteen "strongly agree."

The next survey question stated, "I plan on continuing to follow [Museum A] on social media for at least another year." Seven indicated "neither agree nor disagree," five answered "somewhat agree," and thirteen answered "strongly agree."

In answer to "I plan on visiting [Museum A] within the next three years," only one respondent answered "neither agree nor disagree," while five answered "somewhat agree," and nineteen answered "strongly agree."

Here are the comments of the one free-response question on the survey, which asked "How do you perceive the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts's social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" Eight respondents provided a response to this question, which are ranked from positive, negative, neutral, didn't know about their social media efforts, not applicable, or unrelated, or sometimes a mix, particularly when people used this as a forum to ask the museum questions or provide the museum with their opinions on various items related to the museum but not to the study. These responses were as follows: "Very positive (Would love to see a cafe/coffee shop at the Museum!)" (positive/unrelated); "Excellent even if I am not completely plugged in myself" (positive); "What media efforts? (didn't know about their social media efforts/negative); "Not familiar with all media efforts. It is a wonderful little gem of a museum. Great art and amenities." (Not familiar with sm/unrelated); "Since I was not aware of it, I cannot answer" (not familiar); "I have never seen it on social media" (not familiar); "Great idea" (positive); and lastly, "Can't answer that at the moment as this survey is my first interaction. Will be changing that though when I'm done here." (didn't know).

Museum B
Survey respondents = 13

The following questions in the survey were demographic information questions. Of the respondents, they were mostly older. One was 18-24, one was 25-34, one was 35-44, four were 45-54, two were 55-64, and four were 65 or older. Nine respondents were female, four were male. Twelve respondents were White and one indicated another ethnicity, which they wrote in as "Scottish."

The second question of the survey invites respondents to indicate on which platforms they follow Museum B: Facebook, Instagram, both, or neither. Nine indicated that they follow Museum B on Facebook, four indicated that they don't follow Museum B on Facebook nor Instagram, and zero respondents indicated that they follow on both Facebook and Instagram, and zero indicated following Museum B only on Instagram.

The third question asks, "When was the last time you visited [Museum B]?" There were twelve total responses to this question. Four indicated that it had been more than two years since they last visited Museum B. Two indicated that they've visited in the past two years, zero

indicated in the past year, five indicated that they've visited within the past six months, and one indicated that they visited within the past month. [Notes here about how that's kind of weird that it's either been a very long time OR within the past few months.]

In answering the next question, twelve total respondents indicated how they "most often find out about exhibitions, events, and programming at [Museum B]." From most to least, three respondents indicated that they most often find out through social media, three from museum email, two from local publications, two from "other," one from museum direct mail, and one from friends/family.

The next set of questions delves into how often respondents interact and engage with Museum B on Facebook. The first of this set asked "How often do you read posts/watch videos by [Museum B]?" In order of the presented choices, one indicated daily, four indicated weekly, one indicated monthly, two indicated "between 6 - 11 times a year," one indicated "between 1-5 times a year," no respondents indicated "less than once a year," one indicated "rarely," and three indicated "I have never read posts/watched videos by [Museum B] on Facebook."

The next question asked, "How often do you comment on posts by [Museum B] on Facebook?" Two indicated weekly, one indicated "less than once a year," three indicated "rarely," and five indicated that they have never commented on Museum B's posts on Facebook.

The next question asked, "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum B]?" One indicated that they tag others in Museum B's Facebook posts "between 6-11 times a year, two indicated "less than once a year," three indicated that they rarely tag others, and five indicated that they have never tagged others in posts by Museum B on Facebook.

Twelve respondents responded to the next question, which asked how often they send Museum B direct messages on Facebook. One indicated weekly, one indicated "between 6-11 times a year," three indicated "rarely," and seven indicated that they have never sent Museum B a direct message on Facebook.

The next set of questions asked the same things as before, but in regard to Instagram. As mentioned previously, many of the respondents do not actually follow the museum on Instagram, so many of the responses to the follow set of questions indicated that they have never interacted with Museum B on Instagram.

The first question asked, "How often do you read posts/watch stories by [Museum B] on Instagram?" One indicated "between 6-11 times a year," one indicated "rarely," and ten indicated that have never.

The next question asked how often they comment on Instagram posts from Museum B. One indicated weekly, and eleven indicated that they have never commented on any of Museum B's Instagram posts.

The next question asked how often they tag others in posts by [Museum B] on Instagram. One indicated "less than once a year," one indicated "rarely," and ten indicated that they have never tagged others in Museum B's posts on Instagram.

In response to the next question that asked how often they've sent Museum B direct messages on Instagram, all twelve respondents indicated that they have never.

The next questions on the survey examine how patrons and people in the local area perceive the museum. In response to the statement, "[Museum B] treats patrons fairly and justly," eight responses indicated that they "strongly agree," three indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement said, "Whenever [Museum B] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Four indicated that they "strongly

agree" with the statement, three indicated "somewhat agree," and four indicated "neither agree nor disagree," for a total of eleven responses on this question.

Respondents for the next statement—which stated, "[Museum B] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons."—remained positive. Six indicated "strongly agree," two indicated "somewhat agree," and three indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement read, "[Museum B] misleads patrons." Seven indicated that they "strongly disagree," two indicated that they "somewhat disagree," and two indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next question said, "[Museum B] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons." Eight indicated that they strongly agree, two that they somewhat agree, and two neither agree nor disagree.

The next question said, [Museum B] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons." Eight indicated that they strongly agree with the statement, one somewhat agree, and two neither agree nor disagree.

The next statement said, "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum B]. Five strongly agree, five somewhat agree, and one neither agree nor disagree.

In answer to the statement, "Both [Museum B] and its patrons benefit from their relationship," six respondents indicated that they "strongly agree," four "somewhat agree," and one indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement read, "Patrons are happy with [Museum B.] Six "strongly agree," two "somewhat agree," and three "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement asked "Interacting with [Museum B] is a pleasant experience for patrons." Seven indicated "strongly agree," two indicated "somewhat agree," and two indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

In responding to the statement "Patrons feel important to [Museum B]," seven respondents "strongly agree," one indicated "somewhat agree," and three indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement stated, "[Museum B] neglects patrons." Six indicated that they "strongly disagree" with the statement, while two indicated "somewhat disagree," two indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "somewhat agree."

