

THE EMPEROR'S TREASURE WITHOUT THE WALLS:
AN ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT WITH STRATEGIC
PUBLICS FOR THE NATIONAL PALACE MUSEUM IN TAIWAN

A Master's Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Yu-han Huang

August, 2011

THE EMPEROR'S TREASURE WITHOUT THE WALLS:
AN ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT WITH STRATEGIC
PUBLICS FOR THE NATIONAL PALACE MUSEUM IN TAIWAN

Yu-han Huang

APPROVED:

Lan Ni, Ph.D.
Committee Chair
Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

Jennifer Vardeman-Winter, Ph.D.
Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

Jason Draper, Ph.D.
Conrad N. Hilton College of Hotel and Restaurant Management

John W. Roberts, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Department of English

THE EMPEROR'S TREASURE WITHOUT THE WALLS:
AN ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT WITH STRATEGIC
PUBLICS FOR THE NATIONAL PALACE MUSEUM IN TAIWAN

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Yu-han Huang

August, 2011

ABSTRACT

To fill the gaps in research on strategically integrating public segmentation and relationship management (Kim & Ni, in press), this study explored using simultaneously the Situational Theory of Publics and Relationship Management Theory in the context of museum/tourism public relations. An experimental research design was used in which 336 subjects from Taiwan were asked to offer their perceptions of their own problem recognition, constraint recognition, involvement recognition, referent criterion, relationship outcomes, experience use history, museum visitation purposes, and intention for future visitation before and after the exposure to a museum digitalization campaign.

Findings suggest that the digitalization campaign did not produce any effect on public types but helped enhance participants' perceptions of OPR outcomes, which encouraged the participants to build positive relationship with the organization in the future. Surprisingly, this study found strong predicative power of the visitors' past visitation experience on intention for future visit. In addition, the study indicated that museum visitation purposes affected the public types as well as OPR outcomes, which could be useful for museums in designing more appealing visitors' programs.

This study is significant in that it has examined a more effective way of identifying/segmenting as well as building and maintaining mutually beneficial relationships with museum visitors. In addition, it explored the applicability of the two important theories

to a foreign cultural background. This research also supports the effectiveness of a new trend and a critical means of building relationships with publics in museum industry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure to thank those who not only made this thesis possible, but also made this one of the most rewarding experiences in my life.

I owe my deepest gratitude to my dedicated committee chair, Dr. Lan Ni; without her support, encouragement and guidance I could not have completed this thesis. I am truly grateful for Dr. Ni's generosity in sharing her rich research experience and great public relations knowledge with me, patiently and with kindness during this process. In addition to having Dr. Ni as my advisor, I was lucky to have her as my professor in my courses. Her motivational courses inspired me to choose my current field of study. She sets a great example as a teacher, scholar, and leader, and has impacted me greatly. I am heartily thankful for Dr. Ni's efforts which helped me complete both my thesis and my Master's degree.

I am also grateful to my committee member, Dr. Jennifer Vardeman-Winter, who helped me organize and complete this research project. As my professor, her courses also gave me the foundation of my theories of PR knowledge; which I applied during the thesis writing process. Dr. Vardeman-Winter's caring way and dedication to international students have been a great value to me. Personally, her kindness has helped me through much more than just my academic career.

My sincere thanks are due to my committee member, Dr. Jason Draper, whose invaluable suggestions have been indispensable to the completion of this thesis. During my

preparation for doing the research, his detailed review and excellent advice guided through unfamiliar territory as I incorporated a new discipline, tourism, into my study. For his help and guidance, I am most thankful.

What is more, I wish to extend my thanks to the faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication for their support of this study. Specifically, I want to give thanks to Dr. Robert L. Heath, and Dr. Shawn McCombs, whose classes contributed to my graduate career and research.

Thanks also due to Mr. Louis Whittington and Ms. Millie Whittington, who never failed to give me great encouragement and suggestions. Their selfless contribution of time and love made my project possible, and I will not forget their graciousness. They are the role models of my life.

Special thanks go to my fellow colleague and friend, JiaJie Dai, who helped me with the conceptualization of this thesis. To my dear friends Yu-Jeng Ma and Yi-Er Shieh, who provided support and motivation throughout the thesis process. I truly appreciate having each one of you in my life.

I could not have completed this thesis without the love and support of my incredible family. My dad, Sung-Po Huang, my mom, Li-Chen Chang, my brother, Tzu-Chun Huang, and my boyfriend, Chien-hung Chen, your faith and consideration fueled me to reach for the goal I believe. You are my courage, my inspiration, and my determination. I love you all.

Thanks to everyone who has made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Contributions	3
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Situational Theory of Publics (STP).....	5
The beginning of STP	5
Independent and dependent variables	5
The relationship between IVs and DVs	7
Four types of publics.....	7
Relationship Management Theory	9
The definition of OPR.....	9
Models of relationships	10
Four relationship outcome variables	11
Tourism Public Relations	12
The major goal of travel, tourism, and hospitality	12
Cost-benefit & cost-effective	13
Three constructs of recreational behaviors	14
Museum Public Relations	16

Museum-visitor relationships	17
Museum campaign strategies—collections digitalization	19
Case Study: Old is New? The National Palace Museum’s Difficulties	21
Linkage Among Public Types, Relationship Management Theory, and Museum Public Relations.....	23
Museum digitalization and community involvement	25
Past experience and future visitation.....	26
Research Questions	26
CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY	28
Sampling	28
Procedures	31
Measurement	32
Data Analysis.....	33
CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS	34
RQ1.....	34
RQ2.....	35
RQ3.....	36
RQ4.....	37
RQ5.....	39
DISCUSSION	42
Major Findings	42

Theoretical Implications	42
Public formation and change	43
Organizational-public relationship management.....	44
The Relationship between public types, OPR outcomes, and visit factors	45
Practical Implications	47
Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research.....	49
REFERENCES	51
APPENDICES	64
Appendix A Informed Consent Form.....	64
Appendix B Questionnaire 1 (Control Group)	67
Appendix C Questionnaire 2 (Experiment Group).....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Types of Public Defined by the Three Independent Variables	9
Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics	30
Table 4.1 The Distribution of Four Types of Publics.....	35
Table 4.2 Mean and Standard Deviation for Relationship Outcomes of Relationship Management Theory.....	36
Table 4.3 Logistic Regression Predicting Who will Visit the NPM in the Future	41

Chapter One

Introduction

The value of public relations lies in the relationships an organization develops with its publics (Kim & Ni, 2010). Two core public relations theories, which focus on identification of publics and organization-public relationships, are chosen in this study: the Situational Theory (“public”) and the Relationship Management Theory (“relations”). The situational theory of publics (STP) is a foundational theory in public relations research and practices (Aldoory & Sha, 2006; Grunig, 1997). It defines publics at different levels (i.e., active, aware, latent, and nonpublics) using four independent variables. The theory is considered particularly useful in conceptually and methodologically breaking down the general population into more meaningful categories within and across issues (Aldoory, 2001; Ban, 2010; Grunig, 1989; Kim, Ni, & Sha, 2008; Sha, 2006; Tindall & Vaderman, 2008). The theory is known as one of the most practical theories with its contribution to the prediction of communication behaviors and segmentation of publics. Even though STP has been widely applied in public relations field in the United States, it has been seldom tested outside of the western culture. Therefore, more research is needed to test the applicability of this theory in other places in the world.

Relationship Management Theory aims to help generate mutual understanding and benefit as well as desired outcomes of organization-public relationships (OPRs)—so as to

achieve an organization's goals by focusing on the common needs and expectations of organizations and interacting publics. In Hung's (2005) view, OPRs arise when organizations and their strategic publics are interdependent, and this interdependence results in consequences for each other that organizations need to manage constantly (p. 396). The four relationship outcomes, trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction occur consistently and represent the essence of OPR (Huang, 2001).

Public relations study in the museum industry is still limited. Traditionally, museums have tended to ignore many of their publics (Gil & Ritchie, 2008). Nowadays, the relationship between museums and tourism has been an important topic of study (Harrison, 1997). Experience use history (EUH), place bonding, and resource substitution in tourism public relations will be helpful to distinguish the level of visitors' past visitation experience and how it affects their future visitation behaviors.

Also, the fast increasing user demand for cyber information has already changed the function of cultural institutions, such as museums. One of the most important missions for museums nowadays is to actively create closer relationships between their collections and visitors; museum digitalization provides a public-oriented option for museum display and tries to attract the young generation to visit the museum (Library of Congress, 2000).

At present, large museums and libraries worldwide have initiated digital projects as their new way of managing collections. However, the effect of digitalization on the visitors is

still unclear. This study attempts to extend the Relationship Management Theory by synthesizing it with the Situational Theory and museum/ tourism public relations. These theories would help to identify the types of publics, examine the relationship outcomes, and clarify the visitation purposes among the publics before and after the organizational campaigns—digitalization of museum collections.

Theoretical Contributions

Practically speaking, this research provides museum public relations practitioners a useful criterion to determine whether new technology campaigns can efficiently add value to the communication strategy in attracting their target visitors. Also, the research examines the applicability of the two theories to a foreign cultural background to see if they help produce a more accurate public analysis.

A case of National Palace Museum in Taiwan was used. The National Palace Museum (NPM) is ranked as one of the top four must-see museums in the world, along with the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the Louvre Museum in Paris, and the British Museum in London (Taiwan Tourism Bureau, 2005). Its entire collection covers 5,000 years of China's historical and artistic achievements. However, it seems that many local young people aged from 18 to 30 are less interested in the Exhibitions Related to Chinese Culture (ERCC) than they are in those exhibitions related to western culture. Hence, the NPM has started three campaigns recently to change the situation. One strategy, ERCC digitalization,

was used in this study.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

Situational Theory of Publics (STP)

The beginning of STP. In a public relations campaign, messages are designed to be disseminated to the target group accurately and in a timely manner. Messages that are directed at an unsegmented population may reach the target audience but may also reach disinterested publics (Hamilton, 1992). Grunig (1968) originally developed the Situational Theory of Publics (STP) to segment the publics from a larger population based on the activeness or passiveness of communication behavior (Hamilton, 1992). Subsequently, Grunig (1989) made an analogy of making a fish nest; where the inner nest catches the fish we desire the most, while the outer one might catch the same fish, but they can also catch the potential fish that we don't want. This theory helps to explain when and how people are likely to communicate and when communications aimed at people are most likely to be effective.