The next survey statement said, "[Museum B] listens to and responds to patrons. Four indicated "strongly agree," three indicated "somewhat agree," and four indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement read, "When interacting with [Museum B], patrons feel a sense of control." Three strongly agree, two somewhat agree, and six neither agree nor disagree with that statement.

The next statement read, "[Museum B] cooperates with patrons. Five responded that they "strongly agree," two "somewhat agree," and four "neither agree nor disagree."

The following set of questions asked patrons if they would "continue following {Museum B] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Seven indicated that they "strongly agree," one indicated "somewhat agree," and three "neither agree nor disagree."

In answer to the statement, "I plan to continue following [Museum B] on social media for at least another year," seven responded that they "strongly agree," one responded "somewhat agree," and three indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement said, "I plan on visiting [Museum B] sometime within the next three years." Six said "strongly agree," three said "somewhat agree," and one said "somewhat disagree."

The next and final question to the survey (besides the demographic information) is a short answer, allowing patrons to write their responses. The question reads, "How do you perceive [Museum B]'s social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" Five people responded, and their answers are varied. The first respondent does not actually adress the question and talks instead about the location of the museum in relation to somewhere they had lived previously. The next response does answer the question by saying, "I see it [Museum B's efforts on social media to build relationships] as a way to invite established patrons as well as new patrons to learn about and interact with the Milton community." The next response says, "I believe that [Museum B] is doing its best using social media to keep in touch with more people. The only thing I would suggest is try to get more exhibits. And including some more recent things in [location's] history to try and connect with the younger people so it doesn't seem so far away and that it doesn't affect them." The next response simply read, "Ok." The final response said, "Uhmm; this is a bit weird. I don't imagine that [Museum B] is out to grind axes; of course they cherish their patrons!" which is likely in response to the survey itself rather than as a response to the question posed.

Museum C
Survey respondents = 36

The age of the respondents varied more than either Museum A or Museum B, but still featured a large percentage of respondents coming from the 65 and older category. Of the 35 respondents, 18 were 65+ years old (51.43%), seven were 55-64 years old (20%), six were between 18-24 (17.14%), and there was one respondent for both the 25-34 range and the 35-44 range (2.86% for each). Half of the respondents identified as female, and 44% identified as male, and 5% chose not to answer. Thirty-one respondents were White, while one was Asian, one was Caribbean, and three preferred to not answer their ethnicity.

In answer to the question of which platform people follow Museum C on, 19 indicated following only on Facebook, five indicated following only on Instagram, three indicated following on both, and nine indicated not following Museum C on either platform.

The responses to the question of "When was the last time you visited Museum C?" followed a bell curve pattern. Seven respondents indicated that they had visited that month, nine indicated they've visited in the past six months, nine in the past year, six in the past two years, and five last visited Museum C over two years ago.

The next question asked how respondents most often find out about exhibitions, events, and programming at Museum C. The responses were incredibly varied—much more so than the responses from the other museums. The majority of respondents (10 respondents/27%) indicated social media, while nine respondents (25%) indicated that the museum email is how they most often find out about programming and exhibitions at the museum. Other responses include three for TV, three for exterior signage in the city (ads on transport, billboards, etc.), three from friends/family, three from other sources, two from museum direct mail, one from radio, one from newspaper, and one from local publications. This indicates that the highest source of information about the museum is coming from social media or from other publications from the museum itself.

The next set of questions asked respondents about their engagement habits with Museum C on Facebook, specifically. The first question asked "How often do you read posts/watch videos by Museum C on Facebook?" Four indicated reading/watching posts from Museum C daily, eight indicated weekly, six indicated monthly, three indicated between 6-11 times a year, one respondent indicated less than once a year, five indicated "rarely," and nine indicated that they have never read posts/watched videos by Museum C on Facebook.

The next question asks "How often do you comment on posts by Museum C?" One respondent indicated that they comment on a post from Museum C weekly, two indicated monthly, two indicated between 6-11 times a year, one indicated between 1-5 times a year, three indicated less than once a year, twelve indicated "rarely," and 15 indicated that they have never commented on any content posted by Museum C on Facebook.

The next question asked "How often do you tag others in posts by Museum C?" One indicated weekly tagging others in posts by Museum C, one indicated monthly, four indicated between 1-5 times a year, one indicated less than once a year, eleven indicated "rarely," and 17 indicated that they have never tagged others in posts by Museum C on Facebook.

The next question (and final question about the Facebook engagement) asked respondents "How often do you send Museum C direct messages on Facebook?" One respondents indicates that they send Museum C direct messages on Facebook daily, two indicated weekly, two indicated monthly, two indicated between 6-11 times a year, two indicated between 1-5 times a year, seven indicated "rarely," and 20 indicated that they have never sent Museum C a direct message on Facebook.

The next set of questions asked about engagement with Museum C on Instagram. In answer to the question, "How often do you read posts/watch stories by Museum C on Instagram?," two indicated daily, two indicated weekly, four indicated monthly, one indicated between 6-11 times a year, three indicated between 1-5 times a year, two indicated "rarely," and 22 indicated that they have never read posts/watched stories by Museum C on Instagram.

The responses to the question, "How often do you comment on posts by Museum C were as follows. One indicated weekly commenting, one indicated between 6-11 times a year, one indicated less than once a year, three indicated "rarely," and 29 (83%) indicated that they have never commented on Instagram posts from Museum C.

The next question follows a similar pattern. In answer to "How often do you tag others in posts by Museum C?," two indicated monthly, one indicated between 6-11 times a year, four indicated "rarely," and 28 (80%) indicated that they have never tagged others in posts by Museum C.

The last Instagram question asked, "How often do you send Museum C direct messages on Instagram?" One respondent answered that they send a direct message of Museum C on Instagram less than once a year, four indicated "rarely," and 30 (86%) indicated that they have never sent Museum C a direct message on Instagram.

The next set of survey questions provided statements to which respondents chose answers from a 5-point Likert scale. The first of these is "Museum C treats patrons fairly and justly." Twenty-one respondents (58%) indicated "strongly agree," nine (25%) indicated "somewhat agree," five (14%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "Whenever [Museum C] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." For this statement, ten (28%) indicated "strongly agree," 14 (39%) indicated "somewhat agree," ten (28%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and two indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next statement reads, "[Museum C] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons." In response, 15 (41%) "strongly agree," eight (22%) "somewhat agree," 12 (33%) "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next question asks respondents to consider the following: "[Museum C] misleads patrons." Nineteen respondents (52%) indicated that they "strongly disagree," seven (19.4%) "somewhat disagree," nine (25%) neither agree nor disagree, and one indicated "somewhat agree."

In response to the next statement, which reads "[Museum C] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship with patrons," respondents again answered mostly in the affirmative. Seventeen (47%) indicated that they "strongly agree," 13 (36%) indicated "somewhat agree," three indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and three indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next question and the subsequent responses closely mirror the previous question and responses. This statement reads, "[Museum C] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons. Seventeen (47%) indicated "strongly agree," fourteen (39%) indicated "somewhat agree," two indicated the neutral, and three (8%) indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next statement says, "Patrons feels a sense of loyalty to [Museum C]. In response, fifteen (41.7%) indicated "strongly agree," sixteen (44%) indicated "somewhat agree," and five answered in the neutral.

The next statement read, "Patrons are happy with [Museum C]." Twenty (55%) indicated "strongly agree," eleven (30%) indicated "somewhat agree," four indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next statement says, "Interacting with [Museum C] is a pleasant experience for patrons. Twenty-one (58%) indicated "strongly agree," ten (28%) indicated "somewhat agree," four indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next survey question presents this statement: "Patrons feel important to [Museum C.] These answers were less extreme and more spread. Eleven (30%) indicated "strongly agree," fourteen (39%) indicated "somewhat agree," nine indicated "neither agree nor disagree," one indicated "somewhat disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next question says, "[Museum C] neglects patrons." Fifteen (41%) strongly disagree, eight (22%) somewhat disagree, nine were neutral, and four (11%) indicated "somewhat agree."

In response to "[Museum C listens to and responds to patrons," seven (19%) indicated "strongly agree," eleven (31%) indicated "somewhat agree," and fourteen (39%) were neutral, while three (8%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

In response to "When interacting with [Museum C], patrons feel a sense of control," most respondents were neutral. Four (11%) indicated "strongly agree," nine indicated "somewhat agree" and nineteen (53%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," while four responded "somewhat disagree."

The first question in this section reads, "I would recommend visiting [Museum C] to others." Most respondents indicated "strongly agree"—30 respondents (83%). Five respondents indicated "somewhat agree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement reads, "I would continue following [Museum C] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Twenty-three responded "strongly agree," five responded "somewhat agree," five responded "neither agree nor disagree," one responded "somewhat disagree," and one responded "strongly disagree."

The answers to the previous question are slightly reflected again in this next statement: "I plan on continuing to follow [Museum C] on social media for at least another year." Nineteen

(54%) indicated "strongly agree," eight (22%) indicated "somewhat agree," six responded in the neutral, and one indicated "somewhat disagree," and one indicated "strongly disagree."

The next question, and the last multiple choice question on the survey, asked respondents if they planned on attending Museum C sometime within the next three years. Even with the disgruntled answers from previous questions, the responses to this question were strongly positive. Twenty-two (61%) indicated "strongly agree," eleven indicated "somewhat agree," and three indicated "neither agree nor disagree."

The last question of the survey is an open-ended short answer response, in which respondents could answer the optional question: "How do you perceive [Museum C's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" Answers were generally positive. All the answers are relayed here: "I would like to see more. I am amazed at how many of my friends and acquaintances know little [or] nothing about it [or] its origin, especially the younger ones. I tell everyone who plans to visit [city] it is a must see!" (positive, wants to see more from the museum); "Advertisements via social media seem to appeal to a variety of age groups and levels of attraction" (positive); "The Facebook posts are very informative and very inviting. We have loved [Museum C] from the beginning" (positive); "I do not follow on Facebook" (neutral); "Good" (positive); "Making the public aware of special exhibits, lectures and a variety of opportunities for learning more about [topic] and [topic] needs to be a priority" (positive, still needs work); "You neglect to have enough seating for those not in wheelchairs but are old or unable to stand long periods to watch videos. A pamphlet better describing each display and more directional signs would help" (not related to the question of social media relationship-building); "Not deaf friendly the last time I went. No captions nor a guide to read when sounds or voices are involved" (not related to the question of social media relationship-building); "Proud to be a charter member and learn new things every time I go. I appreciate the social media contacts" (positive); "Although I use Facebook daily, I'm not particularly tuned in to your posts" (neutral/negative); "Good" (positive); "Need more updates on Facebook. Need real people to answer phones, not answering machines" (negative, constructive); "I think they are doing a fabulous job. We recommend it strongly to any of our friends who are in town and they (without exception) have come away most satisfied and impressed. [...] I feel there is still a great deal to be added to it and look forward to seeing that done" (positive); "It is a good way to communicate……" (positive).

Museum D
Survey respondents = 29

Of the 37 respondents, none were between the ages of 18-24, one (3.7%) was between 25-34, eight (29%) were between 35-44, five (18%) were between 45-54, six (22%) were between 55-64, and seven (29.5%) were 65+. Just over 67% of respondents were female and 32% were male. Twenty-five (92%) respondents were White, one was an ethnicity note listed, and one preferred to not answer their ethnicity.

For this survey, I asked the same questions as the previous and following museums.

The first question of the survey asks on which platforms (Facebook, Instagram, both, neither) respondents follow Museum D. Ten (35%) respondents answered only Facebook, one (3.57%) answered only Instagram, five (17.86%) answered both, and 12 (42.86%) answered neither.

The following question may have been confusing to respondents, as the museum has not been open for more than a year, but the survey question asks when the last time they visited Museum D, and the answers range from "this month" at one end to "it has been more than two years since I visited." The responses were 8 (36.36%) for "this month" and 14 (63.64%) "it has been more than two years," without any answers in between.

The next question asked how respondents most often find out about exhibitions, events, and programming at Museum D. As has been the case for many of the museums in this study, social media was the top way. Nine respondents (37.5%) indicated that social media was how they most often find out about museum events and exhibitions, seven (29%) indicated another way other than listed options, two (8.33%) indicated museum email, two indicated friends/family, and one each indicated newspaper, magazine, local publications, and museum direct mail.