Independent & dependent variables. Grunig and Hunt (1984) stated that "communication behaviors of publics can be best understood by measuring how members of publics perceive situations in which they are affected by such organizational consequences" (p. 148). They identified four independent variables based on the public's behaviors. Among all of the independent variables, level of involvement, constraint recognition, and problem recognition are commonly used theoretically and practically, which influence the likelihood

for information seeking and information processing (Aldoory, Kim & Tindall, 2010). Problem recognition refers to the extent to which people recognize an issue as a dilemma; constraint recognition involves the perceived or actual barriers that hinder people from doing something about a problem; and level of involvement is the degree of personal connectedness or relevance to an issue (Aldoory, Kim & Tindall, 2010). A fourth independent variable—referent criterion—identified by Grunig (1997) might also affect the communication behavior of publics (Sriramesh, Moghan & Wei, 2007). However, its effectiveness is not as conclusive as the other three.

The first three independent variables predict the dependent variables—information seeking and information processing (Hamilton, 1992). The former dependent variable can also be named as “active communication behavior” when people look for information and try to understand the information. The latter variable can be named as “passive communication behavior”, which refers to how a public processes information that comes to them rather than seeking the information by themselves.

People who enact the information seeking behaviors have more power and decisive influence on the organization. Because information seeking is the purposeful search for information (Aldoory, 2001; Grunig, 1997) and characterizes the active players in a public opinion issue (Slater, Chipman, Auld, Keefe, & Kendall, 1992), information seeking is considered as of a higher priority compared with information processing.

The relationship between the IVs & DVs. The three independent variables affect each other and affect the dependent variables. Problem recognition increases the level of information seeking, information processing, and communication effects (Grunig & Hunt, 1984). People who have a higher level of problem recognition are willing to engage in information seeking and information processing about the organizational consequences. However, the constraint recognition has a negative connection with the likelihood that people seek the information or pay attention to the information that comes to them (information processing). Compared with problem recognition and constraint recognition, the third independent variable, the level of involvement, has a more limited effect on information processing (Grunig, 1997), but it indicates how strong people are actively connected to a certain issue, which helps to distinguish whether the person's communication behavior will be active or passive.

Four types of publics. Publics are always specific. They form because of a given problem. In Tkalac's (2007) view, the formation of a public is a result of a problematic situation that has equal or similar consequences on particular groups of people. The publics that develop around problems differ in the extent of their awareness and their upcoming behaviors about the problem solution. Therefore, it is impossible to consider our target group as the general public. Public relations practitioners identify the linkage between the organization and its public. Later on, we determine whether those linkages form certain

groups of publics. Grunig and Hunt (1984) and others identified four types of publics based on the independent variables of the STP—nonpublic, a latent public, an aware public, and an active public. A nonpublic is a group of people who is not affected by the consequences created by the organization; a latent public is a group of people who faces a problem but fails to detect the problem; an aware public is a group of people who recognizes the problem; lastly, the active public is a group of people who organizes and discusses the problem caused by the organizational behavior.

The four types of publics are formed based on the different level of the independent and dependent variables. Active publics have low constraint recognition and high problem recognition and involvement. Members of this public actively seek and share information, and often become activists. Aware publics have high problem recognition, constraint recognition and involvement, but do not move into action. Latent publics have low problem recognition and moderate involvement (Aldoory & Sha, 2006). Nonpublics are people who have no concern about the issue or the organization. Table 2.1 shows the relationships between the public types and the independent variables.

Table 2.1 *Types of Public Defined by the Three Independent Variables. (Adapted from Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p.153.)*

	High Involvement	Low Involvement
High Problem Recognition Low Constraint Recognition	Active	Aware/Active
High Problem Recognition High Constraint Recognition	Aware/ Active	Latent/ Aware
Low Problem Recognition Low Constraint Recognition	Active	None/ Latent
Low Problem Recognition High Constraint Recognition	Latent	None

STP not only identifies publics but also helps the organization determine what to do once we recognize them. This is especially important when the organization needs to build and maintain relationships with its publics. The following section talks about the organization-public relationships in Relationship Management Theory.

Relationship Management Theory

The definition of OPR. Relationship Management Theory aims to generate mutual understanding and benefit—the desired outcome of organization-public relationships (OPRs)— which helps to achieve an organization’s goals by focusing on the common needs and expectations of organizations and interacting publics. Ledingham and Bruning (1998) defined organization-public relationships (OPRs) as “the state which exists between an organization and its key publics, in which the actions of either can impact the economic, social, cultural or political wellbeing of the other “(p. 62). The quality of OPR keeps

changing because relationships between the organization and the public are dynamic. Broom, Casey and Ritchey (2000) suggested that “relationships consist of the transactions that involve the exchange of resources between the organizations and the publics and that lead to mutual benefit as well as mutual achievement” (p. 91).

Grunig (1993) specified two types of OPR: symbolic and behavioral, which are built based on the effort of communication. However, communication alone can't sustain the long-term relationships. Ledingham and Bruning(2001) suggested that a series of studies of OPR indicated the positive relations between two-way symmetrical communication and the public's supportive behaviors. Shared interests and common goals of the organization and its publics sustain the long-term OPRs.

Models of relationships. Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (1997) first postulated a pioneer model of OPR, which includes the antecedents, subsequent states, and of the consequences. The first stage, antecedents, includes the perceptions, attitudes, motives, needs, and behaviors derived from the environment. The subsequent states suggest that transactions are a part of the process of fulfilling needs and can be used to categorize and evaluate the quality of relationships. Lastly, they defined “the consequences as the outputs that have the effects of changing the environment and of achieving, maintaining or changing goal states both inside and outside the organization” (p.94).

Subsequently, Grunig and Huang (2000) developed another three-staged model of

relationship management that includes “antecedents, maintenance strategies, and outcomes of relationships” (p.23). Antecedents are used for identifying which public needs to build relationships with the organization; the maintenance strategies stand for the relationship states, and outcomes of the strategies are the consequence of the relationships. They further suggested methods for monitoring the three stages: environmental scanning for the antecedents phase, observation by management and the publics for the relationship states, and coorientational measurement for the consequences.

Four relationship outcomes variables. Bendapudi and Berry (1997) noted that key public dependence on an organization is based upon whether the partnership yields a valued outcome. In order to measure the outcome of OPR, four quality dimensions (Grunig & Huang, 2000) are developed and widely adopted in academic and practical research (Jo, 2006; Ki & Hon, 2007; Ni & Wang, in press). The specific measures for the outcome include trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction (Hon & Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001).

In general, trust means one’s confidence in the other party and the willingness of one to open himself or herself to the other party. Five common dimensions in trust were identified: dependability, faith, competence, benevolence, and integrity (Hung, 2002). Control mutuality refers to the “degree to which partners agree about which of them should decide relationships goals and behavioral routines” (Stafford & Canary, 1991, p. 224), which means that each party agrees that one is or both are able to influence the decision-making process. Relational

satisfaction is the degree to which both parties are satisfied with the relationships (Kim & Ni, 2009). In social exchange perspective, a satisfying relationship can be established when the relational rewards equal or outweigh the cost. Subsequently, relational commitment refers to an enduring desire to maintain a relationship because it is valued (Moorman, Zaltman, & Deshpande, 1992). Two aspects in this dimension were identified (Meyer & Allen, 1984): continuance commitment, or the commitment to continue a certain line of action, and affective commitment, or “the affective or emotional orientation to an entity” (Grunig & Huang, 2000, p. 46).

Tourism Public Relations

The major goal of travel, tourism, and hospitality. The major goal of the travel, tourism, and hospitality industries (TT & H) is not only to focus on creating new groups of clientele but also to employ ways to maintain and nurture relationships with visitors so these travelers will return. There are three variables developed to assist management for formulating customer-oriented strategy; which are satisfaction, perceived value and intentions to revisit.

Once the satisfied customers develop their attachment and loyalty to a certain leisure place, they have a chance to turn into a repeat visitor. Also, it is six times less expensive to plan marketing strategies for retaining customers than it is to attract new customers (Petrick, 2002). Those old customers have the potential to voluntarily become a free advertisement by word of mouth, providing a cost-effective method to maintain the organizational clientele

base. There is no guarantee that a satisfied consumer will definitely be a repeat visitor; however, there is a good chance that a dissatisfied consumer will not return (Petrick, 2002).

In addition, TT & H is a service-oriented industry, which means that the public relations strategies in their campaigns should include two-way communicative channels for their target audience to provide their feedback as a measurement of the PR outcomes.

Cost-benefit and cost-effective analysis. Oftentimes, quantitative techniques are used to measure the public relations outcomes. There are two kinds of programs for the PR campaign evaluation, the cost-benefit analysis and the cost-effectiveness analysis. The outcomes of programs in a cost-benefit analysis are expressed in monetary terms, while the outcomes of programs in a cost-effectiveness analysis are expressed in substantive terms (Rossi & Freeman, 1993).

Public relations benefits are mostly intangible, such as reputation establishment and maintenance; a cost-effectiveness analysis would examine the costs associated with establishing a reputation through proper and appropriate public relations activities (Fall, 2002). For example, a cost-effectiveness analysis in an anti-smoking campaign would estimate the money spent on converting each smoker into a non-smoker and determine whether the campaign brings the expected outcomes for the organization, whereas a cost-benefits analysis would focus on the money literally spent on the anti-smoking campaign.

Three constructs of recreational behaviors. The recreation behavior has been conceptualized under the constructs of experience use history (Hammitt & McDonald, 1983; Schreyer, Lime, & Williams, 1984), place bonding/ attachment (Williams & Patterson, 1996; Korpela, Hartig, Kaiser, & Fuhrer, 2001), and resource substitution (Shelby & Vaske, 1991).

Experience use history (EUH), was developed by Schreyer, Lime and Williams (1984), which functions as an individual's past experience for the potential participation of leisure activity. Past experience means the "sum of life experience a recreationist has within a particular recreation activity or style of participation" (Virden, 1992), which create loyalty and attachment to behaviors.

Experience use history (EUH) is usually measured in terms of total visits, total years of use, and frequency per year of participation in an activity and/or resource at a specific site and/or other sites (Hammit & McDonald, 1983; Schreyer, Lime, & Williams, 1984). Use experience is cumulative over time and some researchers have defined EUH as a spectrum, where recreationists begin as novices and may become experienced veterans (Schreyer, Lime, & Williams, 1984). EUH has been demonstrated in past research to be an indicator variable linked to recreation user's perception, behavior, and management preference (Hammitt, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004).