The next questions got into the engagement habits and practices on Facebook. In response to the question, "How often do you read posts/watch videos by [Museum D]?", five (19%) said weekly, three (11.54%) said monthly, one (3.85%) said between 1-5 times a year, two (7.69%) said rarely, and 15 (57.69%) said that they have never read posts/watched videos from Museum D on Facebook.

The next question asks, "How often do you comment on posts by [Museum D] on Facebook?" One respondent (3.57%) answered in each of the following categories: daily, weekly, monthly, between 1-5 times a year, and less than once a year. Three (10.71%) indicated "rarely," and 20 (71.43%) indicated that they have never commented on posts by Museum D on Facebook.

In keeping with the same low-activity answers, the responses to the question "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum D]?" were two (7.14%) for monthly, four (14.29%) for rarely, and 22 (78.57%) for never having tagged others in a post from Museum D.

Answers are similar for the question "How often do you send [Museum D] direct messages on Facebook?" Two (7.14%) indicated weekly, one (3.57%) indicated less than once a year, one indicated rarely, and 24 (85.71%) indicated that they have never sent Museum D a direct message on Facebook.

The next set of questions asks the same, but for Instagram engagement and activity. The first of these questions asks "How often do you read posts/watch stories from [Museum D]?" Three (10.71%) indicated weekly, one (3.57%) indicated monthly, three indicated "rarely," and 21 (75%) indicated that they have never read posts/watched stories by [Museum D] on Instagram.

One respondent (3.85%) indicated that they weekly comment on Museum D's Instagram posts, three (11.54%) indicated "rarely," and 22 (84.62%) indicated that they have never commented on Museum D's Instagram posts.

The responses are similar for "How often do you tag others in posts by Museum D on Instagram?" One respondent (3.7%) indicated monthly, three (11.11%) indicated rarely, and 23 (85.19%) indicated that they have never tagged others in a post by Museum D on Instagram.

And in response to "How often do you send [Museum D] direct messages on Instagram?", 100% of respondents indicated that have never sent Museum D a direct message on Instagram.

The next set of questions, which make up the majority of the survey, are statements use to measure how respondents feel the museum is doing in making an effort to build strong relationships with its patrons. The first statement says, "[Museum D] treats patrons fairly and

justly." Six (24%) respondents answered "strongly agree," one (4%) answered "somewhat agree," 17 (68%) answered with the neutral "neither agree nor disagree," and one answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement reads, "Whenever [Museum D] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Four (16%) respondents answered "strongly agree," one (4%) answered "somewhat agree," and 20 (80%) answered neutrally. Again, an unsurprising response considering how new the museum is.

The next statement reads, "[Museum D] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons." Four (17.39%) responded than they "strongly agree" and 19 (82.61%) responded neutrally.

The next statement states, "[Museum D] misleads patrons. Six respondents (26.09%) indicated that they "strongly disagree," one (4.35%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and 16 (69.57%) indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree."

The next statement on the survey states, "[Museum D] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons." Seven (30.43%) indicated that they "strongly agree," two (8.70%) indicated that they "somewhat agree," and 14 (60.87%) indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," in keeping with the rest of the answers of being highly neutral.

Next on the survey, respondents answered the statement "[Museum D] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons." Eight (34.78%) indicated that they "strongly agree," one (4.35%) indicated that they "somewhat agree," and fourteen (60.87%) answered neutrally.

The next statement read, "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum D." Five (21.74%) indicated that they strongly agree and 18 (78.26%) indicated that they neither agree nor disagree.

Responses were similar to the question "Both [Museum D] and its patrons benefit from their relationship." Seven (30.43%) indicated that they strongly agree, one (4.35%) indicated that they somewhat agree, and 15 (65.22%) indicated neutral.

In response to "Patrons are happy with [Museum D]," there is a slight difference in response pattern, though still overwhelmingly neutral. Three (13.04%) respondents indicated they "strongly agree," three indicated that they "somewhat agree," sixteen (69.57%) indicated that they "neither agree nor disagree," and one (4.35%) indicated that they "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "Interacting with [Museum D] is a pleasant experience for patrons." Six (27.27%) responded "strongly agree," one (4.55%) responded "somewhat agree," and 15 (68.18%) responded "neither agree nor disagree."

In response to "Patrons feel important to [Museum D]," five (22.73%) indicated "strongly agree," two (9.09%) indicated "somewhat agree," and 15 (68.18%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," in keeping with the usual pattern of response for Museum D.

The next statement read, "[Museum D neglects patrons." Sixteen (72.73%) answered neutrally and six (27.27%) answered "strongly disagree."

"[Museum D] listens to and responds to patrons," elicited a slightly more varied response. Sixteen (72.73%) answered neutrally, three (13.64%) answered "strongly agree," 2 (9.09%) answered "somewhat agree," and one (4.55%) answered "strongly disagree."

In response to "When interacting with [Museum D] patrons feel a sense of control," two (9.09%) answered "strongly agree," three (13.64%) answered "somewhat agree," and 17 (77.27%) answered neutrally.

The next statement read, "[Museum D] cooperates with patrons." Four (18.18%) indicated "strongly agree," one (4.55%) indicated "somewhat agree," and 17 (77.27%) responded "neither agree nor disagree."

The next few questions examined the intended behaviors of respondents as they relate to Museum D. The first question of this section reads "I would recommend visiting [Museum D] to others." Eight (34.78%) answered "strongly agree," one (4.35%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (56.52%) responded neutrally, and one (4.35%) responded "strongly disagree."

The next question read: "I would continue following [Museum D] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Ten (45.45%) responded "strongly agree," two (9.09%) responded "somewhat agree," 9 (40.91%) responded "neither agree nor disagree," and one (4.55%) responded "somewhat disagree."

"I plan on continuing to follow [Museum D] on social media for at least another year," had a similar response pattern. Ten (45.45%) "strongly agree," two (9.09%) "somewhat agree," and ten "neither agree nor disagree."

The next question asks "I plan on visiting [Museum D] sometime within the next three years," to which the pattern was changed from majority neutral to majority positive. Thirteen (56.52%) responded "strongly agree," four (17.39%) responded "somewhat agree," and six (26.09%) responded "neither agree nor disagree."