Place bonding conceptualizes how over repeated exposures with a place might build the shared identity between the users and the place, which consists the two major dimensions

of place identity and dependence (Moore & Graefe, 1994; William & Vaske, 2003). Place identity is defined as a “sub-structure of the self-identity of the person consisting of broadly conceived cognitions about the physical world in which the individual lives” (Proshansky, Fabian & Kaminoff, 1983). Place dependence is defined as a functional reliance on a place, reflected in the importance of a place in providing features and conditions that support specific goals and desired activities (Stokols & Shumaker, 1981; Wilhams, Roggenbuck, & Watson, 1992). Furthermore, Hay (1998) reports an analysis with three more dimensional models of place bonding, including place familiarity, belongingness, and rootedness. Place familiarity refers to the initial stages of the bonding process, which involves a sense of place knowing, security, and environmental preference that results from acquaintances and memories associated with special places (Acredolo, 1982). Place belongingness involves a more social level in which people feel affiliated with the place, as though they hold “membership” and are a part of the place (Milligan, 1998). Place rootedness refers to the bonding situation wherein people become so bonded to a specific place that they long for very few or no other places for recreation (Hammit, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004).

Resource substitution occurs when a specific recreation resources outstrips other resources, which may become a problem because the experienced users who create attachment to their favorite place may be reluctant to accept a substitute or an alternative.

In a past study, the EUH-bonding relationship can be considered as the covariant of

place bonding, which explains the influence of the tourists' past experience on their willingness to pay for places or to develop their habitual use of places. Subsequently, research has hypothesized and found that place bonding is linked to resource substitution; so a strong bond to a particular place may be associated with low use of alternative places (Mesch & Manor, 1998; Stokols & Shumaker, 1981).

Museum Public Relations

Public relations is still a new practice to many museum organizations. Traditionally, museums have tended to ignore many of their publics (Gil & Ritchie, 2008). The relationship between museums and tourism has been an important topic of study (Harrison, 1997). Because culture is a significant factor in the choice of a city as a tourist destination (Hughes, 1998), museums now have become important attractions and tourism resources in the tourism industry, what has been developed in a way to benefit the local communities (Biodiversity and Tourism, 1997).

In museum public relations, tourists and residents are the two major groups for museum visitation. The role of residents is especially crucial because they have the potential to become the frequent visitors and bring long-term benefits to the cultural organizations. Hence, it is important to understand and assess their perceptions of local tourism development (e.g., museums in their neighborhood) to maintain their level of support and involvement (Allen, Long, Perdue, & Kieselbach, 1988; Johnson, Snepenger, & Akis, 1994;

Pearce, Farrell, & Klitzke, 1980; Sheldon & Abenoja, 2001).

Museum-visitor relationships. In Adam's (1983) view, there are six requirements for the museum public relations. First, it is crucial to identify the key public and to understand the core value of the museum's programs. Subsequently, the following literature on museums discusses a "new museology" where society, often broken into specific publics, is central to the interpretation of museums (McLean, 1997). Second, the museum should continuously measure the public perception and adjust to it if necessary. A survey is the most common tool for museum industry to explore the public opinions. Third, the public interest should be considered as the framework for museum's policy-making procedure. This process aims to balance the interests between the organization and the publics to eliminate the organization-public expectation gap. Next, the museum should set plans to evaluate its goals and performance, that is to say, museums should always employ methods to measure a public relations plan's effectiveness (Loomis, 1987). Fifth, museum public relations develops the purposeful collaboration with the media to reach the target group. Finally, museum public relations sets up a plan with long-term vision and are prepared for any possible situations in the future. Those requirements are very similar to the traditional management process of public relations progress, i.e., research, objectives / program planning, implementing plan, and evaluation (ROPE) (Lindenmann, 2006).

Among the six requirements, Adam (1983) suggested that the essence of the museum

public relations is to listen to, communicate with and respond to the key publics.

Understanding the information needs of museum visitors is the first key element to success (Booth, 1998), which is also called stimulus factors (Baloglu, 1999). There are two ways for visitors to receive the information they need—secondary information and primary information. Gunn (1994) proposed a typology of information sources by individuals as following:

1. Induced—referring to advertising in the mass media, which depends on information transmitted by individuals or the organization.
2. Autonomous—which includes the mass media that transmit all kinds of organization-related information
3. Organic—when people, relatives, friends, and information offices provide information about a museum.
4. An actual visit to a museum—considered as the intensity of visitation, that is, how many times the person has been there before.

The first three information sources are regarded as secondary. The fourth typology refers to the group of people that prefers to build their museum experience based on the primary information source. Gil and Ritchie (2008) showed that visitors were less influenced by “advertisements”, but more influenced by comments of “the quality of visitation experience of friends and relatives” (p. 491). Therefore, conclusion can be made that those

individuals who possess the primary information source hold the power of disseminating positive or negative information to affect the opinion of others about the museums. In order to fulfill all the expectations of all types of publics and build beneficial relationship with them, it is essential to understand their museum visiting purposes.

People walk into the museum with different kinds of purposes. My research aims to analyze how these visitor publics would vary based on their visiting purposes. According to Graburn, curator of the Lowie Museum of Anthropology at the University of California in Berkeley, museum visitors can be classified in terms of three types of purpose: the *reverential*, the group of people in search of a personal experience with something out of the ordinary; the *associational*, visitors who use the museum as a place to socialize with family or friends; and the *educational*, people who interpret the world by museum collections (Adams, 1983).

Those three visitation purposes indicate the visitors' motivation and what they want to obtain from their museum experience, which can also be interpreted as the antecedents of the museum-public relationship. Hence, understanding the visitor's purpose is the first step before we move forward to the museum campaign design.

Museum campaign strategies—collections digitalization. According to Kleiner and Tansey (1996), "human beings have recorded their cultures in images for over 30,000 years" (p. 26). Finding new ways to make the cultural images such as painting and calligraphy permanent and accessible to publics is a continuous mission beyond eras and nationalities.

Nowadays, libraries and museums have seen the digitalization process as an exciting evolution in curatorial methods, because digital copy images of a museum's printed photograph collection accomplish two important goals of cultural heritage institutions: access and preservation (Library of Congress, 2000). Large museums and libraries worldwide have initiated the digital projects as their new collection management. The new technique offers a more trustworthy preservation method and even breaks the stereotype of the traditional collections display.

According to Social Exchange Theory (SET), a conceptual framework widely used for tourism evaluation, collection digitalization should bring benefits to both museums and local publics. The central tenet of SET is that a basic form of human interaction is the exchange of social and material resources. Individuals engaged in the exchange interaction intend to seek mutual benefits which maximize their rewards and minimize their costs (Choi & Murray, 2009). SET consists of negative and positive impacts. The negative impact of tourism to the local community includes the traffic congestion, crime, and parking issue, whereas the positive impact refers to local economic growth. The museum digitalization effectively reduces the negative impacts in SET evaluation, for example, people can save the time on commuting and can interact with the collections through digitalization, which meet the individuals' expectation by maximizing the value of their exchange outcome (Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). However, it still remains unknown whether the digitalization further raises

the level of the local community's participation in and attachment with the museums.

Case Study: Old is New? The National Palace Museum's Difficulties

In the past decade, the National Palace Museum (NPM) in Taipei has been positioned as the core of Chinese art history in the scholarly world. However, the mission of the museum for the new century is to play a stronger educational role for the general population. In other words, the rich antiques are no longer hidden in the ivory tower, but are now becoming the new inspiration for future generations. Hence, the former director, Mun-Lee Lin, suggested a new vision for the old treasure house (Lai, 2007) and proposed a brand-new slogan of "Old is New" after the reopening of the NPM in 2006.

In 1985, Dr. Chin, the president of the NPM who placed great importance on the social educational function of the museum, implemented the new policy that attempted to recruit more young students to walk into the museum, such as collaborating with school districts by providing guided tours to 500 primary and secondary school students in Greater Taipei every day. However, results showed that since the 1980's, the NPM has been the type of place that students visit only once in elementary school, but never return to (Lai, 2007). Those people are now young adults aged from 18 to 30.

In 2007, the NPM did a qualitative study to investigate young people's participation in the Exhibition related to Chinese Culture (ERCC). There were 2,650,551 visitors in total from January to December in 2007. However, among the 2,076,791 visitors who were local

residents, only 105,569 people (about 5%) were aged from 18 to 30 (The National Palace Museum Annual Report, 2007). Therefore, since 2007, the local young group of people is set to be the target audience by the NPM.

Meanwhile, the NPM shifted away from the old image of the warehouse of collections to a powerhouse of history and art inspiration. First, they transformed the ERCC through digitalization and provided access to all Internet users, especially the younger generation. Second, the NPM is collaborating with the media and the British Museum to attract more attention to exhibitions related to Chinese culture. For example, they simultaneously established two new style exhibitions, one from western culture named “the beauty of the human body in ancient Greece” and one Chinese art exhibition named “dynastic renaissance—art and culture of the southern Song dynasty”. The marketing strategy was to encourage people interested in western history to also walk into Chinese art exhibition. Visitors could buy tickets in package priced only at NT \$250 (US \$8) for both exhibitions. In this way, those western-culture lovers would be encouraged to take the opportunities to also visit the next-door exhibition about the beauty of Chinese traditional art. Third, the NPM has publicized new activities called Saturday Night at the NPM—when young people (especially students) enter for free for all exhibitions every Saturday with extended hours from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Furthermore, the NPM would open its patio as a platform for young groups’ talent shows.

Little research has been done to explore whether those new strategies are working or not, but the NPM's intention to get involved with its key public's community is obvious. Hence, this study focuses on one of the three campaigns, the ERCC digitalization, to find out whether the NPM uses the right strategy by identifying the appropriate types of publics and establish positive relationship outcomes among the local young group.

Linkages Among Public Types, Relationship Management Theory, and Museum Public Relations

Kim and Ni (2009) distinguished two types of public relations problem: public-initiated PR problems (PPR problems) and organization-initiated PR problems (OPR problems). My study falls under the category of OPR Problems because "an organization recognizes a problem arising from either some consequences from stakeholders/publics"(p.7).

In OPR problems, organizations attempt to create a public about the problem that the organizations experience or think of as crucial. Also, they plan to move up the public communication behaviors from passive to active. In other words, for OPR Problems, non/latent publics are to be changed into active/aware publics (Kim & Ni, 2009).

In Kim and Ni's (2010) view, the value of public relations lies in helping organizations become more effective by scanning the organizational environment, identifying strategic publics, reconciling organizational goals with expectations of these publics, and building long-term, quality relationships with these publics to reduce costs and gain support (p.36).

Practically speaking, an organization starts its programming by identifying who hold the OPR stakes and which relationships are highly connected with the organization. The process is usually accomplished by STP, which helps to identify and segment the key publics in OPR. As the identification is completed, the Relationship Management Theory would help initiate and sustain the long-term OPR.

Yang (2007) further concluded that an organization should focus on the identification of active publics before the organization cultivates relationship with their publics because these are the groups of people who have the strongest interests to seek, process, and share all the organization-related information. All individuals have the potential to act as active public. Hence, "even if the public has not yet engaged in active communications with an organization, the PR professionals need to foster the communication behaviors of those publics, as long as they are segmented as the key publics for a given PR activity" (p.115).

The situational theory of publics has the premise that, the publics are situational. They come and go, which means the people who comprise a certain group might replace one another according to the organizational reaction to the public needs. Each consequence caused by the organizational behavior may bring about a public with different people in it. It is necessary to pay attention to any type of publics because each public has the potential to move from the original type to a new one.

However, such change is usually gradual. A latent public may first become an aware

public, if their exposure to the information campaign from the organization is strong enough to change their problem recognition, involvement recognition as well as constraint recognition. The public might become more aware or even active later on (Kim & Ni, 2009). In other words, effective campaigns can successfully move up the potential publics to more active types. So my goal is to test the theory by examining the target group's perception of a given organization's campaign.

Museum digitalization and community involvement. The definition of community has moved from tangible to intangible groups of people. The cyberspace community has become a mainstream in the world of young people. Ledingham and Bruning (1998) postulated that "organizational involvement in and support of the community in which it operates can engender loyalty toward the organization among the key publics when that involvement/support is known by key publics" (p.63). One of the most important missions for museums nowadays is to actively create closer relationships between its collections and visitors.

According to Kotler & Kotler (2001), museums are seeking ways to reach major publics and strengthen their ties to the key publics' communities. The only way to achieve the goal is to make the collections accessible to the key public without the limitation of time and space. Therefore, the cultural organizations show its support and involvement for the cyberspace community by offering collections digitalization.

The fast growing user demand for cyber information has already changed the function

of cultural institutions. However, it is still unclear whether museum digitalization can effectively raise the community's involvement not only in cyberspace but also encourage young people to walk into the museum.

Past experience and future visitation. Experience in recreation behavior includes two dimensions. First, the term represents the number and type of events in which the individual has participated. Second, it represents an individual's interpretation of a given event. Oftentimes, the interpretation is implied by the evaluation of previous recreational participation. (Schreyer, Lime & Williams, 1984). The evaluation determines the participants' experience level. Virden (1992) further states that "it is beneficial to segment the participants by their experience level as a method to improve the effectiveness of the organizational program and marketing" (p.7). Hence, three constructs of recreational behaviors: experience use history (EUH), place bonding, and resource substitution, are created to understand the leisure participants experience background and how to raise their positive experience level.

Several researchers (Shinew, 1993; Williams, Schreyer & Knopf, 1990) have also contended that an individual's past experiences can mediate their present leisure behavior. Thus, in this study, the museum visitors' experience level would be tested for the future participation prediction.

Research Questions

From this literature, the following research questions have emerged:

RQ1: What types of publics can be identified among the potential young museum visitors?

RQ2: What kind of relationship outcomes can be identified among the potential young museum visitors?

RQ3: What changes can the museum digitalization campaign make to different public types and relationship outcomes?

RQ4: How does the purpose of a museum visit influence the public types and the relationship outcomes?

RQ5: Can museum digitalization influence the key public's intention to visit the museum?

Chapter Three

Methodology

This study extended Relationship Management Theory by synthesizing it with the Situational Theory and museum/tourism public relations. It aimed to identify the types of publics, relationship outcomes and the role of museum visitation purposes among potential museum visitors, and how one campaign, the ERCC digitalization, influenced both types and relationship outcomes.

This study involved a two-group experimental design with a web-based survey posted on SurveyMonkey.com. This chapter addresses the research methodology. It first describes the sampling of this study. Next, it explains the data collection procedures and then the measurement. Lastly, it notes the statistical procedures that were used to analyze the data.

Sampling

Data were collected from young people (aged 18 to 30) who currently lived in Taipei, where the National Palace Museum was located. Individuals completed the survey voluntarily. First, I used a convenience sample of 50 respondents from the researcher's acquaintances. Then, I used a snowball sampling in which the initial respondents were asked to refer other respondents, and once these people were contacted, they were asked for additional respondents (Frey, Botan & Kreps, 2000). The survey link was posted online. At the beginning of the survey, I asked those acquaintances who completed the survey to each pass

the link to another two people, and in turn, the respondents were asked to pass the link to two additional participants. Fifteen small prizes of \$10 gift cards were offered as incentives for those people who participated and completed the survey.

In the end, a total of 352 local young residents in Taipei participated in the survey but 16 responses were not usable because they were under or over the age range I set. In total, the sample size was 336. Participants were randomly assigned to two groups: experiment group (n=168) and control group (n=168). Respondents in the control group were asked to complete the questionnaire based on their past NPM experience. For the experiment group, participants were exposed to the digitalization campaign before they filled out the same questionnaire.

Of the 336 participants, 46.4% (n= 156) were male, and 53.6% (n= 180) were female. In this study, about 47.6% were 18 –22 years old (n= 160), 30.4% were 23 – 26 years old (n=102), and 22.0% were 27 – 30 years old (n=74).

Since the major barrier of the NPM is known to be its traffic inconvenience, there were two cross-situational questions about the transportation to the NPM. Among all the respondents, 17.9% of the subjects used private vehicles (n=60), and 82.1% of the subjects used mass transportation (n= 276). Among the 60 participants who used private vehicles, the majority of people (61.7%, n=37) need more than 30 minutes to get to the NPM. On the other hand, among the 276 participants who used the mass transportation, the majority of people (71.7%, n=198) need more than 30 minutes to get to the NPM. Since Taipei is a compact city,

traffic time over 30 minutes is regarded as long. Table 3.1 shows detailed descriptives of the participants.

Table 3.1 *Descriptive Statistics*

Variable	Value	Frequency	Sample (%) (n=336)
Gender	Female	180	53.6%
	Male	156	46.4%
Age	18-22 years	160	47.6%
	23-26 years	102	30.4%
	27-30 years	74	22.0%
Transportation	Private Vehicles	60	17.9%
	< 15 min	4	6.7%
	15 min-30 min	19	31.6%
	>30 min	37	61.7%
	Mass Transportation	276	82.1%
	< 15 min	11	4.0%
	15min- 30 min	67	24.3%
	>30 min	198	71.7%

Procedures

Once the questionnaire was developed, an IRB application was submitted to the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects at the University of Houston. Once the application was approved by the Committee, I started collecting data.

Data were collected through a two-group experimental study. At the beginning of the questionnaires for both control and experiment groups, screening questions were asked to determine the participants' eligibility. Participants in the control group were asked to answer questions that helped determine their public types based on situational variables. Next, the types and outcomes of relationships they had with NPM were explored. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked questions about their museum visitation purposes, past visitation experience in the NPM, and intention for future visitation. Participants in the experiment group were first exposed to the NPM online website containing the digitalization campaign and then proceeded to fill out the same questionnaire for participants in the control group.

For the convenience of participants in Taiwan, the questionnaire was translated into Chinese. In order to ensure translation accuracy of all questionnaires, back translation and decentering translation procedures (Vijver & Leung, 2001) were used. The original script was designed in English (E1) and be translated into Chinese (C1). Next, the translator translated the Chinese text (C1) into English text (E2) again. Finally, E2 was used to compare with E1

to test the consistency of the two contexts. The questionnaire was pilot tested on 10 participants. Because the pilot test participants did not have any problem with the questionnaire, no changes were made to the questionnaire.

Measurement

Public types were measured through the perceptual and situational variables in the Situational Theory. Relationship outcomes were examined through four indicators: control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, and commitment. Museum visitation purposes were measured through three items summarized from relevant literature (Adam, 1983). Below is a detailed report of all measurements.

The overall reliability levels of all perceptual variables in the STP were moderately high, with Cronbach's alphas at .756 for problem recognition, .794 for involvement recognition, and .663 for constraint recognition.

The quality of organization-public relationships was measured by the four relationship outcomes in this study. Each variable had four to six items for testing. An example item for trust was "I am confident that the NPM has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do." For satisfaction, an example item was "Generally speaking, the NPM meets my needs." For commitment, an example item was "I believe that it is worthwhile to try to maintain the relationship with the NPM." For control mutuality, an example item was "Both the NPM and I agree on what we can expect from one another."

The reliability levels for all OPR outcomes were considerably higher, with Cronbach's alphas at .836 for control mutuality, .853 for trust, .843 for satisfaction, and .833 for commitment.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). RQ1 was answered using the summation method to segment publics according to their level of problem recognition, constraint recognition, and involvement recognition. RQ2 was answered using descriptive data to present the distribution of relationship outcomes in control and experiment groups. Next, RQ3 was answered using one-way ANOVA to see the differences in public types and relationship outcomes between the control and experiment groups. For RQ4, data were analyzed using the regression method with the museum visitation purposes as the independent variable and the public types and relationship outcomes as the dependent variables.

RQ5 was answered using logistic regression to analyze the factors contributing to publics' willingness to visit the NPM. Independent variables included the assigned group (indicating whether participants were exposed to the campaign or not) as well as other cross-situational variables such as age, gender, means of transportation, commuting time, past visitation experience, visitation purposes, and visitation experience in other museums.

Chapter Four

Results

This chapter presents the results of the study. It addresses each of the 5 primary research questions individually.

RQ1: What types of publics can be identified among the potential young museum visitors?

Public types were relatively evenly dispersed across four types of publics. In total, 336 participants were asked about their perceptions of the local young people's ERCC participation in the NPM. The result showed that 26.2% were nonpublics about the issue (n=88), 20.5% were latent publics (n=69), 28.9% were aware publics (n=97), and 24.4% were active publics (n=82).

If we break the types of publics down according to the two groups, control group (n=168) and experiment group (n=168), results showed that in the control group, 31.0% (n=52) were nonpublics, 14.9% (n= 25) were latent publics, 32.1% (n= 54) were aware publics, and 22.0% (n=37) were active publics. On the other hand, in the experiment group, 21.4% (n=36) of the participants were nonpublics, 26.2% (n= 44) were latent publics, 25.6% (n= 43) were aware publics, and 26.8% (n=45) were active publics.

Aware publics are always the interests of PR practitioners because they cultivate the public awareness of a certain issue (Ni, & Kim, 2008) and with most number of people. In this study, among the 336 participants, most people (28.9%, n= 97) gathered in the aware

publics group, which supported the previous STP findings. An initial comparison indicated that there were more latent and active publics in experiment group and more nonpublics and aware publics in control group. The significant difference between these two groups was examined in RQ3. Table 4.1 shows the detailed distribution of public types.

Table 4.1 *The Distribution of Four Types of Publics*

	All Participants	Control Group	Experiment Group
Nonpublics	26.2% (n= 88)	31.0% (n= 52)	21.4% (n= 36)
Latent Publics	20.5% (n= 69)	14.9% (n= 25)	26.2% (n= 44)
Aware Publics	28.9% (n= 97)	32.1% (n= 54)	25.6% (n= 43)
Active Publics	24.4% (n= 82)	22.0% (n= 37)	26.8% (n= 45)
Total	100% (n= 336)	100% (n= 168)	100% (n= 168)

RQ2: What kind of relationship outcomes can be identified?