The final question of the survey is an opened-ended optional response, to which respondents are given this question: "How do you perceive [Museum D's] social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" Responses were varied and are listed here, along with sentiment: "The last I had heard, [Museum D] was doing pop-up events and had no permanent location. This survey is the first time I found out it really exists. I hope to visit as soon as the weather improves. June, perhaps." (unrelated to the question); "This is the first time I've heard of it." (unrelated to the question); "Have never visited the place. In fact I didn't even know it existed. What's the location?" (unrelated to the question); "I know nothing about it!" (unrelated to the question, negative); "It is a quick, easy way [to] get news of what they are accomplishing and I appreciate it." (positive); "I have never been there, where is it? What is on display?" (unrelated to the question); "Good job" (positive); "I feel they have room for improvement. I think they are still trying to figure out how to best use social media with the museum." (constructive criticism); "This is the first time I have heard of [Museum D]. Saw it on FB. I've lived here 20 years. We are art collectors and visit art museums all over the world. I know about [other regional museum] (have helped with their fundraiser before). I suppose it never dawned on me to look up an art museum here." (unrelated to the question); "I never knew that [city] had an art museum!" (unrelated); "I have seen very few social media posts about the museum and until I recently read a short article about the museum I didn't know that [location] had an art museum." (constructive criticism, negative); "Didn't know the museum existed. Start there." (negative); "I think it needs to be more active and interactive!" (constructive criticism).

Museum E
Survey respondents = 53

Of the 53 respondents, none were between the ages of 18-24, seven (13.21%) were between 25-34, six (11.32%) were between 35-44, eight (15.09%) were between 45-54, 14 (26.42%) were between 55-64, and 18 (33.96%) were 65+. Just over 58% of respondents were female and 37% were male, and 1.89% identified as another gender, and 1.89% preferred not to answer. Forty-seven (83.93%) respondents were White, one was Asian, two were of an ethnicity not listed, and two preferred to not answer their ethnicity.

The first question of the survey asks if respondents follow Museum E on Facebook, Instagram, both, or neither. Fourteen respondents (26.92%) indicated that they follow Museum E

only on Facebook, one (1.92%) indicated they follow only on Instagram, five (9.62%) indicated they follow Museum E on both Facebook and Instagram, and 32 (61.54%) do not follow Museum E on either platform.

In answer to when the last time that respondents visited Museum E, 31 respondents (60.78%) indicated that they've visited in the past six months. Two (3.92%) have visited within the month, eight (15.69%) within the past year, and five (9.80%) within the past two years. Five responded that it has been more than two years since their last visit.

In keeping with the pattern of the other museums' respondents to the question of how they most often find out about museum exhibition, events, and programming, respondents for Museum E most often find out through social media, followed closely by email from the museum. Thirteen responded (27.66%) indicated social media was their primary source, 10 (21.28%) indicated the museum email. Nine indicated a source other than those listed, seven (14.89%) indicated local publications, five (10.64%) indicated friends/family, two (4.26) indicated a magazine, and one (2.13%) indicated a newspaper.

The next set of questions deals with respondents' patterns of interacting with Museum E on Facebook. Twenty-nine respondents (54.72%) indicated that they have never read posts/watched video by Museum E on Facebook. Seven (13.21%) "rarely" read posts/watch video by Museum E on Facebook, one (1.89%) indicated "less than once a year," three (5.66%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," six (11.32%) indicated "between 6-11 times a year," five (9.43%) indicated "monthly," one (1.89%) indicated weekly, and one indicated daily.

In keeping with the patterns established in the literature and within the responses of the other museums' surveys, questions about commenting, tagging, and interacting with the museums receive less affirmative answer. In response to "How often do you comment on posts by Museum E on Facebook?," 40 respondents (75.47%) have never. Eight (15.09%) indicated "rarely," two (3.77%) indicated "less than once a year," one (1.89%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," and two indicated "monthly."

In response to the question of "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum E]?", 45 (86.54%) responded that they had never tagged others in posts by Museum E. Five (9.62%) indicated that they "rarely" tag others in posts from Museum E, and one (1.92%) indicated they do "less than once a year," and one "between 1-5 times a year."

The last question about Facebook interactivity asked, "How often do you send [Museum E] direct messages on Facebook?" Forty-five (84.91%) responded that they have never sent a direct message to Museum E on Facebook. Five (9.43%) indicated "rarely," one (1.89%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," and two (3.77%) indicated "monthly.

The next set of questions are the same, except they ask about Instagram activity, rather than Facebook activity. The first question is "How often do you read posts/watch stories by Museum E on Instagram?" Forty-four (83.02%) respondents indicated that they have never read any Instagram posts by Museum E. Three (5.66%) indicated "rarely" reading posts/watching stories by Museum E on Instagram, one (1.89%) indicated "between 6-11 times a year," three (5.66%) indicated "monthly," and two (3.77%) "weekly."

In asking how often they comment on posts by Museum E on Instagram, again, the vast majority have never commented on any of Museum E's Instagram posts. Forty-nine (92.45%) responded "never," one (1.89%) responded "rarely," one (1.89%) responded "less than once a year," two (3.77%) responded "monthly."

In answer to "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum E] on Instagram?," 50 (96.15%) respondents indicated that have never. One (1.92%) indicated "rarely," and one indicated "monthly."

In response to "How often do you send [Museum E] direct messages on Instagram?," 52 of 53 responded indicated that they have never sent the museum a direct message on Instagram. One respondent indicated "monthly."

The next set of questions are statements about the museums' perceived attitude towards its patrons. The first statement reads, "[Museum E] treats patrons fairly and justly." Thirty-one (58.49%) respondents indicated "strongly agree," four (7.55%) indicated "somewhat agree," 14 (26.42%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree." While there are respondents in each category, the over half are a strong agree, and over a quarter are neutral.

The next statement reads, "Whenever [Museum E] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Fifteen (28.30%) respondents "strongly agree," four (7.55%) "somewhat agree," 30 (56.60%) "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) "somewhat disagree," and two "strongly disagree."

The responses to "[Museum E] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons," are slightly more positive, but with the majority still neutral. Seventeen (32.08%) respondents "strongly agree," that the museum can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons, four (7.55%) "somewhat agree," 32 (60.38%) "neither agree nor disagree."