In total, 336 participants were asked about their relationships with the NPM. Overall, the relationship outcomes that NPM had with its publics were positive. On a scale of 1-7, the mean for control mutuality was 3.99 (SD = .91), 4.45 for trust (SD = .98), 4.86 for satisfaction (SD = 1.08), and 4.56 for commitment (SD = .73). Among the four OPR indicators, participants perceived a higher level of satisfaction than other indicators, and a lower level of control mutuality.

For the control group, the mean for control mutuality was 3.84 (SD = .89), 4.34 for trust

(SD = .95), 4.74 for satisfaction (SD = 1.00), and 4.48 for commitment (SD = .74). For the experiment group, the mean for control mutuality was 4.13 (SD = .91), 4.56 for trust (SD = 1.01), 4.98 for satisfaction (SD = 1.14), and 4.63 for commitment (SD = .72). Significant difference between these two groups was examined in RQ3. Table 4.2 shows the detailed mean and the standard deviation for the relationship outcomes.

Table 4.2

Mean and Standard Deviation for Relationship Outcomes

	Control Mutuality		Trust		Satisfaction		Commitment	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
All Participants	3.99	.91	4.45	.98	4.86	1.08	4.56	.73
Control Group	3.84	.89	4.34	.95	4.74	1.00	4.48	.74
Experiment Group	4.13	.91	4.56	1.01	4.98	1.14	4.63	.72

RQ3. What changes can the museum digitalization campaign make to different public types and relationship outcomes?

One-way ANOVA was conducted with the assigned group (1 for control group and 2 for experiment group) as the independent variable to evaluate the difference in public types and OPR outcomes between the two groups. For public types (measured as activeness in this

given issue), there was no significant difference between the control group and the experiment group ($p = .309$).

However, all four OPR outcomes were significantly different between the two groups, with $p = .004$ for control mutuality, $p = .038$ for trust, $p = .042$ for satisfaction, $p = .050$ for commitment. In addition, participants in the experiment group rated all four OPR outcomes higher than those in the control group. Control mutuality was significantly lower in the control group ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .89$) than that of the experiment group ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .91$). Trust of the control group was significantly lower ($M = 4.34$, $SD = .95$) than that of the experiment group ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.01$). Satisfaction of the control group was significantly lower ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.00$) than that of the experiment group ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.14$). Finally, commitment of the control group was also significantly lower ($M = 4.48$, $SD = .74$) than that of the experiment group ($M = 4.63$, $SD = .72$).

In conclusion, digitalization campaign did not produce any effect on public types but did have an effect on all of the OPR outcomes. Overall, digitalization helped enhance participants' perception of OPR outcomes.

RQ4. How does the purpose of a museum visit influence the public types and the relationship outcomes?

There are three visitation purposes in this research: the *associational* purpose, "I visit the ERCC in the NPM to spend time with friends and family"; the *educational* purpose, "I visit

the ERCC in the NPM to learn new knowledge”; and the *reverential* purpose, “I visit the ERCC in the NPM to gain extraordinary experience from cultural collections.” The Pearson Correlation showed a strong correlation ($r = .747$) between the educational and reverential purposes.

A simple regression analysis was done for this research question. Results showed that the combination of these variables did significantly predict public types ($p < .001$). The predictive power was not very strong though, with only 9.8% of the variance in the public type predicted from the visitation purposes. The effect of each purpose on public types varied. The reverential purpose ($p = .074$) had no effect on public types. However, the associational ($p = .032$) and educational purpose ($p = .013$) both predicted public types.

Visitation purposes taken together were also found to predict all four OPR outcomes at a highly significant level, $p < .001$ for control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, and commitment. Again the predictive power was low for control mutuality (7.5% of the variance predicted from visitation purposes), trust (9.3%), and satisfaction (10.2%). However, 28.6% of the variance in commitment could be predicted from the visitation purposes, which was moderate.

The effect of each of the three visitation purposes on OPR outcomes varied. The associational purpose ($p = .005$) and the reverential purposes ($p = .028$) both predicted the level of control mutuality. However, the educational purpose ($p = .206$) did not. The

associational purpose ($p = .034$) and reverential purpose ($p = .002$) both predicted the level of trust, whereas the educational purpose ($p = .341$) again had no effect. Only the reverential purpose significantly predicted satisfaction ($p = .004$) whereas associational purpose ($p = .416$) and the educational purpose ($p = .106$) did not. Lastly, the educational purpose ($p < .001$) and the reverential purpose ($p < .001$) both predicted the level of commitment, while the associational purpose ($p = .819$) did not.

In addition, the r square between all visitation purposes and public types is positive ($r = .106$) as well as all visitation purposes and relationship outcomes ($r = .084$ for control mutuality, $r = .101$ for trust, $r = .110$ for satisfaction, and $r = .292$ for commitment). It proves that the direction here is significantly positive.

In conclusion, the museum visitation purposes affected public types. They also played a role in all of the OPR outcomes. In addition, among all visitation purposes, the reverential purpose was noteworthy because it was influential for all four relationship outcomes.

Q5. Can museum digitalization influence the key public's intention to visit the museum?

Participants were asked about their intentions for future participation. Logistic regression was used to test if museum digitalization would predict participants' intention to visit. In the regression analysis, independent variables were entered such as assigned group, gender, age, means of transportation used to get to NPM, commuting time to NPM, previous visits to NPM, the three museum visitation purposes, and previous museum visit experiences.

When all variables were considered together, they significantly predicted intention to visit, the model $\chi^2 = 38.21$, $df = 10$, $p = <.001$. Table 4.3 presents the odds ratios, which suggest that the odds of visiting NPM in the future are increasingly greater as the levels of previous visits to NPM, associational purpose, and reverential purpose increase. The campaign itself reflected in the assigned group indicating whether participants were exposed to the campaign, however, was not a predictor for future visit intention.

Table 4.3: Logistic Regression Predicting Who Will Visit the NPM in the Future

Variable	B	SE	Odds ratio	<i>P</i>
Group	.18	.54	1.20	.735
Gender	.08	.55	1.08	.888
Age	.12	.09	1.13	.165
Tool	.00	.71	1.00	.998
Traffic	-.34	.61	.71	.577
Previous NPM visit	1.68	.65	5.37	.010
Purpose 1 (associational)	.42	.17	1.51	.017
Purpose 2 (educational)	-.06	.29	.95	.843
Purpose 3 (reverential)	.70	.30	2.00	.018
Previous Museum visits	-.01	.04	.99	.730

Chapter Five

Discussion

Major Findings

In this study, five research questions were examined. Results suggested that the campaign did not change public types, which means people's activeness about this particular topic has not changed significantly as a result of the digitalization campaign. However, the campaign did significantly improve participants' perceptions of all four OPR outcomes. In this study, the highest level of relationship outcomes that the participants perceived was satisfaction, whereas control mutuality received the lowest rating.

Results also suggested that reverential purpose was highly related to all of the OPR outcomes but not predicative of the change in public types. In addition, past NPM visitation experience, the reverential purpose, and the associational purpose were key factors in determining the publics' intention to visit the museum. The following paragraphs discuss the essential theoretical implications, focusing on the integration of theories, as well as the practical implications of the findings. The chapter concludes with limitations and directions for future research.

Theoretical Implications

Theoretically speaking, this study assessed and extended the Situational Theory of Publics and Relationship Management Theory in the museum/tourism public relations context. Exploring the effect of digitalization campaign on public formation and relationship

management can potentially help museum management to identify and build/ maintain mutually beneficial relationships with museum visitors. The findings also demonstrated practical usefulness in addressing the visit factors such as the visitors' visitation experience and visitation purposes.

Public formation and change. Kim and Ni (in press) proposed innovative ways to use existing theories such as theory of publics. They suggested that, instead of being used mostly in formative research in any public relations campaign, the theory of public segmentation could also potentially be used as evaluative measures for the effectiveness of a particular campaign. In other words, the change in public types or the activeness of publics might be good indicators of how a campaign has successfully influenced the perceptual variables and hence changed the way publics look at a certain issue. However, in this particular study, the museum digitalization campaign did not significantly improve the publics' interests to solve the young people's participation problem. This finding could potentially be explained by the assumptions in the theories of public formation.

Traditionally, the situational of theory of publics (Grunig, 1997) has a fundamental premise that publics are not to be created and that they arise on their own when problems arise (Grunig & Repper, 1992). Acknowledging the fact that publics are difficult to change, this premise has, to a great extent, argued against the commonly held perceptions of public relations practitioners that they can easily manipulate publics through messages.

In this study, the majority of the respondents realized the problem (totally 73.8% of people were categorized in latent, aware, and active publics). Generally speaking, people will spend considerable time thinking about the issues that connect with them (Kim & Grunig, 2011). However, the campaign itself was not powerful enough to significantly change the publics' activeness on this particular issue. This, to some extent, has supported the idea that the mere presence of an intervention message or campaign may not be enough to affect how publics perceive the issue. On the other hand, this might be a problem in the campaign itself. Maybe just transferring materials online is not sufficient in influencing publics. Other strategies need to be considered in order to "move" or "change" publics' activeness. One of the NPM campaigns, Saturday Night at the NPM, offers young people a platform to present the exhibitions in terms of drama, dance, and music. It successfully encourages students to seek for information related to the ERCC and to subsequently create ERCC messages to their fellows by performance. This campaign has its potential to achieve the goal by giving the museum participants new roles—changing them from passive message receivers to positive message co-creators. This case is an inspiration for museum strategy design. In the future, museum management can attract more visitors by working on the induction of young people's physical involvement and experiential learning with the museum exhibits or events.

Organization-public relationship management. This study found that overall, participants perceived the highest level of satisfaction and the lowest level of control

mutuality toward the organization. This is consistent with the findings in previous research. Perception of control mutuality was the weakest indicator among the six relationship indexes (trust, satisfaction, commitment, control mutuality, exchange, and communal relationship) (Hon & Brunner, 2002).

Grunig and Hung (2002) noted that active communication behaviors, familiarity, and personal experience of publics are positively correlated with the quality of OPR outcomes. The digitalization campaign was found to have the potential in creating positive OPR outcomes; in other words, it significantly moved up the participants' perceptions of the levels of satisfaction, trust, commitment, and control mutuality. Even though the campaign did not convince the participants of the connection and importance of the young people's participation problem, it did show an effect on moving up the people's perceptions of their personal relationship with the organization. These were the keys for people to form positive attitude toward the museum and subsequently develop a mutually beneficial relationship for both sides.

The relationship between public types, OPR outcomes, and visit factors. Several researchers (Shinew, 1993; Williams, Schreyer & Knopf, 1990) have contended that an individual's past experiences can mediate their present leisure behaviors. This has been supported by results in this study, i.e., participants' past NPM experience significantly predicted their future visit intention. In other words, in this organization-public relationship,

each participant's past experiences affected their interactions with the organization. This is also supported by the Experience Use History (EUH). EUH is cumulative over time (Schreyer, Lime, & Williams, 1984), which is not only the reference frame for visitors to evaluate their participation but also an indicator for them to determine their future participation back to the same activity or leisure environment. This study proved the effectiveness of EUH because people who had visitation experience in the NPM interpreted the museum environment as familiar and developed higher likelihood for another visit.

Karp, Kreamer, and Lavine (1992) identified museum's main purpose in the following way, "All museums are, at the most fundamental level, concerned with information/knowledge" (p.160). Traditionally, museums were dedicated to public education by providing people of all ages and future generation with knowledge of the nation's cultural and historical heritage (Museum working, 2005). Until now, most of the museums still play the role as social educators by disseminating the information/knowledge through their collections. However, the findings in this research were not consistent with how museums positioned themselves. Reverential purpose, or the purpose of those visitors who are in search of a personal experience with something out of the ordinary (Adam, 1983); and associational purpose, visitors who use the museum as a place to socialize with family or friends (Adam, 1983) are found to have a stronger influence on visitors' intention for future visit. In addition, reverential purpose was significant in determining the level of all four OPR outcomes.

A museum must understand its publics to attract visitors, satisfy various publics, enhance its programs, and thrive (Adam. 1983). The finding in this research indicated that visitors nowadays may have changed their mind for museum offerings, that is, family-oriented environment and extraordinary visit experience have outweighed the importance of the educational purposes for them in general. According to Ambrose and Paine (1993), a successful museum aims to provide services that meet its users' needs. Therefore, museums have to increase and expand its responsibilities to the society to keep up with the new trend.

Practical Implications

The results indicate that visitors expect their visitation of the museum exhibitions to be something novel and family-oriented, instead of a collection house purely for educational function. Moreover, the extraordinary visitation experience will give visitors more positive perceptions of the relationship outcomes with the organization, and further enhance their willingness for future visitation.

For the museum management, it is the time to establish a family-friendly exhibits environment. The cultural organizations need to play a key role in providing an accessible, welcoming environment for family learning (Guardian, 2011). Museums now are devoted to integrating services to reach out to families. Research pointed out:

“Family learning” enables adults and children to learn together and involves explicit

learning outcomes for both. It helps children to achieve their learning goal and gives parents the confidence to go on learning and even encourages progression for their learning. (NIACE, 2006)

Family learning can be achieved by developing the family learning sessions, such as family day, which can be held weekly or monthly to make it as a routine in visitors' life. Those family learning programs offer not only a platform for visitors to learn from the collections but also a good chance for museums to promote and enhance the visitors' identity and place bonding to the museum.

After the participants developed their habit for frequent visit, the ticket price might be another potential obstacle for visitors. In this case, family membership is a good museum strategy. It encourages museum visitors to participate in any museum events or exhibits as a family unit. In family membership programs, the admission fee per person is lower than the regular ticket price, which reduces the visitors' economic burden and enhances their interest in paying more visit.

For reverential purposes, the 3D technique in virtual reality combined with family tour, which allows museum visitors to take their family or friends to initiate their visitation experience is another good choice for future exhibitions design. Some recent research in Europe shows that about 35% of museums have already started developing the 3D presentation of objects (Tsapatori, 2003). For the 3D technology, the exhibitions can be

created as real as the world we lived both inside and outside the museums (e.g., the touch-screen displays installed inside galleries and at the same time showcased on the Internet) (Wojciechowski, Walczak, White, & Cellary, 2004). The interactive program combined with the cutting-edge technology is an exciting and appealing manner to fulfill visitors' needs and attract them to walk into the museum.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Even though traffic was the biggest problem of the NPM, it surprisingly did not show any significant connection with public types, relationship outcomes, and visitation factors in this research. However, it still has its value for further study.

In this research, only the effect of relationship outcomes was examined. Future research can explore the linkage among the four relationship outcomes themselves and find out what relationship variables are actually antecedents to others. The linkage is helpful for the management to design strategy and change the publics' perception step by step.

Another limitation of this study is that it only examined the publics' opinions. Ledingham and Bruning (1998, 2001), in a series of studies of organization-public relationships, emphasized the need for both (the organization and public) behaviors and communication. The management perceptions of the relationships are as important as the perceptions of publics. If perceptions of the relationship can be measured by both sides, public relations practitioners are able to measure the gaps in how the management and the public define the relationship.

Such a gap plays the essential role in designing strategies to maintain or repair the relationships.

In addition, this study used completely convenience sampling where respondents were selected nonrandomly on the basis of availability (Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000). Unlike the random sampling, this method did not guarantee that each person in the target population had an equal chance to be selected. Most of the people who participated in this research were from researcher's network of friends; therefore, they shared similar economic and educational background. It might produce a potentially biased and skewed sample, affecting the findings of this study.

Experience Use History (EUH) provides tourism a frame of reference for the linkage between the individual's leisure behavior (i.e. usage patterns, familiarity, and past experience), and their satisfaction, motives and constraints (Petrick, 2002). In addition, it has been demonstrated in past research to be an indicator variable linked to a number of recreation user perception, behavior, and management preference (Hammit, Backlund, & Bixler, 2004). Further research can be conducted by continuing the process of using EUH to segment the visitors' experience level, the Situational Theory of Publics to identify the target publics and Relationship Management Theory to understand the visitors' interpretation (relationship outcomes and types) to examine a leisure activity.

References

- Acredolo, L. P. (1982). The familiarity factor in spatial research. *New Directions for Childhood Development, 15*, 19-30.
- Adams, G. D. (1983). *Museum public relations*. Nashville, TN: The American Association for State and Local History.
- Aldoory, L. (2001). Making health communications meaningful for women: Factors that influence involvement and the situational theory of publics. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 13*, 163-185.
- Aldoory, L., Kim, J-N., & Tindall, N. (2010). The influence of perceived shared risk in crisis communication: Elaborating the situational theory of publics. *Public Relations Review, 36*, 134-140.
- Aldoory, L., & Sha, B-L. (2006). The situational theory of publics: Practical applications, methodological challenges, and theoretical horizons. In E.L. Toth (Ed.), *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management: Challenges for the next generation* (pp. 339-355). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on resident's perception of community life. *Journal of Travel Research, 27*, 16-21.
- Ambrose, T., & Paine, C. (1993). *Museum basics*. New York, NY: ICOM.

- American Association of Museums (2005). *Report of the AAM Museums Working in the Public Interest*. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from <http://www.aam-us.org/aboutmuseums/publicinterest.cfm>
- Baloglu, S. (1999). The relationship between destination images and sociodemographic and trip characteristics of international travellers. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 3, 221-233.
- Ban, Z. (2010, May). *Situational motivations of information forwarding behavior*. Paper presented at International Communication Association Conference, Singapore.
- Bendapudi, N., & Berry, L. L. (1997). Customers' motivation for maintaining relationships with service providers. *Journal of Retailing*, 73, 15-27.
- Biodiversity and Tourism. (1997). *International conference for environmental ministers for biodiversity and tourism*. Retrieved on November 28, 2010, from <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/eco-tour/berlin.html>
- Booth, B. (1998). Understanding the information needs of visitors to museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 17, 139-157.
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9, 83-98.
- Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (2000). Concept and theory of organization-public relationships. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Relationship Management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Choi, H. C., & Murray, I. (2010). Resident attitudes toward sustainable community tourism.

Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 18, 575-594.

Edwards, H. H. (2006). A rhetorical typology for studying the audience role in public

relations communication: The Avon 3-day disruption as exemplar. *Journal of*

Communication, 56, 836-860.

Fall, L. T. (2002). Examining the economic value of publicity and promotional activities

among state tourism communication programs. *Journal of promotion management, 8*,

35-45.

Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., & Kreps, G. L. (2000). *Investigating communication: An*

introduction to research methods (2nd Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gil, S. M. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2008). Understanding the museum image formation process: A

comparison of residents and tourists. *Journal of Travel Research, 47*, 480-493.

Grunig, J. E. (1968). The role of information in economic decision making. *Journalism*

Monographs, No.3.

Grunig, J. E. (1989). Publics, audiences and market segments: Segmentation principles for

campaigns. In C. T. Salmon (Ed.), *Information campaigns: Balancing social values and*

social change (pp. 199-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grunig, J. E. (1993). Image and substance: From symbolic to behavioral relationships. *Public*

Relations Review, 19, 121-139.

Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: conceptual history, recent challenges and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacManus & D. Vercic (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp.3-49). International Thomson Business Press.

Grunig, L. A., Grunig, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E. & Huang, Y-H. (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: A relational approach to public relations* (pp. 23-53). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E., & Hung, C. F. (2002). *The effect of relationships on reputation and reputation on relationships: A cognitive, behavioral study*. Paper presented at the PRSA Educator's Academy 5th Annual International, Interdisciplinary Public Relations Research Conference, Miami, Florida.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Grunig, J. E., & Repper, F. C. (1992). Strategic management, publics, and issues. In J. E.

- Grunig (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 31-64). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gunn, C. A. (1994). *Tourism planning: Basic, concepts, cases* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.
- Hamilton, P. K. (1992). Grunig's Situational Theory: A replication, application, and extension. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 4, 123-149.
- Harrison, J. (1997). Museum and tourist expectations. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 23-40.
- Hay, R. (1998). Sense of place in development context. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 18, 5-29.
- Hammitt, W. E., Backlund, E. A., & Bixler, R. D. (2004). Experience use history, place bonding and resource substitution of trout anglers during recreation engagements. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36, 356-378.
- Hammitt, W. E., & McDonald, C. (1983). Past on-site experience and its relationship to managing river recreation resources. *Forest Science*, 29, 262-266.
- Heath, R. L. (2006). A rhetorical theory approach to tissues management. In C. H. Botan & V. Hazleton (Eds.), *Public relations theory II* (pp. 63-99). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hon, L.C., & Brunner, B. (2002). Measuring public relationships among students and

- administrators at the University of Florida. *Journal of Communication Management*, 6, 227-238.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.
- Huang, Y. H. (2001). OPRA: A cross-situational, multiple-item scale for measuring organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13, 61-90.
- Hung, C. F. J. (2002). *The interplays of relationship types, relationship cultivation, and relationship outcomes: How multinational and Taiwanese companies practice public relations and organization-public relationship management in China*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Hung, C.-J. F. (2005). Exploring types of organizational-public relationships and their implications for relationship management in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 17, 393-426.
- Hughes, H. L. (1998). Theatre in London and the inter-relationship with tourism. *Tourism Management*, 19, 445-522.
- Jo, S. (2006). Measurement of organization-public relationships: validation of measurement using a manufacturer relationship. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 18, 225-248.
- Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Host resident perceptions of tourism in a transitional rural economy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 629-642.