In response to "[Museum E] misleads patrons," one respondent (1.89%) indicated "strongly agree," twenty-five (47.17%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three (5.66%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and 24 (45.28%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement of the survey says, "[Museum E] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons." Fifteen (28.30%) indicated "strongly agree," 12 (22.64%) indicated "somewhat agree," 22 (41.51%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and two indicated "strongly disagree."

The responses to the next question skew more positive. The statement reads "[Museum E] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons." Twenty-five respondents (47.17%) indicated "strongly agree," 12 (22.64%) indicated "somewhat agree," 12 (22.64%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement asks respondents to consider, "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum E]." Thirteen (24.53%) strongly agree, 17 (32.08%) "somewhat agree," 20 (37.74%) "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and two (3.77%) "strongly disagree."

The next statement reads, "Both [Museum E] and its patrons benefit from their relationship." Twenty-six respondents (49.06%) indicated they "strongly agree" with this statement. Fourteen (26.42%) indicated "somewhat agree," ten (18.87%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and one (1.89%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement is "Patrons are happy with [Museum E]." In a similar pattern, 24 (45.28%) indicated "strongly agree," 12 (22.64%) indicated "somewhat agree," 16 (30.19%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and one (1.89%) indicated "strongly disagree."

In response to the next statement, "Interacting with [Museum E] is a pleasant experience for patrons," the responses followed a similar pattern. Twenty-eight (52.83%) indicated "strongly

agree," thirteen (24.53%) indicated "somewhat agree," ten (18.87%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and two (3.77%) indicated "strongly disagree."

Respondents then indicated their feelings to the following statement: "Patrons feel important to [Museum E]. Twenty (37.74%) indicated "strongly agree," 12 (22.64%) indicated "somewhat agree," 16 (30.19%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement yielded a similar response pattern—but the inverse— "[Museum E] neglects patrons." Twenty-five indication "strongly disagree," eight (15.09%) indicated "somewhat disagree," fourteen (26.42%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three (5.66%) indicated "somewhat agree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly agree."

The next set of responses yielded many more neutral responses. The statement read, "[Museum E] listens to and responds to patrons." Ten (18.87%) indicated "strongly agree," nine (16.98%) indicated "somewhat agree," 31 (58.49%) indicated the neutral "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and two (3.77%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The responses to "When interacting with [Museum E], patrons feel a sense of control," followed a similar mostly-neutral response pattern. Nine (17.31%) indicated "strongly agree," eight (15.38%) indicated "somewhat agree," 32 (61.54%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.85%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and one (1.92%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement reads, "[Museum E] cooperates with patrons." Twelve (22.64%) indicated that they "strongly agree," eight (15.09%) that they "somewhat agree," 31 (58.49%) that they "neither agree nor disagree," and two (3.77%) that they "somewhat disagree."

The next set of questions asks respondents how likely they are to participate in behaviors, based on their relationship with Museum E. The first statement reads, "I would recommend visiting [Museum E] to others." The responses to this skewed very positive. Forty-two (79.25%) indicated "strongly agree," four (7.55%) indicated "somewhat agree," two (3.77%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement reads, "I would continue following [Museum E] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Twenty-six (49.06%) indicated "strongly agree," ten (18.87%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (24.53%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," one (1.89%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "I plan on continuing to follow [Museum E] on social media for at least another year." Twenty-three (43.40%) indicated "strongly agree," eight (15.09%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (24.53%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three (5.66%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and six (11.32%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement elicited very positive responses. The statement reads, "I plan on visiting [Museum E] sometime within the next three years." Forty-two (79.25%) indicated they "strongly agree," six (11.32%) indicated "somewhat agree," two (3.77%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and three (5.66%) indicated "strongly disagree."

The last question was a short-answer response that allowed patrons to write their response to the prompt, "How do you perceive the Kirkland Museum's social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" There were many responses, and I have sorted them into themes ranging from "positive," "neutral," negative," unrelated/off-topic," and "wasn't aware." The responses are included here, with the category in parentheses:

"I will not return because you have banned children from your museum. Figure out how to make more items childproof so our grandkids can enjoy our history!" (off-topic); "more naked things" (off-topic); "I have never thought about their relationship to social media" (wasn't aware); "I don't have enough experience to offer any meaningful feedback" (neutral); "Do not use social media" (negative); "I have not interacted with the museum on sm [social media]" (wasn't aware); "I haven't seen any posts regarding [Museum E], except during Museum Week. I haven't been to the new location, but plan to go. [Museum E], in my opinion has the best collection in town. I love decorative arts, and many of my teachers from the Art program at Metro are represented there." (off-topic); "I've never seen their social media" (wasn't aware); "Efforts are positive, active, consistent" (positive); "This is the first I've heard of it, but good on you! I'll start following today! (positive); "This is the first time I've heard of you. This survey doesn't tell me anything, but the poor grammar is a little off-putting" (off-topic); "I wouldn't know. You asked all these questions after I told you that I don't follow and have never seen anything from [Museum E] on social media" (off-topic); "I'm not sure. Most of my answers in this survey related to them not allowing children in their space, which is really inconvenient. I also think it sends the wrong message about who art is for" (off-topic); "My first and only visit to [Museum E] was to two one act opera put up by Opera [Location]. I did not like the operas and found the venue to be limited and uncomfortable for performances, but I absolutely adored the museum and would return in a heartbeat. I've strongly recommended it to others and intend to visit, again soon. I am not a heavy social media user and plan to leave FB in the next six months. This is a reflection on FB and in no way a reflection on [Museum E] (off-topic); "I'm not sure" (neutral); "[Museum E] could be more active on social media and utilize the different features each platform has in order to engage with the public. For example, Instagram polls, Q&A, etc" (negative); "My knowledge of the museum is limited to what I learned watching Arts District on KRMA-TV. I plan to visit the museum when I am in that part of the city" (off-topic); "Needs to be inclusive. Banning families with children is not good" (off-topic); "I haven't paid much attention to social media from [Museum E]. I'm a fan of the museum because of its [location] focus and the diversity of arts and crafts presented" (off-topic); "I don't think about it at all" (neutral); "It can. It could also have patrons taking selfies constantly and not paying attention to the art" (neutral); "inadequate" (negative); "I live on the cutting edge of obsolescence so am not social media savvy" (off-topic); "I don't see a lot on FB, and use no other social media" (negative).