Karp, I., Kreamer, C. M., & Lavine, S. D. (1992). *Museums and communities: The politics of public culture*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institute.

Kelley, H. H. and Thibaut, J. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York, NY: Wiley.

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

Kids in museums campaign. (April, 2011). GUARDIAN News. Retrieved on June 16, 2011 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/travel/kidsinmuseumscampaign>

Kim, J. N., & Grunig, J. (2011). Problem solving and communicative action: A situational theory of problem solving. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 120-149.

Kim, J-N., & Ni, L. (in press). Integrating formative and evaluative research in two types of public relations problems: A review of research programs within the behavioral, strategic management paradigm. *Journal of Public Relations Research*.

Kim, J-N & Ni, L. (2010). Seeing the forest through the trees: The behavioral, strategic management paradigm in public relations and its future. In R. L. Heath (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Public Relations* (pp. 35-59). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, J-N., Ni, L., & Sha, B-L. (2008). Breaking down the stakeholder environment: explicating approaches to the segmentation of publics for public relations research. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85, 751-768.

- Kleiner, F. S. & Tansey, R. G. (1996). The birth of art. In F. S. Kleiner, C. J. Mamiya, & R. G. Tansey (Eds.), *Gardner's art through the ages* (pp. 26). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace College.
- Korpela, K. M., Hartig, T., Kaiser, F. G., & Fuhrer, U. (2001). Restorative experience and self-regulation in favorite places. *Environmental Behavior*, 33, 572-589.
- Kotler, N. & Kotler, P. (2001). Can museum be all things to all people? Missions, goals, and marketing role. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 18, 271-281.
- Lai, Y-Y. (2007). *Creative performance of the National Palace Museum* (Research Report No. 1). Retrieved on November 11, 2010, from National Taiwan University of Arts website: [www.ntua.edu.tw/~culture/word/Old is New- the creative agenda.pdf](http://www.ntua.edu.tw/~culture/word/Old%20is%20New-the%20creative%20agenda.pdf)
- Lai, Y- Y. (2007). *The museum without walls: Tourism and the National Palace Museum* (Research Report No. 2). Retrieved on November 11, 2010, from National Taiwan University of Arts website : www.ntua.edu.tw/~culture/word/0811Walls.pdf
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management and public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship. *Public Relations Review*, 24, 55-56.
- Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (2001). Community relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 527-534). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Library of Congress (2000). *American Memory*. Retrieved on December. 15, 2010, from <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/>

- Lindenmann, W. K. (2006). *Public relations research for planning and evaluation* (Research Report No. 1). Retrieved on January 20, 2011, from the Institute of Public Relations website: http://www.instituteforpr.org/files/uploads/2006_Planning_Eval.pdf
- Loomis, R. J. (1987). *Museum visitor evaluation: New tool for management*. Nashville, TN: AASLH.
- Mclean, F. (1997). *Marketing the museum*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mesch, G. S., & Manor, G. (1998). Social ties, environmental perception and local attachment. *Environmental and Behavior, 30*, 504-519.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the side-best theory of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*, 372-378.
- Milligan, M. J. (1998). International past and potential: The social construction of place attachment. *Symbolic Interaction, 21*, 1-33.
- Moore, R. L., & Graefe, A. R. (1994). Attachments to recreation settings: The case of rail-trail users. *Leisure Science, 16*, 17-31.
- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G., & Deshpande, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of marketing research: The dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research, 29*, 314-329.
- National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, The impact of learning as a family: A model for the 21st century (2006). Report of the NIACE *The impact of learning as a*

family: A model for the 21th century. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from

<http://www.aam-us.org/aboutmuseums/publicinterest.cfm>

National Palace Museum (2007). *Annual Report 2007*. Retrieved on November, 22, 2010,

from National Palace Museum official website:

www.npm.gov.tw/UserFiles/File/zh-tw/335000000E-I52-113.pdf.

Ni, L., & Kim, J-N. (2008). Classifying publics: Communication behaviors and

problem-solving characteristics in controversial issues. *International Journal of*

Strategic Communication, 3, 217-241.

Ni, L. & Wang, Q. (in press). Anxiety and uncertainty management in an intercultural setting:

The impact on organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*.

Pearce, P. L., Farrell, B. H. & Klitzke, L. (1980). Tourism's human conflicts: Towards a

more psychological approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 7, 122-126.

Petrick, J. F. (2002). Experience use history as a segmentation tool to examine golf travellers'

satisfaction, perceived value and repurchase intentions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*,

8,332-342.

Proshansky, H. M., Fabian, A. K. & Kaminoff, R. (1983). Place identity: The physical world

and socialization of the self. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 57-83.

Rossi, P. H. & Freeman, H. W. (1993). *Evaluation: A systematic approach*. Newbury Park,

CA: Sage Publications.

- Schreyer, R. S., Lime, D. W., & Williams, D. R. (1984). Characterizing the influence of past experience on recreation behavior. *Journal of Leisure Research, 16*, 34-50.
- Sha, B-L. (2006). Cultural identity in the segmentation of publics: An emerging theory of intercultural public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 18*. 45-65.
- Shelby, B., & Vaske, J. J. (1991). Resource and activity substitutes for recreational salmon fishing in New Zealand, *Leisure Sciences, 13*, 21-32.
- Sheldon, P. J., & Abenoja, T. (2001). Resident attitudes in a mature destination: The case of Wakiki. *Tourism Management, 22*, 435-443.
- Shinew, K. J. (1993). *The attractiveness and effectiveness of organizational reward options*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Clemson University, Clemson, SC.
- Slater, M. D., Chipman, H., Auld, G., Keefe, T., & Kendall, P. (1992). Information processing and situational theory: A cognitive response analysis. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 4*, 189-203.
- Sriramesh, K., Moghan ,S., & Wei, L-K. (2007). The situational theory of publics in a different cultural setting: Consumer publics in Singapore. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 19*, 307-332.
- Sttaford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender, and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8*, 217-242.

- Stokols, D., & Shumaker, S. A. (1981). People and places: A transactional view of settings. In J. Harvey (Ed.), *Cognition, social behavior, and the environment* (pp. 441-488). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Taiwan Tourism Bureau (2005). *Report of the TTB Taipei City*. Retrieved June 30, 2011, from http://www.go2taiwan.net/monthly_selection.php?sqno=1
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Tindall, N., & Vardeman, J. (August, 2008). *Identity, culture, and heart disease communication*. Paper presented in the Commission on the Status of Women Division at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, IL.
- Tkalac, A. (2006). The application of situational theory in Croatia. In E. L. Toth (Ed.), *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management: Challenges for the next generation* (pp. 527-543). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tsapatori, M. (2003). *ORION research roadmap evaluation and assessment* (Object Rich Information Network Report No. 8). Retrieved on June 16, 2011 from <http://www.orion-net.org/Admin/Libraryloc/file28.pdf>.
- Vijver, F. J. R. van de, & Leung, K. (2001). Personality in cultural context: Methodological issues. *Journal of Personality*, 69, 1007-1031.
- Virden, R. J. (1992). Integrating past experience into leisure marketing strategies. *Leisure Information Quarterly*, 16, 6-8.

- Williams, D. R., Patterson, M. E. (1996). Environmental meaning and ecosystem management: Perspective from environmental psychology and human geography. *Society and Natural Resources*, 9, 507-521.
- Williams, D. R., Patterson, M. E., Roggenbuck, J. W., & Watson, A. E. (1992). Beyond the commodity metaphor. Examining emotional and symbolic attachment to leisure. *Leisure Sciences*, 14, 29-46.
- Williams, D. R., Schreyer, R., & Knoop, R. C. (1990). The effect of the experience use history on the multidimensional structure of motivations to participate in leisure activities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 23, 36-54.
- Williams, D. R. & Vaske, J. J. (2003). The measurement of place attachment: Validity and generalizability of a psychometric approach. *Forest Science*, 49, 830-840.
- Wojciehowski, R., Walczak, K., White, M., & Cellary, W. (2004). *Building virtual and augmented reality museum exhibitions* (Research Report of The Poznan University & University of Sussex). Retrieved on June 11, 2011, from <http://ar.netminer.org/viewpub.do?pid=648091>
- Yang, S-U. (2007). An integrated model for organization-public relational outcomes, organizational reputation, and their antecedents. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 19, 91-121.

Appendix A: Informed Consent Form
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

PROJECT TITLE:

The emperor's treasure without the walls: An analysis of relationship management with strategic publics for the National Palace Museum in Taiwan

You are being invited to participate in a research project conducted by the investigator, Yu-han Huang, from the School of Communication at the University of Houston, which is under the instruction of the Assistant Professor Dr. Lan Ni. This project has been reviewed by the University of Houston Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (713)-743-9204.

NON-PARTICIPATION STATEMENT

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You may also refuse to answer any question.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study has two purposes. First, it aims to improve our understanding of how the new trend—museum digitalization—is likely to be effective in changing the public types and creating more positive relationship outcomes. Second, it examines the applicability of the two theories to a foreign cultural background to see if they help produce a more accurate public analysis.

PROCEDURES

You will be one of approximately 200 subjects to be asked to participate in this project. This questionnaire is designed to assess some of your general feelings about the young people's interests in the exhibitions related to the Chinese culture in the National Palace Museum and your overall relationship with the organization according to your previous visitation experience/ online campaign visitation experience. You will need to respond to a survey questionnaire, which will take approximately 40 minutes via a web-based survey.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your participation in this project is anonymous. The project will not ask any personal information in the survey.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS

Because this survey is anonymous and participants will not be identified by name, this project

presents no foreseeable risk to participants. Participants will be told that their participation is voluntary and that they can decline to answer specific questions or to end their participation at any time without penalty.

BENEFITS

While you will not directly benefit from participation, your participation may help investigators better understand how people change their communication behaviors and attitude after the museum digitalization campaign, which helps examine the feasibility of situational theory of publics and Relationship Management Theory in Taiwan. Also, this research provides the museum public relations practitioners a useful criterion to determine whether the new technology campaign can effectively add value to the communication strategy to attract their target visitors.

ALTERNATIVES

Participation in this project is voluntary and the only alternative to this project is non-participation.

INCENTIVES/REMUNERATION

The participants will have chances to get \$10 prizes as rewards for participation; if you would like to participate in the drawing, please leave your contact information after completing the online survey.