Museum F
Survey respondents = 53

The age breakdown of the 53 respondents were predominantly older, in keeping with the age demographics of the other museums' survey respondents. Twenty-five respondents (48.08%) were 65 years old or older, 16 (30.77%) were between 55-64, five (9.62%) were between 45-54, three (5.77%) were between 35-44, none were between 25-34, and three (5.77%) were between 18-24.

The respondents to this survey were predominantly female (88.46%), while 9.62% respondents were male, and 1.92% preferred to not indicate their gender.

In keeping with the ethnicity demographics from the other surveys, the respondents to this survey were predominantly White. Forty-six (85.19%) were White, one was Black, one was Hispanic/Latinx, four were of an ethnicity not listed, and two preferred not to answer.

The first question of the survey reads, "Have you visited [Museum F]?" Fifty (94.34%) respondents answered yes, and three (5.66%) responded no.

The next question asks respondents to select which of the social media platforms on which they follow [Museum F], the choices being Facebook, Instagram, Both, and Neither. Twenty-five respondents (47.17%) indicated following only on Facebook, four (7.55%) indicated following only on Instagram, none followed on both, and 24 (45.28%) followed on neither platform.

The next question reads, "When was the last time you visited [Museum F]? Eight (15.69%) respondents indicated that they have visited within the last month of taking the survey, 17 (33.33%) indicated that they have attended in the past six month, nine (17.65%) indicated they've visited in the past year, 11 (21.57%) indicated visiting in the past two years, and six (11.76%) indicated that it had been more than two years since their last visit to Museum F.

The next question asks respondents, "How do you most often find out about exhibitions, events, and programming at [Museum F]? In keeping with the top response of the other surveys, the majority (33.96%) indicated that they most often find out about events and programming at Museum F via social media. The second-most answered was museum direct mail (13.21%), followed by friends and family (11.32%), museum email (11.32%), local publication (9.43%), other (9.43%), radio (5.66%), newspaper (3.77%), and TV (1.89%).

The next set of questions asks about respondents' habits with engaging with Museum F's Facebook content.

The first question is "How often do you read posts/watch videos by [Museum F] on Facebook?" While the majority (28.85%) indicated that they have never read posts nor watched videos by Museum F on Facebook, there were some in almost every category that had. Three (5.77%) indicated "daily," four (7.69%) indicated "weekly," seven (13.46%) indicated "monthly," eight (15.38%) indicated "between 6-11 times a year," seven (13.46%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," none indicated "less than once a year," and eight (15.38%) indicated "rarely."

The next question asks, "How often do you comment on posts by [Museum F] on Facebook?" Twenty-three (45.10%) answered that they have never. Twenty-two (43.14%) indicated "rarely." One person each answered "weekly," "monthly," and "between 1-5 times a year," and three indicated "between 6-11 times a year."

The next question on the survey asks, "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum F] on Facebook?" Twenty-eight (54.90%) indicated never. Seventeen (33.33%) indicated "rarely. One indicted "less than once a year" and one indicated "weekly." Four (7.84%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year."

The next question asks how often respondents sent [Museum F] a direct message on Facebook. Thirty-six (69.23%) indicated never. Seven (13.46%) indicated "rarely." One indicated "less than once a year," five (9.62%) indicated "between 1-5 times a year," and one each indicated "monthly," "weekly," and "daily."

The next set of questions asks the same, except about Instagram usage. The first of these questions is "How often do you read posts/watch stories by [Museum F] on Instagram?" Because the number who follow on Instagram is much lower, the trend of non-participation are higher than in the Facebook responses. Forty-one (80.39%) indicated never. Four (7.84%) indicated "rarely," three indicated "between 1-5 times a year," one indicated "monthly," and two indicated "weekly."

Answers to "How often do you comment on posts by [Museum F] on Instagram?" were similar in pattern. Forty-four respondents (88%) answered that they had never comment on posts by Museum F on Instagram. Two indicated "rarely," three indicated "between 1-5 times a year," and one indicated "monthly."

Similarly, the answers to "How often do you tag others in posts by [Museum F] on Instagram?" showed that the vast majority have not ever tagged someone else in a post by Museum F on Instagram. Forty-seven (90.38%) answered "never," two answered "rarely," one answered "less than once a year," and two answered "between 1-5 times a year."

In answer to "How often do you send [Museum F] direct messages on Instagram?", 50 respondents (96.15%) answered "never," and two answered "rarely."

The next set of questions are statements that respondents answered to, using a five-point Likert scale. The first statement in this section was "[Museum F] treats patrons fairly and justly." Twenty-eight (54.90%) respondents answered "strongly agree," five (9.80%) answered "somewhat agree," fifteen (29.41%) answered in the neutral "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.92%) answered "somewhat disagree," and one (1.96%) answered "strongly disagree." The skew was positive, and one-third were neutral.

The next statement said, "Whenever [Museum F] makes a decision, patrons know that the museum will consider that decision's impact on patrons." Fourteen (26.92%) indicated "strongly agree," seven (13.47%) indicated "somewhat agree," twenty-eight (53.85%) indicated in the neutral "neither agree nor disagree," two (3.85%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and one (1.92%) indicated "strongly disagree."

Patrons responded to "[Museum F] can be relied upon to keep promises to patrons" in a similar pattern of answering. Twenty (38.46%) indicated "strongly agree," four (7.69%) indicated "somewhat agree," twenty-five (48.08%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three (5.77%) indicated "somewhat disagree," and none indicated "strongly disagree." Again the skew is positive, though nearly half of respondents answered in the neutral.

The next statement said, "[Museum F] misleads patrons." None answered "strongly agree" nor "somewhat agree." Twenty-three (44.23%) answered neutrally, eight (15.38%) answered "somewhat disagree," and twenty-one (40.38%) answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement read "[Museum F] is trying to maintain a long-term relationship to patrons." Twenty (38.46%) answered "strongly agree," ten (19.23%) answered "somewhat agree," twenty (38.46%) answered neutrally, one each answered "somewhat disagree" and "strongly disagree."