PUBLICATION STATEMENT

The results of this study may be published in professional and/or scientific journals. It may also be used for educational purposes or for professional presentations. However, no individual subject will be identified.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS REGARDING THIS PROJECT. PLEASE CONTACT Yu-han Huang at yhuang3@mail.uh.edu. You may also contact Lan Ni, faculty sponsor, at 713-743-1872 or lni@uh.edu. IF YOU AGREE WITH THE CONSENT FORM, PLEASE MOVE ON TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING YOUR RIGHTS AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT MAY BE ADDRESSED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS (713-743-9204).

Principal Investigator's Name: Yu-han Huang

Signature of Principal Investigator: _____

IF YOU AGREE WITH THE CONSENT FORM, PLEASE MOVE ON TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

Appendix B: Questionnaire 1 (Control Group)

Questionnaire 1

The National Palace Museum (NPM) is ranked as the 11th must-see museum in the world. The collection of cultural artifacts held by the National Palace Museum is composed of precious objects inherited from the previous Sung, Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties. The entire collection covers 5,000 years of Chinese historical and artistic achievements. I'd like to know a little bit about your perception of the National Palace Museum (NPM).

PART I.

The first part of this questionnaire is designed to gather general demographic information. Please check ONE answer choice for each question.

1. Gender:

- Female
- Male

2. Age:

What is your age? _____

3. How do you get to the NPM?

- By private vehicles
- By mass transportation (e.g.: taxi, subway, bus or the NPM shuttle bus)

4. How long would it take you to go from your home to the NPM by the transportation you chose above?

- Within 15 min
- 15 to 30 min
- Over 30 min

If you are aged 18 to 30 and are willing to participate the survey, please move on to the next page.

INTRODUCTION:

Research shows that since the 1980's, the NPM has been the type of place that students visit once in elementary school, but seldom voluntarily return to. In 2007 survey, there were 2,650,551 visitors in total from January to December. However, among the 2,076,791 visitors who were local residents, only about 5% were visitors aged from 18 to 30 (National Palace Annual Report, 2007). This survey aims to find out your perceptions about the young people's (local residents aged from 18 to 30) level of interest in the exhibition related to Chinese culture (ERCC) in the NPM.

PART II

The second part of this questionnaire is designed to assess some of your general feelings about the young people's interests in the exhibitions related to the Chinese culture in the National Palace Museum. There are no right or wrong answers. You are asked to circle ONE answer choice for each question.

1. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest is important to you personally?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

2. To what extent do you believe that you have the ability to change the situation about the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

3. I am confident about my knowledge about the situation of the young people's level of interest.

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

4. To what extent would you say that the problem of the young people's level of interest is more difficult for you to understand than other problems?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

5. To what extent do you consider the young people's level of interest is a serious problem?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

6. In your mind, how much of a connection do you see between yourself and the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

7. How strongly do you feel that something needs to be done to improve the situation for the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

8. How often do you stop to think about the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

9. To what extent do you think that the current situation regarding the young people's level of interest differs from your expectations about the problem?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

10. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest is a problem that you can personally do something about?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

11. I strongly support a certain way of solving the problem of the young people's level of interest.

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

12. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest could involve you or someone close to you at some point?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

13. I have a strong preference in terms of how the problem of the young people's level of interest should be solved.

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

PART III

Please fill out the following questions which aim to find out your overall relationship with the organization according to your previous visitation experience. Just as the above questions, give a number ranging from 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree).

1. I'm happy with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

2. Generally, the NPM and I are both satisfied with the decision-making process.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

3. Both the NPM and I agree on what we can expect from one another.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

4. Members of the NPM administration are truthful with me.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

5. The NPM and I are attentive to what each other says.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

6. I wish I had never entered into the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

7. I believe that it is worthwhile to try to maintain the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

8. The management of the NPM gives people like me enough say in the decision-making process.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

9. The NPM and I are cooperative with each other.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

10. The NPM treats me fairly and justly, compared to other similar organizations.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

11. The NPM keeps its promises.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

12. Generally speaking, the NPM meets my needs.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

13. In general, I'm satisfied with the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

14. I do not wish to continue a relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

15. Generally speaking, my relationship with the NPM has no problems.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

16. I am confident that the NPM has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

17. I wish to keep a long-lasting relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

18. In most cases, during decision making the NPM and I have equal influence.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

19. I value my experience as a visitor at the ERCC in the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

PART IV

The last section aims to find out your past experience and future possibility of the ERCC visitation in the NPM. Please check ONE answer choice for each question.

1. Do you have previous experience visiting the ERCC in the NPM in the past two years?

- No
- Yes

2. Based on your visitation experience in the past two years, how important were the purposes below to you when you went to visit the ERCC in the NPM? Please circle ONE answer choice for each purpose.

2-1. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to spend time with friends and family.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

2-2. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to learn new knowledge.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

2-3. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to gain extraordinary experience from cultural collections.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

3. In the past two years, how many other museums did you visit?_____

4. At this moment, are you willing to walk into the NPM for the ERCC?

Yes

No

Thank you for your participation! The participants will have chances to get \$10 prizes as rewards for participation; if you would like to participate in the drawing, please leave your contact information after completing the online survey. All the personal information will be protected.

Name:_____

Email:_____

Appendix C: Questionnaire 2 (Experiment Group)

Questionnaire 2

The National Palace Museum (NPM) is ranked as the 11th must-see museum in the world. The collection of cultural artifacts held by the National Palace Museum is composed of precious objects inherited from the previous Sung, Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties. The entire collection covers 5,000 years of Chinese historical and artistic achievements. I'd like to know a little bit about your perception of the National Palace Museum (NPM).

PART I.

The first part of this questionnaire is designed to gather general demographic information. Please check ONE answer choice for each question.

1. Gender:

- Female
- Male

2. Age:

What is your age? _____

3. How do you get to the NPM?

- By private vehicles
- By mass transportation (e.g.: taxi, subway, bus or the NPM shuttle bus)

4. How long would it take you to go from your home to the NPM by the transportation you chose above?

- Within 15 min
- 15 to 30 min
- Over 30 min

If you are aged 18 to 30 and are willing to participate the survey, please move on to the next page.

INTRODUCTION:

Research shows that since the 1980's, the NPM has been the type of place that students visit once in elementary school, but seldom voluntarily return to. In 2007 survey, there were 2,650,551 visitors in total from January to December. However, among the 2,076,791 visitors who were local residents, only about 5% were visitors aged from 18 to 30 (National Palace Annual Report, 2007).

Hence, since 2007, the NPM implements the “Old is New” strategy and tries to build the brand-new relationship with the local young group by three campaigns. One of them is to transform the ERCC by digitalization and provide access to all Internet users, especially the younger generation aged from 18 to 30.

This survey aims to find out your perceptions about the young people's (local residents aged from 18 to 30) level of interest in the exhibition related to Chinese culture (ERCC) in the NPM.



PART I.

Now, please view the ERCC website—Treasures of the Forbidden City: Palace Imprints of the Ching Dynasty (<http://tech2.npm.edu.tw/dianben/index/intro.html>) and click the section “Craftsmanship and Techniques—the Art and Craft of Bookbinding”. After you complete the visitation, please answer the following questions by choosing ONE answer as your best choice.

1. What do you like the most about the website?

- The webpage graphic design
 - The information display
 - The buffering speed of the website
 - Others_____
2. What do you dislike the most about the website?
- The webpage graphic design
 - The information display
 - The buffering speed of the website
 - Others_____

PART II

After viewing the interactive ERCC website—Treasures of the Forbidden City: Palace Imprints of the Ching Dynasty (<http://tech2.npm.edu.tw/dianben/index/intro.html>), please fill out the following questions which aim to find out your perception about the young people's interests issue after the campaign. Just as the previous questions, give a number ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely).

1. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest is important to you personally?
Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely
2. To what extent do you believe that you have the ability to change the situation about the young people's level of interest?
Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely
3. I am confident about my knowledge about the situation of the young people's level of interest.
Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely
4. To what extent would you say that the problem of the young people's level of interest is more difficult for you to understand than other problems?
Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely
5. To what extent do you consider the young people's level of interest is a serious problem?
Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely
6. In your mind, how much of a connection do you see between yourself and the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

7. How strongly do you feel that something needs to be done to improve the situation for the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

8. How often do you stop to think about the young people's level of interest?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

9. To what extent do you think that the current situation regarding the young people's level of interest differs from your expectations about the problem?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

10. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest is a problem that you can personally do something about?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

11. I strongly support a certain way of solving the problem of the young people's level of interest.

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

12. To what extent do you believe the young people's level of interest could involve you or someone close to you at some point?

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

13. I have a strong preference in terms of how the problem of the young people's level of interest should be solved.

Not at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely

PART III.

After experiencing the ERCC digitalization, please fill out the following questions which aim to find out your overall relationship with the organization after the campaign. Just as the in the previous questions, give a number ranging from 1 (disagree) to 7 (agree) to register your amount of agreement.

1. I'm happy with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

2. Generally, the NPM and I are both satisfied with the decision-making process.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

3. Both the NPM and I agree on what we can expect from one another.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

4. Members of the NPM administration are truthful with me.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

5. The NPM and I are attentive to what each other says.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

6. I wish I had never entered into the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

7. I believe that it is worthwhile to try to maintain the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

8. The management of the NPM gives people like me enough say in the decision-making process.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

9. The NPM and I are cooperative with each other.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

10. The NPM treats me fairly and justly, compared to other similar organizations.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

11. The NPM keeps its promises.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

12. Generally speaking, the NPM meets my needs.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

13. In general, I'm satisfied with the relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

14. I do not wish to continue a relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

15. Generally speaking, my relationship with the NPM has no problems.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

16. I am confident that the NPM has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

17. I wish to keep a long-lasting relationship with the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

18. In most cases, during decision making the NPM and I have equal influence.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

19. I value my experience as a visitor at the ERCC in the NPM.

Disagree 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Agree

PART IV.

The last section aims to find out your perception of future visitation in the NPM after experiencing the digitalization campaign. Please check ONE answer choice for each question.

1. Before doing the survey, do you have previous experience visiting **the interactive ERCC website** in the past two years?

- No
- Yes

2. Do you have previous experience visiting **the ERCC in the NPM** in the past two years?

- No
- Yes

3. After the online visitation experience, how important were the purposes below to you if you plan to visit the ERCC in the NPM? Please circle ONE answer choice for each purpose.

3-1. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to spend time with friends and family.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

3-2. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to learn new knowledge.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

3-3. I visit the ERCC in the NPM to gain extraordinary experience from cultural collections.

Not important at all 1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7 Extremely important

4. After the online visitation experience, are you willing to walk into the NPM for the ERCC now?

Yes

No

Thank you for your participation! The participants will have chances to get \$10 prizes as rewards for participation; if you would like to participate in the drawing, please leave your contact information after completing the online survey. All the personal information will be protected.

Name: _____

Email: _____