In answer to "[Museum F] wants to maintain a positive relationship with patrons," 27 respondents (51.92%) answered "strongly agree," 12 (23.08%) answered "somewhat agree," eleven (21.15%) answered neutrally, and one each answered "somewhat disagree" and "strongly disagree."

The next statement was "Patrons feel a sense of loyalty to [Museum F]." Sixteen (30.77) answered "strongly agree," 22 (42.31%) answered "somewhat agree," ten (19.23%) answered neutrally, three (5.77%) answered "somewhat disagree," and one (1.92%) answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement in survey was "Both [Museum F] and its patrons benefit from their relationship." Twenty-five (48.08%) answered "strongly agree," sixteen (30.77%) answered "somewhat agree," nine (17.31%) answered neutrally," one each answered "somewhat disagree" and "strongly disagree."

In answer to "Patrons are happy with [Museum F]," 25 (48.08%) answered "strongly agree," 13 (25%) answered "somewhat agree," 13 (25%) answered neutrally, and one answered "somewhat disagree."

The next statement was "Interacting with [Museum F] is a pleasant experience for patrons." Thirty (57.69%) indicated "strongly agree," ten (19.23%) indicated "somewhat agree," ten (19.23%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," none indicated "somewhat disagree," and two (3.85%) indicated "strongly disagree." Again, the answers are skewing very positive.

In answer to "Patrons feel important to [Museum F]," 19 (36.54%) indicated "strongly agree," 15 (28.85%) indicated "somewhat agree," 13 (25%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," and five (9.62%) indicated "somewhat disagree." None indicated "strongly disagree."

The next statement was "[Museum F] neglects patrons." Twenty-nine (55.77%) indicated "strongly disagree," ten (19.23%) indicated "somewhat disagree," ten (19.23%) indicated "neither agree nor disagree," three (5.77%) indicated "somewhat agree." None indicated "strongly agree."

The next statement on the survey read, "[Museum F] listens to and responds to patrons." This statement had slightly less of a positive skew, with more answering in the neutral. Twelve (23.03%) answered "strongly agree," 11 (21.15%) answered "somewhat agree," 26 (50%) answered neutrally, and three (5.77%) answered "somewhat disagree." None answered "strongly disagree."

In answer to "When interacting with [Museum F], patrons feel a sense of control," seven (13.46%) answered "strongly agree," nine (17.31%) answered "somewhat agree," 27 (51.92%) answered "neither agree nor disagree," and nine (17.31%) answered "somewhat disagree." None answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "[Museum F] cooperates with patrons." Sixteen (31.37%) answered "strongly agree," 11 (21.57%) answered "somewhat agree," 18 (35.29%) answered "neither agree nor disagree," and six (11.76%) answered "somewhat disagree." None answered "strongly disagree.""

The answers to "I would recommend visiting [Museum F] to others" were very positive. Thirty-nine (75%) answered "strongly agree." Eight (15.38%) answered "somewhat agree," four (7.69%) answered neutrally, and one (1.92%) answered "somewhat disagree." Again, no respondents answered "strongly disagree."

The next statement read, "I would continue following [Museum F] on social media even if another comparable museum were available in my area." Twenty-seven (52.94%) answered "strongly agree," and eleven each (21. 57%) answered "somewhat agree" and "neither agree nor disagree." Two (3.92%) answered "somewhat disagree." None answered "strongly disagree."

In response to "I plan on continuing to follow [Museum F] on social media for at least another year,," 29 (56.86%) indicated "strongly agree," nine (17.65%) indicated "somewhat agree," twelve (23.53%) indicated neutral, and one (1.96%) indicated "somewhat disagree."

The next statement read, "I plan on visiting [Museum F] sometime within the next three years." An overwhelming majority of 46 respondents (88.46%) answered "strongly agree," five (9.62%) answered "somewhat agree," and one (1.92%) answered "neither agree nor disagree."

The last question on the survey was an optional open-response wherein respondents could provide a response to the prompt, "How do you perceive [Museum F]'s social media efforts as a way to foster relationships with the public?" The responses are listed here, along with the category of the response in parentheses:

"Excellent" (positive); "I do not have a lot to say about the matter. The reason my overall perception isn't very positive and the reason I very rarely go is that it is not a great museum for young children. The rules around baby carriers were a source of disagreement when I last visited, and it was clear that the museum did not really want kids there. I felt that I should stick with other museums when I am with my children. I don't blame [Museum F] but thought this perspective might be useful to hear. I still follow [Museum F] on FB and will come back eventually" (unrelated); "I haven't really seen [Museum F] on social media" (have never seen); "I have never seen a post form [Museum F]" (never seen); "ok" (neutral); "They keep me well informed on Facebook" (positive); "I've only passed the museum and I'm not sure what all there is. Ads for different installations on social media would be helpful" (unrelated); "All forms of social media need to be used to reach all age bracket[s]. For instance I am on FB but no[t] Instagram. Also I was a member in 2019, I received zero information about anything from the museum. And I emailed twice asking about it. Plus some of the staff is fabulous, but some of them are real putz!" (unrelated); "I plan on visiting for the first time in April" (unrelated); "Unsure. I feel that you are providing info but I don't feel I'm in a relationship" (unsure); "[Museum F] is attempting to strengthen its relationship with the public by stepping up its social media efforts. The more the museum publicizes its events the more the public will attend those events" (positive); "I hear pro[s] and cons about the museum. I don't like the thought of being followed around like a criminal. If this were to happen to me on my first visit I wouldn't be back" (unrelated); "Don't know" (unsure); "Good efforts!" (positive); "I think they are positive in terms of increasing awareness" (positive); "I had no idea they were on FB or Instagram. I will [be] following them now on FB" (have never seen); "Works for me--keeping informed" (positive); "[Museum F] shows work by diverse artists" (unrelated); "Generally positive" (positive); "I've never interacted" (neutral); "I really don't do much with social media. I do like the fact that events come up on my Facebook page, and then I have the ability to put them on my calendar to go to special events. I very much enjoy the music in your outdoor area and the summer" (positive); "It seems to relate to the ones that are interested. Special events seem well attended. I am going to attend most every new exhibit no matter what goes on with social media" (neutral); "It helps as people are strongly tied into social media" (positive); "We are members but have never received emails, newsletters, etc. You may have the incorrect email address. It is [lists email]" (unrelated).